

25-6392
No. _____

ORIGINAL

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

DEC 02 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

Christopher Tyler Bray,

Petitioner,

v.

State of Texas,

Respondent.

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the Texas Supreme Court.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Christopher Tyler Bray & the Holy Ghost

Pro se Petitioner

819 Farnham Rd.

Charleston, SC, 29412

737-710-3990

thechristbearer777@gmail.com

The Lord's Anointed

I. Questions Presented

What is the meaning of religion as it concerns the Free Exercise Clause and the Establishment Clause of the 1st Amendment, and what are the implications of such?

How is the court system and entire government supposed to handle, according to their constitutional law, an individual who proffers evidence of his Anointment according to Christian Scripture?

According to compelling interest tests in Free Exercise cases and the solemn oath of the government to serve the better interest of the people, that the people may not understand themselves as is remedied by the mechanisms of a Republic, would it not then be explicitly in the interest of the government to respect the Truth when the Truth has been revealed?

II. Parties to the Proceedings

Petitioner Christopher Tyler Bray and the Holy Ghost were Defendants in the trial court and Appellants before the Courts of Appeal.

Respondents: Mary Ann Espiritu was the judge in the initial trial court; Dimple Malhotra was the judge who signed the order of protection; Jeffrey D. Kyle is the clerk for the Third Court of Appeals; Jose Garza is the District Attorney for Travis County; The Clerk for Travis County is also a respondent.

III. Texas State Court Proceedings

Travis County at Law No. 5, Cause No. C-1-CR-22-501587, State of Texas vs. Christopher Tyler Bray, final judgment entered on January 29, 2025.

Travis County at Law No. 4, Cause No. C-1-CV-24-000994, Alana Stubbs vs. Christopher Bray, order of protection entered on January 30, 2025.

Travis County at Law No. 5, Cause No. C-1-CR-22-501587, State of Texas vs. Christopher Tyler Bray, motion for new trial, filed on 3/3/2025, was denied by operation of law.

Third Court of Appeals of Texas, Cause No. 03-25-00336-CR, Christopher Tyler Bray v. The State of Texas, final judgment entered on 6/20/2025.

Third Court of Appeals of Texas, Cause No. 03-25-00414-CV, Christopher Tyler Bray v. State of Texas, final judgment entered on 7/3/2025.

Texas Supreme Court, Case No. 25-0659, Christopher Tyler Bray v. State of Texas, final judgment entered on 9/5/2025.

IV. Table of Contents

I.	Question Presented	i
II.	Parties to the Proceedings	ii
III.	Texas State Court Proceedings	ii
IV.	Table of Contents	iii
V.	Table of Authorities	v
VI.	Petition for Writ of Certiorari	vii
VII.	Opinions Below	1
VIII.	Jurisdiction	1
IX.	Statutes.....	1
X.	Constitutional Provisions Involved	1
XI.	Statement of the Case	2
	1. Court Proceedings	3
	2. Denied Evidence Injury	3
	3. Appeal Proceedings	3
XII.	REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	
	A. This Court should grant review to define Religion, the Most Debated and fought over meaning in U.S. Law, pertaining to the Establishment Clause, Free Exercise Clause, and the Separation of Church and State, all granted by the 1st Amendment of the U.S. Constitution	4

B.	This Court should grant review to direct the government on how to humble itself before both Almighty God and the U.S. Constitution when the Creator has clearly chosen one	9
C.	This Court should grant review to help this Court and the lower courts, all comprising the government, better define and implement compelling interest tests and show the one true standard to such tests	18
XIII.	CONCLUSION	20
XIV.	APPENDIX	22

V. Table of Authorities

Cases

<i>Church of the Holy Trinity v. United States</i> , 143 U.S. 457 (1892)	7
<i>City of Boerne v. Flores</i> , 521 U.S. 507 (1997)	15, 19
<i>District of Columbia v. Heller</i> , 554 U.S., at 634-635 (2008)	8
<i>Employment Division, Department of Human Resources of Oregon v. Smith</i> , 494 U.S. 872 (1990)	19, 20
<i>Gonzales v. O Centro Espírita Beneficente União do Vegetal</i> , 546 U.S. 418 (2006) ...	19
<i>Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church and School v. EEOC</i> , 565 U.S. 171 (2012)	17
<i>Regina v. Wagstaff</i> (10 Cox Crim.Cases, 531)	16
<i>Reynolds v. United States</i> , 98 U.S. 145 (1878)	8, 15
<i>Sherbert v. Verner</i> , 374 U.S. 398 (1963)	19
<i>Wisconsin v. Yoder</i> , 406 U.S. 205 (1972)	19

Statutes

Religious Freedom Act of 1993, 42 U.S. Code § 2000bb-1 - Free exercise of religion protected	14, 19
Texas Rules of Evidence 404(a)	3, 13, 14
42 U.S. Code § 9601(1)	14, 15
82. A Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom, 18 June 1779	8

Constitutional Provisions

State of Texas Constitution, Preamble	2, 13
---	-------

State of Texas Constitution, Article I, Section 1	1, 13
State of Texas Constitution, Article I, Section 5	1, 13
State of Texas Constitution, Article I, Section 6	2, 13, 14
United States Constitution, Amendment I	2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 19, 20
United States Constitution, Amendment V	2, 17
United States Constitution, Amendment VI	3
United States Constitution, Amendment XIV	2, 17

Miscellaneous

The Declaration of Independence (U.S. 1776)	9
<i>The Mayflower Compact</i> (1620)	7
William Blackstone, <i>Commentaries on English Law</i> (1765 - 1769)	12, 13
James Madison, <i>A Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments</i> (June 20, 1785)	11
Saint Thomas Aquinas, <i>Summa Theologica</i> (1274)	5
Chief Justice John Jay, <i>A Letter to John Murray</i> (October 12, 1816)	6
Benjamin Franklin, <i>Franklin's Epitaph</i> (1728)	18
Benjamin Franklin, <i>A Letter to Ezra Stiles, president of Yale College</i> (March 1784) ..	6
Justice Joseph Story, <i>Life and Letters of Joseph Story</i> , Volume II, Page 8 (1851)	6
Thomas Jefferson, <i>Letter to Danbury Baptist Association</i> (1802)	10

VI. Petition for Writ of Certiorari

I, Christopher Tyler Bray, the petitioner in the form of pro se, respectfully petition for a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the Texas Supreme Court, but also to place the correct judgment over all of mankind. This shall place the Truth upon and above U.S. law fulfilling Divine Providence in this land. This is also my religious duty after much suffering that ought to be respected for the sake of Salvation.

VII. Opinions Below

The opinion of the Texas Supreme Court concerning the Petition for Review on a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus is included in (App. 1a). The opinion of the Third Court of Appeals concerning the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus is included in (App. 2a). The opinion of the Third Court of Appeals concerning the Notice of Appeal is included in (App. 3a). For the Motion for New Trial, there was no opinion issued as it was automatically denied due to the operation of law.

VIII. Jurisdiction

The judgment of Court #5 at law in Travis County for a new trial was denied by operation of law. The judgment of the Third Court of Appeals, pertaining to appealing the denial for a new trial, was entered on 6/20/2025. The Third Court of Appeal's judgment for a Petition of Writ of Habeas Corpus was entered on 7/3/2025. The Texas Supreme Court's judgment for a Petition for Review, which was filed as a Petition for Writ of Mandamus by the Clerk, in relation to the denied Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, was denied and entered on 9/5/2025. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S. Code § 1257(a).

IX. Statutes

The relevant portions of the statutes used: Religious Freedom Act of 1993, 42 U.S. Code § 2000bb-1; Texas Rules of Evidence 404(a); 42 U.S. Code § 9601(1); 82. A Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom, are reproduced in (App. 11a).

X. Constitutional Provisions Involved

The relevant portions of the Constitutional provisions involved: Texas Constitution Preamble; Texas Constitution Article I Section 1; Texas Constitution Article I Section 5; Texas Constitution Article I Section 6; U.S. Constitution 1st Amendment; U.S. Constitution 5th

Amendment; U.S. Constitution 6th Amendment; U.S. Constitution 14th Amendment, are reproduced in (App. 13a).

XI. Statement of the Case

What is now known as the United States was first settled to avoid religious persecution after the Church of England had let its newfound autonomy from the Roman Catholic Church lead it into corruption. In 1620, the Pilgrims made a compact vowing to spread Christendom throughout the new world. Following, mankind spent much time and many minds theorizing a new form of government, and the 1st Amendment was established with all intent to keep government out of churches and from churches using government to subjugate other churches. This Court has set precedent that this is a Christian country, but we still don't have what I'll call the missing piece, or better yet cornerstone that connects all the dots to give modern man, those willing to believe, the Truth.

This case presents the questions of the meaning of religion and what doctrine it is anchored by according to the 1st Amendment, how a government under said 1st Amendment shall handle one of Almighty God's when he has physical evidence of his testimony, and what the true compelling interest test is and the truthful answer to such.

Furthermore, the case that gave grounds to this petition is the third time I've been falsely accused by a woman in the legal system, and I know this is God opening the door to deliver me into the right hearts and minds. I will say I've struggled and been made an outcast doing no malicious wrong, but struggling, and through this struggling, I've learned true mercy and grace. All in my past aside from God's Works, whether others may deem it as good or bad, is accounted as dung. There is no other joy or fulfillment absent from Christ. And I've been prepared to humbly address this Court and allow Christ to be elucidated.

1. Court Proceedings

Said false accusation stated that the supposed incident happened on 8/18/2022. The charge of Indecent Assault was formally filed on 11/08/2022, and an arrest warrant was issued. The jury role call took place on 1/26/2025, and the first day of the trial was on 1/27/2025, Chief Justice Robert's 70th birthday, and the second day of the jury trial was on 1/28/2025, Justice Barrett's 53rd birthday. The third, and concluding day of the jury trial, was on 1/29/2025. As a result of false conviction, I signed an order of protection, lasting 20 years, on 1/30/2025.

2. Denied Evidence Injury

I had requested many times and in many different ways of communication for my trial counsel to allow me to use the presentation of my testimony, yet she, Jessica Bernstein, Bar Number: 24071342, denied my requests, citing the Texas Rules of Evidence 404(a). Not being able to submit and exhibit the presentation of my testimony was an infringement on my 6th Amendment right under 'right to counsel.' However, she did nothing ethically wrong, because it was never her shot to call, and God ensured this to allow me to address this Court. I further tried to submit the evidence to higher courts in the appeal process, but never got to present it as is my religious duty. Yet, what I now call the *Manifestum Christi* has always been intended for this Court, and by making no official opinion on the presentation, they have avoided blaspheming the Holy Ghost and given the responsibility of receiving God the Father's Announcement to the appropriate party.

3. Appeal Proceedings

My right to appeal was waived on 1/29/2025, and a Motion for New Trial was filed in the original trial court on 3/1/2025 and accepted by the clerk on 3/3/2025. Upon the operation of law, said motion was rejected. A notice of appeal for said rejected motion was filed on 5/12/2025. A

Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, addressing constitutional infringements, was filed on 6/12/2025. The notice of appeal was denied by the Third Court of Appeals on 6/20/2025. The Third Court of Appeals denied the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus on 7/3/2025. The Petition for Review was filed on 7/30/2025. The Texas Supreme Court denied the Petition for Review, which they had named a Petition for Writ of Mandamus, on 9/5/2025.

XII. REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

A. This Court should grant review to define religion, the Most Debated and fought over meaning in U.S. Law, pertaining to the Establishment Clause, Free Exercise Clause, and the Separation of Church and State, all granted by the 1st Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

Now, one could argue that religion pertains only to a natural law as defined by mankind, but this cannot be, since the Bill of Rights were established as unalienable rights given by what the people deemed were natural laws, since a natural law, that mankind's government can apply under its authority, cannot be purely theoretical and must be able to be applied, else how is it natural and fair in the sense if mankind cannot conform to it and would be punished by the government for such? John Locke, who may be the most influential political theorist who influenced the Jurisprudence of this country, utilized natural law to provide mutual security and to propose the concept of unalienable rights that were either derived from nature or God but not by Government decree, and even he referenced the existence of the Creator. Now, concerning unalienable rights that are derived from God, the government can't recognize such or have invoked such on its own authority, else it is establishing a religion, and so the Bill of Rights comprised the natural laws that early Americans agreed on, but even this foundation cannot have authority over religion.

The concept of natural law, relative to Western political theory, was uniformized by Thomas Aquinas in *Summa Theologica* (1274). In his concept of natural law, there are: Lex Eterna, Lex Naturalis, Lex Divina, and Lex Humana. The categories I'm concerned with are Lex Divina, which is Divine Law according to the Law provided by the Scripture, which is what one may call the 'Red Letters' in the Holy Bible, and Lex Eterna, which is the immutable Divine Knowledge, which is delivered to mankind by the Holy Ghost. It is understood that the combination of the Establishment Clause and Free Exercise Clause prohibits the government from claiming to have any authority over such, else they would be establishing, or endorsing, a religion in opposition to such. And so religion cannot be defined in the context of natural law inasmuch as the government can have authority over it, and the government must respect and honor it when the Truth has been revealed. Also, it is evident that man can establish a natural law that references religion and the unalienable right for an individual to exist according to their religion, but in no way has this exclusively defined what religion is, though it has given many examples of such by using the concept of conscience in relation to religion. A simple example of this, which is already God-given, is the individual deciding to abide by what's written in Scripture or what someone who is a self-proclaimed pastor is saying that is counter to such, to rely on their understanding, or withhold judgment and have the Holy Ghost provide.

Let's also think about clouds and rain. Rain is evidence that clouds exist and that, if it's raining, there's at least a cloud overhead. Rain comes from clouds, but the act of it raining isn't necessary for a cloud to be a cloud, since not all clouds cause it to rain at any given moment. Clouds can cause it to rain, but rain is not necessary for it to be a cloud. But if you recognize rain, you are recognizing the existence of a cloud or clouds, even if the rainwater has collected and clouds are nowhere to be seen overhead. Natural laws, according to man's understanding, are

conceptual rain that comes from the clouds, but one must discern how the rain was incubated afterward. If rain sits in a swampy area, mosquitoes and bacteria are made plentiful. If rain is collected and then purified and treated by human methods, it's stripped of much needed minerals and bacteria needed to support a healthy immune system, and so we can recognize that the one natural law that is universal to all living organisms in Creation is that water is needed, and so this is universally applicable and according to reality, man taking it and using it to their ends isn't pure in the natural sense. And so religion cannot truly apply in the context of what mankind deems as natural laws, and this leaves us with the unanswered question of what religion means according to the 1st Amendment?

“Providence has given to our people the choice of their rulers, and it is the duty as well as the privilege and interest of our Christian nation, to select and prefer Christians for their rulers.”

Chief Justice John Jay, *A Letter to John Murray*

“As to Jesus of Nazareth, my opinion of whom you particularly desire, I think the system of morals and His religion as He left them to us, the best the world ever saw or is likely to see.”

Benjamin Franklin, *A Letter to Ezra Stiles*

“One of the beautiful boasts of our municipal jurisprudence is that Christianity is a part of the Common Law. There never has been a period in which the Common Law did not recognize Christianity as lying at its foundations.”

Justice Joseph Story, *Life and Letters of Joseph Story*

The combination of these quotes from some of the most influential men in American history gives enough reason for this Court to grant this petition in order to answer what religion is in this country and to edify that this is a Christian nation, but we will continue.

In *Church of the Holy Trinity v. United States*, 143 U.S. 457 (1892), Justice Brewer wrote in the Court opinion, "This is a religious people. This is historically true. From the discovery of this continent to the present hour, there is a single voice making this affirmation..." One can simply look at the name of the case and readily recognize the original intention of this Court with respect to religion. Religion, in this country and the Bill of Rights, is referenced according to the Doctrine of Christianity. In 1620, the *Mayflower Compact* stated: "Having undertaken for the Glory of God, and advancement of the Christian faith... a voyage to plant the first colony in the northern parts of Virginia..." This, as the historical context, shows the original intention of settling this land, considering the principle of discovery in terms to who had dominion over the New World, was to spread Christendom, and the reasoning that the Establishment Clause was established is to keep the government out of Church affairs, but not the Church out of government, because the Church comprises individuals and groups who all share a common set of beliefs known as Christian Doctrine, and this is not to be made separate from this life we live.

"Well aware that the opinions and belief of men depend not on their own will, but follow involuntarily the evidence proposed to their minds; that Almighty God hath created the mind free, and manifested his supreme will that free it shall remain by making it altogether insusceptible of restraint; that all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments, or burthens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and are a departure from the plan of the holy author of our religion, who being lord both of body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by

coercions on either, as was in his Almighty power to do, but to extend it by its influence on reason alone; that the impious presumption of legislators and rulers, civil as well as ecclesiastical, who, being themselves but fallible and uninspired men, have assumed dominion over the faith of others, setting up their own opinions and modes of thinking as the only true and infallible, and as such endeavoring to impose them on others, hath established and maintained false religions over the greatest part of the world and through all time."

82. *A Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom, 18 June 1779*

These words of Thomas Jefferson were later referenced, unanimously, by the U.S. Supreme Court, in *Reynolds v. United States*, 98 U.S. 145 (1878), as the Statute that "defined" religious freedom. Now, not only did the Court affirm that religion, according to Constitutional law, is based on Christian Doctrine, but Jefferson also showed this was the intent of the founders and people at the time of establishing the 1st Amendment, and what I deem, according to Christianity, are all the clauses comprising it that protect Religious Freedom. I must finish this reference with the one inherent flaw, which is that Jefferson was a deist and supposedly didn't believe in miracles, but reasoned to himself that all things, according to God, have to be able to be justified based on man's reason. Though what I've offered through the entirety of my testimony is Reason, he is wrong in trying to define the Nature of God, along with deism, in both the arena of reason and the existence of miracles, yet the believers, though not on their own, made sure that even the founders had no authority to stray this country ultimately away from God.

"Constitutional rights are enshrined with the scope they were understood to have when the people adopted them." - *District of Columbia v. Heller*, 554. U.S., at 634-635 (2008). At the

time of establishing the Establishment Clause and Free Exercise Clause, the historical scope clearly referred to an idea of a Supreme Being. Still, I must say, humbly, before Almighty God, that the scope can only be determined by God Himself, for God is Infinite and all that is infinite is under Him, and the founders admitted to this. By prohibiting man's government from imposing dogma, of its own doing, they were admitting that God would, as He always does, reveal Himself without the concern of the opinions and laws of mankind at any given time, though predestined for those who inquire into Him. This is inherently implied, since mankind needs no assistance in committing and living in Original Sin. Furthermore, we see that God always started with one man to fulfill His Will rather than the masses, for God isn't concerned with the opinions of others, and a ruler is only honest by their humility, else they are nothing more than a tyrant. When the Spirit speaks through the few men given authorship of the Scripture, the Lord is telling one to gird his loins and measure up to the Calling through the One Book that makes Life Everlasting come to fruition.

B. This Court should grant review to direct the government on how to humble itself before both Almighty God and the U.S. Constitution when the Creator has clearly chosen one.

“When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.”

Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776.

According to this founding document of the United States of America, which was primarily written by Thomas Jefferson, there are events throughout humanity that lead a people, or an individual, to dissolve political bands due to what the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them to do. And that the only thing people, or an individual, owes the other party is a declaration of the causes to compel such a separation. Jefferson also stated, in a letter to the *Danbury Baptist Association* in 1802, that the 1st Amendment erected, "a wall of separation between church and State." Now, the beauty of my *Manifestum Christi*, which has been declared by Almighty God, is that it can be claimed diplomatically throughout the framework of the U.S law that may leave one wondering how, in the Course of human events, did all this converge to the Truth and the Independence one must declare in opposition to the world. And that the state shall not tell the Church what to do. Before we move on, I'd like to point out the wording 'Nature's God,' and elucidate that an Originator of all Authority is mentioned, who is the God of Nature, and would it be too bold to declare that my presentation/evidence reveals the Truth of Nature's God? Or would it be a gross injustice for me to withdraw? Sounding like a fool and a crazy man in the world, I admit I don't believe I've ever had a choice on this matter. We all desire to be guided by something, and it seems beyond valuable in every man's life, if it happens, to come to terms with their Creator, and isn't it humbling to see the very ones who helped establish worldly liberty, because once Christ had come True Liberty had been granted, debate through so many facets of philosophy all to fall short and to have Almighty God reveal Himself for the sake of all the children who belong to His Kingdom?

"Because we hold it for a fundamental and undeniable truth, 'that Religion or the duty which we owe to our Creator and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence.' The Religion then of every man must be

left to the conviction and conscience of every man; and it is the right of every man to exercise it as these may dictate. This right is in its nature an unalienable right. It is unalienable, because the opinions of men, depending only on the evidence contemplated by their own minds cannot follow the dictates of other men: It is unalienable also, because what is here a right towards men, is a duty towards the Creator. It is the duty of every man to render to the Creator such homage and such only as he believes to be acceptable to him. This duty is precedent, both in order of time and in degree of obligation, to the claims of Civil Society. Before any man can be considered as a member of Civil Society, he must be considered as a subject of the Governour of the Universe: And if a member of Civil Society, who enters into any subordinate Association, must always do it with a reservation of his duty to the General Authority; much more must every man who becomes a member of any particular Civil Society, do it with a saving of his allegiance to the Universal Sovereign. We maintain therefore that in matters of Religion, no man's right is abridged by the institution of Civil Society and that Religion is wholly exempt from its cognizance."

James Madison, *Memorial and Remonstrance*.

In this writing, James Madison asserted that it is up to the individual, based on reason and personal conviction, to fulfill the duty one has to all our Creator, and this shall not be done by force or coercion from the government or any worldly authority. Now, what happens when a man proffers rationality, evidence, and conviction of God's Hand that when one studies the Scripture, realizes these events had already been prophesied and with not just the conviction of his soul but with evidence proves his duty is to God and not man? What about when it has been announced as an individual's duty to the Creator to address their worldly government and to

announce the Truth? This is my Unalienable Right that the U.S. Constitution protects, and such is not dependent on interpretation, nor shall any authority of Society or the State burden the fulfillment of my Duty to my Creator.

“Further, in 1824, we find it held that ‘proceedings in our Courts are founded upon the law of England, and that law is again founded upon the law of nature and the revealed law of God. If the right sought to be enforced is inconsistent with either of these, the English municipal courts cannot recognize it.’”

William Blackstone, *Commentaries on the English Law*.

According to Sir William Blackstone, English law, the law that American Jurisprudence relies on for both reference and foundation, is subordinate to the “law of nature” and the “revealed law of God.” This means that human laws, those that are created by the legislative bodies comprising the federal and state governments, cannot infringe on the authorities mentioned. Yet, the government has given itself authority to do so in what it evidently claims are exceptions by claiming what is ‘good’ for the general public, but this, itself, is playing god if the government denies God’s involvement when it happens, and in no way honors the Separation of Church and State, and the only viable argument that one may use to support the clumsy use of human reason to determine what is truly good, distinct from Christ though nothing is hidden from the Light, is that courts can claim the possibility that the proponent of religion is not of Divine Origin, and if it originates with man and not God, then it falls under human law and is subject to governmental regulation. But when a man can provide reasonable evidence of the Truth of his Religion, then the government must humble itself and honor the Foundation of its own law by granting this petition.

“Man, considered as a creature, must necessarily be subject to the laws of his creator, for he is entirely a dependent being...This law of nature, being co-eval with mankind and dictated by God himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other. It is binding over all the globe, in all countries, and at all times: no human laws are of any validity if contrary to this; and such of them as are valid derive all their force and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original.”

William Blackstone, *Commentaries on English Law*

With respect to Texas, the ideal state for my cause, considering their Constitution is pro-God, and if they're willing to hold me under their law that is under their Constitution, and that is under Almighty God, then they ought to respect one who has been chosen. First, I'd like to state that in their Preamble, they invoke Almighty God's blessings in order to grant themselves authority to establish the law of their land. Furthermore, Article I, Section 1 of the Texas Constitution claims, legally, they are only under the U.S. Constitution, which is the legal foundation of my petition through the Establishment Clause, Free Exercise Clause, and the Separation of Church and State. Therefore, because they have implemented such a contract, they shall be held accountable to the exact remedy you provide me as an individual. Section 5 states that I have every right to have used the evidence of my testimony in a court of law in the state of Texas, and that they have disqualified the Holy Ghost from giving His Testimony as He is the Witness. Under Section 6-6a, I also have every right to claim who I have been named since my reliance on God, and God alone, via my testimony falls under a form of worship, as what we serve we worship. Therefore, the nature of the evidence and the evidence itself ought to have been admissible in court. By my trial counsel utilizing the Texas Rules of Evidence 404(a) to

deny admission of my testimony from Almighty God, they, themselves, have infringed upon Section 6a, which states:

"This state or a political subdivision of this state may not enact, adopt, or issue a statute, order, proclamation, decision, or rule that prohibits or limits religious services, including religious services conducted in churches, congregations, and places of worship, in this state by a religious organization established to support and serve the propagation of a sincerely held religious belief."

Texas Constitution, Article I, Section 6a.

The Texas Rules of Evidence 404(a) denies a defendant providing evidence that shows he acted in a particular instance according to character, yet also allows him to show evidence of a pertinent trait. Neither of these parameters references what to do in the case of True Acts of God, and therefore cannot be used in defiance of Him nor His Chosen. And this is a pertinent reason why my testimony and evidence ought to be reviewed by this Court, considering you all have the sole authority to interpret the U.S. Constitution with respect to the legal system in America, and I believe God will be honored by this Court.

The Religious Freedom Act of 1993 Pub. L. No. 103-141, 107 Stat. 1488, codified at 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb through 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb-1 (c) states: "A person whose religious exercise has been burdened in violation of this section may assert that violation as a claim or defense in a judicial proceeding and obtain appropriate relief against a government. Standing to assert a claim or defense under this section shall be governed by the general rules of standing under Article III of the Constitution." As stated, this is what I'm seeking a remedy for, and due to the evidence of my testimony alongside the language, I'm seeking this Court to help remedy. And I state that it is specifically this Court, since Almighty God would surely give a man of His Anointing the

foresight and wisdom to know this Court is the only worldly court qualified to handle this, that I would've rather have found myself before, and this is the purpose of this petition.

One may say, due to the ruling in *City of Boerne v. Flores*, 521 U.S. 507 (1997), that the entirety of my claim cannot be granted pertaining to states and local governments, but this thought is in error. *Boerne* only dealt with a religious organization trying to deem they could supersede the local laws pertaining to historic preservation and sought to tear down a historic church building, which the city deemed it had jurisdiction over, and I will say it was a nonsensical fight over authority between the two, since all stones placed by the hands of man shall stumble and fall. However, for the sake of the purpose at hand, wasn't it the states that included in their own constitutions allegiance to Almighty God, who demanded the inclusion of the Bill of Rights, and so ought those who insisted on such be held accountable to such as this was and is the original intention? To also include as fact is the reference to God in 46 of the 50 state constitutions and 32 references to the Lord. States have a constitutional duty, of their own, to abide by the remedy this Court grants me. And by no force or coercion do I expect this to be done, but by reason and faith so that His Story may be preserved.

42 U.S. Code § 9601(1). Acts of God, according to civil law, are generally defined as an unpredictable natural disaster. The result, in a civil sense, is that when acts of God are decided to be such, exceptions are made to what we may call a contract between any number of parties. Now, if the government, which is also under the Free Exercise Clause and Establishment Clause, can grant such immunity to things because of an unexpected nature, then how more so is the government Constitutionally required to do when Almighty God speaks to mankind?

Reynolds v. United States, 98 U.S. 145 (1878). In this case, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled: "It is not a valid defense to a crime to cite a religious belief or religiously imposed duty." This

was in response to a member of the Mormon church who claimed he was religiously allowed to partake in bigamy, as was customary and encouraged, as a religious duty, to do so in the Mormon church. The purpose of this reference is not to measure the validity of such a claim, but to point out the wording. The wording implies the action of merely citing a religious belief, which can be denied by reasoning that it is speculative and possibly a wrongful interpretation. However, this doesn't include physical evidence in such a combination that makes the Scripture come to Life through an individual, and the reason is that the Court couldn't fathom what I proffer as I will admit I didn't either at the time of happening, and one may ask if they lacked the ability to cogitate and foresee such, then how do their opinions have any authority on the matter at hand if they are meant to limit the Free Exercise of Religion? But I believe if any number of honest and impartial Justices had been offered what I have, they too would come to the conclusion of God's involvement. Furthermore, I have provided enough to fulfill any reasonable burden to show on my part that ought to be necessary for an individual to claim what I'm claiming. God gives to those exactly what they need for the Work at hand.

Furthermore, the U.S. Supreme Court cited *Regina v. Wagstaff* (10 Cox Crim. Cases, 531), which they used to reason that negative actions pertaining to religion were to be ruled on differently than positive actions, such as committing a crime, because one believes, religiously, that the law should never have existed. This opinion cannot hold true in a universal sense, because even aside from religion, citizens have a civic duty to sometimes disobey their government for the overall good, and this is the foundation that established the independence of this country. No part of a government that derives its authority from a document that claims the right to oppose an unfit government for the sake of its establishment can exercise against such, especially when the law that is based on any right to oppose worldly authority is bound to the

Free Exercise Clause and the Establishment Clause. And in patience and faith, if one is for God, God will give that one a testimony, and you'll know him by his stripes.

The "ministerial exemption" was established in *Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church and School v. EEOC*, 565 U.S. 171 (2012) that the Free Exercise Clause and Establishment Clause forbid the government from interfering in disputes between religious institutions and their key employees. An employee, in the natural sense, is an identity of who they serve. An institution must always begin with one individual, and in the case of Christianity, it begins and ends with One Man. And the combination of these two is essentially a covenant, a social contract, that in the particular case of religion extends far beyond the human social arena, that an individual enters into with another, whether a plurality or a singular. Due to who has been revealed to me, I can only enter into a covenant via the mediums, which are the Free Exercise Clause, the Establishment Clause, and the Separation between Church and State. And by you all, the worldly Highest Justices of this Land known as the United States of America, holding to the U.S. Constitution by granting me this judicial relief, you hold true to the American Dream, which is the long-awaited elucidation of Divine Providence, and uphold the Civil Liberties of All, no matter what government they're under.

Without this Court granting review, I, based on the 5th and 14th Amendments, am deprived of Due Process, since facts and testimony of such a pertinent nature need to be addressed by those who understand American law at its highest and the Holy Bible. The word of my testimony needs to be analyzed by those with the capacity to comprehend, and this shall make all else reveal the single voice affirming eternity. Without a party understanding the True Law I'm bound to, they cannot possibly pass any form of fair judgment, and to be who I am in Christ, these things had to happen. There needed to be 5 of the 6 Originalists on the Court, and

America had to age and have the experiment run long enough so even those who love to argue will inevitably torture themselves if they continue to deny. I was once such a one, and arguing against God is futile. It's one thing for a man to speak, but a whole other when we have the span of history show the Truth in the Way that mankind couldn't have done this on their own, and that it's not up to chance, but any idea of such is due to the finiteness of the mind. Furthermore, having to speak on anything but the Truth that has been delivered to me can be likened to being forced to be a witness against myself, and this is how the world and all who dwell in it are. If I've been given an absolute name and have to represent myself under a different name, isn't this acting as a witness against myself? Granting review of this petition is the fulfillment of my right to Due Process in the legal system you serve, but I must say, serve Almighty God before the government. Serving any government before God results in corruption and despotism, and this country has strayed far away from God, and we're already paying dearly. Serve God, and America shall transform to even greater heights than the founders could fathom.

"The Body of B. Franklin, Printer; like the Cover of an old Book, Its Contents torn out, And stript of its Lettering and Gilding, Lies here, Food for Worms. But the Work shall not be wholly lost; For it will, as he believ'd, appear once more, In a new & more perfect Edition, Corrected and amended By the Author."

Benjamin Franklin, *Franklin's Epitaph*

Christ is the Foundation, the Author, and the Son made manifest. Now, I haven't been sent to abolish your law, but One may say to fulfill it, and I must give eternal thanks to Christ Jesus of Nazareth. Amen.

C. This Court should grant review to help this Court and the lower courts, all comprising the government, better define and implement compelling interest tests and show the one true standard to such tests.

In *Employment Division, Department of Human Resources of Oregon v. Smith*, 494 U.S. 872 (1990), this Court effectively eliminated the compelling interest test for general and neutral laws that may incidentally burden religious practices. The *RFRA* reinstated the Sherbert Test, which was set forth by *Sherbert v. Verner*, 374 U.S. 398 (1963), and *Wisconsin v. Yoder*, 406 U.S. 205 (1972). This Court overturned this statute's authority over states in *Boerne* but held the federal government to its strict standard in *Gonzales v. O Centro Espirita Beneficente União do Vegetal*, 546 U.S. 418 (2006). Though what this petition calls for is to utilize the original intention and meaning of the religious clauses granted by the 1st Amendment, and the facts that this ruling pertains to one individual, and the references to God, in at least some form, in the state's constitutions. The requirement for meeting the compelling interest test is that it must be of the highest order and not merely preferential, and, in relation to this, preserve judicial integrity in which, I must say, by this Court granting both the petition and the entirety of what is and will be requested, they are testifying that there is one U.S. Supreme Court that all other courts are subject to, and this Court is better equipped to see over the trees and think by the big picture. The highest order ought to respect the Constitution and the Foundation of this country, which is Christianity. A compelling issue would elucidate the original intention of the U.S. Constitution.

According to the requirement for "narrow tailoring," a law must not restrict liberty more than is necessary for compelling interest, but what greater liberty is there than for a man to be bound to his Maker? Furthermore, the least restrictive means would be to grant this petition and rule in God's favor as to preserve the original intention of this country while holding all with

authority under the Truth, which measures all according to true equality. Now, granting this petition will allow us to work together to provide the Truth.

Also, in *Smith*, Justice Scalia quoted:

"It is a permissible reading of the [free exercise clause]...to say that if prohibiting the exercise of religion is not the object of the [law] but merely the incidental effect of a generally applicable and otherwise valid provision, the First Amendment has not been offended.... To make an individual's obligation to obey such a law contingent upon the law's coincidence with his religious beliefs, except where the State's interest is "compelling"—permitting him, by virtue of his beliefs, "to become a law unto himself,"—contradicts both constitutional tradition and common sense. To adopt a true "compelling interest" requirement for laws that affect religious practice would lead towards anarchy."

The language here refers to the broad application of such, and is not the intention of my petition. This petition is narrow and comes equipped with physical evidence of my testimony. In no way shall the rightful ruling on this matter promote such anarchy as is defined by Justice Scalia. Rather, the prince of the air, the true anarchist, shall be rebuked, and we shall provide humanity with the ultimate choice, and no longer shall they be ignorant, whether intentional or not. The appropriate handling of this petition and what follows will establish the true compelling interest test, and no compromising body in this Court has been able to do so until now. I will faithfully and boldly proclaim this shall be the legacy of the Roberts Court, for we will be opening the door to heaven and awaken many to the Truth.

XIII. CONCLUSION

The petition for writ of certiorari ought to be granted to respect and revere Almighty God.

DATED this 2nd day of December, 2025.

Respectfully Submitted and Diligently Prayed before the Almighty Father God,

Chris F. Bray

Christopher Tyler Bray & the Holy Ghost

Pro se Petitioner

819 Farnham Rd.

Charleston, SC, 29412

737-710-3990

thechristbearer777@gmail.com

The Lord's Anointed