

25-7674
No.

ORIGINAL

IN THE

FILED

DEC 12 2025

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF THE UNITED STATES

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

In Re SABRINA VERONICA PEREZ PETITIONER

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS TO THE
CALIFORNIA STATE COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Sabrina Veronica Perez
300 North Arroyo St.
Visalia, California 93292
sabrinaveronicaperez@gmail.com

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Will the United States Supreme Court invalidate the California Tort Claims Act?
2. Will the United States Supreme Court order Donald J. Trump to pay The People classified as “aliens” and “immigrants” Who were and are deported, detained, arrested and imprisoned \$900 million each, for each month that The People were deported, detained, arrested and imprisoned respectively?
3. Will the United States Supreme Court order the United States of America to pay The People classified as “aliens” Who were and are deported, detained, arrested and imprisoned \$900 million each, for each month that The People were deported, detained, arrested and imprisoned respectively? by “respectively” in numbers 2 and 3 I mean each individual time and person, and not a \$900 million collectively spread across The People classified as “aliens”?
4. Does the United States Supreme Court interpret The People classified as “aliens” and “immigrants” as citizens to make The People’s interpretation accurate?
5. Does the United States Supreme Court order the United States government and President Donald J. Trump to stop

indefinitely as in forever the detaining, deporting, arresting,
and imprisoning The People classified as “aliens” and
“immigrants” on the basis of being classified as “aliens”
and “immigrants”?

LIST OF PARTIES

1. Sabrina Veronica Perez as a Self Represented Plaintiff
2. Tulare County Adult Pre-Trial Facility as the Defendant 1
3. Donald J. Trump as a party of interest
4. Rob Bonta as Attorney General of California Per Supreme
Court of the United States Court Rule 29 4(c)
5. Dean John Sauer as Solicitor General of the United States
Per Supreme Court of the United States Court Rule 29 4(a)
& 29 4(b)

RELATED CASES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	5-6
JURISDICTION.....	6-8
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS	
INVOLVED.....	8
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	8-9
REASONS FOR GRANTING THIS WRIT.....	9-36
CONCLUSION.....	36

INDEX TO APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Opinion of the Court of California in and for the
County of Tulare, Appellate Division (Heard on August 28, 2024,
Opinion Filed on September 9, 2024)..... Attached Doc.

Appendix 2. The opinion of the trial court’s Appellate Division
appears at Appendix 1 of the petition and was filed on
9/09/2025..... Attached Doc.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
<i>Brimmed v. Rebman</i> , 138 U.S. 78.....	34
<i>Burger King Corp. v. Rudzewicz</i> , 471 U.S. 462, 472, 105, S. Ct. 2174, 85 L. Ed. 2d 528 (1985).....	7
<i>Cheney v. United States Dist. Court For D.C.</i> (2004).....	7
<i>Gibbons v. Ogden</i>	11
<i>Goodyear Dunlop Tires Operations SA v. Brown</i> , 131 S. Ct. 2846, 2853, 180 L. Ed. 2d 796 (2011).....	7
<i>Hanson v. Denckla</i> 357 U.S. 235, 253, 78 S. Ct. 1228, 2 L. Ed. 2d. 1283 (1958).....	8
<i>Henderson v. Mayor of New York</i> , 92 U.S. 259, 273.....	27
<i>Hines v. Davidowitz</i> 312 U.S. 52, 33, (1941) U.S.....	21-22
<i>Lung v Freeman</i> 92 U.S. 275, 279.....	22
<i>Mcdonald’s v. City of Chicago</i>	10
<i>Minnesota v. Barber</i> 136 U.S. 313.....	34
<i>Passenger Cases</i> , in 7 Howard.....	12
<i>Scott v. Sanford</i> 60 U.S. 393 (1856), 1856 U.S.....	15
<i>Snyder v. Massachusetts</i> , 291 U.S. 97, 105, 54 S. Ct. 330, 78 L. Ed. 674 (1934).....	10

<i>Takahashi v. Fish & Game Com.</i> 334 U.S. 410, 23 (1948), 1948	
U.S.....	16
<i>Todok v. Union State Bank</i> , 281 U.S. 449, 454-455.....	27
<i>Twinning Id.</i> , at 102, 29 S. Ct. 14, 53 L. Ed. 97.....	10
<i>Slaughter-House Cases</i>	9,10,12-14
<i>Vermeulen v. Renault, U.S.A. Inc.</i> 985 F. 2d 1534, 1546 (11th Cir. 1993).....	7
<i>World-Wide Volkswagen Corp. v. Woodsen</i> 444 U.S. 286, 297, 100 S. Ct. 559, 62 L. Ed. 2d 490 (1980).....	8
STATUTES AND RULES	
28 U.S. Code § 1651.....	6
Supreme Court Rule 20.....	6
OTHER	
AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONAL LAW VOLUME ONE-Third Edition by Laurence H. Tribe.....	14
Article 6 of the U.S. Constitution.....	28
84 Cong. Rec. 9536.....	23
Federalist paper No. 3.....	26
Federalist Paper No. 80.....	23
Federalist 1787.....	25
Magna Carta.....	13
McWilliams, Prejudice (1944), ch. VII. 334 U.S. 410, 424 (1948).....	16
§1 of the Fourteenth Amendment.....	9
Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo 1848.....	28-31
28 U.S.C. 1257 (a).....	6

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the trial court's Appellate Division appears at Appendix 1 of the petition and was filed on 9/09/2025. The Opinion of the California Supreme Court to review the merits appears at Appendix 2 and was filed on 7/31/2025.

JURISDICTION

- A. 28 U.S.C. 1257 (a) final judgements or decrees rendered by the highest court of a state in which a decision could be had, may be reviewed by the Supreme Court where the validity of a treaty or statute of the United States is drawn in question on the ground of its being repugnant to the constitution, Treaties, or laws of the United States, or where any title, right, privilege, or immunity is specially set up or claimed under the constitution or the treaties or statutes, or any commission held or authority exercised under, the United States. This case argues against and for respectively the California Tort Claims Act statute, the Hidalgo Treaty of 1848, and the [rights] privileges of the Plaintiff Sabrina Veronica Perez and The People classified as "aliens" and "immigrants"
- B. The Plaintiff Sabrina Veronica Perez respectfully requests the court treat this case as a Petition for Mandamus with a Certiorari together regarding the Superior court claims, and constitutional violations in this Mandamus, respectively.¹
- C. The People classified as "aliens" individually going to court have been proven to not work because of the below

¹All Writs Act (28 U.S.C. § 1651): Empowers the Court to issue all writs necessary or appropriate in aid of their jurisdictions. Et. Supreme Court Rule 20

listed constitutional violations continuing to happen to every new person classified as “aliens” and “immigrants.” Attempting to resolve the below written constitutional violations with a Superior Civil Court and a Superior Criminal court makes every new person classified as an “alien” and “immigrant” case have the below listed constitutional violations done to The foregoing People classified. This Petition for a Writ of Mandamus seeks exactly what Mandamus cases are made for, an order from a court to the inferior government official ordering President Donald J. Trump to properly fulfil the official duties of the President and correct and stop the abuse of discretion stated below in this Mandamus. See e.g. *Cheney v. United States Dist. Court For D.C.* (2004). The court is asked to order on legal doctrines that if not re-opened by the United States Supreme Court will remain dormant and explained inaccurately respectively in the precise way to use them incorrectly against The People including those classified as “aliens,” “immigrants,” and the Plaintiff Sabrina Veronica Perez.

- D. The general personal jurisdiction of this court is invoked under the Due Process Clause See *Goodyear Dunlop Tires Operations SA v. Brown*, 131 S. Ct. 2846, 2853, 180 L. Ed. 2d 796 (2011). As it relates to constitutionality “minimum contacts” for specific personal jurisdiction, “the defendant’s contacts with the applicable forum must satisfy three criteria.” *Vermeulen v. Renault, U.S.A. Inc.* 985 F. 2d 1534, 1546 (11th Cir. 1993). First the contacts must be related to the Plaintiff’s cause of action or have given rise to it.” *Id.* Citing *Burger King Corp. v. Rudzewicz*, 471 U.S. 462, 472,

105, S. Ct. 2174, 85 L. Ed. 2d 528 (1985). This is shown in the way of Donald J. Trump created the below stated Executive Orders that deported, detained, imprisoned, and arrested The People classified as “aliens” and “immigrants.” “Second, the contacts must involve some act by which the defendant purposefully avails itself of the privilege of conducting activities within the forum..., thus invoking the benefits and protections of its laws.” *Id.* (quoting *Hanson v. Denckla* 357 U.S. 235, 253, 78 S. Ct. 1228, 2 L. Ed. 2d. 1283 (1958)(alteration in the original)). Donald J. Trump created the below listed Executive Orders that have the below described constitutional violations. “Third the defendants contacts with the forum must be ‘such that the [defendant] should reasonably anticipate being haled into court there’ *Id.* (quoting *World-Wide Volkswagen Corp. v. Woodsen* 444 U.S. 286, 297, 100 S. Ct. 559, 62 L. Ed. 2d 490 (1980) alteration in original)). Donald J. Trump created the below stated Executive Orders that violate the below stated Constitutional provisions and this is described how below.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS

INVOLVED

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On Plaintiff Perez filed this suit against the Tulare County Adult Pre-Trial Facility for not giving the Plaintiff clean water, an officer of the Facility pushing the Plaintiff Perez, a separate officer watching the Plaintiff’s vagina and butt while peeing for the entirety of the time, the Facility forcing the Plaintiff Perez to listen

to an inmate wailing loudly, and the Facility being unclean in general everywhere and while injecting medical vaccine(s) to the Plaintiff.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Certificate of Word Count

The text of this brief consists of 9991 words as counted by the Google docs program used to generate the brief.

REASONS FOR GRANTING WRIT OF MANDAMUS

1. The People classified as "aliens" and "immigrants" not being recognized as United States Citizens and President Donald J. Trump's Executive Orders 14287, 14165, 1459, and all Trump's other Executive Orders that deport, detain, arrest, and imprison The People classified as "aliens" violate the 14th Amendment's Privileges or Immunities.

A. §1 of the Fourteenth Amendment provides that

"a state may not abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States or deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law"

- B. "All persons [including The People classified as 'aliens' and 'immigrants'] born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside."
Slaughter-House case 83 U.S. 36, 71 (1872), 1872 U.S. LEXIS+ 1139 on the Pages 25 and 26
- C. In the *Slaughter-House* case Justice Field's dissent states, "under the pretence of the police regulations that the police arrest, imprison, detain, and deport The People classified as

'aliens' and 'immigrants' The State cannot be permitted to encroach" 83 U.S. 36, 94 (1872), 1872 U.S. LEXIS+ 1139 on the Pages 33 upon any of the just rights of the citizen, which the Constitution intended to secure against abridgment." In the same case Justice Field stated the officers landing and inspecting the animals were police regulations, the officers in this case land The People deported onto different countries, pat downs are allegedly done to some of The People classified as "aliens" and "immigrants" arrested, when The People classified as "aliens" and "immigrants" are imprisoned, and deported prisons have printed papers which have listed the items that The People classified as "aliens" and "immigrants" have physically on them at the time of The People classified as "aliens" and "immigrants" arrests.

- D. When reading this case the United States Supreme Court should decide the accurate way of interpreting the law in compliance with the Constitution is The People classified as "aliens" and "immigrants" are United States Citizens for the above and below stated explanations.
- E. In the *Slaughter-House Cases*,

"Under the Court's narrow reading, the Privileges or Immunities Clause protects such things as the right 'to come to the seat of government to assert any claim [a citizen] may have upon that of [****23] government, to transact any business he may have with it, to seek its protection, to share its offices, to engage in administering its functions . . . [and to] become a citizen of any State of the Union by a bona fide residence therein, with the same rights as other citizens of that State." Id., at 79-80, 83 U.S. 36, 21 L. Ed. 394 (internal quotation marks omitted).

- F. Cited on Page 13 of 95 the *McDonald's v. City of Chicago* case cited the *Twining* case [**3032] The Court used different formulations [***910] in describing the boundaries of due process. For example in *Twining*, the Court referred to "immutable" principles of justice which inhere in the very idea of free government which no member of the Union may disregard." Id., at 102, 29 S. Ct. 14, 53 L. Ed. 97 (internal quotation marks omitted).
- G. Cited on Page 15 of 95 in the *McDonald's v. City of Chicago* case cited, *Snyder v. Massachusetts*, 291 U.S. 97, 105, 54 S. Ct. 330, 78 L. Ed. 674 (1934), the Court spoke of rights that are "so rooted in the traditions and conscience of our people as to be ranked as fundamental." And in

countries is not permitted due to The People classified as "aliens" and "immigrants" have the right to move with freedom. The Louisiana Act that the Plaintiffs argued against was detailed

by the Louisiana legislature as "an act to protect the health of the city of New Orleans to locate the stock landings and slaughter houses, and to incorporate

"The crecent City Live-Stock Landing and Slaughter House Company" *Slaughter House Cases* 16 Wall 36

Firstly,

The reason why the above listed health reason used to prevent The People classified as "aliens" and "immigrants" enforced with Police powers does not have a direct relation as means to the end of health and is arbitrary is the Police powers used in this Mandamus are the Police are inspecting The People via pat downs prior to arrest and typing into computers the items The People have on physically as the means to the end of having a healthy United States and by healthy United States here what is meant is health is relevant and present in the way of in The *Passenger* cases in 7 Howard states "the 'immigrants' would bring pauperism, crime, idleness, increased expenditures, and disorderly conduct and that this is in nature health acts." *Slaughter-House* Page 17 and

C. In the *Slaughter-House* case Justice Field stated the act in

question adopted in the interest of various things including

to protect the cities health was a legitimate exercise of what

is termed the police power of the state. Justice Field opined,

"Power undoubtedly extends to all regulations affecting the health, good order, morals, and peace of society. But under the pretense of prescribing a police regulation the state cannot be permitted to encroach *Slaughter-House Cases* 83, U.S. 36, 94 (1872) U.S. LEXIS 1139 on the Page 33 upon any of the just rights of the citizens, which the constitution intended to secure against abridgement.

The court should also consider that in The *Passenger Cases*, in 7 Howard, "Are replete with discussions on the police powers of the States. The arguments in that case, "appeal to the various titles in which the freedom of State action has been supposed to be

unlimited. Immigrants, it was said, would bring pauperism, crime, idleness, increased expenditures, disorderly conduct. The acts, it was said, were in the nature of health acts [on LEXIS+ Page 17].

Notwithstanding, the Magna Carta stated on Page 47 of the

Slaughter-House cases,

"The people of this country brought with them to its shores the rights of Englishment; the [***143] rights which had been wrested from English sovereigns at various periods of the nation's history. One of these fundamental rights was expressed in these words, found in Magna Charta: "No freeman shall be taken or imprisoned, or be disseized of his freehold or liberties or free customs, or be outlawed or exiled, or any otherwise destroyed; nor will we pass upon him or condemn [*115] him but by lawful judgment of his peers or by the law of the land." Freeman in this case are The People classified as "aliens" and "immigrants" and they are taken in the way of being arrested, imprisoned, and deported. The imprisonment on the basis of the above stated classification is disseized of his freehold and liberties. The People who are classified as "aliens" and immigrants" is pervading the Magna Carta's statement that people cannot be outlawed, and is such a large departure from the structure and spirit of the accurate interpretation of the United States Constitution.

- D. The granting of monopolies, or exclusive [*Slaughter-House* Cases 83 U.S. 36, 423, (1872), 1872 U.S. LEXIS 1139] privileges to individuals or corporations, is an invasion of the right of others to choose a lawful calling, and an infringement of personal liberty. Here the *Slaughter-House* Case describes that granting the privilege of citizenship to The People but not other individuals included in The People who are classified as "aliens" and "immigrants" is an infringement of personal liberty the court must observe this with the fact that the Fourteenth Amendment explicitly states "persons."

This court must also observe that to have the exclusive right to the privilege of being a citizen is what the *Slaughter-House* Cases described as,

"But even these exclusive privileges are becoming more and more odious, and are getting to be more and more regarded as wrong in principle, and as inimical to the just rights and greatest good of the people." 83 U.S. 36, 121, (1872), 1872 U.S. LEXIS 1139. It is

odious to say The People from foreign nations will bring idleness, impoverishment, and crime to the United States.

This must be paired with that the United States have a monopoly on who of The People can and cannot be permitted to enter in to the United States and when observing the National Sovereignty used to incorrectly justify this the court must look at that Sovereignty is based on, "the principle that a king can do no wrong and if a king does wrong he did not intend to."³

E. In the *Slaughter-House* case on the Pages 26 and 27 of

LEXIS+,

"The first occurrence of the words privileges and immunities in our constitutional history, is to be found in the fourth of the articles of the old Confederation. It declares that the better to secure and perpetuate mutual friendship and intercourse among the people in the different states in this union, the free inhabitants of each of these states, paupers, vagabonds and fugitives from justice excepted, shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of free citizens in the several states; and the people from each state shall have free ingress and regress to and from any other state, and shall enjoy therein all the privileges and immunities of trade and commerce, subject to the same duties, impositions, and restrictions as the inhabitants as the inhabitants there respectively."

In this case the vagabonds would be considered The People

classified as "aliens" and "immigrants" because they are not

permitted to be in the U.S. on the basis of their citizenship status,

and then the privileges and immunities which The just mentioned

People are in the old articles of Confederation stated to be allowed

all the Privileges and Immunities which include the right to vote

and citizenship. The court must with this observe that since,

"The [person in The People classified as] 'alien' is excluded,

because, being born in a foreign country, he cannot be a member of

³AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONAL LAW VOLUME ONE-Third Edition by Laurence H. Tribe

the community until he is naturalized" *Scott v. Sanford* 60 U.S. 393 (1856), 1856 U.S. LEXIS 472 on Page 18.

The above quoted articles of the old confederation stated it is best for mutual intercourse among the people in different states [and the state of California was owned by Mexico until America stole it in the guise of conquered it]; the free to ingress and regress to and from states with the same privileges and immunities to be enjoyed.

60 U.S. 393, 62 (1856), 1856 U.S. LEXIS 472 on Page 20 "it was deemed prudent to describe with precision and caution the persons to whom this high privilege was given -- and the word citizen was on that account substituted for the words free inhabitant [free inhabitant as in The People classified as "aliens" and "immigrants." [The word citizen excluded, and no doubt intended to exclude, foreigners who had not become citizens of some one of the States when the Constitution was adopted; and also every description of persons who were not fully recognized as citizens in the several States. This, upon any fair construction of the instruments to which we have referred, was evidently the object and purpose of this change of words." And to exclude in this and via deportation is not to embrace which is mentioned in the Articles of Confederation and observed below.]

60 U.S. 393, 63 (1856), 1856 U.S. LEXIS 472 on Page 20 The first of these acts is the naturalization law, which was passed at the second session of the first Congress, March 26, 1790, and confines the right of becoming citizens "to aliens being free white persons.

60 U.S. 393, 707 (1856), 1856 U.S. LEXIS 472 on Page 20 Now, the Constitution does not limit the power of Congress in this respect to white persons. And they may, if they think proper, authorize the naturalization of any one, of any color, who was born under allegiance to another Government. But the language of the law above quoted, shows that citizenship [*420] at that time was perfectly understood to be confined to the white race; and that they alone constituted the sovereignty in the Government."

Here the directly above stated quote is explicitly relevant to the sovereignty that the Government has that gives the United States the monopoly on who of The People are allowed to enter into the United States. The sovereignty given to the Government that allows the monopoly of who of The People is allowed to enter the United States is done wrong due to the wrong in the sovereignty principle is citizenship being based on being confined to the white race. And that the Sovereignty was in fact based on "king doing wrong and meaning wrong" by confining citizenship to white race.

3.The above stated U.S. law and Trump's above listed Executive Orders violate the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment.

A. *Takahashi v. Fish & Game Com.* 334 U.S. 410, 23 (1948),
1948 U.S. LEXIS 2718 on Page 8 quoted cases That,

"Fever, of course, is traceable to the refusal or the inability of certain groups to adjust themselves economically and socially relative to residents of Japanese ancestry. For some years prior to the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, these protagonists of intolerance had been leveling unfounded accusations and innuendoes against Japanese fishing crews operating off the coast of California. These fishermen numbered about a thousand and most of them had long resided in that state. It was claimed that they were engaged not only in fishing but in espionage and other illicit activities on behalf of the Japanese Government. As war with Japan approached and finally became a reality, these charges were repeated with increasing vigor. Yet full investigations by appropriate authorities failed to reveal any competent supporting evidence; not even one Japanese fisherman was arrested for alleged espionage. Such baseless accusations can only be viewed as an integral part of the long campaign to undermine the

reputation of persons of Japanese background and to discourage their residence in California.”

The above cited bringing crime claim here is shown to be false as

The Japanese People did not commit the accused of crimes. The directly above stated quote is an example of how preventing crime in the United States has historically been a strawman argument against The People classified as “aliens” and “immigrants” and this is shown in the way of The Japanese People classified as “aliens” were accused of the crime espionage and there was not evidence presented to prove charges of espionage against The Japanese People classified as “aliens.” Also, See McWilliams, Prejudice (1944), ch. VII. 334 U.S. 410, 424 (1948), 1948 U.S. LEXIS 2718 on Page 9 stated,

“Once evacuation was however, does not permit a state to discriminate against resident ‘aliens’ in such a fashion, whether the purpose be to give effect to racial animosity or to protect the competitive interests of other residents. The 1945 amendment to § 990 which is now before us stands in no better position than the 1943 amendment. This later alteration eliminated the reference to ‘alien Japanese’ and substituted therefore, ‘a person ineligible to citizenship.’ Adoption of this change also occurred during a period when anti-Japanese agitation in California had reached one of its periodic peaks. The announcement of the end of the Japanese exclusion achieved, an intensive campaign was begun to prevent the return to California of the evacuees. [*424] All of the old charges, including the ones relating to the fishermen, were refurbished and augmented. This time the Japanese were absent and were unable to provide effective opposition. The winds of racial animosity blew unabated. 334 U.S. 410, 28 (1948), 1948 U.S. LEXIS 2718 Not a word was said in this report regarding the need for the conservation of fish or the necessity of limiting the number of fishermen. The obvious thought behind the amendment

was to attempt to legalize the discrimination against Japanese 'alien' fishermen by dropping the specific reference to them."

B. In the same directly above quoted there is,

"Dissent by: REED Dissent The proposed revision was adopted. The trial court below correctly described the situation as follows: 'As it was commonly known to the legislators of 1945 that Japanese were the only aliens ineligible to citizenship who engaged in commercial fishing in ocean waters bordering on California, and as the Court must take judicial notice of the same fact, it becomes manifest that in enacting the present version of Section 990, the Legislature intended thereby to eliminate alien Japanese from those entitled to a commercial fishing license by means of description rather than by name. To all intents and purposes and in effect the provision in the 1943 and 1945 amendments are the same, the thin veil used to conceal [****29] a purpose being too transparent. Under each and both, alien Japanese are denied a right to a license to catch fish on the high seas for [*427] profit, and to bring them to shore for the purpose of selling the same in a fresh state . . . this discrimination constitutes an unequal exaction and a greater burden upon the persons of the class named than that imposed upon others in the same calling and under the same conditions, and amounts to prohibition. This discrimination, patently hostile, is not based upon a reasonable ground of classification and, to that extent, the section is in violation of Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States."

The United States in The People classified as "aliens" and "immigrants" imposes the burden of not having citizenship to The People native born foreign nations on the notion that they bring pauperism and crime but when other people included in The People are paupers and criminals they are still allowed to have citizenship. The racial animosity in the Japanese Case is also present in the United States immigration laws prohibiting The People classified as "aliens" and "immigrants" to be citizens and

Trump's above stated Executive Orders that The People classified as "aliens" and "immigrants" to be deported, detained, arrested, and imprisoned in the way of The People classified are being not allowed to be in the United States on the false ideas that The People classified as, "aliens" bring crime to the United States as is claimed in the above cited cases and that in effect is unhealthy. The court must also see that it is unlikely the the Constitution is accurately construed for lawmakers and any person at all to pick and choose which rights written in the Constitution are to be allowed to The persons and with this historically the law cases have cited and recognized the Equal Protection Clause, Liberty, Fourteenth Amendment Protections to protect The People classified as "aliens" it is not in accordance with the Spirit as in intent of the United States Constitution to pick and choose which of persons can be allowed to use the Citizenship protections.

4.The above stated U.S. law and Trump's above listed Executive Orders violate the Thirteenth Amendment.

A. In the *Slaughter-House* Cases Justice Field stated,

"It is, however, clear that they include something more than slavery in the strict sense of the term; they include also serfage, vassalage, villenage, peonage, and all other forms of compulsory service for the mere benefit or pleasure of others. Nor is this the full import of the terms. The abolition of slavery and involuntary servitude was intended to make every one born in this country a freeman, and as such to give to him the right to pursue the ordinary

avocations of life without other restraint than such as affects all others, and to enjoy equally with them the fruits of his labor." Page 34 on LEXIS+

The People classified as "aliens" and "immigrants" are enslaved by vassalage in the way of the U.S. via employees forces The People to be arrested, imprisoned, detained, and deported to be bound to the prisons, the countries the people are deported to, and the mere benefit is the supposed health of the state which health is described as,

"The pretence of sanitary regulations for the grant of the exclusive privileges is a shallow one, which merits only this passing notice." Page 33 on LEXIS+

The enslavement of The People is prohibited by the fact that it is not permitted to exist within the United States or any place subject to their jurisdiction as is described in the,

Slaughter-House Cases 83 U.S. 36, 69 (1872), 1872 U.S. LEXIS 1139 "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States or any place subject to their jurisdiction."

"The thirteenth article forbids any other kind of slavery, now or hereafter. If Mexican peonage or the Chinese coolie labor system shall develop slavery of the Mexican or Chinese race within our territory." *Slaughter-House* 83 U.S. 36, 67 (1872), 1872 U.S. LEXIS 1139

The People classified as "aliens" and "immigrants" are arrested, imprisoned, detained, and deported on the basis that they are not legally permitted to reside in the United States. Servitude is being

completely subject to someone more powerful, and The People are arresting, imprisoning, detaining, and deporting The People with Police powers that The People classified as “aliens” and “immigrants” do not have.

5. Trump’s above listed Executive Orders violate the Fifth Amendment’s Substantive Due Process of Law.

A. The Fifth Amendment states,
“Nor shall any state deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of laws”

B. In *Hines v. Davidowitz* 312 U.S. 52, 33, (1941) U.S. LEXIS 1103 the court stated,

“Opposition to laws permitting invasion of the personal liberties of law-abiding individuals, or singling out aliens as particularly dangerous and undesirable groups, is deep-seated in this country. Hostility to such legislation in America stems back to our colonial history, 27 and champions of freedom for the individual have always vigorously opposed burdensome registration systems. The drastic requirements of the alien Acts of 1798 28 brought about a political upheaval in this country the repercussions from which have not even yet wholly subsided. 29 So violent was the reaction to the 1798 laws that almost a century elapsed before a second registration [*71] act was passed...

The supremacy of the national power in the general field of foreign affairs, including power over immigration, [*Hines v. Davidowitz* 312 U.S. 52, 402 1941, (1941) U.S LEXIS 1103] “naturalization and deportation, is made clear by the Constitution, was pointed out by the authors of The Federalist in 1787, The Federal Government, representing as it does the collective interest of the forty-eight states, is entrusted with full and exclusive responsibility for the conduct of affairs with foreign sovereignties.” Also, “For local interests the several states of the 312 U.S. 52, 585, 1941, (1941) U.S LEXIS 1103 union exist, but for national purposes, embracing our relations with foreign nations, we are 312 U.S. 52, 20, 1941, (1941) U.S LEXIS 1103 but one people, one nation, one power

312 U.S. 52, 21, 1941, (1941) U.S LEXIS 1103 Our system of government is such that the interest of the cities, counties and states, no less than the interest of the people of the whole nation, imperatively requires that federal power in the field affecting foreign relations be left entirely free from local interference. As Mr. Justice Miller observed of a California 312 U.S. 52, 64, 1941, (1941) U.S LEXIS 1103 statute burdening immigration: "if the United States should get into a difficulty which would lead to war, or to suspension of intercourse, would California alone suffer, or all the union citing *chy Lung v Freeman* 92 U.S. 275, 279 on Page 9 of 16 of LEXIS+

The People classified as "aliens" and "immigrants" are burdened in the way of being arrested, imprisoned, detained, and deported on the basis of not having citizenship rights. To say we are but one people about the foreign nations when embracing is to say The People classified as "aliens" and immigrants" are a part of The People in the constitution in the full entire constitution, to say we are one embracing The Foreign nations but pick and choose when The constitutional rights are given to The People Native Born to "foreign nations" is a contradictory opinion that is repugnant to the constitution and the above and below documents the constitution was based on. In many ways to apply the law in the sense of embracing foreign nations giving them equality of the law but not to the full extent of the law on the constitution is applying the law in a 'shady' way that does not exist as in comparable to the spirit of 'separate but equal' interpretations of the law. Additionally, to embrace someone is not to imprison them for being present and taking them away from their families, putting them under the

involuntary servitude described in this document, to arrest The People, detain, and deport them. The People classified as “aliens” and “immigrants” not being recognized as United States Citizens, Trump’s above listed Executive Orders, and The United States government deport The People but not before staying imprisoned in a place where actual criminals inhabit in other strikingly same buildings with distinct names and the same procedural structures in those prisons of being in a cell, not being free, and being arrested and taken away to be put in there –that is embracing foreign nations by imprisoning their people and not giving them the full entire protection of the constitution is an oxymoron.

- C. “In Cf Alexander Hamilton in Federalist Paper No. 80: The peace of the whole ought not to be left at the disposal of a part. The union will undoubtedly be answerable to foreign powers for the conduct of its members” That the Congress was not unaware of the and 80. possible international repercussions of registration legislation is apparent from a study of the history of the 1940 federal Act Congressman Coffee, speaking against an earlier version of the bill, said: “Are we not guilty of deliberately insulting nations with whom we maintain friendly diplomatic relations? Are we not humiliating their nationals? Are we not violating the traditions and experiences of a century and a half?” 84 Cong. Rec. 9536.

To say The People classified as “aliens” and “immigrants” are not allowed in this country due to they will bring crime, and pauperism, and are not white is supposedly protecting the peace of The People who are not classified at the expense at The People who are classified being imprisoned, detained, arrested, and

deported to be imprisoned is not to be at peace and neither is to be taken away from their families and to be arrested like criminals is not peaceful. The People classified as “aliens” and “immigrants” being imprisoned when in the United States doing that to the other nations native born The People in America is not maintaining friendly diplomatic relations, it is not friendly [and the United States government and the above listed Executive Orders do this] to imprison the native born people of other countries and deport them and take them away from their families. It is humiliating and degrading to have The People classified as “aliens” and “immigrants” be with aluminum like blankets, The People sexually abused by ICE officers in detention facilities that are actually concentration camps like the Nazis did. The Congressman Coffee’ words here are with See below quote of, “And HN7 where the federal government, in the exercise of its superior authority in this field, has enacted a complete scheme of regulation and has therein provided a standard for the registration of aliens, states cannot, inconsistently with the purpose of Congress, conflict or interfere with, curtail or complement, the federal law, or enforce additional or auxiliary [312 U.S. 52, 67, 1941, (1941) U.S. LEXIS 1103] regulations.” 18 conflict with what is occurring to The People. The real wrong of willfully ignoring that The People classified as “aliens” and “immigrants” are imprisoned, et al. in the United

States has led to is The People classified as “aliens” and immigrants” being treated like the Jewish People in concentration camps, exactly like those not long ago times The immigrations and Customs (ICE) officers; this is shown in the way of these officers are going into the jobs, the food stores, the clothes stores, the public and taking The People classified as “aliens” and “immigrants” away into camp like prisons and citizenship was historically cited as for white people above, camp like prisons because it has shown on the news the non-shelter camp prisons non shelter as in non warm aluminum look like blankets, the alligator alcitraz with government officials citing the purpose is to prevent escapes that is so medieval times and dystopian of The People to be imprisoned in just for not being born in the United States in general and highlighted when the Federalist 1787 that the United States Constitution is based on the principles of reads to embrace foreign nations. Also to do the foregoing evil actions to The People and subjecting The People [to those environments created in prison camps by ICE officers born] in foreign nations is not embracing. To truly embrace The People in the full definition of the word embrace is to recognize and acknowledge that The People classified as “aliens” and “immigrants” are citizens of the United States to say otherwise is using a “*shady*” made up definition of the word embrace.

[continuance of prior paragraph quote] citing,

‘For a collection of typical international controversies that have arisen in this manner, see Dunn, *The Protection of Nationals* (1932), pp. 13 et seq. Cf. John Jay in Federalist paper No. 3: "The number of wars which have happened or will happen in the world will always be found to be in proportion to the number and weight of the causes, whether real or pretended, which provoke or invite them. If this remark be just, it becomes useful to inquire whether so many just causes of war are likely to be given by United America as by disunited America; for if it should turn out that United America will probably give the fewest, then it will follow that in this respect the Union tends most to preserve the people in a state of peace with other nations.’

The Federalist paper no. 3 stated to preserve the peace with other nations was But To have The People born in other nations in camps like the Nazi days not long ago, with the above stated nonliving conditions it is not maintaining peace with other nations to do that to their native born people.

“In consequence of the right of protection over its subjects abroad which every State enjoys, and the corresponding duty of every State to treat aliens on its territory with a certain consideration, an alien . . . must be afforded protection for his person and property. . . . Every State is by the Law of Nations compelled to grant to aliens at least equality before the law with its citizens, as far as safety of person and property is concerned. An alien must in particular not be wronged in person or property by the officials and courts of a State. Thus the police must not arrest him without just cause. . . .’ 1 Oppenheim, *International Law* (5th ed., 1937), pp. 547-548. And see 4 Moore, *International Law Digest*, pp. 2, 27, 28; Borchard, *The Diplomatic Protection of Citizens Abroad* (1928), pp. 25, 37, 73, 104. In general, both treaties and international practices have been aimed at preventing injurious discriminations against aliens. Concerning such treaties, this Court has said: ‘While treaties, in safeguarding important rights [****23] in the interest of reciprocal beneficial relations, may by their express terms afford a measure of protection to aliens which citizens of one or both of the parties may not be able to demand

against their own government, the general purpose of treaties of amity and commerce is to avoid injurious discrimination in either country against the citizens of the other." 15 *Todok v. Union State Bank*, 281 U.S. 449, 454-455.

LEdHN[3] [3]Legal imposition of distinct, unusual and extraordinary burdens and obligations upon aliens -- such as subjecting [312 U.S. 52, 66, 1941, (1941) U.S. LEXIS 1103] [312 U.S. 52, 25, 1941, (1941) U.S. LEXIS 1103] them alone, though perfectly law-abiding, to indiscriminate and repeated interception and interrogation by public officials -- thus bears an inseparable relationship to the welfare and tranquillity of all the states, and not merely to the welfare and tranquillity of one. Laws imposing such burdens are not mere census requirements, and even though they may be immediately associated with the accomplishment of a local purpose, they provoke questions in the field of international affairs. And HN6 16 *Henderson v. Mayor of New York*, 92 U.S. 259, 273. specialized regulation of the conduct of an alien before naturalization is a matter which Congress must consider in discharging its constitutional duty "To establish a Uniform Rule of Naturalization . . ." It cannot be doubted that both the state and the federal registration laws belong "to that class of laws which concern the exterior relation of this whole nation with other nations and governments." 16 [312 U.S. 52, 28, 1941, (1941) U.S. LEXIS 1103] Consequently the regulation of aliens is so intimately blended and intertwined with responsibilities of the national government that where it acts, and the state also acts on the same subject, "the act [312 U.S. 52, 26, 1941, (1941) U.S. LEXIS 1103] of Congress, [312 U.S. 52, 404, 1941, (1941) U.S. LEXIS 1103] or the treaty, is supreme; and the law of the State, though enacted in the exercise of powers not controverted, must yield to it." 17 And HN7 where the federal government, in the exercise of its superior authority in this field, has enacted a complete scheme of regulation and has therein provided a standard for the registration of aliens, states cannot, inconsistently with the purpose of Congress, conflict or interfere with, curtail or complement, the federal law, or enforce additional or auxiliary [312 U.S. 52, 67, 1941, (1941) U.S. LEXIS 1103] regulations. 18 There is not -- and [312 U.S. 52, 587 1941, (1941) U.S. LEXIS 1103] from the very nature of the problem there cannot be -- any rigid formula or rule which can be used as a universal pattern to determine the meaning and purpose of every act of Congress. This Court, in considering the validity of state laws in the light of treaties or federal laws touching the same subject, has made use of the following expressions: conflicting; contrary to; occupying the field; repugnance; difference;

irreconcilability; inconsistency; violation; curtailment; and interference. 19 [312 U.S. 52, 29 1941, (1941) U.S. LEXIS 1103] But none of these [312 U.S. 52, 27 1941, (1941) U.S. LEXIS 1103] on Page 11 in LEXIS+

[312 U.S. 52, 30 1941, (1941) U.S. LEXIS 1103] Our conclusion is that appellee is [312 U.S. 52, 588, 1941, (1941) U.S. LEXIS 1103] correct in his contention that the power to restrict, limit, regulate, and register aliens as a distinct group is not an equal and continuously existing concurrent power of state and nation, but that whatever power a state may have is subordinate to supreme national law. 23 We proceed therefore [312 U.S. 52, 69 1941, (1941) U.S. LEXIS 110] to an examination of Congressional enactments to ascertain whether or not Congress has acted in such manner that its action should preclude enforcement of Pennsylvania's law.

The above stated case prohibits,

The U.S. Constitution states to honor treaties and it is a substantive violation of that to imprison, deport, detain, arrest, and do the above stated crimes to them rape to their children, et al when the Treaty of Hidalgo 1848 states to be friendly between the unions, to imprison just for being present is not to be friendly to the Unions' Native born in Mexico People. The United States Supreme Court need grant this Petition for Mandamus as soon as the Court can so Plaintiff can file a preliminary injunction to release The People native born to other countries who are imprisoned.

An example of a treaty the United States Supreme Court must look at and order the United States Law and Trump to be in compliance with is the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo 1848 Per Article 6 of U.S.

Constitution stating treaties are Supreme Law of The Land firstly
on,

“ARTICLE I

There shall be firm and universal peace between the United States of America and the Mexican Republic, and between their respective countries, territories, cities, towns, and people, without exception of places or persons.”

To do the above described and stated things to The People classified as “aliens” and “immigration” is not keeping peace between The People, arresting The People is not keeping the peace. And this is the first part of the treaty The United States and Trump completely disregard. Supremacy Clause in Article VI, Clause 2, which declares that all treaties made under the authority of the United States are the "supreme Law of the Land." This binds federal and state courts to uphold treaties over state laws.

The United States has disregarded the above cited Article I because the states of the union are not permitted to be in peace with America. This is shown in the way of

Also the part of the above state treaty,

“ARTICLE VII

The river Gila and the part of the Rio Bravo del Norte lying below the southern boundary of New Mexico, being, agreeably to the fifth article, divided in the middle between the two republics, the navigation of the Gila and the Bravo below said boundary shall be free and common to the vessels and citizens of both countries; and neither shall, without the consent of the other, construct any work that may impede or interrupt, in whole or in part, the exercise of this right; not even for the purpose of favoring new methods of navigation. Nor shall any tax or contribution, under any denomination or title, be levied upon vessels or persons navigating the same or upon merchandise or effects transported thereon, except in the case of landing upon one of their shores. If for the purpose of making the said rivers navigable, or for maintaining them in such state, it should be necessary or advantageous to establish any tax or contribution, this shall not be done without the consent of both Governments.

The stipulations contained in the present article shall not impair the territorial rights of either republic within its established limits."

Currently the United States does not permit The People of in river Gila and Rio Bravo del Norte the above stated treaty states to be citizens just via the above quoted treaty. Currently Gila and the Bravo where Mexico was which is now called the places in the U.S. stated below are deporting The People classified as "aliens" and "immigrants" thus America not zallowing the concurrent citizenship described in the above Article.

Additionally,

ARTICLE VIII

Mexicans now established in territories previously belonging to Mexico, and which remain for the future within the limits of the United States, as defined by the present treaty, shall be free to continue where they now reside, or to remove at any time to the Mexican Republic, retaining the property which they possess in the said territories, or disposing thereof, and removing the proceeds wherever they please, without their being subjected, on this account, to any contribution, tax, or charge whatever.

Those who shall prefer to remain in the said territories may either retain the title and rights of Mexican citizens or acquire those of citizens of the United States. But they shall be under the obligation to make their election within one year from the date of the exchange of ratifications of this treaty; and those who shall remain in the said territories after the expiration of that year, without having declared their intention to retain the character of Mexicans, shall be considered to have elected to become citizens of the United States.

In the said territories, property of every kind, now belonging to Mexicans not established there, shall be inviolably respected. The present owners, the heirs of these, and all Mexicans who may hereafter acquire said property by contract shall enjoy with respect to it guarantees equally ample as if the same belonged to citizens of the United States."

The People classified as "aliens" and "immigrants" are deported, detained, imprisoned, and arrested include Mexicans and Article VIII states Mexicans which remain for the future within the limits of the United States that previously belonged to Mexico [prior to

being stolen by the United States of America in the guise of conquered] are to shall be free to continue where they now reside... and may either retain the title and rights of Mexican citizens or acquire those of citizens of the United States and those who don't choose shall become U.S. Citizens. Despite this The People just mentioned are not being given citizenship with California, Nevada, Utah, most of Arizona, and parts of New Mexico, deporting The People classified as "aliens" and "immigrants."

And,

"ARTICLE IX

The Mexicans who, in the territories aforesaid, shall not preserve the character of citizens of the Mexican Republic, conformably with what is stipulated in the preceding article, shall be incorporated into the Union of the United States. and be admitted at the proper time (to be judged of by the Congress of the United States) to the enjoyment of all the rights of citizens of the United States, according to the principles of the Constitution; and in the meantime, shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty and property, and secured in the free exercise of their religion without restriction."

The above stated Mexican People are not incorporated into the Union of the United States. This is shown by the same way as above which is the above stated places in the United States deport, detain, arrest, imprison, The Mexican People on the basis of being classified as "aliens" and "immigrants" All of the Articles here are also shown to not be complied with in the above stated ways of The People classified as "aliens" and "immigrants" are kept with sex offending ICE officers, with aluminum blankets, taken away from their families, et. al. reasons/showings listed near these listed above previously.

The United States Constitution is the Supreme Law of the land and "equality before the law" includes the law of the right to citizenship in the U.S. Constitution; with this the court must also see that The People classified as "aliens" and "immigrants" being arrested on the basis of "alienage" when The People are to be treated as "equality before the law" is contradictory.

In Federalist paper No. 42, the reasons for giving this power to the federal government are thus explained: "By the laws of several States, certain descriptions of aliens, who had rendered themselves obnoxious, were laid under interdicts inconsistent not only with the rights of citizenship but with the privilege of residence. What would have been the consequence, if such persons, by residence or otherwise, had acquired the character of citizens under the laws of another State . . . ? Whatever the legal consequences might have been, other consequences would probably have resulted, of too serious a nature not to be provided against. The new Constitution has accordingly, with great propriety, made provision against them, and all others proceeding from the defect of the Confederation on this head, by authorizing the general government to establish a uniform rule of naturalization throughout the United States."

"Chinese Exclusion Case, 130 U.S. 581, 606. Thomas Rec. 9536. Jefferson, who was not generally favorable to broad federal

powers, expressed a similar view in 1787: "My own general 13 For a collection of typical international controversies that idea was, that the States should severally preserve their have arisen in this manner, see Dunn, The Protection of sovereignty in whatever concerns themselves alone, and that Nationals (1932), pp. 13 et seq. Cf. John Jay in Federalist whatever may concern another State, or any foreign nation, paper No. 3: "The number of wars which have happened or should be made a part of the federal sovereignty." Memoir, will happen in the world will always be found to be in Correspondence and Miscellanies from the Papers of Thomas proportion to the number and weight of the causes, whether Jefferson (1829), vol. 2, p. 230, letter to Mr. Wythe. Cf. James real or pretended, which provoke or invite them. If this remark Madison in Federalist paper No. 42: "The second class of be just, it becomes useful to inquire whether so many just powers, lodged in the general government, consist of those causes of war are likely to be given by United America as by which regulate the intercourse with foreign nations. . . . This disunited America; for if it should turn out that United America class of powers forms an obvious and essential branch of the will probably give the fewest, then it will follow that in this federal administration. If we are to be one nation in any respect the Union tends most to preserve the people in a state respect, it clearly ought to be in respect to other nations."

- A. Legal imposition of distinct, unusual and extraordinary burdens and obligations upon aliens – such as subjecting [312 U.S. 52, 66 1941, (1941) U.S LEXIS 1103] [312 U.S. 52, 25, 1941, (1941) U.S LEXIS 1103] them alone, though perfectly law-abiding, to indiscriminate and repeated interception and interrogation by public officials -- thus bears an inseparable relationship to the welfare and tranquillity of all the states, and not merely to the welfare and tranquillity of one. Laws imposing such burdens are not mere census requirements, and even though they may be immediately associated with the accomplishment of a local purpose, they provoke questions in the field of international affairs.

6. The California Tort Claims Act violates the 14th Amendment's Privileges or Immunities.

- A. The purpose of a statute must be determined from the natural and legal effect of the language employed; and

whether it is or is not repugnant to the constitution of the United States must be determined from the natural state of such statutes when put into operation and not their proclaimed purpose. *Minnesota v. Barber* 136 U.S. 313; *Brimmed v. Rebman*, 138 U.S. 78 The California Tort Claims Act tolls the statute of limitations to 100 days after the California Tort Claims Act claim is mailed by the Plaintiff Perez Per Cal. Gov. Code 911.2 (Deering 1973) The California Tort Claims Act is required to be filed within 100 days as well as other Plaintiffs by making this case not be permitted to commence until after the 100 days that the California Tort Claims Act claim requirement is given to the State board and the Clerk in Tulare county, the California Tort Claims Act denied the Plaintiff Perez and others the statute of limitations defense which out-of-state people may use. See *Bendix* at p. 893, 108 S. Ct. 2218 creating a new statute of limitations for claims that require the California Tort Claims Act claim requirement.

7. This Petition for Writ of Mandamus requests that the Supreme Court of the United States order the United States Government and the President Donald J. Trump to pay the above stated money amounts.

- A. This Mandamus is in Donald J. Trump's personal capacity. The above listed constitutional violations the Party of Interest Trump did are actions not within the scope of duties of a President in an official capacity. The money that the party of interest Trump owes The People who were deported, detained, arrested, and imprisoned must be paid by Donald J. Trump, not the fellow American Taxpayers of The People classified as "aliens" and "immigrants." Due

Process requires the remedies of Donald J. Trump to pay The People classified as "aliens" for the above listed constitutional violations, and ICE officers to immediately stop deporting, detaining, arresting, and imprisoning The People classified as "aliens" and "immigrants" to be meaningful, and The People classified as "aliens" and "immigrants" to be recognized as United States citizens. Firstly, there are above listed constitutional violations done to The People deported, arrested, detained, and imprisoned. Also, The People arrested, deported, detained, and imprisoned missed paid work time while deported, detained, arrested, and imprisoned. Also The People were deported, detained, arrested, and imprisoned when their jobs required The People to go to their jobs. And, the People deported, detained, arrested, and imprisoned were taken away from their families, and their everyday lives in America. Also Trump put The People classified as "aliens" and "immigrants" in slavery as is described above. Additionally, The People classified as "aliens" and "immigrants" were in slavery by the United States people in the government which is one of the reasons The People classified as "aliens" and "immigrants" are particularly legally entitled to the total being requested in the asked questions above in this Petition. A small total doesn't fulfill that Due Process requires remedies to be meaningful quote due to the degree which slavery, et. al. other above listed descriptions which occurred are repugnant to the United States Constitution. The above stated money relief is requested per Justice Field's dissent of "Lastly: Can the Federal courts administer relief to citizens of the United

States whose privileges and *Slaughter-House* Cases 83 U.S. 36, 155, (1872), 1872 U.S. LEXIS 1139 on Page 55 of LEXIS+ immunities have been abridged by a State? Of this I entertain no doubt." Per the same foregoing legal authority the United States is legally obligated to pay the above money amount due to the same above stated constitutional violations are done and upheld by the United States; The United States imprisons, detains, arrests, and deports The People classified as "aliens" and "immigrants" taking them away from their families, their jobs, their lives, placing them in concentration camps in the guise of facilities, and exactly like Trump putting them in slavery as is described above.

Conclusion

This Petition for Writ of Mandamus should be granted.

Verification

I, Sabrina Veronica Perez, am the Plaintiff of this case. I have read the foregoing Verified Petition for Writ of Mandamus with a Certiorari Petition, with the attached Proposed orders and motion for expedited hearing, and the facts alleged in this file are within my knowledge, and I know them to be true.

Date: February 4, 2026 

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws in the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date: February 4, 2026 

Declaration

I declare under Penalty of Perjury of the laws of the state of California the foregoing is true and correct.

Date: February 4, 2026 