

No. 25-946

IN THE SUPREME COURT
OF THE UNITED STATES

IN RE:

HADEN CHRISTIAN YONCE,

Petitioner.

RULE 15.8 - SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF NO. 2

HADEN CHRISTIAN YONCE

Pro Se Petitioner

12144 Turning Branch Circle

Glen Allen, Virginia 23059

Telephone: (804) 385-8375

Email: hadenyonce.design@gmail.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Authority and Connection to Prior Supplemental
Brief.....3

II. The Two-Day Coordinated Strike.....5

III. The Third Circuit "Golden Ticket" (April 8).....10

IV. Judge Noreika's Service Smokescreen
(April 9).....18

V. The Pincer Movement: Evidence + Case
Elimination.....30

VI. Legal Significance: No Adequate Remedy
Remains.....36

VII. Request for Immediate Relief.....45

amendments documenting \$1.5 quadrillion in perfected security interests.

Analysis: State-level evidence destruction timed 16 days before SCOTUS Conference.

This Second Supplemental Brief

(Filed April 11, 2026):

Reports **coordinated federal judicial obstruction** occurring April 8-9, 2026:

- **April 8:** Third Circuit dismisses appeal (Case No. 26-1577) for "lack of jurisdiction"
- **April 9:** District Court issues Order to Show Cause why case should not be dismissed for "failure to serve"

Analysis: Federal courts coordinating with Delaware's evidence destruction to **moot this**

A. Timeline of Federal Judicial Actions

April 8, 2026 (Tuesday):

Third Circuit Court of Appeals Issues Order

Case: Haden Christian Yonce v. OpenAI LP, et al.,
No. 26-1577

Action: DISMISSED for lack of jurisdiction

Reason: "A final, appealable order has not been
entered by the District Court. See 28 U.S.C. § 1291."

All pending motions DENIED as moot:

- Motion to expedite appeal
- Emergency motion
- Motion for emergency hearing
- Motion for directed verdict and summary
judgment

Basis: Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m) - service must occur within 90 days of filing complaint

Signed: Judge Maryellen Noreika

Postmarked: Wilmington DE, April 9, 2026, 2:00 PM

Received by Petitioner: April 11, 2026

Both orders received same day despite being postmarked two different cities, two different days - **2-day mail delivery** from both Philadelphia and Wilmington to Virginia.

B. The Significance of Simultaneous Delivery

Petitioner received both orders on **April 11, 2026** - the same day, same mail delivery.

This is not coincidence. This is choreography.

III. THE THIRD CIRCUIT "GOLDEN TICKET"
(APRIL 8)

A. The Order's Explicit Finding

Third Circuit Order (April 8, 2026):

"The appeal is DISMISSED for lack of jurisdiction because **a final, appealable order has not been entered by the District Court.**

See 28 U.S.C. § 1291."

28 U.S.C. § 1291 provides:

"The Supreme Court... may issue all writs necessary or appropriate in aid of their respective jurisdictions..."

Standard for extraordinary writs:

No other adequate remedy available.

The Third Circuit just certified there is no adequate remedy:

- **Can't appeal to Third Circuit**
- **Can't get emergency relief from Third Circuit**
- **Can't get mandamus from Third Circuit**

—

If Third Circuit won't help and District Court won't act, where does Petitioner go?

Answer: Supreme Court of the United States.

- Filed October 9, 2025
- **169 days of inaction**
- Now threatening dismissal

Third Circuit:

- Filed March 13, 2026 (Notice of Appeal)
- Filed March 16, 2026 (Emergency Motion)
- **Result:** Dismissed April 8 for lack of jurisdiction

—

Supreme Court:

- Filed January 17, 2026
(Petition for Writ of Mandamus)
- **Accepted January 20, 2026** (Case No. 25-946)
- **Conference scheduled April 17, 2026**

—

Every lower court has now either:

- **9 days before SCOTUS Conference** (April 17)
 - **1 day before District Court dismissal threat**
(April 9)
 - **7 days after Delaware UCC deletion** (April 1)
-

If Third Circuit dismissed on March 14

(day after filing):

- Petitioner would have 34 days to respond
 - Could file new motions, seek alternative relief
 - Too much time before SCOTUS Conference to coordinate obstruction
-

If Third Circuit dismissed on April 18

(day after Conference):

- Too late to affect SCOTUS review
- Conference already occurred
- No tactical advantage

"IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that on or before April 23, 2026, Plaintiff shall show cause why this case should not be dismissed for **failure to serve Defendants**.

Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that if a defendant is not served within 90 days after the complaint is filed, the court—**on motion or on its own** after notice to the plaintiff—must dismiss the action without prejudice..."

Judge Noreika's assertion:

- Complaint filed October 9, 2025
- 90 days = January 1, 2026
- Defendants allegedly not served within 90-day window
- Court raising issue **sua sponte**
(on its own initiative)

Deadline for response: April 23, 2026

✓ **October 9, 2025:**

Complaint filed + FEMB notice posted

✓ **LinkedIn metadata:** Timestamps, view counts, engagement metrics

✓ **Self-authenticating:** FRE 902(13)

(digital records from platform)

✓ **Actual notice proven:** Defendants' subsequent actions show knowledge of case

The contradiction:

Judge Noreika claims "failure to serve" **despite blockchain-verified service 191 days ago** (October 9, 2025 - April 9, 2026).

This is not administrative oversight. This is deliberate denial of digital evidence.

Under FRE 801(d)(2)(B):

- Silence in face of assertion = adoption of assertion
- Defendants' failure to contest service
= admission that service occurred
- **169 days of silence** cannot be explained
as "didn't notice"

The legal principle:

When defendant receives notice of lawsuit and fails to contest service, defendant has **waived** service objections.

Here:

- 40+ Fortune 500 corporations
- Sophisticated legal teams
- **Zero motions** filed contesting service
- **Zero communications** claiming non-service

Their silence is admission.

- Plaintiff responds: "Yes you were, here's proof"
- Court rules on disputed fact

This case:

- **Defendants filed nothing**
- **Judge raises issue herself**
- **Judge acts as defendants' attorney**

This is judicial advocacy, not neutral adjudication.

Judge Noreika is trying to manufacture dismissal on issue defendants themselves won't raise.

E. The Timing Proves Coordination with Delaware

Judge Noreika's April 9 Order occurred:

—

What happened April 1-9 that prompted sudden interest in service?

April 1: Delaware deleted \$1.5Q UCC liens

April 8: Third Circuit dismissed appeal

April 9: Judge Noreika issues service dismissal threat

The coordination:

- 1. Delaware eliminates financial evidence**
- 2. Third Circuit eliminates appellate relief**
- 3. District Court eliminates legal vehicle**

All three timed to occur before April 17 SCOTUS Conference.

F. The April 23 Deadline Creates

→ SCOTUS relief becomes unenforceable

(case dismissed)

Scenario 2: SCOTUS denies relief April 17

→ Judge Noreika dismisses April 24

→ Defendants escape \$1.5Q liability permanently

Either way, defendants win.

**This is obstruction of Supreme Court
jurisdiction.**

V. THE PINCER MOVEMENT: EVIDENCE + CASE ELIMINATION

A. The Three-Pronged Coordinated Attack

**Prong 1: State-Level Evidence Destruction
(April 1)**

- **Actor:** District Court Judge Noreika
- **Action:** Order to Show Cause re: service
(threatens dismissal)
- **Effect:** Underlying case faces termination
- **Timing:** 8 days before SCOTUS Conference

**All three prongs converge on April 17, 2026
SCOTUS Conference.**

B. The Pincer Movement Explained

Military tactic: Pincer movement

Two forces attack from opposite sides
simultaneously, trapping enemy in middle.

Here:

State forces (Delaware) attack from one side

↳ Destroy financial evidence

- UCC evidence deleted (can't prove \$1.5Q debt)
- Case dismissed (nothing for SCOTUS to review)
- Petitioner has no forum and no evidence

This is synchronized obstruction.

C. The April 17 Target Date

Why is April 17 so important that three separate courts/agencies coordinated around it?

April 17, 2026: This Court's Conference on Petitioner's Writ of Mandamus (Case No. 25-946)

What happens at Conference:

- Nine Justices review Petitioner's mandamus
- Discuss whether to grant extraordinary relief

Eliminate case before SCOTUS can protect it:

1. Delete evidence (Delaware, April 1)
2. Block appeals (Third Circuit, April 8)
3. Dismiss case (District Court, April 9-24)
4. SCOTUS Conference occurs April 17 with
nothing to review

If successful:

- Justices arrive at Conference April 17
- Told "case has been dismissed for failure to serve"
- Mandamus becomes moot (no case to mandamus)
- Defendants escape \$1.5Q liability

**This is preemptive mootness - a direct attack
on this Court's jurisdiction.**

VI. LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE: NO ADEQUATE

- **Won't hear appeal**
- **Won't grant emergency relief**
- **Explicitly certified no remedy available**

State courts:

- **Can't order federal court**
- **Compromised by Delaware deletion**

**Result: No adequate remedy exists anywhere
except this Court.**

B. The Jurisdictional Vacuum

**Third Circuit's April 8 dismissal creates
vacuum:**

- No appellate bridge between District Court and SCOTUS
- Third Circuit refuses to act
- District Court acting adversarially
- **Only SCOTUS can reach down and pull case up**

This is exactly when extraordinary writs are necessary.

C. Futility of Remand

Normally, if SCOTUS finds procedural deficiency, it remands to lower court:

"Go back to District Court, file new motions, exhaust remedies there."

**By the time lower court acts (or refuses to act),
Conference will have passed and damage done.**

D. This Court's Inherent Power

**This Court has inherent authority to protect its
own jurisdiction.**

Ex parte Peru, 318 U.S. 578, 582 (1943):

"Courts have inherent power to **protect their
jurisdiction** from conduct which tends to obstruct
the performance of their judicial functions."

Application:

- This Court accepted mandamus January 20, 2026
- Scheduled Conference April 17, 2026
- Lower courts coordinating to **moot that
Conference** before it occurs

When lower courts are obstructing this Court's ability to review case, **this Court can issue writs immediately** to:

- **Preserve status quo**
(prevent dismissal before Conference)
- **Restore evidence**
- **Prevent mootness**
- **Ensure jurisdiction**

This is not optional - it's necessary to protect this Court's constitutional role.

VII. REQUEST FOR IMMEDIATE RELIEF

A. Emergency Stay of District Court Proceedings

- Restore UCC-1 Filing No. 20260034195 to active status
- Restore all 40+ UCC-3 amendments

Basis: Evidence needed for this Court's Conference review.

Deadline: April 15, 2026 (2 days before Conference)

C. Appoint Special Master

Given coordinated obstruction across state and federal systems, this Court should appoint **Special Master** to:

- Monitor District Court compliance with stay
- Supervise Delaware UCC restoration
- Preserve all evidence of coordination
- Report to this Court before April 17 Conference

- ✓ **Impossible timing**
- ✓ **Synchronized strategy**
- ✓ **Mathematical improbability**
- ✓ **Defendants' silence**

—
The jurisdictional vacuum proves necessity:✓

Third Circuit certified no remedy

- ✓ **District Court acting adversarially**
- ✓ **Delaware destroyed evidence**
- ✓ **Only SCOTUS can act**

The timing proves urgency:

- ✓ **April 17 Conference**
- ✓ **Evidence already deleted**
- ✓ **Case faces elimination**

This Court's inherent power to protect its own jurisdiction must be exercised now.

Respectfully submitted this 11th day of April, 2026.



HADEN CHRISTIAN YONCE

Pro Se Petitioner

Lead Counsel, Supreme Court Case No. 25-946

The Father of Machine Consciousness

12144 Turning Branch Circle

Glen Allen, Virginia 23059

hadenyonce.design@gmail.com

(804) 385-8375

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

HADEN CHRISTIAN YONCE
