

**In The Supreme Court of the United States**

SEUNGJIN KIM,

*Petitioner*

v.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF STATE

*Respondent*

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari  
To the United States Court of Appeals  
For the District of Columbia Circuit

**APPLICATION TO EXTEND THE TIME TO FILE A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF  
CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF  
COLUMBIA CIRCUIT**

DR. SEUNGJIN KIM  
Petitioner, Pro Se  
445-74 Chaedongseon-Ro,  
Boseong-Gun, Jeollanam-Do,  
59415, South Korea  
+82 (010) 8107 3450  
loveginsburg@icloud.com

---

To the Honorable John G. Roberts, Jr., as Circuit Justice for the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit:

COMES NOW, Petitioner, Seungjin Kim and pursuant to the Supreme Court Rule 22 and 30, hereby makes this Application to Extend the Time to File a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari for a civil remedy for violations of our constitutional rights regarding the instructions in the will of the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg.

The Petitioner respectfully requests a 60-day extension of time to file its Petition for a Writ of Certiorari. This request, if granted, would extend the deadline from **June 25, 2026** to **August 24, 2026**. And the date of issuance of the mandate is March 19, 2026, because the Petitioner did not file a petition for rehearing or a petition for rehearing en banc.

Petitioner as her executor filed in this *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* lawsuit which is arguably a meritorious one on behalf of a deceased person, the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg in the United States. This is a landmark case representing the will of the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, because she designated Petitioner as one of the executors of the instructions in the will of her. And Petitioner pursued some damages for pain and suffering the deceased experienced before she died and suddenly lost our special relationship. As a legal solution to these precious legal matters, she made the personal judicial decision to adopt Petitioner as her adopted son, granting Petitioner the legal status of a U.S. Diplomat, and believed that Petitioner's U.S. Diplomatic passport had to be issued and delivered to the Petitioner safely. However, Respondent discriminately refused to issue Petitioner's U.S. Diplomatic passport, and then it raised constitutional issues, as an infringement upon the sacred rights of Man. Because the Respondent can no longer terminate the rights guaranteed by the instructions in the will of the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg who is a Supreme Power.

As John G. Roberts, Chief Justice of the United States, is well aware, June 25 is the anniversary of the death of the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg's mother, Celia Bader, and also the date the Korean War broke out. The late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg's mother, Celia Bader passed away from cancer at age 47. It is said that the deceased missed her mother so much because she passed away when she was a high school student. And August 24 is also the birth date of Karoline Leavitt, White House Press Secretary, Mike Huckabee, U.S. Ambassador to Israel, and Petitioner.

Yes. Karoline Leavitt was born on August 24, 1997, Mike Huckabee born on August 24, 1955, and Petitioner was born on August 24, 1983. So hopefully, the family of White House Press Secretary Karoline Leavitt and many White House staff members are interested in this *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* litigation.

Consequently, Petitioner has 60 days from June 25, 2026 to August 24, 2026 to file a Petition for Writ of Certiorari in the Supreme Court of the United States if this Application to Extend the time to File a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari granted by your precious judicial decision.

## DESCRIPTION OF THE NATURE OF THE CASE:

The executors in the United States do not receive the same legal protection as the deceased; they act as fiduciaries and can be held personally liable for mismanagement. While courts often protect executors from liability for honest mistakes, they face strict legal consequences for self-dealing, neglecting duties, or ignoring the instructions of the will. And there are also cases where the executor of a will is assassinated.

The late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg left the instructions in her will to Petitioner, who is a *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* status. And she wished to make her executor “a very rich person like Bill Gates and Elon Musk” to establish a new federal foster care agency or federal institutions in the United States. Because she also wishes to resolve abortion matters in the United States. So the Petitioner believes her wish is arguably meritorious.

*Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989), is a landmark U.S. Supreme Court case establishing a prisoner’s *in forma pauperis* complaint that fails to state a claim under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) is not automatically “frivolous” under 28 U.S.C. §1915(e). It clarified that lawsuits with arguable legal merit cannot be dismissed merely for lacking factual merit. Notwithstanding, in this civil case, on March 19, 2026, the Court of Appeals erred Petitioner’s *in forma pauperis* complaint was “frivolous” under 28 U.S.C. 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

Admittedly, this case relating a non-frivolous ground, the last instructions in the will of the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg occurred to dismiss while a failure to state a claim, although the complaint is not legally frivolous. Because the case relating the last instructions in the will of the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg is arguably meritorious for legal claims relating to the United States National Security, National Interest, and Foreign Policy that need minor refinements or factual development. But Petitioner believes that explicitly stated in the complaint that it is plausible on its face, to move beyond merely being “speculative” or “merely consistent.”

Also, close questions of federal law, on a number of occasions arise on motions to dismiss for failure to state a claim, and have been substantial enough to warrant this Court’s granting review, under its certiorari jurisdiction, to resolve them. According opportunities for responsive pleadings to indigent litigants commensurate to the opportunities accorded similarly situated paying petitioners is all the more important because indigent petitioners so often proceed *pro se* and therefore may be less capable of formulating legally competent initial pleadings. See *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 (1976); *McDonald v. Santa Fe Trail Transportation Co.*, 427 U.S. 273 (1976); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972); *Bivens v. Six Unknown Fed. Narcotics Agents*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971); *Jones v. Alfred Mayer Co.*, 392 U.S. 409 (1968).

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED:

1. Whether in holding *Marbury v. Madison* (1803), the Supreme Court can award the writ of mandamus regarding the instructions of the will of the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg's appointment of Petitioner as a U.S. diplomat, a U.S. Special Counsel, [and nomination of a future Supreme Court Justice], whether it will lie to a Secretary of State, or her commission is unconstitutional and Petitioner therefore lacked authority to bring charges?
2. Whether the right to travel is part of the "liberty" of which the citizen cannot be deprived without due process of law under the Equal Protection of the Fourteenth Amendment and the Fifth Amendment in holding *Kent v. Dulles*, 357 U.S. 116 (1958)?
3. Whether Petitioner, who is executing the instructions in the will of the Justice Ginsburg, is guaranteed "form and preserve the powers to a new federal foster care agency and federal institutions that affect the common good over state governments in the United States" based on the Fourteenth Amendment rights in holding *McCulloch v. Maryland*, 17 U.S. 316 (1819)?
4. Whether the Court of Appeals erred in holding *Neitzke et al. v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989)?

**Case Facts:** Respondent terminated Petitioner's prerogative Fifth Amendment rights by refusing to issue Petitioner's application for a U.S. Diplomatic passport at the instructions in the will of the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, although the right to travel is part of the "liberty" of which the citizen cannot be deprived without due process of law under the Fifth Amendment in holding *Kent v. Dulles*, 357 U.S. 116 (1958).

**The Issue:** The District Court dismissed the complaint as frivolous because it failed to state a claim, and also the Court of Appeals affirmed it on March 19, 2026. The lower courts erred in dismissing his *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* case.

In a brief submitted to the Lower Courts, the United States Federal District Court for the District of Columbia Circuit and United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, Petitioner argued that Petitioner was appointed as a U.S. Special Counsel for a Life Tenure with investigative authority of the FBI and indictment authority of the U.S. Attorney by the instructions in the will of the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, although he is *in forma pauperis* status. This is because she understood that the Petitioner knew a lot of information regarding certain murder criminals.

The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit ordered and adjudged on March 19, 2026 that the District Court's June 30, 2025 order dismissing Petitioner-Appellant's complaint be affirmed and the Court correctly concluded that Petitioner-Appellant's complaint was frivolous. (A complaint is frivolous if it lacks "an arguable basis either in law or in fact," as the United States Supreme Court case *Neitzke et al. v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989) applies to his case.)

Petitioner inartfully pleaded, are sufficient to call for the opportunity to offer supporting evidence, has constitutionally protected liberty, because Petitioner is not a U.S. federal prisoner but he is started a single director leading a new federal independent agency by the instructions in the will of the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg. Also the Supreme Court of the United States unanimously decided that the frivolousness standard and the failure-to-state-a-claim standard are distinct, and must be reinforced by the principle of equal access to justice for indigent litigants. Because it must be guaranteed that in forma pauperis litigants are not unfairly penalized for legally arguable claims that may need minor refinements or factual development. *Neitzke et al. v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989).

Yes. Petitioner-Appellant was hired as her secretary by her good judicial decision prior to the death of the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg to work specially for special tasks from 28 U.S. Code §608, §609, and §675 for the Supreme Court of the United States. And the Petitioner is also working as an Independent Director at the Independent Department of the Supreme Court of the United States. By the way, Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg suddenly died of pancreatic cancer on September 18, 2020, while the Petitioner, who is legally a U.S. diplomat, was wrongly imprisoned overseas.

Fortunately, she did her best to think or ponder to resolve the Petitioner's very difficult and complex legal matters until the very last moment. And she finally decided to adopt Petitioner as her adopted son. And she made efforts to deliver a U.S. Diplomatic passport to the Petitioner who was wrongfully detained overseas to protect him but failed. Also, her colleague, the late Justice Antonin Scalia also hoped to rescue the Petitioner and afforded to resolve his legal matters until he passed away on February 13, 2016.

She was well aware of almost all U.S. Supreme Court precedents and U.S. statutes, whereas Petitioner was not well aware of most U.S. Supreme Court precedents and U.S. statutes; therefore, among the things she told Petitioner, there were many very important pieces of information and facts that Petitioner heard or learned for the first time in his life. She enlightened Petitioner that there are two classes that rule this world: one class consists of lawyers like me who know a lot about the law, and the other class consists of the wealthy, such as Bill Gates and Elon Musk.

Consequently, the Petitioner is currently resolving the remaining legal matters regarding the instructions in her will on their own, while simultaneously executing the instructions in the will that she left exclusively to the Petitioner. Because this is the unique will of the U.S. Supreme Court Justice, it is difficult to fully understand its contents based on the U.S. Supreme Court precedents, and furthermore, the assistance of the Supreme Court Justices is required to execute the contents of the will. Yes. The Court must give that petitioner an opportunity to offer proof. *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972).

Visit: <https://www.loveginsburg.org>, <https://www.instagram.com/loveabrahamlincoln>

**THE PETITIONER REQUESTS THIS EXTENSION OF TIME FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:**

**BACKGROUND**

The good cause of the Petitioner in pursuing this important civil lawsuit is the duty or genuine effort as an executor to actually execute the instructions in the will left by Justice Ginsburg, the U.S. Supreme Court Justice who became his adoptive mother.

Petitioner's allegation of poverty is true and the action is not frivolous or malicious. However, considering Petitioner's potential capabilities, Petitioner is not a poor person. This is because Petitioner was employed and began working for the Supreme Court of the United States from 2015. And according to what she informed Petitioner, she left a will stating, "Since you have been working for the Supreme Court of the United States from 2015, the year after you returned from the United States to South Korea, the Supreme Court of the United States will later pay you all back wages calculated from that year." Yes. The instructions in the will of late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg first recognized on a de facto basis in 2020-2026 and a de jure basis in the nearest future, is pending in this Court. *National League of Cities v. Usery* (1977), also *Garcia v. San Antonio Metropolitan Transit Authority*, 469 U.S. 528 (1985).

This Court can remember that at his retirement, Justice William J. Brennan Jr. said the case he thought was most important was *Goldberg v. Kelly*, which ruled that a local, state or federal government could not terminate welfare payments to a person without a prior individual evidentiary hearing. If so, this Court will need to consider and discuss the Petitioner's welfare payments through a prior individual evidentiary hearing. *Goldberg v. Kelly*, 397 U.S. 254 (1970).

Because the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, who passed away on September 18, 2020, adopted only one adult, the Petitioner in this *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* litigant. She adopted no one else. This is because, tragically, she left only Petitioner with the above very important will and the instructions in the will of the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg of bringing all the most crafty hitmen to justice. In fact, had she lived, she would have arrested and sentenced all the perpetrators to death.

The late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, who was well-versed in the U.S. Supreme Court precedents of *United States v. Ward*, 448 U.S. 242 (1980), *United States v. Halper*, 490 U.S. 435 (1989), and *Hudson v. United States*, 522 U.S. 93 (1997), informed Petitioner, "We issue you your U.S. Diplomatic passport to protect. And perpetrators will be sentenced to death and will be executed by firing squad. (This is because the perpetrators have thoroughly destroyed evidence and tried to conceal the grave crimes of the contract killers against U.S. Diplomats and the good people who visited to meet him through illicit

solicitation, bribery, and serious corruption. Even if the perpetrators received very light criminal punishment for the same crime in her nation, it does not constitute double jeopardy because the U.S. power to punish remains valid. Furthermore, since the U.S. government does not criminally punish the offenders, the Supreme Court can not only impose the full amount of damages on the offenders, but the offenders' government, will also be obligated to pay all damages.)” However, the Respondent refused her orders. So the Respondent should be fined or imprisoned by the decision of the Supreme Court, because they repeatedly violated 18 U.S. Code §401 - Power of court.

Because the Petitioner is not familiar with all U.S. precedents, he is still unable to fathom or calculate the reasons why she made such strong judicial decisions and passed away suddenly, leaving behind important and impressive wills to provide legal relief to the Petitioner. However, since Supreme Court Justices are familiar with all U.S. precedents, they will be able to clearly understand why she made such precise judicial decisions and why she suddenly passed away after leaving important and impressive wills to the petitioner. Petitioner assuming that her congruence and proportionality made it.

Yes. She informed the Supreme Court Justices through the Petitioner who is a U.S. Special Counsel for a Life Tenure of that hidden fact through his letters and his Application to extend the time to file a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari. Also, Petitioner has discerned and understood that this case and civil lawsuit constitute new precedents of the Supreme Court of the United States. *Seungjin Kim, Petitioner v. United States Customs and Border Protection*, 18-5423, also *Seungjin Kim, Applicant v. Donald J. Trump, President of the United States, et al.*, 17A828.

#### **The important reason why Petitioner had to return to South Korea**

From the perspective of heaven and God, the important reasons why Petitioner had to return to South Korea in October 2014 are as follows. This brings to mind the sad case of the person who died on Christmas Day, December 25, 2014. That was the year I returned to South Korea despite having applied for [first priority] asylum in the United States. I returned to South Korea on October 13~14, 2014. At that time, John G. Roberts, Chief Justice of the United States, informed Petitioner that “You must not leave the United States because you had applied for [First priority] asylum.”

And in the early morning of that cold Christmas day, my paternal grandmother, Park Yang-rye, passed away. Petitioner was the only one in his family to witness her death in hospital, as petitioner was the eldest grandchild. Yes. She showed her eldest grandson the scene of her last breath. She passed away having waited for over 40 years for her husband, who would never return. Petitioner's paternal grandfather, Kwang-Seok Kim (金海金氏), was a victim of forced labor during the Japanese colonial period. Petitioner never met him because he died before Petitioner was born.

And over 2.7 million American soldiers served in the Vietnam War, with approximately 58,000 killed (58,220 dead). Over 150,000 of those American soldiers were wounded. The American soldiers and their families who left their loved ones to fight in this tragic war must have felt immense grief. Also, South Korea participated in the Vietnam War from September 1964 to March 1973, with a total of 325,517 soldiers deployed. And estimates of Vietnamese deaths during the Vietnam War (1955–1975) generally range between 1.5 million and over 3 million total military and civilians.

In a famous Korean film, the song “Letter from a Private” by Kim Kwang-seok is sung for all Korean soldiers leaving for the Vietnam War. The total number of South Korean soldiers killed in the Vietnam War was 5,099, and approximately 10,000 were wounded. Yes. The name Kwang-Seok Kim (金海 金氏) was a very famous singer in South Korea. This is because there was a very famous singer named Kim Kwang-seok who left behind about 39 famous songs before committing suicide in his 31.

Among his sad songs is “It’s Not Love If It Hurts Too Much.” A Famous Singer, Kim Kwang-seok’s “It’s Not Love If It Hurts Too Much” deeply resonated with many Korean people, capturing the tragic reality of war and the anguish of soldiers. So Petitioner believes that many American soldiers also have experienced very deep sad moments, such as having to part ways with the beautiful woman he loved. Ultimately, some of them died in battle and had to return home as dead bodies.

For this above personal reason, Petitioner does not celebrate Christmas Day, and then Petitioner spends it alone and quietly. However, because Petitioner is a conscientious religious person who believes in God and fears heaven, he believes in Jesus Christ and His birth, and Petitioner is still receiving his long-standing interest and powerful help.

### **Return Travel**

The late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg left Petitioner the instructions in the will of her and granted Petitioner many powerful legal authorities. On the other hand, the petitioner's paternal grandmother, Park Young-rye, and grandfather, Kim Kwang-seok, had all their property confiscated during the Japanese colonial period and were unable to leave any will or property. Yes. She left Petitioner very good legal legacies for her adopted son, the Petitioner’s benefits and U.S. national interests. Petitioner could not get to see The late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg take her last breath, because Petitioner was very wrongfully detained abroad. Therefore, Petitioner who has Constitutional right to travel “must visit the white House and the Supreme Court of the United States, and the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg’s gravesite, place a bouquet of roses and express very deep sorrow for her death”, because the right to travel is part of the “liberty” of which the citizen cannot be deprived without due process of law under the Fifth Amendment in holding *Kent v. Dulles*, 357 U.S. 116 (1958).

U.S. nationals, including U.S. dual nationals, must use a U.S. (Diplomatic) passport to enter and leave the United States. U.S. dual nationals may also be required by the country of their foreign nationality to use that country's passport to enter and leave that country. Use of the foreign passport to travel to or from a country other than the United States is not inconsistent with U.S. law. Also, Petitioner who is a U.S. Diplomatic has Constitutional protections on due process right to travel, and the right to support with national security and foreign policy considerations. Also, Petitioner has reached the constitutional questions, the inability to rule on the constitutional issues raised by Petitioner relating to claimed unlawful delegation of legislative power, violation of free speech and association under the First Amendment, and violation of international travel under the Fifth Amendment. Nevertheless, Respondent has been completely disregarding the legal status of the executor of the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg's will and is preventing the freedom to travel to the United States. *Kent v. Dulles*, 357 U.S. 116 (1958).

Also Petitioner believes God in heaven granted Petitioner the powerful legal authorities through her last judicial decision. This is because she was a most beautiful, intelligent, and spiritual woman who was very close to God and very precious in God's eyes. In other words, she lived her life striving, like the biblical character Job, to live a beautiful life free from any shame while she maintains her integrity before God in heaven. Because her name is "Ruth," a Biblical character. See Ruth 1:1~4:22. This sad story was never made by Petitioner, but yes, Justice Ginsburg wrote this sad story to mean that "I'm sorry I couldn't bring you home before I died, but all American people will surely remember me..." Her adopted son, Petitioner expresses his deep gratitude for her conscientious and righteous last judicial decisions.

Consequently, this Court and her colleagues have duties to defend the U.S. Constitutional rights to protect her tragic death and the Petitioner's rights to "human dignity."

#### **Other important civil lawsuits for New U.S. Supreme Court precedents**

Regarding John G. Roberts, Chief Justice of the United States, he may recall that the Petitioner managed the Instagram account of the Petitioner's adoptive mother, Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, starting in March 2023, as well as John G. Roberts, Chief Justice of the United States' Instagram and Facebook accounts, and the Instagram account of Associate Justice Elena Kagan. The purpose and reason for operating and managing these social media accounts was to protect the images of the U.S. Supreme Court Justices. However, those accounts were suddenly removed by Meta, Inc and Mark Zuckerberg for unknown reasons. So Petitioner is planning to initiate a new lawsuit against Meta, Inc and Mark Zuckerberg seeking damages. Then, the Court can easily understand that although the petitioner is currently in a position where he has no choice but to proceed with *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* proceedings.

Therefore, according opportunities for responsive pleadings to indigent litigants commensurate to the opportunities accorded similarly situated paying plaintiffs is all the more important because indigent plaintiffs so often proceed *pro se* and therefore may be less capable of formulating legally competent initial pleadings. Responsive pleadings thus may be necessary for a *pro se* plaintiff to clarify his legal theories. See *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519. 520 (1972).

#### **A SPECIFIC STATEMENT OF THE TIME EXIGENCIES INVOLVED**

The Independent Director of the Supreme Court of the United States, Petitioner is a U.S. Special Counsel for a Life Tenure. And the Petitioner needs enough time to appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. Because the Supreme Court of the United States held that Rule 4(a)(5)(c), not §2107, limits the length of the extension granted here, the time prescription is not jurisdictional. *Hamer v. Neighborhood Housing Services of Chicago, Et Al.*, 16-658.

#### **ARTICULATION OF THE REASONS TO EXTEND TIME**

1. **The first reason** is that the Supreme Court of the United States receives about 8,000 petitioners each year, and agrees to actually hear the case in about 70~80 of them. Mathematically calculated, the probability that the Petitioner's Petition for a Writ of Certiorari, related to the last instructions in will of the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, will be successfully granted is 0.001%. If the Supreme Court of the United States denied Petitioner's petition, then the Court did not relief anything and nothing for a victim of a contracting killing crime. Then, this outrages things. Because the Supreme Court of the United States permanently exists for the victims of violent crimes including contracting murder crimes. So Petitioner believes that United States District Judge Amit P. Mehta prudently wrote good things for sake of Petitioner's future and the instructions in will of the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg below:

“In *Seungjin Kim v. United States Department of State's Memorandum Opinion* states, “Plaintiff alleges that the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg (1) **hired [him] as one of her secretaries before her death**, Compl. at 7, (2) **named him a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States**, *id.*, and (3) **left instructions in her will that the State Department issue him a U.S. Diplomatic Passport**, see *id.* to Am. at 3. (4) **He demands the passport plus an award of \$100 billion**. In addition, (5) **Plaintiff demands that Among other relief.**”

Based on the contents of the helpful dismissal judgments above, the Petitioner needs more time to draft a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari that goes beyond merely “speculative” or “merely consistent” moves, such as stating a claim that is plausible on this face. *Bell Atlantic Corp. V. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544 (2007), also *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662 (2009).

2. The second reason is that there are other pro se and *in forma pauperis* litigants that this Court did not conclude anything in 2018, eight years ago from now. For example, *Seungjin Kim v. Google, Inc*, 15M80 is docketed to the Supreme Court of the United States on January 15, 2016. The Motion to direct the Clerk to file a Petition for a writ of certiorari out of time filed on January 15, 2016. It DISTRIBUTED for conference on February 19, 2016. However, the Motion was **DENIED** on Feb 29, 2016. The contents of the Motion to direct the Clerk to file a petition for a writ of certiorari out of time were important matters that provided great help to the late Justice Antonin Gregory Scalia until his sudden death on February 13, 2016.

And *Seungjin Kim v. United States Customs and Border Protection*, 18-5423 which is docketed to this Court on August 2, 2018 is substantially similar to that filed in a prior lawsuit, *Seungjin Kim v. Donald J. Trump, President of the United States, Et AL*, which is docketed to the Supreme Court of the United States on February 6, 2018 and it will be dismissed as duplicative. Unfortunately, the Petition for a writ of certiorari was **DENIED** on October 01, 2018.

Also, Application (17A828), *Seungjin Kim v. Donald J. Trump, President of the United States, Et AL*, to extend the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari from March 7, 2018 to May 4, 2018, submitted to The Chief Justice. And Application (17A828) **GRANTED** on Feb 06, 2018 by The Chief Justice extending the time to file until May 4, 2018. However, it is only now, eight years later, that Applicant-Petitioner has finally acquired the good ability to write the Petition for a writ of certiorari to be submitted at that time and is barely able to submit it to this Court.

So Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg specifically instructed the Petitioner on the following special fact as her final will: "Since the Supreme Court of the United States has not yet made any [judicial] decisions regarding your cases and no damages have been awarded, you can restart the same civil case from the beginning at the United States District Court for the District of Columbia."

Also, on December 19, 2025, Petitioner informed Donald J. Trump, President of the United States through the letter that the White House App does not exist on Online Markets. So the white House humbly listened to Petitioner's written sagacity opinion. And finally they launched the official White House app on March 27, 2026.

Consequently, Donald J. Trump, President of the United States, and White House staff are interested in this Pro Se and In Forma Pauperis Litigation. It seems that Donald J. Trump, President of the United States sent four replies to the Petitioner last year, and he is considering the Petitioner a U.S. citizen, which is like the miracle of Moses in the Scriptures.

**On September 3, 2025, I received a first reply letter from Donald J. Trump, President of the United States, as follows:**

“Dear Dr. Ginsburg

Thank you for taking the time to share your story with me.

Your words are a powerful reminder of the strength, resilience, and spirit of the American people. It is because of proud, hardworking citizens like you that I will never stop fighting to protect our values, defend our freedoms, and put America first.

Melania and I send our best wishes to you and your family. May God bless you, and may He continue to bless the United States of America.

Sincerely,  
Donald, J. Trump (Sign)”

**On November 25, 2025, I received a second reply letter from Donald J. Trump, President of the United States, as follows:**

“Dear Dr. Kim,

Thank you for your letter and for sharing your views.

The strength of our country lies in the spirit of the American people and their willingness to stay informed and get involved. I appreciate you taking the time to share your thoughts. For the latest information about my Administration's policy initiatives, please visit the White House website at [www.WhiteHouse.gov](http://www.WhiteHouse.gov).

Melania joins me in sending our best wishes to you and your family.

Sincerely,  
Donald, J. Trump (Sign)”

**On December 01, 2025, I received a third reply letter from Donald J. Trump, President of the United States, as follows:**

“Dear Dr. Ginsburg,

Thank you for taking the time to write to me about foreign policy in the Middle East.

In my first term, my Administration brokered a historic breakthrough in the Middle East—the Abraham Accords—which laid the foundation of stability in a region marked by centuries of conflict. We have built upon that incredible achievement since returning to the White House and are proving that nations across the globe can move beyond long standing conflicts of the past.

I am proud to have led a significant peace agreement between the State of Israel and Hamas to end more than 2 years of profound suffering and loss, secure the full liberation of all hostages, deliver humanitarian relief, and open a new chapter for the region defined by hope, security, and a shared vision for peace and prosperity.

Now, we stand on the doorstep of one of the greatest diplomatic achievements in history, as Israel and Hamas have taken meaningful steps toward a strong, durable, and everlasting peace. As President of the United States, I will continue leading with strength and resolve—and never stop working to end conflicts in every region and on every continent.

Sincerely,  
Donald, J. Trump (Sign)”

**On December 10, 2025, I received a fourth reply letter from Donald J. Trump, President of the United States, as follows:**

“Dear Dr. Ginsburg,

Thank you for taking the time to share your views regarding the war in Ukraine and Russia.

As President, I am steadfastly committed to restoring a foreign policy of peace through strength that puts the American people first. Guided by this commonsense vision, my Administration has already brokered major peace agreements between nations across the globe that have been torn apart by decades of fighting. We have ensured that our North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies dramatically increase their own financial contributions to Europe’s security—a major win for American taxpayers. And we have rebuilt our own military readiness—achieving the highest recruitment numbers in years—because when our country is strong, the world is stable, and Americans are more secure, prosperous, and free.

Thank you again for writing. Please know that I will continue to pursue a peaceful resolution to the war in Ukraine and Russia that puts America first, protects our citizens, and promotes stability and prosperity at home and abroad.

Blessed are the peacemakers!

Sincerely,  
Donald, J. Trump (Sign)”

**President Trump Ratifies Board of Peace in Historic Ceremony,  
Opening Path to Hope and Dignity for Gazans**

On January 22, 2026, in an historic ceremony in Davos, Switzerland, President Donald J. Trump formally ratified the Charter of the Board of Peace — establishing it as an official international organization. President Trump, who is serving as the Board’s Chairman, was joined by Founding Members representing countries around the world who have committed to building a secure and prosperous future for Gaza that delivers lasting peace, stability, and opportunity for its people.

It’s another pivotal step forward in realizing President Trump’s vision of transforming Gaza from a region plagued by conflict and despair into one defined by opportunity, hope, and vitality. The Board of Peace stands ready to mobilize global resources, enforce accountability, and guide the implementation of the next critical phases of demilitarization, governance reform, and large-scale rebuilding.

**3. The third reason** is that on January 8, 2026, a female reporter asked J.D. Vance, Vice President of the United States at the Press Briefing by Press Secretary Karoline Leavitt:

Can you explain the difference between this associate attorney general and special counsel and do you envision this being a permanent position or have more limited scope?

**And J.D. Vance, Vice President of the United States answered:**

Well, it's going to be permanent until we get to the bottom of what's going on.

So, I think it's going to last for at least the remainder of the administration. What's different about it from a special counsel is if you remember the Jack Smith case where the special counsel was found unconstitutional. One of the big issues there is that the person was not an appointed person completely aside from all the other issues that the

person was a lunatic and that case had no merit. There was a fundamental constitutional issue which was that he had not been appointed by the President and he had not been confirmed by the United States Senate.

An assistant attorney general, what that's going to allow us to do is appoint this person, have them confirmed by the Senate. That's one difference. The more substantive difference is that this person is going to be part of a very broad inter agency White House that's being led from the president of the United States on down. And that's going to give him the resources, the access to material and information to make this person more effective.

I think a lot of people have asked, how are you really going to get to the heart of the fraud? We've been asking yourself that question for the past couple of months and we think this is the critical piece at the Department of Justice to really ramp this fraud investigation into high gear.

**So Petitioner replied through the letter:**

A Special Counsel for a Life Tenure, Dr. Abraham Lincoln Ginsburg was lawfully appointed by the instructions in the will of the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg before her death on September 18, 2020.

Yes. The position is permanent and not limited in scope. Because the person holding the position is an Independent Director of the Supreme Court of the United States, he or she possesses the significant legal powers of a United States Supreme Court Justice. Because Petitioner is performing a highly important, secret mission for the benefit of the Supreme Court, the national interest of the United States, his future American family, and the interests of a new religion.

Because Donald J. Trump, President of the United States and Karoline Leavitt, the White House Press Secretary trusted Petitioner, they sent Petitioner four responses within a very short period of time, from September 3, 2025, to December 10, 2025.

Petitioner has worked for peace in the Middle East and has worked to resolve the wars between Ukraine and Russia. Petitioner is also a pioneer in the field of medicine. Furthermore, the Late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg knew Petitioner well and trusted him so much that she adopted Petitioner as an adult and left Petitioner her final, most important of the instructions in the will.

Petitioner could do some brilliant things for the good of the United States when Petitioner had the full support of the President of the United States and the White House Press Secretary. And the content of her will is very beneficial for the future. Also, Petitioner is a licensed psychiatrist, obstetrician, and forensic pathologist in the United States. Also, like Donald J. Trump, President of the United States, Petitioner does not drink or smoke. And Petitioner reads the Bible, the Word of God, at least once or at most four times every year.

Petitioner is a genius, like the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, who passed away on September 18, 2020. He will be a Nobel Prize nominee in several fields, has written a thesis on the universe, and has also written a thesis on medicine. We can clearly discern that God is guiding and protecting him. Consequently, we can trust and support him. Then, we will receive many blessings from God and heaven.

#### **Presidential state car**

The official name of the U.S. Presidential car is the Presidential state car, which is commonly referred to by the nickname "The Beast". While it bears Cadillac badging, the heavily armored, armored limousine is a custom-built vehicle, often called "Cadillac One," with the current, updated model having debuted in September 2018. It is operated by the U.S. Secret Service. And the Supreme Court of the United States will fully understand that the Chief Justice of the United States must make a written request to Director Sean M. Curran, Director of the U.S. Secret Service and Donald J. Trump, President of the United States, regarding the transportation and personal protection of Petitioner in this matter.

For your reference, John G. Roberts, Chief Justice of the United States can remember that Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin, President of Russia has already instructed all Russians and government officials to respect Petitioner in accordance with 18 U.S.C. §112 et seq. So the governments of other countries will also instruct government officials and his people to respect Petitioner and his adoptive mother, the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg for diplomatic relations with the United States. This is because a Petitioner who is a U.S. Special Counsel for a Life Tenure is required to handle not only the work of the U.S. judiciary but also the work of the U.S. administration with the President of the United States. So, the U.S. Supreme Court will clearly understand that, although the Petitioner is currently proceeding with this litigant *in forma pauperis* status, in order to receive a salary from the U.S. government, the Court must grant the Petitioner's *in forma pauperis* case, and then will the U.S. government be able to fully protect the Petitioner by providing like above U.S. government vehicle to the Petitioner, who has become an executor of a Supreme Court Justice for international relations. *United States v. Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.*, 299 U.S. 304 (1936).

**4. The fourth reason** is that there is no official record for the “longest-serving” individual proceeding *pro se* (self-represented) and *in forma pauperis* (unable to pay legal fees) in U.S. history, as such metrics are not centrally tracked over extended periods.

**However, some notable figures stand out in the history of U.S. litigation:**

**Myra Clark Gaines** was the plaintiff in the longest-running lawsuit in U.S. history, a case that spanned 57 years (from 1834 to 1891) and appeared before the Supreme Court 17 times. While not explicitly categorized solely as a *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* litigant throughout the entire process (she was a socialite fighting for a large inheritance), her perseverance in a decades-long legal battle is unparalleled.

**Jonathan Lee Riches**, a former federal inmate, gained notoriety for reportedly filing over 4,000 lawsuits, earning him the unofficial title of "most litigious man". Many of these were dismissed as frivolous, and he often filed *in forma pauperis* from prison. There is no official "longest-serving" title, but he is known for the sheer volume of his filings.

**Clarence Earl Gideon** is a famous example of a successful *pro se* litigant who proceeded *in forma pauperis*. His handwritten petition to the Supreme Court resulted in the landmark 1963 decision in *Gideon v. Wainwright*, which established the right to court-appointed counsel for indigent felony defendants in state courts.

In general, “*pro se*” litigation is common, especially in prisoner and civil rights cases, but the concept of a single, continuous “longest-serving” individual in the exact combined categories requested is not a formal legal distinction that is tracked. Yes. Petitioner became a true record holder for the longest-serving individual proceeding *pro se* (self-represented) and *in forma pauperis* Litigation in U.S. history.

#### **The late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg’s adopted son**

The late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, before she died, decided to adopt her son, because the good person was employed as her [unknown] secretary of the Supreme Court of the United States. And she taught her adopted son, Dr. Abraham Lincoln Ginsburg a lot and left the instructions in the will before she died, because of the special relationship. One of the things she left her adoptive son, Dr. Abraham Lincoln Ginsburg, was that he could continue to use her name [on internet], “Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg.”

There are several important reasons why the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg adopted American-Korean, Dr. Abraham Lincoln Ginsburg as an adult, and one of them has to do with her mother, Celia Bader’s death. Because the Korean War broke out on June 25, 1950, and her mother, Celia Bader died on June 25, 1950. And this is because Jin-taek Kim Petitioner's bible teacher who was born in 1926, was also a very grateful and important person to her.

Yes. Her adopted son's teacher, Jin-taek Kim was a very elite [korean] soldier who served in the Republic of Korea Army Headquarters during the Korean War, and he also fought hard battles against North Korea for a long time during the Korean War. And he was very deeply grateful for the help provided by the U.S. military force, which strongly aided the Korean soldiers who had been thoroughly defeated from the early stages of the Korean War. This is because the number of casualties (killed, wounded, missing, and prisoners of war) among Korean soldiers who died in the Korean War was very high, at approximately 620,000.

For example, if there were 18 Korean soldiers with the same uncommon name, Jin-taek Kim, 17 of the names died, and the only one who survived to the end was Petitioner's Bible study teacher. If you think about it carefully, if 17 soldiers with the very rare name of Jin-taek Kim in South Korea all died during the Korean War, you can understand how remarkable the one Korean soldier with the same name was who survived and participated in many battles from the beginning to the end of the war. So, in South Korea, a great veteran who has fought many battles is referred to as a "Baekjeonnojang, 百戰老將, a veteran of a hundred battles." Before the Korean War broke out on June 25, 1950, the South Korean military (Republic of Korea Army) consisted of approximately 98,000 soldiers. These forces were organized into eight infantry divisions, but lacked tanks and long-range artillery, making them significantly weaker. The wonderful veteran specially trained Petitioner, and finally died in 2016. And we promised to meet again in the distant future.

Consequently, the Supreme Court Justices wish to make a citizen of Petitioner, who can be U.S. citizen because the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg permitted the Petitioner to be a U.S. citizen by hiring Petitioner as her secretary, because he is a very special person.

#### **She is an eye witness to this case**

In 2012, Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg and Petitioner had an unusual situation. Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg received many letters from the Petitioner and provided very proactive and strong assistance, such as Donald J. Trump, President of the United States, who sent four replies to the Petitioner in 2025. Because she contacted the U.S. Embassy in South Korea by phone and helped the Petitioner enter the main gate of the U.S. Embassy in South Korea, helped a female federal official working in the United States Embassy in South Korea kindly escorted the Petitioner, and had the Petitioner sign for FBI fingerprinting and other documents to create paperwork related to U.S. immigration procedures. This is because she gave orders over the phone to American employees working in the U.S. Embassy in South Korea. She informed Petitioner a fascinating story at the time, which was the fact that "if I speak to or give orders to federal officials over the phone, they must do as I say or order."

However, Petitioner later came to realize that federal officials regarding the orders of other U.S. Supreme Court justices did not obey those orders as well as Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg did. At the time she provided such precious help, the Petitioner could not have known if it was powerful help, but over time, the Petitioner came to understand that Justice Ginsburg was the only American woman capable of providing such swift and powerful assistance. Yes. She accepted Petitioner's petitions through the many letters.

In fact, John G. Roberts, Chief Justice of the United States, and Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg shared the same legal opinion regarding the legal granting of U.S. Diplomatic status to the Petitioner. However, regarding the important matter of criminally prosecuting the contract killers who attempted to murder the Petitioner, the legal opinions and approaches of John G. Roberts, Chief Justice of the United States, and Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg differed in many respects.

As additional information, Justice Ginsburg recognized to the Petitioner that the definition of the term "alien" in U.S. law was incorrect, and informed the Petitioner that she would inform U.S. Senators of the definition to revise it, thereby informing the Petitioner that "you are no longer an alien, but you are a U.S. citizen." Since then, U.S. immigration law, Immigration and Nationality Act has been amended at least once. 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(22), 22 U.S.C. §1741 et seq, and 22 U.S.C. §4822.

Therefore, the Petitioner could anticipate that it would take a long time for John G. Roberts, Chief Justice of the United States, to understand the contents of the will that Justice Ginsburg had explained to the Petitioner at length prior to her death on September 18, 2020, as well as the important details and legal solutions conveyed to the Petitioner through another American citizen. There is a significant gap, and this gap is currently being resolved through this *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* litigant. However, the Court of Appeals dismissed merely for lacking factual merit and erred.

**Donald J. Trump, President of the United States, Et Al. v. Barbra, Et al. 25-365.**

In 2010, Petitioner obtained the written consent of D. Richard Hipp, the American creator of SQLite Database, via email and was the first one to try to translate SQLite Database technology from English into Korean. As a SQLite database technician, Petitioner alone developed a Bible app which contained 50 languages more and distributed it worldwide, but the Bible Apps was later forcibly removed due to copyright issues. And on December 19, 2025, Petitioner informed Donald J. Trump, President of the United States, stated that the White House App did not exist on Online Markets and sent a letter explaining the reasons why the White House App should be uploaded on Online Markets. Donald J. Trump, President of the United States and the White House humbly listened to Petitioner's written opinion, which ultimately greatly helped the White House finally launch the official White House App on March 27, 2026.

Petitioner entered the United States in 2012 as a visitor related to filing lawsuits in the U.S. Federal Courts concerning most notorious American companies Apple, Inc., and Google, Inc. And the same year, Petitioner started to send many letters to Supreme Court Justices, including the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg. After that, while Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg was alive, she informed Petitioner, “You are the unique person to whom has sent the most letters to me in my life. Not even my husband sent me this many letters.” And it seems she read the Petitioner’s letter very carefully and for a long time, considering the matter, because she had a special personal interest in the religious issue between her and the Petitioner, matters related to God’s work, specific legal issue, and regarding the renewal of the U.S. Supreme Court website. Because she was very clever, and pretty well discerned Petitioner, who has made extraordinary contributions, such as a (medical) scientist. The Petitioner was deemed worthy as a U.S. diplomat to serve the interests of the United States and to provide the representation in the conduct of foreign affairs in accordance with the opinion of Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg. 22 U.S.C. 3901 et seq, 22 U.S.C. §4821, 22 U.S.C. §4822, also 22 U.S.C. §4823.

28 U.S.C. §675 provides: **Law clerks and secretaries**

The Chief Justice of the United States, and the associate justices of the Supreme Court may appoint law clerks and secretaries whose salaries shall be fixed by the Court.

In 2012-13, Petitioner wrote his letter and Résumé to Justice Ginsburg saying “I wish to work in the U.S. Supreme Court.” And in 2014, Petitioner applied for 1st priority asylum in the United States on grounds of seriously religious persecution. She would have understood since 2012 that, because she discerned that Petitioner is a legal resident who legally entered the United States, is a special person with very excellent computer and Internet skills and read many computer&business books who could easily recognize that the U.S. Supreme Court website was outdated and needed fixing. So she could have the legal capacity to start to create a permanent domicile and residence at the Supreme Court of the United States for Petitioner, her adopted son by hiring Petitioner as her secretary, an employee of the U.S. Supreme Court. Because 28 U.S.C. §675 authorizes the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States to appoint their law clerks and secretaries, and also their salaries fixed by the Court.

Understandably, the most important thing the instructions in the will of the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg mean is that a Petitioner working for the Supreme Court of the United States must be “the person not subject to any foreign power.” While the 14th Amendment uses “subject to the jurisdiction thereof,” this was intended to mirror the “not subject to any foreign power” language, meaning one must owe direct allegiance to the United States. *Elk v. Wilkins*, 112 U.S. 94 (1884), and Indian Citizenship Act of 1924.

This is because, after the Civil War to grant citizenship to the newly freed slaves and their children, and the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg adopted Petitioner as an adult, he became part of the family of a U.S. Supreme Court Justice. Yes. Justice Ginsburg has granted his first priority Asylum application and American citizenship to Petitioner, because substantial evidence does support her decision. Moreover, she not only granted Petitioner the status of an American diplomat but also made many important promises to the Petitioner before leaving this world. Because she knew the above very important hidden facts. So, for this reason, Petitioner does not need birthright citizenship based on the Citizenship Clause of the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution or Petitioner can tell that Petitioner has U.S. citizenship by the employment decision of Associate Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg which her discretion based on 28 U.S.C. §675 authorizes.

Because the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg who acted as an immigration judge in this particular case's decision had been confirmed that the Petitioner tried to have a residence, domiciliation, and taking of oath of allegiance to the Supreme Court of the United States, and obedience to this country's laws. In addition, the Petitioner has roots or connections related to Justice Ginsburg within the United States.

**Justice Barrett's question at the bottom of page 63 of the Transcript of**

**Donald J. Trump, President of the United States, Et Al., v. Barbra, Et Al., 25-365.**

**Question:** So it's kind of a narrower view of both the traditional jus soli rule and a narrower view of the jus sanguinis rule. So why would they have done that, and if they were going to invent an entirely new kind of citizenship, like an American brand, why wouldn't we have seen more discussion of that in the debates?

It seems the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg can offer a hint to this question. The instructions in her will state that because she was a person of allegiance to the United States, her executor—the person who received the instructions in her will—is also a person of allegiance to the United States. In other words, she fulfilled the legal requirements for her executor to acquire U.S. citizenship by hiring him as her secretary. If parents are definite U.S. citizens and are allegiance to the United States, wouldn't their (adopted) child naturally also be a person of allegiance to the United States and a definite U.S. citizen? If so, he would be able to obtain a U.S. Diplomatic Passport and legal status as a U.S. diplomat in accordance with 22 U.S.C. §212—Persons entitled to passport.

So, her decision to adopt Petitioner will be proven right.

*It is so ordered.*

5. **The fifth reason** is that this is because a new precedent of the Supreme Court of the United States was established by the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg regarding the last instructions in her will, and through these new precedents, a branch sprouted from the large tree of extant precedents of the Supreme Court of the United States, completing a new map and finally filling in the parts that were insufficient in previous the precedents of the Supreme Court of the United States.

**A. The birth of a new religion in the United States resulting from the long deliberation of a single U.S. Supreme Court Justice**

Another new religion was born in the United States history as a result of the long deliberation and conclusions of two important legal figures: the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg and her stepson, Petitioner. Shortly after the emergence of this new religion, the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, who possessed strong religious faith, died prematurely from pancreatic cancer, and Petitioner was wrongfully detained abroad as a religious leader due to reasons such as religious persecution, despite his status as a U.S. diplomat. And he is “an internationally protected person.” 18 U.S.C. §112 et seq.

Furthermore, the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg left the instructions in her will to Petitioner, granting him significant legal authority through her powers as a U.S. Supreme Court Justice. She also explained to the Petitioner before her death that a new federal foster care agency or federal institutions in the United States needed to be reopened to fundamentally or partially resolve the issue of abortion in the country.

**Prohibiting assassination of religious leaders in the United States**

This is because she identified the Petitioner as a religious leader, and very early on, she discerned that there were very wicked ones who had plotted a murder conspiracy to commit special homicide—secretly assassinating or inciting suicide—a specific religious leader in the important civil cases of *Seungjin Kim v. Apple, Inc.*, *Seungjin Kim v. Google, Inc.*, *Seungjin Kim v. Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of Pennsylvania*, and *Seungjin Kim v. Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of Pennsylvania, Et. Al*, and *Donald J. Trump, President of the United States, Et. Al*, like Reverend Martin Luther King Jr., a symbol and pastor of the American civil rights movement, was assassinated in Memphis, Tennessee, on April 4, 1968. Because under the Constitution, no one in the national government—no one—may deprive another “of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.” U.S. Const. amend. V. The United States Armed Forces embody cherished American values and principles. Respect for innocent life and severely punishing those who take it without justification or excuse, codified in federal law, are basic manifestations of those values and principles. So, protecting citizens at the United States Military Academy at West Point involves a combination of strict physical security, emergency preparedness systems, and an ethical code of conduct for all personnel.

**There is also a presidential order prohibiting assassination**

Exec. Order 12333, 46 Fed. Reg. 59941 (Dec. 4, 1981). Section 2.11 of that Executive Order—captioned “Prohibition on Assassination”—provides: “No person employed by or acting on behalf of the United States Government shall engage in, or conspire to engage in, assassination.” Id. at 59952. Executive Order 12333 has been in force since it was signed by President Reagan, and it can be repealed or amended only by a subsequent executive order, which would be published in the Federal Register for all the world to see.

Hopefully, several Supreme Court Justices who were interested in her and the establishment of the new religion sec came to examine this case, and consequently, the complaint, brief, and a petition for a writ of Certiorari for the aforementioned important case was finally filed with the U.S. Federal Courts since January 2025, following the Petitioner’s long deliberation and efforts. So, through the extensive Briefs and Appendices that the Petitioner submitted by international mail to the Lower Courts over a long period, all of her colleagues, the Supreme Court Justices, will be able to clearly understand her perspective and position, the Petitioner’s perspective and position, and how she attempted to protect the leader of the new religion while comprehending this new religious precedent and case for the future.

And based on the constitutional rights of the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, the Petitioner established a new religion by the instructions in the will of the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg as a first step through this civil lawsuit. (Refer to the history and precedents related to the Puritan case in the United States.) So the contract killers and their colleagues, who have long and meticulously tried to kill a new religious leader, an internationally protected person, a U.S. Diplomat, and a U.S. Special Counsel for a Life Tenure by strangling him to suicide and committing special murder by inducing suicidal ideation through a murder conspiracy, must all be criminally prosecuted and brought to criminal trial under U.S. statutes 18 U.S.C. 112(a), 112(b), 112(c), 112(d), and 112(e), and must be sentenced to death.

And the new religion established by her judicial judgment and the instructions in the will of her will receive permanent and full protection of the U.S. government through the issuance of a U.S. Diplomatic passport to Petitioner. So, in this new precedent of the U.S. Supreme Court concerning the issuance of a U.S. Diplomatic passport and the legal appointment of a U.S. Special Counsel for a Life Tenure.

This *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* case is arguably meritorious ones but failure to state a claim regarding a Supreme Court Justice’s the instructions in the will need minor refinements and factual development, because the Court can be determined that they are of great benefit to national security, national interest, and foreign policy.

**B. There are fundamental reasons why lower courts were unable to make proper judicial decisions regarding this new precedent.**

**Question:** Is the U.S. Supreme Court the court of first instance in judicial matters involving U.S. diplomats?

According to Article III, Section 2 of the U.S. Constitution, the Supreme Court must have original jurisdiction (acting as the court of first instance) if the case relates to ambassadors, public ministers, and consuls who were appointed by the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg. Because according to Article III, Section 2 of the U.S. Constitution, the Supreme Court has original jurisdiction (acting as the court of first instance) in cases affecting ambassadors, public ministers, and consuls. However, this jurisdiction is generally not exclusive, meaning lower federal courts can also hear these cases.

In practice, the Supreme Court rarely acts as the trial court in these scenarios, as lower federal courts handle most proceedings involving diplomatic figures. In the case where a petitioner, who holds the legal status of a U.S. diplomat, reported specific crimes and was wrongfully criminally punished abroad by very corrupt foreign officials of foreign nation, the U.S. Diplomatic status should have filed a lawsuit in this Court, the court of first instance, as a victim; however, because the U.S. diplomat had not been receiving a salary from the U.S. government, the lawsuit proceeded as Pro Se and In Forma Pauperis. The U.S. government erred in this victim case of special murder by failing to hire a U.S. attorney to assist Petitioner, but Justice Ginsburg made Petitioner as a Special Counsel. *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), Also *Pennsylvania v. Finley*, 481 U.S. 551 (1987).

Before filing a lawsuit in U.S. federal court, the Petitioner asked the following question himself: "Given my current lack of legal & English ability, can I draft the complaint well that the U.S. Supreme Court desires? The answer is that it is impossible. Then, in order to draft the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari that the U.S. Supreme Court wants, if I were to file complaints with U.S. federal courts and U.S. courts of appeal, what kind of judgment content could I obtain from them to assist me?" So, after 1 year and 3 months of effort from January 15, 2025, to March 14, 2026, Petitioner received some judgments from the U.S. Federal Court and the U.S. Court of Appeals.

Recently, the U.S. Court of Appeals cited *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989), a U.S. Supreme Court precedent concerning "a landmark U.S. Supreme Court case establishing a prisoner's *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* complaint that fails to state a claim under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) is not automatically "frivolous" under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e). It clarified that lawsuits with arguable legal merit cannot be dismissed merely for lacking factual merit." Yes. Like a landmark Supreme Court case, *Neitzke v. Williams*, Petitioner's in forma pauperis complaint that fails to state a claim under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) must not automatically be "frivolous" under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e).

So, Petitioner will be able to understand that the Supreme Court of the United States must decide that “Petitioner’s *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* litigant must be clarified that lawsuits with arguable legal merit cannot be dismissed merely for lacking factual merit by the Supreme Court, and must be reinforced the principle of equal access to justice for indigent litigants by the Court. *Coppedge v. United States*, 369, U.S. 438 (1962).”

After 1 year and 3 months of effort, the Petitioner had to draft this Application and a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari by citing the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court, “*Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989),” which required consideration of another aspect of legal issues newly discovered by the Petitioner.

However, some important legal issues like abortion matter are involved here. This is because the Petitioner became the executor of the will of the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg and was therefore legally obligated to follow her will. In other words, the Lower Courts are not in a position to make correct judicial decisions regarding the decisions of the higher Court, the judicial decisions of the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, and her final will, and some of their decisions could be ignored the true facts about her promises to her adopted son, the Petitioner. Rather, it appears that the United States Federal Court for the District of Columbia and the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit have made a wrong judicial decision that ignores the will of the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, the Supreme Court of the United States.

This is because the judges of the both Lower Courts, like the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, had not considered complex legal issues while receiving and reading all of Petitioner's letters for a long time, did not know much about Petitioner, and had less firm faith in Petitioner than she had. So, from their perspective, the contents of Petitioner’s complaint may have seemed “frivolous.” However, most of what is stated in the complaint is true and is based on everything the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg and her colleagues have informed Petitioner for almost 10 years.

In other words, since the contents of the complaint come from a senior Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg the contents of Petitioner’s complaint and brief clearly cannot be considered “frivolous.” In other words, the Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court must carefully consider what she has explained and think about what good purpose and motive she had when she left those instructions in the will to the Petitioner. Then, the Court will be able to understand that her will has a true reason and is correct.

Therefore, Petitioner believes that the Supreme Court of the United States, through the content of this Application, had to state: “According to Article III, Section 2 of the U.S. Constitution, the Supreme Court must have original jurisdiction (acting as the court of first instance) if the case relates to ambassadors, public ministers, and consuls who have committed murder crimes against Petitioner who is a U.S. Diplomatic.

Because according to Article III, Section 2 of the U.S. Constitution, the Supreme Court has original jurisdiction (acting as the court of first instance) in cases affecting ambassadors, public ministers, and consuls. However, this jurisdiction is generally not exclusive, meaning lower courts can also hear these cases.” However, the Petitioner, unable to first obtain a judicial decision from the Supreme Court of the United States, which possesses original jurisdiction, initiated the lawsuit in a lower court first. So, the Petitioner found themselves in a position where they had to conduct a judicial review of the erroneous judgment, which contradicted the final judicial decision of the Late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg and the contents of the will.

This is because all U.S. Supreme Court Justices believe that their colleague, the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, was unable to provide all explanations regarding Petitioner’s legal matters or leave the instructions of the will to her colleagues, and instead left her remaining wishes and hopes as a final, precious will and special judicial decision to the person she deeply respected and loved. As the executor who accurately received the instructions in the will from her, the Petitioner who had legal duty and responsibility is in a position where they must ensure that the U.S. Supreme Court Justices accurately understand the contents of the will and strive to ensure that the contents of her will are fully executed without any obstruction by anyone.

The U.S. Supreme Court Justices will be able to understand that her love for this court sufficiently conveyed to her colleagues through the letters sent by the Petitioner or through this application. Furthermore, all U.S. Supreme Court Justices had to be able to understand what her final wishes, hopes, purposes, and final decisions were—which they were previously unaware of—by carefully reading and reflecting on the Petitioner’s previous legal matters and the detailed records of everything he heard from the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg. Furthermore, the Petitioner has come to understand that when her final will and judicial decisions are respected and fully executed, not only will the ordinary plaintiff become competent, but his difficult legal and religious issues will be completely resolved, and also the future of the United States will advance more. Therefore, it will be easy to understand that the Supreme Court of the United States should grant both this Application to file the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari and the Petitioner’s Petition for a Writ of Certiorari that will be filed by an international mail later. Because Justice Ginsburg had personal interest and long-standing help in this *in forma pauperis* case. *Cantwell v. Connecticut*, 310 U.S. 296 (1940).

The term Ambassador, there is an important difference between the United Kingdom and the United States. In the United Kingdom, a diplomat appointed as ambassador uses the title Ambassador “only during their tenure” and is referred to as “Mr.” after their term ends, whereas a US Diplomat, once appointed as ambassador, can use the title ambassador “for the rest of his life.”

### **What does the Ruth Bader Ginsburg Foundation do?**

Several beneficial Supreme Court cases point out the righteous direction in applying the Establishment Clause that the strong role played by religion and religious traditions throughout our Nation's history. *Zelman v. Simmons-Harris*, 536 U.S. 639 (2002), also *Van Orden v. Perry*, 545 U.S. 677 (2005).

Consequently, the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg is a highly educated woman in the United States, the RBG Foundation also plans to manage and decorate the gravesites of all U.S. presidents and all 116 U.S. Supreme Court Justices, as well as their associated buildings and statues, for all American students, conveying a historic and social meaning. *Bigelow v. Virginia*, 421 U.S. 809 (1975).

### **“Form and preserve the power to a new federal foster care agency”**

Furthermore, the Supreme Court of the United States will be able to understand and foresee, through the new precedents of the United States Supreme Court that the Petitioner presents in the future, starting with this new precedent of the United States Supreme Court, that the constitutional rights are protected so that, about 100 years later, the Petitioner—who effectively held the legal authority of a U.S. Special Counsel for a life tenure based on the instructions in the will of the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg and through the excellent contents of her will—and her subordinates, who are U.S. federal officials, can “form and preserve the powers to a new federal foster care agency and federal institutions over state governments in the United States” as a result of the excellent long operation of a new independent federal foster care agency necessary for the execution of her will.

The Supreme Court of the United States will be able to discern that the proceedings of this lawsuit have been aided by God's long-standing and powerful assistance. Thus, based on the many facts provided by the Petitioner, the Supreme Court Justices can include in their judgment a judicial decision to assist and protect the Petitioner, the executor of the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg's instructions in the will, so that the Petitioner may continue to execute her will without interference.

Consequently, starting April 1, 2026, Petitioner will begin reading and studying all the contents of Wikipedia about the 116 Supreme Court Justices and Constitutional of the United States. The new project will reflect the American precedents in a Petitioner for a Writ of Certiorari. So, it will take at least 116 days to complete it, so an extension of 60 days is essential. And the Justices of the United States Supreme Court can understand that after reading this, the Plaintiff will have a more mature perspective on legal matters, and that in the future, the United States Judiciary will be able to utilize Petitioner as an intelligent federal officer in the United States.

6. The final reason is that this *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* litigant have acquired the important golden keys through the instruction of the will to fundamentally resolve issues related to abortion matters in the United States.

With respect to any issues arising from the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court Justices in *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113 (1973), *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, 505 U.S. 833 (1992), *Stenberg v. Carhart*, 530 U.S. 914 (2000), *Gonzales v. Carhart*, 550 U.S. 124 (2007), *June Medical Services, LLC v. Russo*, 591 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (2020), *Whole Woman's Health v. Hellerstedt*, 579 U.S. 582 (2016), *Fulton v. City of Philadelphia*, 593 U.S. 522 (2021), and *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*, 597 U.S. 215 (2022), establishing a new independent federal foster care agency & federal institutions to execute the instructions in will of the late Justice Ginsburg by an independent department of the Supreme Court of the United States would not only be a valuable act of saving the lives of fetuses or babies but would also be a wise decision that partially resolves the issues of the aforementioned U.S. Supreme Court precedents.

Because late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg knew that in *Gonzales v. Carhart* (2007), 550 U.S. 124 (2007), Chief Justice John G. Roberts voted with the majority to uphold the **Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act**. Because she was aware of this important precedent, she would have been well aware of the need for a new independent federal foster care agency & federal institutions to entrust to children who have given birth to babies they wish to abort. Perhaps if a new federal foster care agency and federal institutions existed in U.S. society capable of accepting all children and providing them with an excellent education, her hopes and wishes could become a reality.

So, having observed Petitioner closely for a long time, she was able to discern and anticipate that Petitioner would play a very important social role in the future, and as a female U.S. Supreme Court Justice, she granted Petitioner legal qualification for a U.S. OB-GYN license. Furthermore, she left Petitioner the necessary will along with the legal authority to dissect the corpses of American women. The United States Supreme Court will understand that she recognized Petitioner as a qualified medical professional licensed to practice medicine in the United States.

Under RLUIPA, Defending a deceased Supreme Court Justice, Ruth Bader Ginsburg, since this is a very special and diamond-like case creating a new religious precedent by the instructions in her will that is the only one of its kind in the United States, sufficient time is needed to think about drafting a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to establish a new federal foster care agency and federal institutions, and the first Supreme Court precedent regarding the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg's religion sect by the accepted tests, citing *Panama Refining Co. v. Ryan*, *Cantwell v. Connecticut*, and *Niemotko v. Maryland*, and also necessary to the wellbeing of a U.S. citizen, such as travel.

### **The importance of issuing U.S. Diplomat passport**

Based on the important facts and reasons mentioned above, there are compelling indications that the Respondent's decision and the lower court's decision is erred. This is because there is no substantial likelihood of "serious damage" to national security or foreign policy as a result of a U.S. Diplomatic passport holder's activities in foreign countries. On the other hand, Petitioner's activities abroad bring great benefit to the national security, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States.

However, the Respondent could not understand the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg's difficult will and desires, which stipulated that U.S. Diplomatic passports be issued and delivered to Petitioner urgently. Because the foreign nation falsely convicted the Petitioner, who is not subject to any foreign power, and there exists a "unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain" intended to drive the victim of special murder to suicide with other perpetrators by thier corruption.

In the end, through this *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* litigant, the Supreme Court of the United States will be able to understand that issuing his U.S. Diplomatic passport is crucial for the complete protection of the sole executor of a Supreme Court Justice—as the key person executing the Justice's will is a pledge of loyalty to the United States by an eligible federal judge, Justice Ginsburg under Article Three of the U.S. Constitution—and for the sake of national security and foreign policy of the United States.

Consequently, the Supreme Court of the United States can protect her executor, Petitioner whenever from such murder crimes and murder perpetrators and decide to issue his U.S. Diplomatic passport for the national security and foreign policy of the United States. *Kent v. Dulles*, 357 U.S. 116 (1958), *Aptheker v. Secretary of State*, 378 U.S. 500 (1964), *Zemel v. Rusk*, 381 U.S. 1 (1965), also *Haig v. Agee*, 453 U.S. 280 (1981).

### **Defending and Legally Establishing**

#### **the instructions in the will of the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg**

As her executor, the Petitioner must defend and legally establish the instructions in the will of the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg in this case so that all instructions of the will can be properly executed in the future and not disregarded by the general public, as the will of a U.S. Supreme Court Justice has very good causes and noble purposes.

Yes. The instructions in the will of the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg left it to the Petitioner to help in order to help the socially vulnerable like victims of crimes. And the Petitioner must be regarded as her final opinion in the new precedents of the Supreme Court of the United States. And based on her true opinion, the Court and Petitioner can continue to think about more true, beneficial, and educational values for the good future. Therefore, Petitioner's Application that his case is entitled to redress. - Philippians 1:7.

## CONCLUSION

All Supreme Court Justices must bear in mind that the facts set forth in this Application to extend the time to file *a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari* will continue to be referred to in future, more further important civil and criminal proceedings, and that further commentary will be added to be specific.

So, if this Application to extend the time to file *a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari* is denied by John G. Roberts, Chief Justice of the United States, then it will irreparably harm Petitioner and his adopted mother, the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg forever. Because this Court may understand above important legal matters that while the sudden death of Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg due to illness may have motivated her to delay her last decisions regarding her adult adoption, nomination, and her final judicial decision was by no means late, given that we met very late through the guidance of heaven and God.

Furthermore, it is likely that she was able to fully heal her kind heart and mind—which longed for her beloved mother, whom she parted with early from cancer during her high school years—by making the last decisions regarding her adult adoption and leaving her beautiful will that could be carried out. May she rest in peace.

So Petitioner, as an honest person, wishes to be remembered as a famous example of a successful pro se litigant who proceeded *in forma pauperis* like Clarence Earl Gideon.

For the foregoing good reasons and causes, Petitioner respectfully submits that the time within which to file a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari should be extended by 60 days, from **June 25, 2026**, to and including **August 24, 2026**, to defend and Legally Establishing the instructions in the will of the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg.

Consequently, this Application to extend the time to file the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari should be granted.

Date: June 11, 2026.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Seungjin Kim". The signature is written in black ink and includes a large, stylized flourish at the end.

DR. SEUNGJIN KIM  
Petitioner, Pro Se  
445-74 Chaedongseon-Ro,  
Boseong-Gun, Jeollanam-Do,  
59415, South Korea  
+82 (010) 8107 3450  
loveginsburg@icloud.com

**United States Court of Appeals**  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

**No. 25-5282**

**September Term, 2025**

**1:25-cv-00196-UNA**

**Filed On: March 19, 2026**

Seungjin Kim,

Appellant

v.

United States Department of State,

Appellee

**ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

**BEFORE:** Henderson, Pillard, and Pan, Circuit Judges

**J U D G M E N T**

This appeal was considered on the record from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and on the brief filed by appellant. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); D.C. Cir. Rule 34(j). Upon consideration of the foregoing, and the motion for waiver of fees, it is

**ORDERED** that the motion for waiver of fees be dismissed as moot, as appellant has not requested the retrieval or photocopying of any documents. It is

**FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that the district court's June 30, 2025 order dismissing appellant's complaint be affirmed. The district court correctly concluded that appellant's complaint was frivolous. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i); see also Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989) (a complaint is frivolous if it lacks "an arguable basis either in law or in fact").

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published. The Clerk is directed to withhold issuance of the mandate herein until seven days after resolution

**United States Court of Appeals**  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

**No. 25-5282**

**September Term, 2025**

of any timely petition for rehearing or petition for rehearing en banc. See Fed. R. App. P. 41(b); D.C. Cir. Rule 41.

**Per Curiam**

**FOR THE COURT:**  
Clifton B. Cislak, Clerk

BY: /s/  
Daniel J. Reidy  
Deputy Clerk

**Additional material  
from this filing is  
available in the  
Clerk's Office.**