

PUBLIC COPY—SEALED MATERIALS REDACTED

No.

In the  
Supreme Court of the United States

In Re [REDACTED]. (Private), PVT R.  
Appellant

v.

The United States and the President(s), Department of War et al., U.S. Army Reserves Command et al., Human Resources Command (HRC) et al., the 88<sup>th</sup> Regional Division et al., ARMEDCOM et al., Dr. Anthony Fauci, Mr. Bill Gates, Operation Warp Speed and those affiliated, Johnson & Johnson et al., Missouri Congressman Hawley and associates, and Missouri Congressman Graves and associates,  
Appellees

MOTION FOR EXTRAORDINARY WRIT ON PETITION FOR  
MANDAMUS AND PROHIBITION  
To The United States Army Reserve, ARMED-COM- Convening Authority

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE FOR INJUNCTIVE AND COMPENSATORY RELIEF  
CORAM NOBIS- RES IPSA LOQUITUR

[REDACTED] (Private), PVT R.  
*Counsel of Record*  
Pro Se- Veteran  
[REDACTED]  
Mobile: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED].com

**QUESTIONS PRESENTED**

1. Whether this Honorable Court may render an order of mandamus compelling USARC DCS G-1, the final “denial/release” authority, to expedite and release the electronic [un]redacted file(s) to the appellant and reimbursement of fees paid.<sup>1</sup> FOIA Request(s) include: FA-24-0108 [substantive verbatim [un]redacted trial proceedings voice recording (via mp3 secure email)], FA-25-0117, FA-25-0130, FA-25-0126, FA-25-0016.
2. Whether this Honorable court will determine after review of an investigation [with appointment of Counsel for the appellant (and/or a Special Master) and denying the opposing parties of any requests for extensions delaying any swift relief (Supreme Court Rule 21.4)] of the Adverse Administrative Separation, Article 15-6 for the appellant and matters fully surrounding to include the lack of due process of the associated congressional inquiries,<sup>2</sup> *Res Ipsa Loquitur*—will/may deem award for immediate injunctive and compensatory relief warranting: full restoration/reversal of the Article 15 and bar of all lesser included offenses from retrial as affirmed by “new” substantial and compelling evidence on direct review.<sup>3</sup>
3. Whether after appointment of Special Masters to investigate if the U.S. (it’s employees), Department of War ((Defense) and its employees), associated pharmaceutical companies, Mr. Gates, Dr. Fauci, violated Article III, Section 3 of the U.S. Constitution— so much as to warrant a pardon and any exemption or any immunities for the compromising of national security and the public’s health by lowering safeguards, manipulating and inciting fear to the grand public for mass compliance with the Covid-19 vaccine mandate, the “Covid-19 virus”, enforcement of infection prevention, that encouraged the assault on humanity (including the appellant) from the bioengineering of the corona

---

<sup>1</sup> UCMJ Rule 1112(e)(1)(A); 18 U.S. Code § 3500; see appendix 36 & 37.

<sup>2</sup> UCMJ § 931g. Art. 131g; UCMJ § 931f. Art. 131f; UCMJ App. 2.1(2.1-7,3.1), UCMJ MOU App. 3; UCMJ Rule 103(c); UCMJ Rule 203; see all appendices attached.

<sup>3</sup> UCMJ § 907(D)(i-ii) (prosecution is barred by the president; immunity from prosecution granted by a person authorized to do so; UCMJ § 875 ART. 75, § 859. Art. 59.; UCMJ § 837. Art. 37; UCMJ R.C.M. 915; U.S. Constitution Amendments V & XIV (due process).

virus and/or the vaccine. Effectively killing, injuring, and/or maiming internal organs of unborn/born children, and/or other innocent bystanders—under the guise of “medical research” and/or for the “greater good of humanity”. Gaining profits from racketeering by manufacturing, promoting, distributing, and/or inciting mass compliance with the mandating of the Covid-19 vaccine through public and military policies and/or its connection with Operation Warp Speed<sup>4</sup> and pharmaceutical companies, being found to be liable in any way warranting the granting of injunctive, and/or compensatory relief for those injured by the Covid-19 vaccination, such as the appellant and/or any additional penalties this Honorable Court deems appropriate for the best interest(s) and the integrity of our National Security, the public’s overall welfare, and that of its perception. <sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Note: Special Masters Reference Option(s):  
- E1517 Articles [www.thelancet.com](http://www.thelancet.com) /Lancetgh Vol 13 September 2025,  
[www.thelancet.com/action/showPdf?pii=S2214-109X\(25\)00232-3](http://www.thelancet.com/action/showPdf?pii=S2214-109X(25)00232-3). Accessed 18 Feb. 2026  
- GAO-16-720 highlights, regulatory guidance (n.d.-b). <https://www.gao.gov/assets/gao-16-720-highlights.pdf>  
- JNJ.com. (n.d.). Covid-19. JNJ.com. <https://www.jnj.com/tag/covid-19>  
- see appendix 69.

<sup>5</sup> UCMJ Article 128 (10 U.S.C.A. § 928) (assault); 10 U.S.C.A. § 893; 18 U.S.C.A. § 1962; Mil. R. Evid. 305(b)(1); see appendices 67-68.

**PARTIES**

1. United States, et al.,
2. Department of War, et al.,
3. Secretary of the Army, et al.
4. 88th Regional Division, et al.
5. Command, Army Reserve Medical Command, et al.  
2801 Grand Avenue  
Pinellas Park, FL 33782  
727-563-3810  
usarmy.usarc.usar-medcom.mbx.sja@army.mil  
usarmy.usarc.usar-medcom.mbx.ao@army.mil
6. Command, United States Army Reserve Command et al.  
4710 Knox St.  
Fort Bragg, NC 28310-5010
- 6.1. USARC Congressional Liaison Team: usarmy.usarc.usarc-hq.mbx.con-  
inquiries@army.mil
- 6.2. USARC Open Door Junior Enlisted Delegate
7. Office of the Staff Judge Advocate Legal Assistance Office- Trial Defense Services  
316 Missouri Avenue Fort Leonard Wood, MO 65473  
573-596-062
8. U.S. Army Inspector General Agency, et al.  
1700 Army Pentagon  
Washington, D.C., 20310-1700  
usarmy.usarc.usarc-hq.list.ig-assistance@army.mil
9. Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, G-:  
9. nancy.b.king.civ@army.mil; 520-706-4531  
9.2. olga.l.pete.civ@army.mil; 703- 695- 5502  
9.3. usarmy.pentagon.hqda-otif.mbx.saig-zxl@army.mil
10. Missouri Congressioanl Liason(s):  
10.1. Chris\_Naylor@hawley.senate.gov; 816-960-4694  
10.2. Cal\_Anderson@hawley.senate.gov  
10.3. Shawn\_Cowing@hawley.senate.gov  
10.4. Natalie\_Ford@hawley.senate.gov; 202-224-6154  
10.5. Janna\_worsham@hawley.senate.gov  
10.6. Buffy.Smith@mail.house.gov; 816-820-4022  
10.7. Melanie/Gossage@mail.house.gov
11. Dr. Anthony Fauci
12. Mr. Bill Gates
13. Johnson & Johnson and affiliates

PUBLIC COPY—SEALED MATERIALS REDACTED

**LIST OF PROCEEDINGS**

US-ARMEDCOM Involuntary Separation Board: Discharge- Misconduct  
Characterization of Service: Under other than honorable conditions

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

QUESTIONS PRESENTED.....ii-iii  
PARTIES.....iv  
PROCEEDINGS.....v  
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....vi  
SUMMARY OF AUTHORITIES.....vi  
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....vii-viii  
APPENDICES.....ix-x  
JURISDICTION.....1  
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND.....1-2  
STATEMENT.....2  
ARGUMENT.....9-25  
CONCLUSION.....25-28  
PRAYER.....29

**SUMMARY OF AUTHORITIES**

MILITARY RULES OF EVIDENCE.....ix  
RULES OF COURT MARTIAL (R.C.M.).....ix  
LEGAL REFERENCES & MISCELANEOUS SUPPORT.....ix  
APPENDICES:  
ADMINISTRATIVE DOCUMENTS.....x  
ADVERSE ADMINISTRATIVE SEPARATION BOARD.....x  
SUBSTANTIATING DOCUMENTS AND E-MAILS.....x  
FOIA DOCUMENTS AND E-MAILS IN SUPPORT.....x  
MEDICAL DOCUMENTS.....xi  
OPEN DOOR: SHOW FOR CAUSE/REDRESS.....xi  
CRIMINAL COUNSEL RETENTION INQUIRY E-MAILS.....xi  
“RELIEF” MISCELLANEOUS SUPPORT.....xi

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**CASES AND OPINIONS**

Augenblick, 393 U.S. at 356.....5  
Barker v. Wingo, 407 U.S. 514, 92 S. Ct. 2182, 33 L. Ed. 2d 101, 1972).....4  
Burns v. Wilson, 346 U.S. 137, 73 S.Ct. 1045, 97 L.Ed. 1508 (1953).....23  
Brown, 81 M.J. at 3.....8  
Calley, 519 F.2d at 199.....25  
Chappell v. Wallace, 462 U.S. 296 (1983).....12  
Clinton v. Goldsmith, 526 U.S. 529.....7

PUBLIC COPY—SEALED MATERIALS REDACTED

In re Cossio, Misc. Dkt. No. 2021-04, 2021 WL 6105497, at \*4 (A.F. Ct. Crim. App. Dec. 20, 2021).....8  
Davis v. U.S., 411 U.S. 233, 93 S. Ct. 1577, 36 L. Ed. 2d. 216 (1973).....14  
Davila v. Davis, 137 S. Ct. 2058, 2064. 198 L. Ed. 2d 603 (201).....27  
Fletcher v. Outlaw, 578 R. 3d 274 (5th Cir. 2009).....25  
Harmon v. Brucker, 355 U.S. 579 (1958).....26  
James & Gray §18.2 R 657-659.....12  
Jessie, 79 M.J. at 440 (citing U.S. v. Brennan, 58 M.J. 351) (C.A.A.F. 2003).....26  
Johnson v. Zerbst 304 U.S. 458 S. Ct. 1019, 82 L. Ed. 1461, 146 A.L.R. 357 (1938).....19  
Loya v. Underwood, 857 Fed. App'x 834, 834 (5th Circ. 2021) .....25  
Monk v. Zelez, 901 F.2d 885, 888 (10th Circ. 1990).....25  
Ortiz v. U.S., 138 S. Ct. 2165, 2170-2171, 201 L. Ed. 2d 601 (2018).....4  
Parisi v. Davidson, 405 U.S. 34 (1972) .....27  
Parker V. Levy, 417 U.S. 733 (1974) .....23  
Pavelic & LeFlour, Petitioner v. Marvel Entertainment Group et al .....3  
Reed, 100 U.S. 13, (1879) .....21  
Rylands 3 H.L. 330, 340 (1868).....13  
Schita v. Cox, 139 F.2d (C.C.A. 3d Cir. 1944).....19  
Schlesinger v. councilman, 420 U.S. 738, 95 S. Ct. 1300, 43 L. Ed. 2d 346 (2019).....4, 25  
Shapiro v. U.S., 107 Ct. Cl. 650, 69 F. (1947).....19  
Stapley, 246 F. Supp. 316 (D. Utah 1965).....19  
U.S. v. Bauerbach, 55 M.J. 501, 506 (A.C.C.A. 2001).....4  
U.S. v. Brennan, 58 M.J. 351.....26  
U.S. v. Budde, 2021 WL 5346633 \*2 (A.F.C.C.A. 2021).....5  
U.S. v. Doss, 57 M.J. 182 (C.A.A.F. 2002).....19  
U.S. v. Denedo, 556 U.S. 904 (2009).....4, 15, 19  
United Novelty Co. v. Daniels, 42 Sr. 2d 395 (Miss. 1949).....12  
Wade v. Hunter 336 U.S. 684, 688 n.4, 69 S. Ct. 834, 93 L. Ed. 974 .....6  
Wainwright v. Sykes, 19 Wake Forest L. Rev. 441 (1983).....3, 14, 27  
Williamson v. Lee optical, inc. 348 us 483, 487-488(1955).....24  
Younger, 401 U.S. at 46.....14  
Yonemoto v. VA, No. 10-151800,2011 WL 3606596 (9th Cir. Ag. 17, 2011).....24  
90-256 — OPINION v. NASCO, INC.....1

**U.S. CONSTITUTION**

Article III, Sec II.....1, 2  
Article IV, section 3, section 4.....23  
Article VI.....22  
Amendment I .....3, 6, 23  
Amendment V.....ii, 3  
Amendment XI.....3  
Amendment 11.6.3.....4  
Amendment XIV.....ii, 3

PUBLIC COPY—SEALED MATERIALS REDACTED

10 U.S.C.A. § 801.....	5
10 U.S.C.A. § 844 (a).....	4
10 U.S.C.A. § 865 (b)(1).....	4
10 U.S.C.A. § 866 (a)(2), (d)(1)(B)(iii), (d)(2), (e)(2), (f)(1)(C).....	26
10 U.S.C.A. § 867 (c)(1)(C).....	26
10 U.S.C.A. § 869 (d)(1)(A).....	26
10 U.S.C.A. § 870 (b).....	4
10 U.S.C.A. § 877.....	13
10 U.S.C.A. § 878.....	27
10 U.S.C.A. § 893.....	iii, 3
10 U.S.C.A. § 894.....	14
10 U.S.C.A. § 928.....	i, ii, 2
10 U.S.C.A. § 1552 (f)(2), (h)(1).....	21
18 U.S.C.A. § 601.....	7
18 U.S.C.A. § 1962.....	iii, 3
18 U.S.C.A. § 3006A (d)(7).....	4
18 U.S.C. A § 3261.....	22
18 U.S.C.A. § 3500 (JENKS ACT).....	i, 5
28 U.S.C.A. § 204(a)(2).....	25
28 U.S.C.A. § 1251 (a).....	2, 7
28 U.S.C.A. § 1251 (b)(1).....	1
28 U.S.C.A. § 1331.....	25
28 U.S.C.A. § 1651 (a).....	1, 2, 7, 15
28 U.S.C.A. § 1916.....	4
28 U.S.C.A. § 2254(b)(1)(A).....	27
28 U.S.C.A. § 2403(a), (b).....	4
28 U.S.C.A. § 2679.....	22

**SUPREME COURT RULES**

Supremacy Clause, Article VI, Clause 2.....	1
Supreme Court Rule 17.5.....	5, 8
Supreme Court Rule 21.4.....	i, 5
Supreme Court Rule 40.....	2

**FEDERAL CIVIL PROCEDURE RULE**

Fed. Civ. Rule 60.....	1, 3
------------------------	------

**UNIFORM CODE FOR MILITARY JUSTICE**

UCMJ Article 31 (b).....	13
UCMJ Article 77.....	13
UCMJ Article 78.....	27
UCMJ Article 93.....	3
UCMJ Article 94.....	3, 14

UCMJ Article 102.....	11
UCMJ Article 128.....	iii
UCMJ Rule 203.....	i
UCMJ Rule 502.....	19
UCMJ Rule 513(d)(7).....	23
UCMJ Rule 915.....	15
UCMJ Rule 916(d)(e) .....	12
UCMJ Rule 1112.....	i
UCMJ Rule 1116.....	26
UCMJ 70(b).....	4
UCMJ § 826. Art. 26.....	16
UCMJ § 829. Art. 29.....	16
UCMJ § 837. Art. 37.....	ii
UCMJ § 859. Art. 59.....	ii
UCMJ § 860b. Art 60(b).....	4
UCMJ § 875 Art. 75.....	ii
UCMJ § 907(D)(i-ii) .....	ii
UCMJ § 931(b)(f)(g).....	4, ii
UCMJ § 933. Art 133.....	16
UCMJ § 938. Art. 138 .....	8
UCMJ Appendix 2.1 Section 2: 2.1, 2.7(e) .....	i, 16
UCMJ Appendix 3 (MOU), (E)(2)(F).....	16

**MILITARY RULES OF EVIDENCE**

M.R.E. 302.....	23
M.R.E. 305(c)(1).....	iii, 13
M.R.E. 308.....	13
M.R.E. 404(a)(2).....	12

**RCM**

R.C.M. 104.....	22
R.C.M. 308(b),(c),(d)(1).....	23
R.C.M. 706.....	23
R.C.M. 915.....	ii, 22
R.C.M. 1114(a)(1).....	5
R.C.M. 1202(b)(1).....	4
R.C.M. 1203(c), Discussion, at II-191.....	5

**LEGAL REFERENCES & MISCELANEOUS SUPPORT**

Huffman, Walter B., and Richard D. Rosen. MILITARY LAW: CRIMINAL JUSTICE & ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS. 2022nd–2023rd ed., THOMSON REUTERS , 2022.....	2
---	---

LEGAL REFERENCES & MISCELLANEOUS SUPPORT

Huffman, Walter B., and Richard D. Rosen. *MILITARY LAW: CRIMINAL JUSTICE & ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS*. 2022nd–2023rd ed., THOMSON REUTERS, 2022.....2

VanLandingham, Lt Col, USAF (ret.), Rachel E., *Ordering Injustice: Congress, Command Corruption of Courts-Martial, and the Constitution* (September 1, 2020). *Hofstra Law Review*, Vol. 49, No. 1, 2020, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4169238>.....2

Glannon, J. W. (2015). *The law of torts*. Wolters Kluwer.....13

Civilian Court Review of Court-Martial Adjudication, 69 Colum. L. Rev. 1259, 1262 (1969).....5

National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) 2021.....1, 6, 20, 26

Rules for the Manual For Courts Martial (UCMJ).....1, 3, 6, 19, 20, 26

Army Regulation 15-6 (AR).....i, 1

AR 27-10.....1

AR 635- 200 .....1

E1517 Articles [www.thelancet.com/lancetgh](http://www.thelancet.com/lancetgh) Vol 13 September 2025, [www.thelancet.com/action/showPdf?pii=S2214-109X\(25\)00232-3](http://www.thelancet.com/action/showPdf?pii=S2214-109X(25)00232-3). Accessed 18 Feb. 2026.....ii, 2

GAO-16-720 highlights, regulatory guidance (n.d.b). <https://www.gao.gov/assets/gao-16-720-highlights.pdf> .....ii, 2

JNJ.com. (n.d.). Covid-19. JNJ.com. <https://www.jnj.com/tag/covid-19>.....ii, 2

Army Soldiers Creed.....11

**APPENDICES**

Administrative Documents:

1. Veteran Status Verification.....1

2. AGR Assignment Orders.....2

3. AGR Separation Orders.....3-4

Adverse Administrative Separation Board:

4. 7 November 23 Board Cancellation.....5

5. Trial Defense Counsel E-mails with ARMEDCOM JAG Team (Board members)....6-16

6. Certified Proof of Mail Copy (insufficient notice).....17-20

7. Final Board Notice.....21-22

8. Conditional Waiver.....23-25

9. Election of Rights.....26-27

10. Signed Notification of Separation.....28-29

11. ARMEDCOM Conditional Waiver Denial.....30

12. Post Board Packet (Certified Record of Trial) .....31-63

13. Appeal.....64-91

Substantiating Documents and E-mails:

14. DD 2-14 (Military Discharge Certificate).....92

PUBLIC COPY—SEALED MATERIALS REDACTED

15. Vaccine Card.....93  
16. Congressional Liaison E-mails .....94-102  
17. USARC Congressional Response.....103  
18. Reduction Board Notification.....104-105  
19. Rank Reduction Debt.....106  
20. DA-Form 1559 (sworn statement-First Sergeant).....107-109  
21. DA-Form 4856 (Covid-19 Refusal).....110-111  
22. E-mail, DA-Form 4187 (REFRAD), ETP recommendation memo.....112-114  
23. Screenshots (Leave Extension denial).....115-116  
24. Covid-19 DOW Mandate(s) .....117-121  
25. CE-MARSG IO Findings and Recommendation. (Gov Exhibit 1 Pg. 2, 9-10).....122-124  
26. Trial Defense Correspondence.....125-128  
27. Redress Article 138....." When can't I (—Unconstitutional)" -pg. (129) .....129-133

FOIA Documents and E-mails in support:

28. Records Release office- Toxic Leadership- ( ) ( ).....134  
29. FOIA Referral ( ) 5).....135  
30. USARC FOIA Memo (FA- ).....136  
31. FOIA DOJ ( ).....137-141  
32. Office of Government Information Services (OGIS) Response Letter.....142  
33. FOIA Referral (SAIG-JAR ).....143  
34. DA FOIA E-mail Response... (expedite response).....144-147  
35. USARC IG/Whistleblower/CID FOIA Memo ( ).....148-151  
36. USARC FOIA FA- Money Order Receipts.....152  
37. White House Letter (FA- ).....153-154  
38. National FOIA Portal Response.....155-156  
39. FOIA DCS G-1 POC E-mail.....157-169  
40. Trial Defense Counsel Memorandum (Trial Records-in support).....170  
41. ARMEDCOM Board Proceedings Audio Recording Request refusal.....171  
42. DCS G-1 FOIA (FA- ).....172  
43. Outpatient Memo (Code 33).....173-177

Medical Documents:

44. Electrocardiogram (abnormal rhythm- ECTOPIC ATRIAL RHYTHM).....178  
45. Emergency Services Note.....179-185  
46. Behavioral Health Therapist Office Letter.....186-188

Open Door: "Show for Cause/Redress" -Post-Trial Appeal:

47. 88th Regional Division (RD) Open Door Request email.....189-194  
48. ARMEDCOM Open Door Policy.....195-196  
49. ARMEDCOM Chaplain E-mail.....197  
50. 7455th MORU Chaplain E-mail.....198-199  
51. USARC Open Door Enlisted POC E-mail.....200-205  
52. (LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY) \_.....

57. Covid-19 Vaccine Mandate Recision.....231-236

“Relief” Miscellaneous Support:

58. HHS Civil Rights Complaint ( ).....237

59. HHS Civil Rights Complaint ( ) Closure letter.....238

60. Appointed Investigating Officer text screenshot.....239

61. FLW TDS Defense Counsel text “Open Door/JAG Appeal Follow Up” .....240

62. HHS Civil Rights Closure E-mail.....241-242

63. USARC IG Complaint Inquiry Intake Correspondance.....243-271

64. FLW TDS Defense Counsel text screenshot “conflict of interest” .....272

65. Congressional Review: The Military’s Covid-19 Vaccination Mandate.....273-276

66. Emergency Services: care instructions- concussion.....277-281

67. DHHS- Docket No. FDA 2021-N-0335.....282-301

68. FOI APPLIED Johnson Memorial Enfield CT 483 10-19-18 Redacted..... 302-308

69. DOW CORONA VIRUS RESPONSE .....309-311

70. FDA LETTER (COVID—REVOKED).....312-325

## JURISDICTION

The Jurisdiction of this court is invoked under Article III, Section II. Exceptional controversial circumstances warranting direct appellate review by this court under 28 U.S.C.A. § 1251(b)(1) and 28 U.S.C.A. § 1651(a). The Judgment's effective (discharge) date was March 3, 2025 (Fed Civ Procedure Rule 60(c)).

“As the Court of Appeals expressed it, “*Erie* guarantees a litigant that if he takes his state law cause of action to federal court, and abides by the rules of that court, the result in his case will be the *same* as if he had brought it in state court. It does not allow him to waste the court's time and resources with *cantankerous* conduct, even in the unlikely event a state court would allow him to do so.” 894 F. 2d, at 706.”<sup>1</sup>

## HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Constitution, The National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), Rules for the Manual For Courts Martial (UCMJ), Army Regulation (AR) 27-10, AR 15-6, and AR 635-200, were promulgated to ensure command influence, prosecutorial discretion, professional misconduct, and safeguards would be respected and carried out lawfully by *any* and *all* of those whom may be *subject* to it. Those delegated “prosecuting” *authority*— are not to exceed the *authority* of the Supremacy Clause Article VI, Clause 2. Gross negligence and continued oversight is clogging the normal flow of actions processed between the Department of War (DOW) and the Department of Veteran Affairs (VA) since before the promulgation of the rules established to curtail *any* said, negligence.

---

<sup>1</sup> 90-256 — OPINION v. NASCO, INC

Note: any delay in the timelines of this appeals is due to the inability to retain legal counsel and assuming all things within the responsibilities of pro se litigation preparation since being discharged.

Negligence which does in fact affect the economy as it extends to the civilian appellate courts, where resources could be better else spent for the nations safety instead of erroneously discharging patriots that would have willingly continued to defend this great nation. Patriots that are subservient to those appointed over them, waiving some of their inherent civil rights and liberties. Delegation of authority has enabled willful neglect and has *empowered* the mishandling of cases in vulnerable situations within various government offices and agencies. Violating the rights and liberties of those subject to their “*power, command, and influence*”. Culpably failing to fulfill constitutional standards requiring an overdue line to be drawn and the rendering of overdue relief to the “actually innocent.”<sup>2</sup>

#### STATEMENT

Now comes the appellant-veteran in the above-titled action to move this Honorable Court for leave to file the attached direct appeal on papers prepared (Supreme Court Rule 40) as an original action pursuant to Article III, Section 2 of the Constitution, 28 U.S.C.A. § 1651(a) and 28 U.S.C.A. § 1251(a). The appellant prays forgiveness from this court for actions sincerely regrettably committed. In retrospect, being absent without leave (AWOL) in lieu of [regrettably] forging by the “preponderance” of having to *unwillingly submit* to a(n) [un]lawful command directed

---

<sup>2</sup> Vanlandingham; Huffman and Rosen); see appendices 65, 67.; E1517 Articles Wwww.TheLancet.Com/Lancetgh Vol 13 September 2025, [www.thelancet.com/action/showPdf?pii=S2214-109X\(25\)00232-3](http://www.thelancet.com/action/showPdf?pii=S2214-109X(25)00232-3). Accessed 18 Feb. 2026; GAO-16-720 highlights, regulatory guidance (n.d.-b). <https://www.gao.gov/assets/gao-16-720-highlights.pdf>; JNJ.com. (n.d.). Covid-19. JNJ.com. <https://www.jnj.com/tag/covid-19>.

order, would have been more *ideal* than dealing with the detrimental ramifications sustained from the Covid-19 vaccine. Substantial permanent physical effects on the appellants' quality of life are irreversibly sustained—internally and externally.<sup>3</sup>

The brief and motion to follow establish the reasons warranting approval for extraordinary relief granting review and establishing substantial facts in support of full reversal, *Res Ipsa Loquitur* the gross miscarriage of justice under Federal Civil Procedure Rule 60(b). Which should be verifiably protected but instead on its face, was *riddled* with obvious transgressions against the appellants civil rights and liberties *on the ground[s]* that the forgery claim had no basis in fact and had not been “investigated” sufficiently by counsel.<sup>4</sup> Privileges under Amendment I, V, and XIV, of the US Constitution, rules for the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) [especially] the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Department of Justice (DOJ). As well as, intentional infliction of emotional distress under UCMJ Article 93, 10 U.S.C.A. § 893, HIPPA violations, permanent physical harm under UCMJ Rule 928, civil substantive violations of RICO under 18 U.S.C.A. § 1962, and blatant “actual” prejudice from government agency employees— showing cause to impose a legal obligation and to compensate the appellant due to injuries sustained and effects thereof, during the line of duty by command directed order “incited” by pressures from the COVID-19 mandate.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> see appendices: 15, 22-24, 44-46, 57, 65-67; 10 U.S.C.A. § 928

<sup>4</sup> AVELIC & LeFLORE, Petitioner v. MARVEL ENTERTAINMENT GROUP et al

<sup>5</sup> Davila v. Davis, 137 S. Ct. 2058, 2064. 198 L. Ed. 2d 603 (2017); Wainwright, 433 U.S. at 84; 28 U.S.C.A. § 2254 (b)(1)(A).; see appendices: 22-23.

The appellant respectfully submits grounds for relief arise from various conflicting actions exacerbated by individuals in positions of trust throughout multiple government agencies to include the Department of War and two individual offices of different Missouri Congressmen.<sup>6</sup>

"The nature of the alleged defect and the *gravity* of the harm from which relief is sought. Moreover, both factors must be assessed in light of the deference [than] that [of which] should be accorded the judgments of the carefully designed military justice system established by Congress."<sup>7</sup>

Appellant has attempted to practice due diligence in mitigating and resolving the issue at hand at the lowest level prior to committing the main offense of (sincerely regrettably) forging her personal Covid-19 vaccine card, and then following up and emailing various USARC, HRC, and other government personnel, up to and after the effective date from the judgments entry advising of injuries sustained and the requirement for entry into the Soldier Recovery Unit and reversal of executed administrative actions against the accused as the entire board was in fact unnecessary and could have been dismissed in several instances that gives rise to granting of this petition for extraordinary relief.<sup>8</sup>

The appellant is requesting: (1) parties listed be served notice by an appointed federal Marshall pursuant to Rule 4(c)(3) of Federal Civil Procedures, (2) counsel be appointed to the appellant IAW the Criminal Justice Act of 1964, 18 U.S.C.A. § 3006A(1),

---

<sup>6</sup> see appendices: 16-17.

<sup>7</sup> Schlesinger, 420 U.S. at 753.; see appendix: 43. (Internal edits added for emphasis)

<sup>8</sup> Denedo, 66 M.J. at 125; U.S. Constitution, Amendment 11.6.3 Officer Suits and State Sovereign Immunity; UCMJ § 860b. Art 60b; UCMJ § 931b. Art 131b; UCMJ § 931g. Art. 131g. See appendices: 16, 22-23, 47-55

(H-J),<sup>9</sup> 28 U.S.C.A. § 1916,<sup>10</sup> and (3) the appointing of a Master to conduct [an] investigation(s) (federal civ procedure Rule 53) for a deep and wide “Standard of Review” of complaint procedures within the DOW, Congressional, Inspector General, Whistleblower, CID, Administrative Separation actions, and Courts Martial cases.

*On direct review...*<sup>11</sup>

“Overturn...court-martial convictions...amounting to violations of the Constitution.”<sup>12</sup>

To include the overturning of adverse actions (for others) related to the Covid-19 vaccine mandate as they are unfounded in hindsight's contrast to the creation of the virus and the vaccine for the virus through Operation Warp Speed, the mandate, their effects and the need for full transparency due to:

“Increased mistrust of the military justice system—and all things [government] military...”<sup>13</sup>

Compulsion for the expediting and release from the Deputy Chief of Staff (DCS), Initial Denial Authority (IDA), G-1 of the appellant's DOW/USARC FOIA Records:<sup>14</sup> (FA- [REDACTED] [substantive verbatim un-redacted trial voice recording], FA- [REDACTED], FA- [REDACTED]

<sup>9</sup> UCMJ 70(b); R.C.M. 1202(b)(1), 10 U.S.C.A. § 870(b)

<sup>10</sup> 10 U.S.C.A. § 865 - Art. 65.(e)(3)(B), 10 U.S.C.A. § 844(a)

<sup>11</sup> Ortiz v. U.S., 138 S. Ct. 2165, 2170-2171, 201 L. Ed. 2d 601 (2018); U.S. v. Bauerbach, 55 M.J. 501, 506 (A.C.C.A. 2001); Barker v. Wingo, 407 U.S. 514, 92 S. Ct. 2182, 33 L. Ed. 2d 101, 1972) (four part test.); 28 U.S.C.A. § 2403(a), (b). See appendices: 1-68.

<sup>12</sup> Augenblick, 393 U.S. at 356. The Court of Claims granted relief based upon a violation of the Jencks Act, 18 U.S.C.A. § 3500, which requires the government to produce a verbatim statement or report.

<sup>13</sup> Civilian Court Review of Court-Martial Adjudication, 69 Colum. L. Rev. 1259, 1262 (1969). Supreme Court Rule 17.5; see appendix: 16.

<sup>14</sup> R.C.M 1114(a)(1); U.S. v. Budde, 2021 WL 5346633 \*2 (A.F.C.C.A. 2021); See appendices: 28-42.

FA [REDACTED], FA- [REDACTED], Fed Civil Procedure Rule E(4)(f) is requested in order to support substantial claims under 10 U.S.C.A. § 801 article I (14)(A), (B), (16):

“Trials conducted in violation of express constitutional mandates, constitutionally unfair trial takes place where the barriers and safeguards are so relaxed or forgotten as in... that the proceeding is more a spectacle.... or trial by ordeal ... than a disciplined contest.”<sup>15</sup>

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 21.4 “in an appropriate case, this Honorable Court may act on a motion without waiting for a response.”, appellant requests this Honorable Court approve extraordinary immediate relief (R.C.M. 1203) by executing an order of mandamus to the appropriate DOW/VA Departments compelling them to execute a full reversal of the discharge rendered for the appellant and changing the:

- Current DD 2-14 codes and remarks necessary,<sup>16</sup>
- Character of separation from “under other than honorable” to “honorable”,<sup>17</sup>
- Correct and/or remove unfavorable records from the accused's personal military records in i-PERMS,
- Granting retroactive “automatic” promotion to Staff Sergeant (E6) as the accused was eligible during the time a non-favorable action (flag) barring promotion was active.
- Cancellation of the appellant's rank reduction debt to be cancelled, effectively. putting the appellant into a retired status.
- Upgrade or order/recommend upgrade for appellants VA disability rating upon review of “new” medical findings suppressed by the ARMEDCOM JAG team back dating to the 2023: CE-MARSG rank reduction board, pre-/during/post-trial/appeal attempts for the injuries sustained from the Janssen Covid-19 vaccine.<sup>18</sup>
- Injunctive relief through the promulgation and/or amending by this Honorable Court of any current policies and regulations to include

---

<sup>15</sup> *Augenblick*, 393 U.S. at 356 (citations omitted).

<sup>16</sup> see appendix: 14.

<sup>17</sup> see appendix: 3.

<sup>18</sup> see appendix: 15, 44-46, 66.

those identified in a review by an appointed of a Master be deemed fundamental...

In order to improve the military judicial system for Soldiers currently combatting similar instances and to elevate the public's perception of the military judicial system as a whole by assisting in boosting the overall moral and confidence of those currently serving that are subject to UCMJ, at the mercy of Command Influence empowered by UCMJ conflictingly with the intent established therein, to include that in the NDAA and the U.S. Constitution.

Amendment I of the Constitution provides: <sup>19</sup>

“Congress shall make... and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.”

Article III of the Constitution, particularly 28 U.S.C.A. § 1651 section (a) provides:

(a) The Supreme Court and all courts established by Act of Congress may issue all writs necessary or appropriate in aid of their respective jurisdictions and agreeable to the usages and principles of law.

And 28 U.S.C.A. § 1251 section (a) provides:

(a) The Supreme Court shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction of all *controversies* between two or more States.

The Appellant respectfully submits to this Honorable Court that the individuals appointed as “*superior officers*” over the appellant are also subject to UCMJ 18 U.S.C.A. § 601, in their respective roles of authority as the accused’s direct chain of command,

---

<sup>19</sup> *Wade v. Hunter* 336 U.S. 684, 688 n.4, 69 S. Ct. 834, 93 L. Ed. 974 (1949). “explicitly avoided the issue”

[(non-)elected] government officials, and congressional liaisons, expressed and enjoyed all the privileges and immunities, which are by simile the equivalent of “other public ministers” or “consuls” as “states” are similarly the equivalent to the “military” as a branch of the sovereign establishment set out in the above mentioned articles of the US Constitution, and 28 U.S.C.A. § 1651(a) and 28 U.S.C.A. § 1251(a), invoking this Honorable Court’s Jurisdiction in an original direct appeal is appropriate and admissible.<sup>20</sup>

This Honorable Court is asked to adjudicate, prior to potential dismissal or referral to a lower court for fear of denial due to more prejudice. This court has the *only* appropriate jurisdiction and has the *only* jurisprudence required for this humble appeal and the only power to authorize the appropriate relief required. It is known standard of practice for higher courts to affirm lower court's rulings upon appeal of most judgments and/or opinions, sometimes without any review by the higher courts, dismissing any/all chance for an accused to defend assertions of privileges and/or limiting options for any relief and any just compensation as potentially preventable if resolved with added stipulations from the lower courts. Potentially implicating the accused and *empowering* commanders, congressmen, and other government “leaders” and their delegates,

---

<sup>20</sup> The Convening Authority below lacked jurisdiction Appendix 3 of the UCMJ; Clinton v. Goldsmith, 526 U.S. 529; see appendices: 26, 43.

arming them to continue misguidedly executing unlawful judgments or failing to render relief where actually appropriate, pertinent, and legal to render swift relief.<sup>21</sup>

Review by appointed Master and this Honorable Court is in the uppermost interest of justice and the integrity of the government's infrastructure pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 17.5. It is imperative this appeal skip the lower courts and upon review, investigate (the) [any relation between the] unlawful Covid-19 vaccine mandate, Operation Warp Speed, the manufacturing of the Corona Virus, and the Covid-19 vaccine. Moreover, the effects that the known *unfair* judicial system has on others similarly stonewalled or left in lengthy legal lurches by unlawful command influence in various court martial proceedings enabled by "conflict-of-interest"—prosecutorial misconduct. Raising the urgent need of attention between multi-role service members within the civilian and military judicial systems, donning both "hats" as JAG and other government attorneys that pose a conflict of interest. Warranting relief in instances such as this case and further demonstrating a much-needed way to mitigate any other similar issues for Soldiers present and future as has been the case historically for the overall interests of the Nation's infrastructure and how it's regarded by the public's perception.

---

<sup>21</sup> In re Cossio, Misc. Dkt. No. 2021-04, 2021 WL 6105497, at \*4 (A.F. Ct. Crim. App. Dec. 20, 2021): "Extraordinary Relief", "Threshold Requirements"; R.C.M. 1203(c), Discussion, at II-191; Brown, 81 M.J. at 3 "to establish subject- matter jurisdiction, the harm alleged must have had the potential to directly affect the findings and sentence.": UCMJ § 938. Art. 138; see appendices: 8, 11, 16-17, 41 49-50, 55, 58-67.

## ARGUMENT

Leadership's inherent obligation is to ensure their subordinates' overall welfare is secure. Appendix 25 confirms "Proactive" measures for Covid-19 100% vaccination compliance was a USARC priority. It was indeed recklessly *trendy* to mindlessly follow suit and [allow/encourage] harass [ment of] those hesitant to comply based off "science". Similar tragedies have occurred with the development of the yellow fever vaccine during the 1900's and the Spanish- American War<sup>22</sup>. Unethical [reoccurring] human experimentation— producing a vaccine with (permanent/ most times deadly) health risks, to "mitigate" potential pathogenic threats. Disregarding basic ethical principles and manipulating *informed* consent. Failing to "anticipate" the *irreversible* harm forcibly sustained by the unwilling such as the appellant, who did in fact expect, warned her command against wanting to get the Covid-19 vaccine, stated the reasons why, and is now suffering from the consequences of her previously assigned command's forced negligence and abuse of the incompetent command's unlawful order forcing safeguards, now unable to enjoy life to the fullest. However, not for lack of trying but rather for the real injuries sustained.

The appellant served as an Army Guard Reserve (AGR) Human Resources Sergeant in the US Army Reserves (USAR) under the USAR Medical Command (ARMEDCOM). The accused signed a counseling statement refusing the Covid-19

---

<sup>22</sup> Note: There are various vaccines required to be given to Soldiers that require safeguard enforcement for vaccine injuries to prevent future "proactive" measures that in part; lowers the nations *Defenses (Soldiers)*.

vaccine for potential health risks and opting for a voluntary separation (REFRAD) prior to the DOW Covid-19 Vaccine Mandate's effective date.<sup>23</sup> While on leave for her great aunt's funeral November 2020 in California, unforeseen in-climate weather made returning prior to the appellants leave end date difficult and was communicated with the immediate commander, who approved the leave extension via text.<sup>24</sup> Not long after, the Commander said any leave extension wouldn't be approved without proof of the Covid-19 vaccine. Request for REFRAD was restated, and the appellant was denied by the BDE commander (two levels up) according to the immediate (unit) commander at that time. The accused requested a leave extension and implored to the chain of command that the voluntary REFRAD from the Army Reserves was preferred and viable option at the time. The immediate commander, insisted that the Brigade Commander was the denial authority exercising the command through her.<sup>25</sup>

"c. Explanation.

(1) Safeguard. A...detail posted by a commander for the protection of persons, ...includes a written order... the effect of a safeguard is to pledge the honor of the nation that the person for property shall be respected by the national armed forces.

(2) Forcing a safeguard. "Forcing a safeguard" means to perform an act or acts in violation of the protection of the safeguard."<sup>26</sup>

*I will maintain my arms, my equipment, and myself,*<sup>27</sup> Soldiers are in fact property as part of the contract which dictates the "command authority" over a subordinate. The CDC

---

<sup>23</sup> see appendix: 24.

<sup>24</sup> see appendix: 23.

<sup>25</sup> Conversely, The immediate commander had mentioned the Brigade Commander having access to a system of record to do with Covid-19.; see appendix: 22.

<sup>26</sup> UCMJ Article 102, 10 U.S.C.A. § 902

<sup>27</sup> Army Soldiers Creed

recommendations and Covid-19 "science/medical" information was promoted as "safe" and that we should trust the "science" as it's approved for "common usage" for preventive medical practices and procedures as approved by the FDA and CDC.<sup>28</sup> "Facts" pushed by the CDC, Mr. Fauci, Mr. Gates, the chain of command all the way to the top, and others so influenced pushing the mass military and civilian mandate forcing safeguard(s) by [un]lawful command force, by civilian employers, and schools.<sup>29</sup>

The government could argue UCMJ Rule 916(d) Obedience to orders: "is a defense to any offense that the accused was acting pursuant to orders unless the accused knew the orders to be *unlawful* or a person of ordinary sense and understanding would have *known* the orders to be unlawful." The accused *felt* the order was unlawful at the time it was deemed lawful by others, normally regarded as having "common-sense" and *still* view the vaccine as "safe".

However, when obedience to the [un]lawful order and offense committed are in self-defense:

"(A)... on grounds, that death or grievous bodily harm was about to be inflicted wrongfully on the accused; and (B) believed that the force the accused used was necessary for protection against **death** or **grievous** bodily harm... was one which a reasonable, prudent person would have held as there was no evident sign of safe retreat to *repel* the attack [order]."<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> Classes were conducted during battle assembly regarding Covid-19 with q&a by the assigned unit medical providers.

<sup>29</sup> Chappell v. Wallace, 462 U.S. 296 (1983); United Novelty Co. v. Daniels, 42 Sr. 2d 395 (Miss. 1949); James & Gray § 18.2 R 657-659.

<sup>30</sup> UCMJ, Rule 916(d)(e); M.R.E. 404(a)(2) (defines victim) (internal edits added for emphasis.)

It's the *principal* of the *unlawfulness* that drove the accused to commit the mislead offense due to the fact that she was being *forced* to get the "actually dangerous" vaccine against her will and better judgment, to include from fear of injury, or similar bad conduct discharge for being AWOL [although] without injuries. Which will continue to be the case in a grander scale of mass conformity if not controlled or prevented.<sup>31</sup> Forcing one to conscientiously abandon one's comfort and submit to a socially *valuable* "norm". Reluctantly eliminating all elements of safety, forcing the assumption of the substantial risk, assuming all of the liability, forcing the brute reduction of a person's dignity and that of any hope for potential relief, reducing the potential of one's wholeness of life, making livability to the fullest harder to reach mentally, emotionally, and physically. What is that, if not a gross violation of power?

"Redefined:

(b) An activity is abnormally dangerous if:

(1) the activity creates a foreseeable and highly significant risk of physical harm even when reasonable care is exercised by all actors; and

(2) the activity isn't one of common usage.<sup>32</sup>

The immediate commander without the delivery of miranda rights or notification of suspicion of offense committed, violated the accused's due process rights by initiating the investigation process and inquiring about the lot number.<sup>33</sup> The accused was cornered into the juxtaposition of (1) being forced and coerced by an "official" [un]lawful order given by a prejudicial superior commanding officer to receive the

---

<sup>31</sup> UCMJ Article 77, 10 U.S.C.A. § 877; Rylands 3 H.L. 330, 340 (1868)

<sup>32</sup> (Glannon, 2015)

<sup>33</sup> UCMJ Article 31(b); 10 U.S.C.A. § 831(b), MRE 305(c)(1), MRE 308

Covid-19 vaccine against the appellant's better judgment and personal wishes due to the unknown irreversible effects on the body as an intravenous bioweapon. Requiring the immediate and overdue relief from injuries sustained by the [commanded] administration of the [Johnson & Johnson (Janssen)] Covid-19 vaccine and (2) having to now deal with the legal ramifications of those bad choices made by both sides.<sup>34</sup>

Issues "discovered" shortly thereafter caused the Covid-19 vaccine mandate to be rescinded<sup>35</sup>, after the effective date had already been extended once before, fully demonstrates the blatant disregard as medical professionals how negligently the command (all the way to the top) acted in "proactively" pushing 100% vaccinations, regardless of how dire the "epidemic" seemed at the time) before the effective date abandoning any leeway for unanticipated risks. Proving the first of many opportunities the accused had to maintain an honorable active role in military service, without the pressures from the Covid-19 vaccine mandate, if not for the commands push for metrics as previously supported in appendices 24, 25 pg 2., 57, 65, and 67. CE-MARSG BDE [similarly] out of their jurisdiction, began their investigation and concluded retention, rehabilitation, and a rank reduction board that the accused and her counsel were scheduled to contest June 2023. ARMEDCOM cancelled the rank reduction board by exercising their "command discretion" to prosecute the accused at their level after finding out, and began their own investigation, also outside of their jurisdiction. Taking

---

<sup>34</sup> Davis v. U.S., 411 U.S. 233, 93 S. Ct. 1577, 36 L. Ed. 2d. 216 (1973); Wainwright v. Sykes "cause" and "prejudice" standard, 19 Wake Forest L. Rev. 441 (1983); Younger, 401 U.S. at 46; UCMJ, Article 94, 10 § 894.

<sup>35</sup> see appendix: 57.

away a second opportunity for the accused's retention, where the action should have been dismissed.

“The military justice system relies upon courts that must take all appropriate means, consistent with their statutory jurisdiction, to ensure the neutrality and integrity of their judgments. Under the premises and statutes we have relied upon here, the jurisdiction and the responsibility of military courts to reexamine judgments in rare cases where a fundamental flaw is alleged and other judicial processes for correction are unavailable are consistent with the powers Congress has granted those courts under Article I and with the system Congress has designed.”<sup>36</sup>

The accused and many others had voiced political opinions and religious beliefs that were sneered by some peers assigned to the same facility at the time.<sup>37</sup> Harassing the “actually innocent” victim by casting a negative light upon the accused among peers ostracizing her during work, in addition to the excessively delayed due process, topped with abuse of command influence was a part of the ongoing cruel and unusual means of psychological warfare.<sup>38</sup> The accused had to eventually succumb to a behavioral health note allowing the accused to telework as the facility was toxic with unprofessionalism after several attempts of counseling over the years of delayed litigation.<sup>39</sup> There are a multitude of errors the prosecution made intentionally or not to

---

<sup>36</sup> see appendix: 4.; 28 U.S.C.A. § 1651(a).; U.S. v. Denedo, 556 U.S. 904 (2009)

<sup>37</sup> In a similar unrelated situation occurred after the accused committed the offense and was publicly investigated; where another AGR Soldier in the building heard of what happened and attempted suicide when he was denied Retirement after 20 plus years if he refused to comply with the Covid-19 vaccine mandate. The command he was under followed procedure for suicide attempts once notified and retired the Soldier without any award or retirement gift normally awarded for honorable service completed. Instead he was subject to involuntary separation with a less than honorable characterization of service had he not tried to commit suicide and still refused the vaccine. See appendix: 20.

<sup>38</sup> see appendix: 46.

<sup>39</sup> see appendix: 20.

make a *point*, objections to those errors were not forfeited and constituted mistrial *with* prejudice, UCMJ Rule 915:<sup>40</sup>

“...mistrial when such action is manifestly necessary in the interest of justice because of circumstances arising during the proceedings which cast substantial doubt upon the fairness of the proceedings... for plain and obvious reasons... legal defect, such as a jurisdictional defect or a defective referral. See also R.C.M. 905(g) concerning the effect of rulings in one proceeding on later proceedings.”

The appellants' defenses were effectively blocked by the convening authority for more than plain and obvious reasons or any “plain error” that offends the integrity of justice.<sup>41</sup>

Mail sent by USPS from ARMEDCOM has been mishandled, leaving unclassified but case related documents easily accessible as they were left unsealed as scanned, without the post office stamp or information showing certified mail, and only secured by the metal clasp.<sup>42</sup> The incident was reported to the accused's Battalion (BN) S1, HR Non-Commissioned Officer in Charge (NCOIC) via text message, where nothing was done about the gross “error”. ARMEDCOM and the Command failed to process a HIPPA sensitive action through email and through the physical paper routes, outside of the standard system for processing as regulated in the Personnel Action Guide (used at the time as a reference) in the RCMS system utilized to process actions prior to the current iPPSA system. ARMEDCOM appointed an unqualified judge is one of many violations.<sup>43</sup> Another is not having the appropriate notifications or requested enlisted board members. The Action was never under their jurisdiction and should have been referred

---

<sup>40</sup> see appendices: 6, 12, 21-23, 26.

<sup>41</sup> UCMJ Article 131(b),(f),(g)

<sup>42</sup> see appendix 6 “insufficient notice”

<sup>43</sup> Davis v. U.S., 411 U.S. 233, 93 S. Ct. 1577, 36 L. Ed. 2d. 216 (1973); UCMJ § 826. Art. 26; UCMJ § 933. Art 133; appendix 2.1 Section 2: 2.1, 2.7(e); R.C.M. 308(b),(c),(d)(1); UCMJ § 829. Art. 29

to CID and the Department of Justice for adjudication where it may have provided a third means for retention IAW the MOU between the DOW and DOJ.<sup>44</sup>

The command negligently mishandled the action making it visible for colleagues with access to read the accused's pending adverse action and flag, to include those at Fort Leonard Wood during out processing that made it obvious while walking in the hallways making it more uncomfortable and that more "real" for the appellant.<sup>45</sup> Through multiple cruel and unusual ways of "punishment" barley outside the limits of appropriate command authority by pushing normal "duties" at inconvenient times outside of duty hours, being unprofessionally petty "teetering the boarder of illegal and/or immoral". These actions of abuse extended to two other AGRs. The senior in grade for the enlisted AGR staff was also undergoing involuntary separation until the command allowed her to retire at 20 years of service.<sup>46</sup> The other [also a witness on the voice trial recording] was pregnant with preeclampsia from the stress and other health issues causing a premature delivery of her first child, putting the newborn child in the NICU for over a month or two, ruining the first time mother-child bonding experience she had been looking forward to. The command accused the appellant of grooming the Soldier to take advantage of medical appointments. The command forced the appellant to stop going to her own physical therapy appointments after having had

---

<sup>44</sup> UCMJ Appendix 3, (E)(2)(F); see appendices: 5, 12.

<sup>45</sup> see appendix: 20.

<sup>46</sup> The now veteran was sent to the ER during the medical part of out processing at Fort Leonard Wood, MO. The Out processing team cut several integral parts from the appellants separation process that would have like wise sent her to the ER and a second opportunity could have been established to care for the accused's medical condition previously raised to the command as a concern and to the female civilian at the Fort Leonard Wood that processed the accused's paperwork in the attached DD 2-14 appendix 14.

double hip surgery herself, hindering the long-term healing process and now suffers from those effects as applied to overall quality of life on top of the then commander's forced vaccine injuries.

The commander stripped the accused of system accesses required to perform duty assignments (as "required", due to the regrettably mindless forgery) and then proceeded to publicly humiliate the accused during pre-battle assembly calls (recorded and given to CE-MARSG investigating officer (IO), ridiculed as being ineffective as to the accused's abilities to complete duties amongst military peers when previously held in decent regard. The Immediate commander was heard gossiping loudly where others heard her talking about the accused's Covid-19 ongoings during one of the BA weekends, texted the accused about it during the time the accused was across the country for her great-aunts funeral, and the commander made up an excuse when confronted over the phone after being texted about it. The toxic commander was separated as a two-time passover and no longer able to, "get every hard-earned citizen's tax dollar that the accused was paid as an AGR" out of retaliation from the accused raising concerns about the XO at the time's lack of system access and duties after being in the assigned role for over a year at that point, losing an Alpha key for the facility, amongst other undisclosed issues.

The trial voice recording has statements by other witnesses on the defendant's behalf, testifying over the previous immediate commander's unprofessional conduct. More witnesses would have, had the accused been privy of the privilege to request compulsion of witnesses (or that of retaining preferred by-name counsel) to testify and

where pertinent questions could have been asked through the appointed defense counsels cross-examination questions prior to the board to better support the defense for the accused's responsibility to fulfill the burden of proof, the appointed ("limited") counsel and (unqualified) judge both failed to notify listed privileges, motions, and objections forfeitable to the accused, putting the accused at a gross disadvantage. Written and verbal motions the counsel did raise were made at various stages of the proceedings to the best of the "ineffective" counsels limited abilities IAW the UCMJ.<sup>47</sup> The accused's one assigned trial defense counsel was not as seasoned in the same sense as the government's prosecution *team*, putting them at a gross disadvantage as much as he tried through his limited Trial Defense abilities so outlined in the UCMJ. The prosecution refused to acknowledge the switch in role as required to carry the burden of production and proof of counterclaims from the accused and instead buried the claims by suppressing evidence that would have exonerated the accused, exceeding "usual tactics and strategies commonly used."<sup>48</sup>

Relief by redress is available through congressional and military congressional liaisons. Though it's not being properly upheld as prescribed by the U.S. Constitution.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> Appointed defense counsel was newly promoted and had no criminal law background, UCMJ Rule 502(d)(2)(c). Stapley, 246 F. Supp. 316 (D. Utah 1965); Schita v. Cox, 139 F.2d (C.C.A. 3d Cir. 1944). Note: reserving right to appeal and other written motions, objections, or claims (rebuttal memo, unsworn statements written and voice recorded, see appendices 13;; Johnson v. Zerbst 304 U.S. 458 S. Ct. 1019, 82 L. Ed. 1461, 146 A.L.R. 357 (1938); Shapiro v. U.S., 107 Ct. Cl. 650, 69 F. (1947); Denedo, 66 M.J.; U.S. v. Doss, 57 M.J. 182 (C.A.A.F. 2002); 18 U.S.C.A. § 3006A

<sup>48</sup> UCMJ, R.C.M. 809: exercise contempt power

<sup>49</sup> see appendices \_\_ redress form and emails

Legal jargon, cookie cutter statements, commonly used on memos or in response emails are used to bury, delay, or circumvent due process, as is/will be the case for others

currently serving and those currently separated from the military also seeking relief. On two separate occasions, delegated government officials overstepped their own professional limits of appropriate professionalism by unbecoming conduct when on one occasion, the Aid de Camp for the 88th RD (at that time) went so far as to tell the appellant that, "good things happened to good people" implying the accused wasn't a good person and informing of the 88th RD CDR'S unavailability as he was on leave. Showing bias and prejudice by barring the accused from open door with the commander at the division level above a brigadier general with authority for issuing relief in the Soldiers line for redress, preventing a fourth attempt for relief. Similarly, on another occasion at a higher level for the USARC CDR, the open door intermediary stated the appellant needed to "lean on family during hard times", refusing to acknowledge other remedies presented by the appellant under the NDAA and UCMJ that were viable options for immediate *recourse* as stated during communications at every CMD level for open door, the various USARC departments, and repeated to congressman Hawley and Graves' associates, who equally barred redress and other chances of available relief.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> see appendices: 16-17.

The immediate commander and the command deny the accused's claims and have expressed as much through actions leading up to this point as previously stated throughout this appeal. The commander denies claims of ordering the vaccine and denying approval of the request for voluntary separation or the extension for leave which would have put the accused in an AWOL status due to in-climate weather making it difficult to return safely.

The requested FOIA recording shows the bitter disdain the command had for the accused which is heard in the voice of the witnesses in opposition and in the opening remarks by the recorder, "it's not a matter of whether the Covid-19 vaccine was mandated or not, it's the fact that the accused forged the Covid-19 vaccine card" — and again during closing statements, "she may have intended to intentionally infect others by remaining unvaccinated" is one of many memories often replayed in the appellants mind. Further demonstrating *more* than mere "harmless error" was at play. It severely affected the appellants substantial rights and should have been dismissed on its face, "...its proceedings cannot be collaterally impeached for any *mere* error or irregularity..."<sup>51</sup>

Following the delivery of the judgment from the appellants counsel at the time, caused the accused to have a syncope episode on July 27, 2024, while still on active duty. The accused immediately informed the chain of command of the event en route to the Emergency room. The accused's family was present at the time of the accused's

---

<sup>51</sup> Reed, 100 U.S. 13, (1879); see appendices: 5, 6, 16, 22, 43, 45.

injury, also suffering emotionally and mentally from witnessing their mother and wife “faint”—jaw and neck muscles clenching, falling straight back, and hitting her head on the corner of a metal patio table so hard, the sound of a metal baseball bat could be heard ringing through the appellants subconscious.<sup>52</sup> The attached EKG and medical documents state “Ectopic Atrial Rhythm Present”.<sup>53</sup> The Command failed to initiate a required serious incident report that would have put the then Soldier in the Soldier Recovery Unit, which was relayed to the chain of command and other government liaisons when attempts for redress were emailed, preventing the accused from another instance of attainable relief. The command never checked on the junior non-commissioned officer at the time that was actively on the unit manning roster and literally suffered a heavy blow to the head.<sup>54</sup>

Death by suicide or by vaccine injury isn't a usually “small risk” one willingly takes lightly. A “small risk” is culpable—it does not have to be likely or probable.<sup>55</sup> The Covid-19 vaccine is no mere “small risk”, it has in fact taken lives of many with underlying health “issues” not identified previously if any, by any random normally healthy person or otherwise less healthy, as is the case with the appellant. Where in fact “most” cases were used as *recommended* and *approved* by the FDA and CDC. Bringing the appellant to the rational (connection) conclusion that the Covid-19 vaccine was pushed and encouraged by some of those listed in the opposing parties. Special

---

<sup>52</sup> 10 U.S.C.A § 1552(h)(1), see appendices: 44- 45, 66,

<sup>53</sup> See appendices 44 & 66. Other medical documents are available upon request and follow up is required with a cardiologist and pulmonologist as would have been the case should the accused been enrolled into the Soldier Recovery unit as required in that instance.

<sup>54</sup> see appendices 49 & 50.

<sup>55</sup> Glannon, pg 245. See appendices 21-25.

Masters review of The Federal Tort Claims Act, the West Fall Act, and The Camp Lejeune Justice Act of 2022 is requested to be compared to the issues presented pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. § 2679 and potential joinder claim(s) for (any) class action lawsuit(s) for vaccine injured military and/or civilian so entitled throughout the land or at least the relief requested for the appellant, if it so pleases this Honorable Court, Lord willing.

Unlimited Command Executive Authority delegated to those in command and further delegated to staff can conflict with afforded constitutional rights, when a *lawful command* could be deadly should it exceed its delegated limits:

*"Supreme law of the land; the judges... anything in the constitution or laws... to the contrary notwithstanding."<sup>56</sup>*

Without any misconception, there is and was in fact gross unlawful,<sup>57</sup> prosecutorial misconduct<sup>58</sup>, and professional misconduct<sup>59</sup> prejudicial to the extent of purposefully harming the integrity of the judicial system, to include through the make-up of the board proceedings— shows lack of respect for the oath sworn as an attorney in a "professional" position of trust. The Command refused to acknowledge any claims of misconduct, including the written statement in a Psychological Exam from a Command Directed Behavioral Health Referral- Code 33.<sup>60</sup> No person in a position of trust with delegated authority should misconstrue the constitution in such a manner that maliciously violates another person's rights to due process and/or keeps and/or

---

<sup>56</sup> Article VI of the US constitution.

<sup>57</sup> R.C.M. 104

<sup>58</sup> R.C.M. 915

<sup>59</sup> 18 U.S.C.A. § 3261

<sup>60</sup> UCMJ Rule 513(d)(7), R.C.M. 706 or Mil R. Evil. 302; see appendix: 43.

hindering an accused from seeking and/or attaining relief through any command open door requests or congressional redress (Article IV, Sec. 3 & 4, and Amendment I of the constitution).<sup>61</sup>

The recorder is/was a DOJ prosecuting attorney on the civilian side, conflicting with the interests of justice by serving in the direct chain of command and effectively acting in multiple capacities to "convict fraud criminals to the fullest extent of the law". Activity as heinous as the manufacturing, distributing, mandating, and racketeering of the Covid-19 virus and the Covid-19 vaccine. Actions of irrevocable harm, weakening the military, our Nations Security, and ruining the public's perception of the judicial system(s) are issues raised of extraordinary importance constituting immediate Supreme Court adjudication as opposed to a lengthy criminal appeals process without legal counsel, posing further detriment, should the request for review of the enclosed appeal be denied, by this Honorable Court.

*A sovereign (and persons affiliated by employment or election), should not be immune from suit or have the right to save any consent, on any terms in any courts jurisdictions, to entertain suit where gross negligence through its delegated power authorizes the carrying of unjust actions prejudicial to good order.*

"Law need not be in every respect logically consistent with its aims to be constitutional. It's enough that there is an evil at the hand for correction, and that it might be thought that

---

<sup>61</sup> Parker V. Levy, 417 U.S. 733 (1974): no "countervailing military considerations which justify the twisting of established standards of due process in order to hold inviolate these articles, so clearly repugnant under current constitutional values...An army isn't a deliberative body. It's the executive arm. Its law is that of obedience. No question can be left open as to the right to command in the officer, or the duty of obedience in the soldier...the rights of men in the armed forces must perforce be conditioned to meet certain overriding demands of discipline and duty.; (Burns v. Wilson, 346 U. S. 137, 140 (1953) (plurality opinion); R.C.M. 308(b),(c),(d)(1); see appendices 47-55.

the particular legislative measure was [a] rational way to correct it.”<sup>62</sup>

In a white house response letter dated September 18, 2025, “President Trump tasked” government personnel to assist with the release of USAR FOIA case number FA- [REDACTED] to the accused pursuant to Rules of Evidence and Trial Records rules.<sup>63</sup> They have refrained from assisting in resolving the issue to include not participating in email correspondence. The voice recording withheld by the G-1, holds a substantial verbatim record that has been needlessly delayed and is a vital source of evidence in need to support the appellant's defense. The redacted voice recording includes the accused's unsworn statement from the trial proceedings and other testimonies necessary to substantiate claims against some of those listed as opposing parties, to solidify and/or confirm justification constituting immediate relief.<sup>64</sup>

### CONCLUSION

A grave error of [un]constitutional significance are so fundamental that they result as miscarriages of justice and will continue to if not corrected in this and future circumstances, as even redress through congress who per *Burns*, established “a complete system of review within the military system to protect the rights of service members, including a hierarchy of appellate tribunals and post-conviction remedies” that need a fail-safe established for similar instances where in point of fact legally sufficient.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> *Williamson v. Lee optical, inc.* 348 us 483, 487-488(1955); (Glannon, law of torts 2015)

<sup>63</sup> see appendices: 28-42.

<sup>64</sup> *Yonemoto v. VA*, No. 10- 12180, 2011 WL 3606596 (9th Cir. Aug. 17 2011) (Berzon, J.)

<sup>65</sup> *Loya v. Underwood*, 857 Fed. App'x 834, 834 (5th Cir. 2021) (quoting *Calley*, 519 F.2d at 199; *Burns v. Wilson*, 346 U.S. 137, 73 S.Ct. 1045, 97 L.Ed. 1508 (1953); *Fletcher v. Outlaw*, 578 R. 3d 274 (5th Cir. 2009)

PUBLIC COPY—SEALED MATERIALS REDACTED

“In the exceptional case when a denial of a constitutional right is so flagrant as to affect the “jurisdiction” (i.e., the basic power) of the tribunal to render judgment, the courts will review upon petition...”<sup>66</sup>

Congress has *empowered* military actions to be treated as final by the courts making regular means of appeal a less ideal route for clemency and compensation for the “actually innocent” accused in this specific circumstance as to the details surrounding the offense for the appeal.<sup>67</sup> Delegated “executive” authority to conduct courts martial, provides for double-standard loop holes, as government employees [wrongly] accept memos as a final answer to an investigation. Wording like “due to unforeseen military exigencies”, “reasonable doubt”<sup>68</sup>, or “by a preponderance of the evidence”, does not give leave to misinterpret any “given authority” to *actually incompetent* Convening Authorities judgment well outside their prescribed jurisdiction or jurisprudence. Government employees generally shouldn’t be allowed to or assume it to be appropriate to ignore issues and/or concerns raised that warrant an investigation and/or relief within the various government agencies or departments through email. Regardless, of how menial or over burdening a request for relief it may seem— they shouldn’t be ignored due to bad conduct or negative discharge *labels presumably correct*.

---

<sup>66</sup> *Id.* at 342.

<sup>67</sup> *Schlesinger v. councilman*, 420 U.S. 738, 95 S. Ct. 1300, 43 L. Ed. 2d 346 (2019); Tucker Act (28 U.S.C.A. § 1331); 28 U.S.C.A. § 204 (a)(2)

<sup>68</sup> *Monk v. Zelez*, 901 F.2d 885, 888 (10th Circ. 1990) (“reasonable doubt” instruction deprived him of due process... “Consideration by the military of such [an issue] will not preclude judicial review for the military must accord to its personnel the protections of basic constitutional rights essential to a fair trial and the guarantee of due process of law.”)

Exposing blatant *prejudice* towards the “actually innocent victim” for covered offenses that are to be processed by general court martial or civilian tribunal, under a *competent* seasoned military judge whom meets specific role requirements to include all the other more than minor, actually *fundamental* errors and requirements the special courts martial neglected to acknowledge and neglected to meet as authorized by UCMJ and NDAA in this instance, having provided yet another outlet for due exoneration.<sup>69</sup> This Court has held:

“Judicial relief is available to one who has been injured by the act of a government official which is in excess of his express or implied powers”.<sup>70</sup>

It's due time to rein in the *authorized* executive delegations and give specific rules and oversight as may be further promulgated or amended by congress, if not by this Honorable Court, or the President of the United States. Conflicts of interest—prejudicial to the integrity of the military and civilian judicial system(s), cause by perceived “societal” controversies present and future, within various government agencies, require immediate means for relief from continued abuse of those in positions to exercise “executive” discretion from further circumventing individual rights and liberties, such as redress or other grievances through congressional, open door, inspector general, and

---

<sup>69</sup> 10 U.S.C.A. § 865(b)(1), 10 U.S.C.A. § 866(a)(2), (d)(1)(B)(iii), (d)(2), (e)(2), (f)(1)(C); § 869(d)(1)(A); NDAA 2021 § 542, 10 U.S.C.A. § 867(c)(1)(C); Jessie, 79 M.J. at 440 (citing U.S. v. Brennan, 58 M.J. 351) (C.A.A.F. 2003); UCMJ Rule 1116

<sup>70</sup> Harmon v. Brucker, 355 U.S. 579 (1958)

any other available channels for Soldiers and/or veterans. Prompting effective communication and transparency between the various government agencies and the public, instilling “good order and faith”. FOIA requests for the accused’s privileged trial records are required for any chance at proving claims, should justify the appeal through lower traditional courts be required, if not allowed on direct appeal by this Honorable Court. Immunity through pardons or other means isn’t appropriate, for any person, in any line of “power” and should never be absolved of irrevocable harm however intended as it applies to the risks of not just the public’s best interests and the Nation’s overall best interest but the lives of our brothers and sisters on this earth, setting the example for future generations.<sup>71</sup> Showing cause to impose a legal obligation and to compensate the appellant (and others potentially) due to injuries sustained during the line of duty by command directed order.<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup> redress— relief from grievances should have assisted, referred and/or reported to the appropriate higher “personnel” as requested to maintain the integrity of the military and civilian judicial system under UCMJ Article 78, 10 U.S.C.A. § 878, where appropriate corrective actions could have been taken to resolve the issues laid out herein at the lowest level had not gross prejudicial misconduct, dictated their actions to circumvent privileged administrative and medical relief to the appellant sooner. *Parisi v. Davidson*, 405 U.S. 34 (1972)

<sup>72</sup> 28 U.S.C.A. § 2254 (b)(1)(A); *Davila v. Davis*, 137 S. Ct. 2058, 2064. 198 L. Ed. 2d 603 (2017); *Wainwright*, 433 U.S. at 84; *Andrews*, 29 M.J.

**PRAYER**

May the Good Lord Father God forgive me for my transgressions, as I forgive those who have transgressed against me. May we not be led into temptation but be delivered from evil. For His is the Kingdom, the Power, and the Glory, forever and ever, in His name I pray. So help our souls. — Amen.

Respectfully submitted this 20th day of March 2026

  
[REDACTED] (Private), PVT R.

*Counsel of Record*  
Pro Se- Veteran

[REDACTED]  
Mobile: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED].com