No.

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

Alejandro Evaristo Perez,

Pro Se Petitioner

v.

Disney Corporation; The Walt Disney Company; Disney Enterprises, Incorporated; Disney ABC Incorporated; et al.

Responders

To The United States Court Of Appeals For
The Fifth Circuit (#24-20354)

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

PRO SE PETITIONER:
ALEJANDRO EVARISTO PEREZ
9233 WESTHEIMER, #405
HOUSTON, TX 77063
(214) 762-0075
alejandro.evaristo.perez@gmail.com

RESPONDERS:
SCOTT JONES
2200 ROSS AVENUE, SUITE 2800
DALLAS, TX 75201
(214) 740-8761
sjones@lockelord.com

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Since the US Supreme Court and Pro Se Petitioner already accepted the crimes of the defaulted Responders in SCOTUS 23-340 via failure to response (Rule 30 violation), the question is:

"Whether the US Supreme Court wants to mediate a settlement of $54,081,000,000, apologies, and licenses via GRANTED; or whether the Court enforces the case law of 'Rossi v. Motion Picture Association of American' by ordering the Disney Villains to pay the $54,081,000,000, retiring the Fallen Judges, and letting the US Army Veteran 1LT Alejandro Evaristo Perez keep his US copyrights in any US jurisdiction in this 'Triple Jeopardy' case via the below 'DENIED' clause?"

The Pro Se Petitioner offers to settle to avoid the question. Regardless, SCOTUS Rule 10's "GRANTED" clause does apply due to the fact the agreed-on case of 'Rossi v. Motion Picture Association of American' is being intentionally violated by Fallen Judges who refuse to talk about it and conspired to deny the motions of a copyright holder in his own jurisdiction. The petition/s are updated, simplified, and consolidated based on SCOTUS "June 24, 2025" letters in order to summon one meeting, reduce paperwork, and ask a "two-option" question in one page. The petition/s have been further updated, simplified, and consolidated based on SCOTUS "September 11, 2025" letter in order to match SCOTUS Rule 40, Rule 33.2, and Rule 12. Based on the new "January 6, 2026" SCOTUS letter, the Pro Se Petitioner has met all requirements of prior SCOTUS letters, and, now required updated and focus the "Statement of Jurisdiction" in its "JURISDICTION & INTERESTED PARTIES" section to better suffice Rule 14, which now mimics recently optioned petitions (ex. 24-482; 24-808; 25-52) in format. Rule 29.6 is "corporate disclosure statement" is required, and sufficed due to no mention for change in any SCOTUS letters.

LIST OF PROCEEDINGS

US Supreme Court

23-340 (Defaulted via Rule 30), 23M2 (Rule 40 Violation), 24M3 (Rule 40 Violation), and 24-??? (Consolidated based on SCOTUS "September 11, 2025" letter)

Alejandro Evaristo Perez, Pro Se Petitioner. Disney Corp., et al., Responders (Updated based on SCOTUS "June 24, 2025" letters)

Date of Final Opinion: December 11 2023

———†———

US Court Of Appeals For The Fifth Circuit

22-20084 (First Jeopardy), 23-20432 (Double Jeopardy), and 24-20354 (Triple Jeopardy)

Date of 1st Final Opinion as Mandate: April 26, 2023 (FILED); May 18, 2023 (MANDATE)

Date of 2nd Final Opinion as Mandate: April 25 2024 (FILED); May 17, 2024 (MANDATE)

Date of 3rd Final Opinion as Mandate: October 7, 2024 (FILED); Certified as true copy and issued as the mandate on October 29, 2024 (5th Cir. CM/EFC Docketed)

———†———

Texas Southern District (TXSD) Federal Court

4:21-cv-00765 (Original Case)

Date of Final Opinion: February 09, 2022

———†———

California Central District (CACD) Federal Court

2:21-cv-03490-JFW-E (Sued at the request of defaulted Responders)

Date of Final Opinion: July 01, 2021

LIST OF PROCEEDINGS – Continued

(Technically, CACD case 2:21-cv-03490-JFW-E is a similar unique independent case in a separate US Federal Jurisdiction under the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals, since the Amazon e-commerce shutdown conspiracy was triggered simultaneously in multiple unique and different US Federal Jurisdictions. Hence, multiple 3rd Civic Jeopardies cases allowed per US Jurisdiction, since 5th Circuit case 22-20084, 23-20432, and 24-20354 exist in relationship to TX4:21-cv-00765, yet independent from CACD case 2:21-cv-03490-JFW-E.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED.....i

LIST OF PROCEEDINGS.....ii

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....iv

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....vi

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI.....1

OPINION BELOW.....1

JURISDICTION AND INTERESTED PARTIES.....1

STATUTES & CASES PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....3

INTRODUCTION 13

STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....15

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....18

CONCLUSION.....19

APPENDIX & ADMIN REQUIREMENTS.....20

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

Opinion issued as mandate by USCA5 Appeal Judges reformatted for readability and for margin compliance as requested and filed by Deputy Clerks, since SCOTUS case 22-726, (October 7, 2024 [Filed]; October 29, 2024 [Mandate] – Docket #51-1) 1a

Opinion by TXSD Judge Keith Ellison reformatted for readability and for margin compliance as requested and filed by Deputy Clerks, since SCOTUS case 22-726, (August 01, 2024 – TXSD Docket #118) 3a

Due to unethical legal ruses by the 5th Circuit pretending to be the final legal authority and denying uploads, the Pro Se Party resubmits an Excerpt from the 5th Circuit's Pro Se Guidelines from 5th Cir. Case 23-20432 in lieu of petition for Panel Rehearing and Rehearing En Banc for 5th Cir. Case 24-20354, in order to remind the US Supreme Court that the issuance of any mandate does not affect his time, or his right, to file with the US Supreme Court. (April 25, 2024 [Filed]; May 17, 2024 [Mandate] - 5th Cir. 23-20432, Dkt # 41-2) 5a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

US ARTICLES

Art. II § 2 C.1 Martial Law.....3

Art. II § 2 C.1.1.16 Martial Law & Disorder.....3

US CODES

15 U.S.C. C.1 § 1 Conspiracy.....iii, 4, 7, 10, 11, 13, 15, 18-19

17 U.S.C. C. 5 Copyright Infringement.....4, 7, 18-19

18 U.S.C. § 1001 False Statements.....4, 5, 6, 12, 14, 20

18 U.S.C. § 1341 Fraud.....1, 5, 7, 10, 14, 16, 18, 19

18 U.S.C. § 1519 Tampering with Evidence.....6, 14

18 U.S.C. § 1621 Perjury 6-7, 18-19

28 U.S.C. § 1654 & 1254(1) Personal Appearance.....2, 6, 7

US FEDERAL CASES

Rossi V. Motion Picture Association Of America Inc.,

9th Cir, No. 03-16034 (2004).....i, 1-3, 7-8, 14-15, 17-19

Alejandro Evaristo Perez v. Disney Corp., et al.,

Sup. Ct. No. 23-340 (2023).....i, ii, 1, 2, 7, 10, 12-13, 15, 17-18

Sup. Ct. No. 23M2 (2023).....ii, 2, 7, 12-13, 15, 17

Sup. Ct. No. 24M3 (2024).....i, ii, 2, 7, 12-13, 15, 17

Alejandro Evaristo Perez v. LinkedIn Corporation,

Sup. Ct. No. 22-726 (2023).....v, 2, 8, 10, 12-13, 15, 17-18, 21, 1a, 3a

Sup. Ct. No. 21M120 (2022) 2, 8, 12-13, 15, 17

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Haines v. Kerner,

Sup. Ct., No. 70-5025 (1972).....2, 9, 21

Hood v. Pope,

5th Circuit, 627 F. App'x 295, 299 n.7 (2015).....2, 9, 15, 18, 21

Family LifeAssur. Co. v. Biles,

5th Circuit, 714 F.3d 887, 895 (2013).....9, 15, 19

Des Isles v. Evans,

5th Circuit, 225 F.2d 235, 236 (1955).....9, 19

Schneider v. TRW, Inc.,

9th Circuit, 938 F. 2d 986, 992, (1991).....10, 14

Resnick v. Hayes,

9th Circuit, 213 F.3d 443, 447 (2000).....10, 21

McKinney v. De Bord,

9th Circuit, 507 F.2d 501, 504, (1974).....2, 10-11, 21

Faretta v. California,

Supreme Court, No. 422 U.S. 806 (1975).....11, 21

USA v. Automated Medical Laboratories,

4th Circuit, 770 F.2d 399 (1985).....2, 11, 20

USA v. Cincotta,

1st Circuit, 689 F.2d 238, 241-42 (1982).....11, 20

State Of Oklahoma v Shriver,

US Supreme Court, No. 21-985 (2022).....11-12, 21

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

International Shoe Co. v. Washington,

Sup. Ct., 326 U.S. 310, No. 107 (1945).....2-3, 12, 14

Benton v. Maryland,

Sup. Ct., 395 U.S. 784, No. 201 (1969).....12, 17

USA v. One Assortment of 89 Firearms,

Sup. Ct., 465 U.S. 354, No. 82-1047 (1984).....12-13, 17

USA v. Ursery,

Sup. Ct., 518 U.S. 267, No. 95-345 (1996).....13, 17

JUDICIAL RULES (only to be listed here to save space)

Sup. Ct. R. 40 Veterans and Military.....i, ii, 2, 4, 7-8, 10, 16-17, 21

Sup. Ct. R. 30 Extension of Time.....i, ii, 7, 13, 16-17

Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(1)(A)(i), 21-Day Deadline.....6

Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)&(b), Amend Pleading.....2-3

Fed. R. Civ. P. 55, Default.....i, ii, 3, 7, 10, 13, 16-18

Fed. R. Civ. P. 56, Summary Judgment.....8-11, 14-15

Fed. R. Civ. P. 64, Seizing a Person or Property.....19

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Alejandro Evaristo Perez, the Pro Se Petitioner and US copyright holder in his own US Federal Jurisdiction, files a petition for a writ of certiorari to reverse the third unjust judgments (App. 3a) of Fallen Judges hiding behind a fraudulent 4th Motion to Dismiss addressed to our recused Honorable Judge Charles Eskridge by an uncertified lawyer. And the Court must enforce right of the Pro Se resident copyright holder to be granted his "Motion for Summary Judgment" in his Federal Jurisdiction based on the TABLE OF AUTHORITIES to favor the Pro Se Petitioner's pleadings based on the choices presented.

———†———

OPINION BELOW

The opinion as the mandate of the Appeal Judges in the Fifth Circuit is reported at 5th Cir. 24-20354 (App. 1a), 5th Cir. 23-20432 and 5th Cir. 22-20084 in the LIST OF PROCEEDINGS. The opinion of the district court (App. 3a) is reported at TXSD 4:21-cv-00765.

———†———

JURISDICTION & INTERESTED PARTIES

The Fifth Circuit issued its 3rd judgment (filed on October 7, 2024) as mandate on October 29, 2024 (App. 1a). The Fifth Circuit denied, and failed to provide a "Fifth Circuit Statement on Petitions for Rehearing or Rehearing En Banc" letter. Therefore, the Pro Se Party is resubmitting the letter from 23-20432 in lieu of petition for panel rehearing and rehearing en banc for 24-20354 (App. 5a) in order to remind the Court that the issuance of any mandate does not affect his time, or his right, to file with this Court. This Court's jurisdiction is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1), which affects all parties. Due to the nature of the case, the Pro Se Petitioner has also invoked his right as a resident copyright holder to grant his

"Motion for Summary Judgment" in his Federal Jurisdiction like in the agreed-on case of "Rossi V. Motion Picture Association Of America Inc.", 391 F.3d 1000, 1007 (9th No. 03-16034 Cir. 2004) first cited by the defaulted responders (the conspirators) in CACD 2:21-cv-03490-JFW-E. Furthermore, the Pro Se Petitioner invoked the "long-arm" statute of "International Shoe Co. v. Washington", 326 U.S. 310 (1945) to exercise power over an self-proclaimed "out-of-state' responders (the conspirators) due to "Minimum Contacts" Standard (ex. Disney Cruise Line in Galveston, Disney+ being offered in the TXSD, Disney Store in the Houston Galleria at the start of TXSD4:21-cv-00765, etc....). The Pro Se Petitioner's "Jurisdictional Invocations", and "Statement of Jurisdiction" must be construed so as to do justice as agreed in the case of "Hood v. Pope", 5th Circuit, 627 F. App'x 295, 299 n.7 (2015), and must be entertained by all Federal Judges, and all Federal Clerks as agreed in the case of "Haines v. Kerner", Supreme Court, No. 70-5025 (1972). And any "Jurisdictional Invocations", "Statement of Jurisdiction", and SCOTUS Rule 14 requirements must be given "every reasonable or warranted factual inference in the Pro Se Party favor" as agreed in the case of "McKinney V. De Bord", 9th Circuit Appeal Court, 507 F.2d 501, 504, (1974). The SCOTUS Rule 29.6 "corporate disclosure statement" (CERTIFICATION AND NOTICE OF INTERESTED PARTIES) is required, sufficed (never corrected in prior SCOTUS letters), and validated on 08 June 2021 in CACD 2:21-cv-03490-JFW-E (Docket#34) with a Certificate of Service. In the certificate, the responder/s, "The Walt Disney Company" corporation declared that "The Walt Disney Company states that is has no parent corporation and that no publicly held corporation owns more than 10% of The Walt Disney Company's stock."; while other responder/s are subsidiaries liable under USA v. Automated Medical Laboratories, 4th Circuit, 770 F.2d 399 (1985). The TXSD Judges and

Clerks, 5th Circuit Judges and Clerks, and SCOTUS Judges and Clerks have accepted the Pro Se Party's amended complaints, the use of the "et al." concept to address the multiple responders (the conspirators), and agreed to listen to the resident copyright holder in his Federal Jurisdiction.

———†———

STATUTES & CASES PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Art. II § 2 Clause 1:

Martial Law

> "The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States; he may require the Opinion, in writing,..." The Pro Se requested Martial Law to restore the "Opinion" of the agreed-on case of "Rossi V. Motion Picture Association Of America Inc., 391 F.3d 1000, 1007 (9th No. 03-16034 Cir. 2004) first cited by the defaulted Responders. The Pro Se never wanted to, but was force to.

Art. II § 2 C.1.1.16

Martial Law and Domestic Disorder

> "In 1957, Governor Orval Faubus employed the Arkansas National Guard to resist court-ordered desegregation in Little Rock, and President Dwight Eisenhower dispatched federal soldiers and brought the Guard under federal authority. In June and September of 1964, President Lyndon Johnson sent troops into Alabama to enforce court decrees opening schools to Black students. And, in 1965, the President used federal troops and federalized local Guardsmen to protect participants in a civil rights march."

The President must protect the rights of Pro Se Party (the Honorable US War Veteran, US Army Officer, and US Copyright holder) from unpatriotic Fallen Judges

who enjoy violating US copyrights, SCOTUS Rule 40, violate Procedural Law, and violate Substantive Case Law. Good Order in the Courts is "Must-Have".

15 U.S.C. Chapter 1 § 1

Trusts, etc., in restraint of trade illegal; penalty

> "Every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, is declared to be illegal. Every person who shall make any contract or engage in any combination or conspiracy hereby declared to be illegal shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by fine not exceeding $100,000,000 if a corporation, or, if any other person, $1,000,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding 10 years, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court."

The Pro Se Party only seeks punitive damages against the conspirators who illegal conspired to shut down his copyrighted works in the Amazon e-commerce platform in all US jurisdictions.

17 U.S.C. Chapter 5

Copyright Infringements and Remedies

> "§ 501 (a) Anyone who violates any of the exclusive rights of the copyright owner as provided by sections 106 through 122 or of the author as provided in section 106A(a), or who imports copies or phonorecords into the United States in violation of section 602, is an infringer of the copyright or right of the author, as the case may be."

The Pro Se Petitioner owns the copyrights and submitted the copyrights to evidence, while the Responders does not and conspired a shutdown in the Amazon platform via false claims.

18 U.S.C. § 1001

False Statements

"(a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Government of the United States, knowingly and willfully— (1) falsifies, conceals, or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact;...." The Disney Villains have falsely stated to own the Pro Party's US Copyrights to fool the Amazon Corporation into illegal conspire against him, among other illegal statements like falsely stating that they do not operate in the TXSD District while operating a "Disney Store" Houston Galleria Store and then shutting it down during legal proceedings.

18 U.S.C. § 1341

Frauds and Swindles

"Whoever, having devised or intending to devise any scheme or artifice to defraud, or for obtaining money or property (ex. US copyrights are intellectual property) by means of false or fraudulent pretenses (falsely claiming to own those copyrights), representations, or promises, or to sell, dispose of, loan, exchange, alter, give away, distribute (or stop distribution in Amazon platform), supply, or furnish or procure for unlawful use any counterfeit or spurious coin, obligation, security, or other article, or anything represented to be or intimated (like legal bullying) or held out to be such counterfeit or spurious article, for the purpose of executing such scheme (like a unauthorized shutdown in the Amazon platform of the Pro Se Petitioner's copyrighted novels) or artifice or attempting so to do (like fraudulent a motion to dismiss addressed to a recused judge), places in any post office or authorized depository for mail matter, any matter or thing whatever to be sent or delivered by the Postal Service (stealing mail), or deposits or causes to be deposited any matter or thing whatever to be sent or delivered by any private or commercial interstate carrier (or stop the Amazon drivers from distributing the Pro Se Petitioner's copyrighted novels via shutdown), or takes or receives therefrom, any such matter or thing, or knowingly causes to be delivered by mail or such carrier according to the direction thereon, or at the place at which it is directed to be delivered by the person to whom it is addressed, any such matter or thing, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both. If the violation occurs in relation to, or involving any benefit authorized, transported, transmitted (the 'The Walt Disney Company' using emails to falsely claim ownership of Alejandro Evaristo Perez's copyrighted novels), transferred, disbursed, or paid in connection with, a presidentially declared major disaster or emergency, or affects a financial institution,

such person shall be fined not more than $1,000,000 or imprisoned not more than 30 years, or both."

18 U.S.C. § 1519

Destruction, alteration, or falsification of records in...

"Whoever knowingly alters (like closing a 'Disney Store' in the Houston Galleria within the timeframe of the cases [Houston Chronicle Article, 'Disney to close Galleria store in next few weeks', 21SEP2021]), destroys, mutilates, conceals, covers up, falsifies, or makes a false entry in any record, document, or tangible object with the intent to impede, obstruct, or influence the investigation or proper administration of any matter within the jurisdiction of any department (like trying to reduce subsidiaries' TXSD jurisdiction presence by closing the Disney Galleria Store) or agency of the United States or any case filed under title 11, or in relation to or contemplation of any such matter or case, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both."

18 U.S.C. § 1621

Perjury

"Whoever— 1) having taken an oath before a competent tribunal, officer, or person, in any case in which a law of the United States authorizes an oath to be administered, that he will testify, declare, depose, or certify truly, or that any written testimony (like the emails between Amazon Inc., Responders, and Pro Se where the Pro Se attached his copyrights while Responders failed), declaration (like an Unsigned Magistrate writing on a Federal Docket), deposition (like filing a late incomplete Motion to Dismiss that violates FRCP 12 addressed to a recused Judge), or certificate (Responders file an invalid Appearance Form) by him subscribed, is true, willfully and contrary to such oath states or subscribes any material matter which he does not believe to be true; or (2) in any declaration, certificate, verification, or statement under penalty of perjury as permitted under section 1746 of title 28, United States Code, willfully subscribes as true any material matter which he does not believe to be true; is guilty of perjury and shall, except as otherwise expressly provided by law, be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than five years, or both. This section....."

28 U.S.C. § 1654

Appearance personally or by Counsel

"In all courts of the United States, the parties may plead and conduct their own cases personally or by counsel as, by the rules of such courts, respectively, are permitted to manage and conduct cause therein." The Pro Se Party is doing so and demands all rights, privileges, and access to all legal systems as any BAR-certified lawyer.

Alejandro Evaristo Perez v. Disney Corp., et al.,

Sup. Ct. No. 23-340 (2023); No. 23M2 (2023); No. 24M3 (2024); No. 24-???

(Consolidated)

After several unpatriotic Rule 40 violations, the Pro Se Party (the copyright holder) and the US Supreme Court finally agreed that the Responder/s failed to respond, that the unresponsive Responder/s defaulted by failing to file response nor extension (Rule 30 violation), and the Court agreed with the statement of:

"IF THE SUPREME COURT DENIES THIS RIGHTEOUS PETITION, THE PRO SE PETITIONER WILL ASSUME THAT THE UNETHICAL RESPONDER AND THE FALLEN JUDGE' WRONGFUL ACTIONS ARE VIOLATING 17 U.S.C. CHAPTER 5 "COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENTS", VIOLATING 15 U.S.C. CHAPTER 1 § 1 "CONSPIRACY", VIOLATING 18 U.S.C. § 1341 "FRAUDS AND SWINDLES", VIOLATING 18 U.S.C. § 1621 "PERJURY", AND VIOLATING THE ONLY AGREED-ON CASELAW OF "ROSSI V. MOTION PICTURE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA INC., 9TH CIRCUIT, NO. 03-16034 (2004), THAT THE SUPREME COURT DOES NOT WANT TO WASTE THEIR TIME ON FELONS, AND THAT THE PRO SE HAS EVERY RIGHT TO HAND THE FELONS TO THEIR RESPECTIVE DISTRICT ATTORNEYS TO BEGIN CRIMINAL PROSECUTION FOR SUCH VIOLATIONS."

Rossi V. Motion Picture Association Of America Inc.,

9th Circuit, No. 03-16034 (2004)

The Courts favored "Motion Picture Association Of America Inc.", who is the US copyright holder in their own US jurisdiction like the Alejandro Evaristo Perez, the Pro Se Petitioner and copyright holder in his own TXSD jurisdiction. The Courts

approved and granted the resident moving party of the Summary Judgment (FRCP 56), because there were no disputes of material of facts and the movant owned the copyright. The Court agreed that no IIED claims for infringers nor conspirators (The Responders). By logic, the Court agreed that only copyright holders can claim IIED, which is been claimed by Alejandro Evaristo Perez (The Pro Se Petitioner) in the District Courts. This is the only agreed-on caselaw by all Parties. The Responders first cited this multijurisdictional case in CACD 2:21-cv-03490-JFW-E on 08 June 2021 (Docket#32, Page 4, 11). Both "Motion Picture Association Of America Inc." and Pro Se Petitioner filed Motions for Summary Judgments (FRCP 56) in their local Federal Courts, and thus, the US Supreme Court must be granted and reinforce any Pro Se Petitioner's "Motion for Summary Judgment" (FRCP 56) in any jurisdiction, especially his own jurisdiction, which is the TXSD Court (the one in question).

Alejandro Evaristo Perez v. LinkedIn Corporation,

Sup. Ct. No. 22-726 (2022); No. 21M120 (2021)

After several unpatriotic Rule 40 violations, the Pro Se Party and the US Supreme Court finally agreed that the unethical actions of the Chinese Communist Party traitors and Fallen Judges was treason, and not Anti-SLAPP Laws. The petition was written with the wording of:

> "IF THE SUPREME COURT DENIES THIS RIGHTEOUS PETITION, THE PRO SE PETITIONER WILL ASSUME THAT THE UNETHICAL RESPONDER AND THE FALLEN JUDGES' WRONGFUL ACTIONS ARE FEDERAL TREASON, THAT THE SUPREME COURT DOES NOT WANT TO WASTE THEIR TIME ON TRAITORS, AND THAT THE PRO SE HAS EVERY RIGHT TO HAND THE TRAITORS TO THEIR RESPECTIVE DISTRICT ATTORNEYS TO BEGINCRIMINIAL PROSECUTION FOR TREASON ON TREASONOUS US CIVILIANS."

The similar "DENIED" clause in that petition is been implemented to this petition to force the US Supreme Court to make the necessary tough decisions.

Haines v. Kerner,

Supreme Court, No. 70-5025 (1972)

"Pro Se Party's pleadings, requests, and motions should be entertained by all US Federal Judges."

Hood v. Pope,

5th Circuit, 627 F. App'x 295, 299 n.7 (2015)

"Pro Se pleadings (any documentation) must be construed so as to do justice"

Family LifeAssur. Co. v. Biles,

5th Circuit, 714 F.3d 887, 895 (2013)

"The 5th Circuit Court affirm the granting of Motion for Summary Judgment, because there were no issues of fact, except a possible acknowledgment form of forgery." As the US Copyright holder in any US jurisdiction, the Pro Se Party is entitled to a granting and affirmation of any his Motion for Summary Judgment, especially when the Disney Villains failed opposed the Pro Se's Motion for Summary Judgment.

Des Isles v. Evans,

5th Circuit, 225 F.2d 235, 236 (2013)

"The rules have for their primary purpose the securing of speedy and inexpensive justice in a uniform and well-ordered manner; rules were not adopted to set traps and pitfalls by way of technicalities for unwary litigants." The Courts agreed that the rules in any Court are designed to help and facilitate the Pro Se Party and any copyright holder in their demands for quick justice. The Pro Se Petitioner is upset by

the illegal ruses (ex. failure to default the Responders in SCOTUS case 23-340, and pay the Pro Se Petitioner in SCOTUS Case 22-726), rule violations (ex. intentionally ignoring the Pro Se Petitioner's multiple "Motion for Summary Judgment"; and SCOTUS Rule 40 violations), case law violations (such as this very case law) by several Courts and Fallen Judges who have done the opposite of this case law.

Schneider v. TRW, Inc.,

9th Circuit, 938 F. 2d 986, 992, (1991)

"4 Elements Criteria for Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress (IIED). (1) the defendant must act intentionally or recklessly; (2) the defendant's conduct must be extreme and outrageous; and (3) the conduct must be the cause (4) of severe emotional distress." The Pro Se Petitioner is extreme distressed by the Disney Villains who refuse to purchase/license the Pro Se Petioner's copyrights. Instead, the cheap Disney Villains are creating more chaos, misleading Amazon Inc., filing fraudulent motions, stealing mail, etc.... The paperwork and problems are 100% responsibility of the Responders' conspiracy and the Fallen Judges who are too cheap and pathetic to respect copyrights while enjoying the disrespect of the Pro Se Petitioner. The Pro Se Petitioner fear for his own safety due the evil actions from the Disney Villains.

Resnick v. Hayes,

9th Circuit, 213 F.3d 443, 447 (2000)

"Pro Se Party must be construed liberally." All Courts must construed liberally all the documentation from the Pro Se Petitioner, which includes this very case.

McKinney v. De Bord

9th Circuit, 507 F.2d 501, 504, (1974)

"Every reasonable or warranted factual inference in the Pro Se Party favor." All Courts must favor all facts, all rules, all case law, all motions, and all filings presented by Pro Se Petitioner, such as any his petitions and any of his motions, whether a "Motion for Summary Judgment" or a "Motion for Leave to Proceed as a Veteran".

Faretta v. California

Supreme Court, No. 422 U.S. 806 (1975)

"Pro Se Parties (ex. criminal defendants) have both a constitutional and statutory right to self-representation in any Federal Court." All Courts must grants Pro Se Party all rights, all powers, and all privileges associated to any BAR-certified lawyer and/or any party like access to any CM/ECF system, access PACER system, etc...

USA v. Automated Medical Laboratories,

4th Circuit, 770 F.2d 399 (1985)

"Parent corporations can be convicted of subsidiary's actions, even in attempts to disassociate or escape-goat employees." All corporate responders are liable for actions of their parent corporations and/or their subsidiaries.

USA v. Cincotta,

1st Circuit, 689 F.2d 238, 241-42 (1982)

"criminal liability imposed on the corporations where the agents are acting within the scope of his employment." The Responders and their agents are criminals and liable for the crimes presented (ex. 15 U.S.C. C.1 § 1 Conspiracy.) when lying about owning the Pro Se Party's copyrights in order to illegally shutdown the Pro Se Party's copyrighted novels in the Amazon's ecommerce platform.

State Of Oklahoma v Shriver,

US Supreme Court, 21-985 (2022)

Sample format booklet offered by US Supreme Clerk Redmond Barnes to follow on 30 November 2022. The US Supreme Court has accepted other formats is proof of corruption and violations of Pro Se caselaw. Regardless, the same booklet format used in SCOTUS 22-726, 21M120, 23-340, 23M2, 24M3, and this case (reformatted).

International Shoe Co. V. Washington,

Sup. Ct., 326 U.S. 310, No. 107 (1945)

"Federal Courts have 'Long-arm Statute' Personal Jurisdiction over any self-proclaimed 'out-the-state' Defendant that operates in their respective jurisdictions." This SCOTUS case states that all Courts must use "Long-Arm" to self-proclaimed 'out-the-state' Defendant/s that operates in their respective jurisdictions. The 5th Circuit Court and TXSD Court ignored this SCOTUS case to falsely claim that lack of jurisdiction against the Pro Se Party, who is US Copyright holder in any US Federal Jurisdiction, and who requested the use "Long-Arm" against the Responders.

Benton v. Maryland,

Sup. Ct., 395 U.S. 784, No. 201 (1969)

"Civic Double Jeopardy is allowed. Restrictions to Double Jeopardy only applied to the US Federal Government." The same applies for 'Triple Jeopardy". This petition is about a case of 'Triple Jeopardy".

USA v. One Assortment of 89 Firearms,

Sup. Ct., 465 U.S. 354, No. 82-1047 (1984)

"The SCOTUS held that the prohibition on double jeopardy extends to civil sanctions which are applied in a manner that is punitive in nature. A Pro Se Party's constants

polite requests for a peacefully settle and to wait patiently on his SCOTUS 23-340 petitions are NOT punitive in nature." The same applies for 'Triple Jeopardy". This petition is about a case of 'Triple Jeopardy".

USA v. Ursery,

Sup. Ct., 518 U.S. 267, No. 95-345 (1996)

"Civil forfeitures always constitute 'punishment' for double jeopardy purposes." The same applies for 'Triple Jeopardy". This petition is about a case of 'Triple Jeopardy". The Pro Se Party's peaceful requests for settlement and offerings to wait on the SCOTUS petitions from a prior case is NOT civil forfeitures nor constitute as civil forfeitures.

———†———

INTRODUCTION

The Pro Se Petitioner is the victim of a conspiracy (15 U.S.C. C.1 § 1) to infringe (17 U.S.C. C.5) and restrict trade against the Pro Se's copyrighted novels by conspirators (the Responders) via an illegal Amazon e-commerce platform shutdown to stop global distribution. The US Copyrights owned by the Pro Se are the satire parodies of "The Real Lord Vader – The Destroyer of Star Wars" (US Copyright TX 8-652-720), "The Real Lord Vaders – The Destroyer of Star Wars" (US Copr. TX 8-986-945), and "Empire of God" (US Copr. TX8-718-247), since the novel is bigger in scope than the "Star War" narrative in this galaxy in our timeline. The US Supreme Court already found the Disney Villains guilt by default (FRCP 55) in SCOTUS case 23-340 via a "denial clause" like 21M120, 22-726 23-340, 23M2, and 24M3; and via their failure to file a SCOTUS response (Rule 30 Violation). However, the Pro Se Petitioner did offer to peacefully sell his multiple related copyrights

(ex. "The Real Lord Vader: The Destroyer of Star Wars", "Empire of God", etc...) to the cheap unethical conspirators to end these multijurisdictional Federal Cases in order to avoid further IIED by the Responders, avoid the criminal prosecution of the conspirators, avoid more unnecessary paperwork, and offering peaceful retirement of Fallen Judges. In contrast, the cheap unethical conspirators are playing legal mind-games to create chaos with a fraudulent "Motion to Dismiss" addressed to a recused judge (18 U.S.C. § 1341), failed Responses to Summary Judgments (FRCP 56), false jurisdiction statements (18 U.S.C. § 1001; 18 U.S.C. § 1621) against "long-arm statute" case law like "International Shoe Co. v. Washington", Sup. Ct., 326 U.S. 310, No. 107 (1945), constantly citing disputed case law to avoid talking about agreed-on case law like "Rossi V. Motion Picture Association Of America Inc.", 9th Cir, No. 03-16034 (2004), "name" games, tampering with evidence (ex. closing the "Disney Store" in the Houston Gallery Store; 18 U.S.C. § 1519), stealing the Pro Se Petitioner's certified mail, and utilizing their brands and resources to misguide an Unsigned Magistrate Judge, stall the TXSD Docket, stall the CACD Docket, and stall the Fifth Circuit Docket in order to further inflict IIED on the Pro Se Party crossing "Schneider v. TRW, Inc., 9th Circuit, 938 F. 2d 986, 992, (1991)" elements of IIED. The only thing that all Parties can truly agree-on is the legal case of "Rossi V. Motion Picture Association Of America Inc., 391 F.3d 1000, 1007 (9th Cir. 2004)", because the unethical conspirators first cited the legal case of "Rossi V. Motion Picture Association Of America Inc.," in the CACD Court (CACD 2:21-cv-03490-JFW-E), and the Pro Se Party agreed. The original decision favored "Motion Picture Association Of America Inc." and so the Court protected the local US copyright holder in their local US Federal Jurisdiction against external infringers, external conspirators, and/or Fallen Judges. The Pro Se Petitioner's local jurisdiction is the TXSD,

because he lives in the TXSD. Therefore, the TXSD Federal Court must grant the Pro Se Petitioner's "Motion for Summary Judgment", who is the local US copyright holder in his own US Federal Jurisdiction like "Motion Picture Association Of America Inc.". Instead following legal precedence, many Fallen Judges and Magistrates from the TXSD Court and 5th Circuit Court openly violated agreed-on "Inter-circuit" case. The Fallen Judges even violated their own agreed-on "Intra-circuit" case law like "Hood v. Pope", 5th Circuit, 627 F. App'x 295, 299 n.7 (2015); and "Family LifeAssur. Co. v. Biles", 5th Circuit, 714 F.3d 887, 895 (2013), when denying the Pro Se's multiple "Motion for Summary Judgment", since the facts are no disputable and as "Matter of Law" (FRCP 56). The Pro Se Petitioner requests that the US Supreme Court stops this unnecessary conspiracy to restrict trade against his copyrighted novels, and politely correct the Fallen Judges, and restore Procedural Law and Substantive Law. All Judges have to respect US Army Officer Alejandro Evaristo Perez (the Pro Se Party who owns the copyrights) like other Honorable Federal Judges respected the "Motion Picture Association Of America Inc." as the copyright holder in his own jurisdiction.

———†———

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Due to another unethical legal ruse by the 5th Circuit pretending to be the final legal authority, the Pro Se Party is filing a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari like the Pro Se Party did and allowed for "Alejandro Evaristo Perez v. The Walt Disney Company" (Sup. Ct. No. 23-340, Sup. Ct. No. 23M2, Sup. Ct. No. 24M3) and "Alejandro Evaristo Perez v. LinkedIn" (Sup. Ct. No. 22-726, Sup. Ct. No. 21M120), because the Pro Se Party disagrees with the corrupted irrelevant decision written by Fallen Judge James Earl Graves, Fallen Judge Stuart Kyle Duncan, Fallen Judge Dana Marie Douglas, which is a ruse to avoid talking

about real agreed-on case law. Due to an unethical legal ruse by the 5th Circuit pretending to be the final legal authority, the Pro Se Party files a "REPEATED" Excerpt (App. 5a) of the 5th Circuit's Pro Se Guidelines and Excerpts of the letter submitted as a logical substitute in in lieu of a petition of en bank and for panel rehearsing and within the MEMORANDUM TO COUNSEL OR PARTIES LISTED BELOW's Pro Se Cases guidelines provided (App. 5a) due to many of the illegal ruses previously mentioned. The Pro Se Petitioner is allowed to file a "PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI" IAW the Judgement Order within a 90 day period of the 3rd Final Opinion: October 7, 2024 (FILED stamped); October 29, 2024 (5th Cir. CM/EFC Docketed). Thus, the "90 day period" deadline ranging from January 5, 2025 to January 27, 2025 (Extended to August 23, 2025 by SCOTUS "June 25, 2025" letters via Rule 30). The Responders and Fallen Judges ignored the Pro Se's letters to the Pro_se@ca5.uscourts.gov and settlement offers, so the Pro Se Petitioner is filing a consolidated "PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI" against the Responders, whose filed a fraudulent Motion to Dismiss (TXSD Docket #93) by an uncertified lawyer addressed to our recused Honorable Judge Charles Eskridge. The US Supreme Court choices are:

CHOICE 1: (GRANT) "PEACEFUL SETTLEMENTS" – The first option in the initial question is **"Whether the SCOTUS wants to mediate a settlement of $54,081,000,000, apologies, and licenses via GRANTED?"**. Therefore, the Pro Se Petitioner invites the US Supreme Court to diplomatically restore Procedural Law and Substantive Law by SCOTUS Rule 40 refunds, apologies from all related Courts, and settlements. Technically, the US Supreme Court already determined the criminality of the defaulted Responders in

"Alejandro Evaristo Perez v. The Walt Disney Company" (Sup. Ct. No. 23-340 (2023)) by default (FRCP 55) in SCOTUS case 23-340 via a "denial clause" like 21M120, 22-726 23-340, 23M2, and 24M3; and via failure to file a response (Rule 30 Violation). This acceptance includes above in the TABLE OF AUTHORITIES and rights associated in favor of Pro Se Petitioner, who is the US copyright holder and US Veteran in any US Federal Jurisdiction. By virtue of existence via 3x Notices of Appeal, the 5th Circuit Case 24-20354 is officially a "Triple Jeopardy" Federal Case in the unique TXSD Jurisdiction, which backed by case law like "Benton v. Maryland", 395 U.S. 784 (1969); "USA v. Ursery", 518 US 267 (1996); and "USA v. One Assortment of 89 Firearms", 465 U.S. 354 (1984) as previously mentioned. The Pro Se Party invites the US Supreme Court to recite the agreed-on caselaw of Rossi V. Motion Picture Association Of America Inc., 9th Cir, No. 03-16034 (2004), which was first cited by the Disney Villain Responders in this multijurisdictional case in CACD 2:21-cv-03490-JFW-E on 08 June 2021 (CACD Docket#32, Page 4, 11). Pro Se Party open to IRS guidance, and open to US Supreme Court proposals after SCOTUS Rule 40 refunds, and apologies.

CHOICE 2: (DENY) "ORDER IN THE COURTS! THE DISNEY VILLAINS PAY THE $54,081,000,000 AND FALLEN JUDGES DISMISSED." - The second option in the initial question is:

"Or whether the Court enforces the case law of 'Rossi v. Motion Picture Association of American' by ordering the Disney Villains to pay the $54,081,000,000, retiring the Fallen Judges, and letting the US Army Veteran 1LT Alejandro Evaristo Perez keep his US copyrights in any US jurisdiction in this 'Triple Jeopardy' case via the below 'DENIED' clause?"

This decision by the Court is the best choice for quick justice to the Pro Se Petitioner, clean the Judicial System from the chaos create by Disney Villains and reinforce the need to follow the US Supreme Court case law like "Alejandro Evaristo Perez v. The Walt Disney Company" (Sup. Ct. No. 23-340 (2023)), the 9th Circuit case law of "Rossi V. Motion Picture Association Of America Inc., 391 F.3d 1000, 1007 (9th Cir. 2004)", and the agreed-on other case law listed in TABLE OF AUTHORITIES. The US Supreme Court grants the Pro Se Petitioner the right to invoice the Responders (the Parent Corporation of "The Walt Disney Company" for simplicity) for $54,081,000,000 settlement like when the Pro Se Petitioner invoice Microsoft (Parent Corporation) for $256,000,000,000 in the agreed-on case of "Alejandro Evaristo Perez v. LinkedIn Corporation", Sup. Ct. No. 22-726 (2023) via its associated 9th Circuit Court of Appeals Case #21-15234, Docket #37. With the blessing of the US Supreme Court, the SEC and IRS force the Disney Villains (defaulted Responders) to pay $54,081,000,000 settlement to US Army Veteran 1LT Alejandro Evaristo Perez (the US copyright holder in his US jurisdiction) or the Disney Pirates face jail time for their crimes in this case as stated in the STATUTES & CASES PROVISIONS INVOLVED.

———†———

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

The US Supreme Court may still want to avoid the jailing of 7 Fallen Judges for their corruption and (x) number of unpatriotic Corporatistas for violating 17 U.S.C. Chapter 5 "Copyright Infringements", violating 15 U.S.C. Chapter 1 § 1 "Conspiracy", violating 18 U.S.C. § 1341 "Frauds and Swindles", violating 18 U.S.C. § 1621 "Perjury", violating the only agreed-on "Intercircuit" case law of "Rossi V. Motion Picture Association Of America Inc., 9th Circuit, No. 03-16034 (2004).", violating "Intracircuit" case law like Hood v. Pope,

5th Circuit, 627 F. App'x 295, 299 n.7 (2015); and Family LifeAssur. Co. v. Biles, 5th Circuit, 714 F.3d 887, 895 (2013); Des Isles v. Evans, 5th Circuit, 225 F.2d 235, 236 (1955). IF THE SUPREME COURT DENIES THIS RIGHTEOUS PETITION, THE PRO SE PETITIONER CAN CLAIM THAT THE UNETHICAL RESPONDERS AND THE FALLEN JUDGE' WRONGFUL ACTIONS ARE VIOLATING 17 U.S.C. CHAPTER 5 "COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENTS", VIOLATING 15 U.S.C. CHAPTER 1 § 1 "CONSPIRACY", VIOLATING 18 U.S.C. § 1341 "FRAUDS AND SWINDLES", VIOLATING 18 U.S.C. § 1621 "PERJURY", AND VIOLATING THE ONLY AGREED-ON CASELAW OF "ROSSI V. MOTION PICTURE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA INC., 9TH CIRCUIT, NO. 03-16034 (2004), THAT THE SUPREME COURT DOES NOT WANT TO WASTE THEIR TIME ON FELONS, AND THAT THE PRO SE HAS EVERY RIGHT TO HAND THE FELONS TO THEIR RESPECTIVE DISTRICT ATTORNEYS TO BEGIN CRIMINAL PROSECUTION FOR SUCH VIOLATIONS, AND THE UNETHICAL RESPONDERS MUST PAY THE PETITIONER A TOTAL OF THE $54,081,000,000. The Pro Se Petitioner has provide the Microsoft Excel spreadsheets with the mathematical formals, scenarios, and facts to the unethical Responders. Mass emails have been sent for mass accountability and to inform stakeholders. The Courts are allowed to use Fed. R. Civ. P. 64, "Seizing a Person or Property" (FRCP 64) to enforce either choice.

———†———

CONCLUSION

The Pro Se Petitioner and copyright holder offered to peacefully settle many times like the Amazon Corporation did for $0 before any lawsuits. Since the Disney Villain Responders wanted to fight and conspire, the Supreme Court must choose between Choice

1 "PEACEFUL SETTLEMENTS" or Choice 2 "ORDER IN THE COURTS! THE DISNEY VILLAINS PAY THE $54,081,000,000 AND FALLEN JUDGES DISMISSED". The unethical Disney Villains Responders failed to purchase the copyrights and continues to falsely claim ownership of the Pro Se Petitioner's copyrights. In accordance with "USA V. AUTOMATED MEDICAL LABORATORIES" 770 F.2d 399 [1985] and "USA V. CINCOTTA", 689 F.2d 238, 241-42 [1982], the list of conspirators with triple jeopardy criminal liability as follows: The Responders (Parent Corporation who and subsidiaries), Bob Iger, (The Walt Disney Company's CEO), Bob Chapek (The Walt Disney Company's former CEO), Christopher Michael Boeck (TXSD), Elizabeth Kristin Duffy (TXSD), Harriet Ellan Miers (TXSD), Thomas A Connop (TXSD), Gregory L Doll (CACD), Conspirator Jamie Kendall (CACD), Scott Jones (TXSD), Andrew Tucker Davison (TXSD), Fallen Judge Keith P. Ellison, Fallen Judge Patrick Errol Higginbotham Jr., Fallen Judge Carl E. Stewart, Fallen Judge Leslie Southwick, Judge James Earl Graves, Judge Stuart Kyle Duncan, Judge Dana Marie Douglas. Petitioner offers "Safe Passage" upon settling.

†

APPENDIX & ADMIN REQUIREMENTS

Any Appendixes and additional documents are the different decisions and administrative items are in uploaded in the Fifth Circuits' PACER-CM/ECF System and other cases associated in the CACD and TXSD. The Pro Se Petitioner requires the US Supreme Court to obey our US Codes, US Supreme Court Rules, caselaw, and/or listings in the Table of Authorities. All Pro Se Party's petitions, pleadings, requests, and/or motions must entertained by all Federal Judges and/or Deputy Clerks in all US Federal Jurisdictions, which is the Pro Se Party's Constitutional and Statutory Right. These "Pro

Se Friendly" case law (*Haines v. Kerner;* Resnick v. Hayes; *McKinney v. De Bord; Faretta v. California; Hood v. Pope)* and waivers includes paperwork, admin requirements, errors, misspelling, grammar, docketing, and processing. These caselaw applies to all US Supreme Court Rules, such as SCOTUS Rule 29 "Filing and Service of Documents; Special Notifications; Corporate Listing"; Rule 33.2 "Document Preparation: Booklet Format; 8 1/2 – by 11 inch Paper Format", Rule 34 "Document Preparation: General Requirements", and the use of Rule 40 "Veterans, Seamen, and Military Cases" to comply for Rule 38 "Fees", Rule 43 "Costs", and more. The petition meets the limits of the "under 40 opaque, unglazed white pages" under 9,000 words IAW Rule 33. The Pro Se Petitioner is following complying "State Of Oklahoma v Shriver" booklet sample like the approved "Perez v. LinkedIn" No. 22-726 booklets from 2022; as well as correspondence from the SCOTUS Deputy Clerks.

As required by US Supreme Court Rule 33.2, the original of any such document shall be signed by the party proceeding Pro Se or under any other applicable federal statute (ex. Title 5 U.S. Code 3331 "Military Officer Oath").

God bless America, NATO, and our Allies,

By: _____ 29JAN2026

Alejandro Evaristo Perez — Date

PRO SE PETITIONER, HONORABLE US VETERAN, US ARMY OFFICER, AUTHOR, COPYRIGHT HOLDER IN HIS OWN JURISDICTION, INNOVATOR, AND MAN AFTER GOD'S HEART.

BLANK PAGE

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

Opinion issued as mandate by USCA5 Appeal Judges reformatted for readability and for margin compliance as requested and filed by Deputy Clerks, since SCOTUS case 22-726, (October 7, 2024 [Filed]; October 29, 2024 [Mandate] – Docket #51-1) 1a

Opinion by TXSD Judge Keith Ellison reformatted for readability and for margin compliance as requested and filed by Deputy Clerks, since SCOTUS case 22-726, (August 01, 2024 – TXSD Docket #118) 3a

Due to unethical legal ruses by the 5th Circuit pretending to be the final legal authority and denying uploads, the Pro Se Party resubmits an Excerpt from the 5th Circuit's Pro Se Guidelines from 5th Cir. Case 23-20432 in lieu of petition for Panel Rehearing and Rehearing En Banc for 5th Cir. Case 24-20354, in order to remind the US Supreme Court that the issuance of any mandate does not affect his time, or his right, to file with the US Supreme Court. (April 25, 2024 [Filed]; May 17, 2024 [Mandate] - 5th Cir. 23-20432, Dkt # 41-2) 5a

OPINION ISSUED AS MANDATE BY USCA5 APPEAL JUDGES REFORMATTED FOR READABILITY AND FOR MARGIN COMPLIANCE AS REQUESTED AND FILED BY DEPUTY CLERKS, SINCE SCOTUS CASE 22-726, (OCTOBER 7, 2024 [FILED]; OCTOBER 29, 2024 [MANDATE] – DOCKET #51-1)

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

No. 24-20354

ALEJANDRO EVARISTO PEREZ,

Plaintiff – Appellant,

versus

DISNEY CORPORATION; THE WALT DISNEY COMPANY; DISNEY ENTERPRISES, INCORPORATED; DISNEY ABC INCORPORATED; DISNEY STORE USA, L.L.C.; DISNEY/ABC INTERNATIONAL TELEVISION, INCORPORATED, doing business as DISNEY - ABC INTERNATIONAL TELEVISION; BUENA VISTA TELEVISION, L.L.C., doing business as DISNEY - ABC DOMESTIC TELEVISION; MAGICAL CRUISE COMPANY, LIMITED, doing business as DISNEY CRUISE LINES (DCL); BUENA VISTA THEATRICAL GROUP, LIMITED, DOING BUSINESS AS DISNEY THEATRICAL GROUP,

Defendants – Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. 4:21-CV-765

UNPUBLISHED ORDER

Before: GRAVES, DUNCAN, and DOUGLAS, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:

IT IS ORDERED that Appellees' opposed motion to dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction is GRANTED.

October 7, 2024 (FILED stamped); Certified as true copy and issued as the **mandate** on October 29, 2024 (5th Cir. CM/EFC Docketed) by Lyle W. Cayce, Clerk.

OPINION BY TXSD JUDGE KEITH ELLISON REFORMATTED FOR READABILITY AND FOR MARGIN COMPLIANCE AS REQUESTED AND FILED BY DEPUTY CLERKS, SINCE SCOTUS CASE 22-726, (AUGUST 01, 2024 – TXSD DOCKET #118)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

ALEJANDRO EVARISTO PEREZ,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	CIVIL ACTION
VS.	§	NO. 4:21-CV-0765
	§	
DISNEY CORPORATION, et al,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

FINAL JUDGMENT

On August 30, 2023, the Court issued an Order dismissing this case. ECF No. 108. The claims against Defendant Walt Disney Company; Disney Enterprises, Inc.; Disney Stores USA, LLC; Disney/ABC International Television, Inc.; Buena Vista Television, LLC; Magical Cruise Company, Limited; and Buena Vista Theatrical Group LTD were dismissed without prejudice for lack of personal jurisdiction. *Id.* The claims against Disney ABC Inc. were dismissed with prejudice for failure to state a claim. *Id.* That judgment was affirmed by the Fifth Circuit on appeal. ECF No. 117. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 58(a), and for the reasons set forth in that Order, final judgment is hereby **ENTERED** for Defendants. The Clerk is directed to administratively **CLOSE** this case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed at Houston, Texas on August 1, 2024.

//SIGNED//
Keith P. Ellison
United States District Judge

DUE TO UNETHICAL LEGAL RUSES BY THE 5TH CIRCUIT PRETENDING TO BE THE FINAL LEGAL AUTHORITY AND DENYING UPLOADS, THE PRO SE PARTY RESUBMITS AN EXCERPT FROM THE 5TH CIRCUIT'S PRO SE GUIDELINES FROM 5TH CIR. CASE 23-20432 IN LIEU OF PETITION FOR PANEL REHEARING AND REHEARING EN BANC FOR 5TH CIR. CASE 24-20354, IN ORDER TO REMIND THE US SUPREME COURT THAT THE ISSUANCE OF ANY MANDATE DOES NOT AFFECT HIS TIME, OR HIS RIGHT, TO FILE WITH THE US SUPREME COURT. (APRIL 25, 2024 [FILED]; MAY 17, 2024 [MANDATE] – 5TH CIR. 23-20432, DKT # 41-2) 5A

The "MEMORANDUM TO COUNSEL OR PARTIES LISTED BELOW" states that:

"Pro Se Cases. If you were unsuccessful in the district court and/or on appeal, and are considering filing a petition for certiorari in the United States Supreme Court, you do not need to file a motion for stay of mandate under Fed. R. App. P. 41. The issuance of the mandate does not affect the time, or your right, to file with the Supreme Court."