

ORIGINAL

FILED

JUL 27 2026

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

26-153
No.

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

Ryan P. Givey,
Petitioner

v.

Pamela Bondi, Kashyap Patel, David Metcalf,
Respondents

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit

PETITION FOR
WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Ryan P. Givey,
Pro Se Petitioner
610.348.5720
Rpg2609@aol.com
428 Hannum Ave.,
West Chester, Pa 19380

RECEIVED

JUL 31 2026

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Never before in the history of this country has it been in dispute that a citizen has Constitutional Right to make a criminal complaint. PETITIONER is an attacked whistleblower and the same agents from Biden's DOJ, who still work at the DOJ, have refused to take a criminal complaint for years, so there is no record of PETITIONER's complaint. PETITIONER's post office mail to Pamela Bondi and Kash Patel were illegally intercepted at the post office and not delivered. An Assistant US Attorney has been blocking PETITIONER from making a criminal complaint for years, including concerning his own conduct, refused to refer a Motion to Disqualify to the DOJ Office of General Counsel, he personally responded in district court and simply ignored the motion before the Third Circuit, in violation of the DOJ policy manual and rules of appellate procedure. PETITIONER believes there is evidence that agents from Biden's DOJ, who still work at the DOJ, are hiding lawsuits from Trump's appointments at the DOJ, allowing ongoing serious crimes to continue unobstructed and allowing whistleblowers to be threatened and harmed.

1. Is it a violation of a citizen's First Amendment Rights for the Department of Justice to refuse to speak to a victim, review evidence and take criminal complaint of ongoing crimes, so there is no record of the complaint?

2. Is it a violation of federal law under 18 U.S.C. § 3332(a) for the Department of Justice to refuse to refer ongoing federal crimes to a grand jury?
3. Is it a Due Process violation for an Assistant United States Attorney to prevent a victim from making a criminal complaint concerning the Assistant United States Attorney's own conduct?
4. Is it a Due Process violation for a federal judge to prevent a victim from making a criminal complaint concerning the judge's own conduct?
5. Is it a Due Process violation for a federal judge to permit federal crimes to be committed to interfere with the court case before them? (Such as interfering with court mail, threatening and harming witnesses, interfering with PETITIONER obtaining legal counsel and interfering with PETITIONER's phone to interfere with PETITIONER contacting journalists, lawyers and printers for his US Supreme Court petitions.)
6. Is it a Due Process violation for an Assistant United States Attorney to ignore a motion to disqualify and file a brief for Respondents without responding to the motion to disqualify?
7. Is it a Due Process violation for the Third Circuit's opinion to arbitrarily dismiss a Merits Panel investigation into a judge's conduct, filed under a motion to disqualify a judge?

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

Petitioner

Ryan P. Givey, Petitioner

Respondents

Pamela Bondi, Respondent
In her official capacity as US Attorney General

Kashyap Patel, Respondent
In his official capacity as Director of the FBI

David Metcalf, Respondent
In his official capacity as
US Attorney for the DOJ EDPA

RELATED PROCEEDINGS

United States Supreme Court:

Givey v Jennifer Arbiter Williams and the
Department of Justice, Case 23-7063,
Certiorari denied

Givey v Givey, Case 25-6035, Certiorari denied,
Rehearing Denied

In Re Ryan P. Givey, Case 25-6881,
Prohibition Denied

Third Circuit Court of Appeals:

Ryan P. Givey v Jennifer Arbiter Williams and the Department of Justice, Case 23-2330, Judgement entered December 26, 2023

Ryan P. Givey v Pamela Bondi, Kash Patel and David Metcalf, Case 25-3575, Judgement entered April 1, 2026, Rehearing denied April 28, 2026.

Ryan P. Givey v Pamela Bondi, Kash Patel and David Metcalf, Case 26-1067, Judgement entered June, 11, 2026, Rehearing denied July 8, 2026.

District Court Eastern District of Pennsylvania

Ryan P. Givey v Jennifer Arbiter Williams and the Department of Justice, Case 2:22-cv-00298-NIQA, Judgement entered July 14, 2023

Ryan P. Givey v Pamela Bondi, Kash Patel and David Metcalf, Case 2:25-cv-00943-NIQA, Judgement entered December 30, 2025

Chester County Court of Common Pleas:

Ryan P. Givey v Alicia A. Givey, No. 2015-06444-CU (Jan. 3, 2025)

v

Ryan P. Givey v Alicia A. Givey, No. 2015-06444-CU (May 15, 2025)

Superior Court of Pennsylvania:

Ryan P. Givey v Alicia A. Givey, No. 153 EDA 2025 (case remanded, application to strike denied, appellant's petition to appear remotely at oral argument denied) (Apr. 25, 2025)

Ryan P. Givey v Alicia A. Givey, No. 1318 EDA 2025 (appeal quashed, application to strike dismissed) (Jun. 23, 2025)

Supreme Court of Pennsylvania:

R.P.G. v A.A.G., No. 362 MAL 2025 (petition for allowance of appeal denied) (Aug. 19, 2025)

R.P.G. v A.A.G., No. 362 MAL 2025 (request for reconsideration denied) (Sep. 10, 2025)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	xiii
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI	1
OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	1
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	1 (APPENDIX F-1 to F-8)
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	2
INTRODUCTION	2
CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO FILE A CRIMINAL COMPLAINT	2
THE COURT DOES HAVE SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION	5
THIS CASE MEETS THE STANDARD FOR MANDAMUS RELIEF	7
PETITIONER'S CLAIMS ARE NOT BARRED	12

THREATS AGAINST WITNESSES	12
CUSTODY CASE AS A PRETEXT TO INTERFERE WITH THIS LAWSUIT	17
APPEAL 153 EDA 2025	26
APPEAL 1318 EDA 2025	26
APPEAL 362 MAL 2025	28
THIRD CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS	28
HISTORY OF THIS CASE	31
FRAUD, WASTE OR ABUSE OF FEDERAL TITLE I FUNDS	31
FRAUDULENT DIAGNOSIS OF MENTAL ILLNESS	33
MAIL TO PAMELA BONDI, KASH PATEL & ALINA HABBA	35
REASONS FOR GRANTING WRIT ..	37
STANDARD OF REVIEW	38
CONCLUSION	38

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX A

MEMORANDUM OPINION OF THE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
PENNSYLVANIA, FILED
DECEMBER 30, 2025 App-1

APPENDIX B

ORDER OF THE UNITED STATES
DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN
DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, FILED
DECEMBER 30, 2025 App-14

APPENDIX C

JUDGMENT OF THE UNITED STATES
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD
CIRCUIT, FILED JUNE 11, 2026 App-16

APPENDIX D

OPINION OF THE UNITED STATES COURT
OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT,
FILED JUNE 11, 2026..... App-18

APPENDIX E

SUR PETITION FOR REHEARING OF THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT, FILED JULY 8,
2026..... App-22

APPENDIX F-1

FIRST AMENDMENT OF THE UNITED
STATES CONSTITUTION..... App-24

APPENDIX F-2	
FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT OF THE UNITED STATES CONSITUTION	App-25

APPENDIX F-3	
18 U.S.C. § 3332(a) POWERS AND DUTIES	App-26

APPENDIX F-4	
TITLE 23 Pa Code Rule § 5424 Temporary Emergency Jurisdiction	App-27

APPENDIX F-5	
42 Pa.C.S. § 5944 CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATIONS TO PSYCHIATRIST OR LICENSED PSYCHOLOGISTS	App-30

APPENDIX F-6	
Title 210 Pa Code Rule § 2521. Entry of Judgment or Other Order.	App-31

APPENDIX F-7	
TITLE 231 Pa. CODE RULE 1915.8 PHYSICAL AND MENTAL EXAMINATION OF PERSONS	App-35

APPENDIX F-8	
CHESTER COUNTY LOCAL RULE 200 A, INDIVIDUAL ASSIGNMENT OF CASES	App-38

APPENDIX G	
DAMAGED BEDROOM DOOR	App-39

APPENDIX H

PA COMMONWEALTH COURT ORDER
NOV. 7, 2024 App-41

APPENDIX I

CHESTER COUNTY COURT, RULE DEC. 11,
2025 App-44

APPENDIX J

CHESTER COUNTY COURT, LETTER DEC.
11, 2025, SWITCHING JUDGES & DATE OF
HEARING App-46

APPENDIX K

CHESTER COUNTY COURT ORDER, JAN. 3,
2025 App-48

APPENDIX L

CHESTER COUNTY COURT ORDER
MAY 15, 2025 App-50

APPENDIX M

PA SUPERIOR COURT ORDER
APR. 25, 2025 App-53

APPENDIX N

PA SUPERIOR COURT ORDER JUN. 23,
2025 App-55

APPENDIX O

OPPOSITION TO EMERGENCY MOTION[S]
TO DIQUALIFY App-60

APPENDIX P

ORDER OF THE UNITED STATES COURT
OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT,
CASE 25-3575, FILED APR. 1, 2026 ... App-62

APPENDIX Q

ORDER OF THE UNITED STATES COURT
OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT,
CASE 26-1067, FILED APR. 1, 2026 ... App-65

APPENDIX R

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF
APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT,
REFERRING MOTIONS TO RECUSE
JUDGES TO THE MERITS PANEL, FILED
APR. 24, 2026 App-68

APPENDIX S-1

AFFIDAVIT OF [ADMINISTRATOR]
..... App-69

APPENDIX S-2

CHROMEBOOK PRICE App-71

APPENDIX S-3

CHROMEBOOK INVENTORY App-72

APPENDIX T-1

INVESTIGATIVE JOURNALIST NICK
SHIRLEY CONFIRMED A MEETING ON
MINNECT APP App-73

APPENDIX T-2

CREDIT CARD CHARGE FOR THE
MEETING WITH NICK SHIRELY App-74

APPENDIX T-3

CONFIRMATION NICK SHIRLEY DID NOT
JOIN THE MEETING App-75

APPENDIX U-1

USPS TRACKING PAMELA BONDI'S
MAIL App-76

APPENDIX U-2

USPS TRACKING KASH PATEL'S
MAIL App-78

APPENDIX U-3

ALINA HABBA'S MAIL RETURNED
..... App-80

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Estate of Morris ex rel. Morris v. Dapolito, 297 F. Supp. 2d 680, 692 (S.D.N.Y. 2004)	3, 8
Gable v. Lewis, 201 F3d 769, 771 (6 th Cir. 2000)	3, 7
Linda R.S. v. Richard D., 410 U.S. 614, 619 (1973)	8
Lott v Andrews Ctr., 259 F. Supp. 2d 564, 568 (E. D. Tex. 2003)	3, 8
<i>Minn. State Bd. for Cmty. Colls. v. Knight</i> , 465 U.S. 271, 285–86 (1984)	9
<i>Rodriguez v. Newsom</i> , 974 F.3d 998, 1010 (9th Cir. 2020)	9
<i>Smith v. Ark. State Hwy. Emp., Loc. 1315</i> , 441 U.S. 463, 464 (1979)	9
United States v. Hylton, 558 F. Supp. 872, 874 (S.D. Tex. 1982)	3, 8
United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542, 552 (1875)	8
United Mine Workers of Am. V. Illinois State Bar Ass’n, 389 U.S. 217, 222 (1967)	8

<i>Wheeler v. Ulsny</i> , 482 F. App'x 665, 669 (3d Cir. 2012)	9
--	---

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS

U.S. Const., Amdt. I	2, 3, 4, 7, 12, 23
U.S. Const., Amdt. XIV	22, 23, 33
18 U.S.C. § 3332(a) POWERS AND DUTIES	5, 8, 11, 12, 30
TITLE 23 Pa Code § 5424 Emergency Jurisdiction	21, 23, 25, 34
TITLE 42 Pa. C.S. § 5944 Psychiatrist/ Psychologist Patient Privilege	22, 23
TITLE 210 Pa. CODE RULE 2521	27
TITLE 231 Pa. CODE RULE 1915.8 Physical and Mental Examination of Persons	23
CHESTER COUNTY LOCAL CIVIL RULE 200 A Individual Assignment of Cases	19

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner prays that the court issues a Writ of Certiorari to review the judgement below.

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals appears at Appendix D and is unreported.

The opinion of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania appears in Appendix A and is unreported.

JURISDICTION

For cases from federal courts:

The date on which the Third Circuit Court of Appeals decided my case was June 11, 2026.

A timely petition for rehearing was denied on July 8, 2026 and a copy of that order denying rehearing appears at Appendix E.

The jurisdiction of this court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Relevant Constitutional and Statutory provisions involved are reproduced in the Appendix of this Petition (APPENDIX F-1 to F-8).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE INTRODCUTION

PETITIONER is an attacked whistleblower reporting waste, fraud or abuse of federal Department of Education Title I funds, related to his former job responsibilities, and demanded the DOJ take a criminal complaint, which agents from Biden's DOJ, who still work at the DOJ, refused to do, protecting large donors to the Democratic party and a University that had employed Joseph Biden.

Contrary to Trump's stated agenda of identifying fraud, waste or abuse in federal spending and Trump's goal to discontinue funding for the Department of Education, agents from Biden's DOJ, who still work at the DOJ, claimed they do not have "speak" to PETITIONER, or even "listen" to him, review evidence or take a criminal complaint, so there would be no record of PETITIONER's complaint or the hundreds of other similar complaints arising within this jurisdiction, thus allowing ongoing crimes to be perpetrated and allowing whistleblowers to be threatened and harmed.

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO FILE A CRIMINAL COMPLAINT

Never before in the history of this country has it been in dispute whether a citizen has a Constitutional Right under the First Amendment of the United States Constitution to file a criminal complaint with law enforcement. There is no precedent in any court to support the DOJ's and FBI's refusal to take a criminal complaint and there is no lawful reason for them to do so.

Courts have found reporting criminal conduct, executing a criminal complaint with law enforcement and assisting with a law enforcement investigation each constitute an exercise of the First Amendment right to Petition. See, e.g., *Gable v. Lewis*, 201 F3d 769, 771 (6th Cir. 2000); *Estate of Morris ex rel. Morris v. Dapolito*, 297 F. Supp. 2d 680, 692 (S.D.N.Y. 2004) (concluding that swearing out a criminal complaint against a high school teacher for assault and seeking his arrest were protected First Amendment petitioning activities.); *Lott v Andrews Ctr.*, 259 F. Supp. 2d 564, 568 (E. D. Tex. 2003) (noting that, “[t]here is no doubt that filing a legitimate criminal complaint with law enforcement officials constitutes an exercise of the First Amendment right.”); *United States v. Hylton*, 558 F. Supp. 872, 874 (S.D. Tex. 1982) (noting that filing a legitimate criminal complaint with law enforcement officials constitutes an exercise of the First Amendment right). By refusing speak with PETITIONER and take a criminal complaint the DOJ has violated PETITIONER’s Constitutional Right to Petition.

The Third Circuit stated on page 3 of its June 11, 2026 order “While Givey has a First Amendment right to petition the Government for redress of grievances, this right does not require the Government to act regarding the relief demanded.”

According federal court precedent the Right to Petition is the Right to make a **criminal complaint**, meaning the FBI and DOJ, by law, has to speak to PETITIONER, review evidence and take a criminal complaint so there is a record of these crimes.

The DOJ argued extensively in their response brief, claiming they do not have "speak" to PETITIONER, "listen" to him, review evidence or take a criminal complaint so there is no record of these crimes, thus according to the Third Circuit June 11, 2026 opinion, the DOJ is clearly violating PETITIONER's right to petition. (Respondent's response brief was submitted to the Court on 2/27/26 without first responding the Motion to Disqualify filed on 1/24/26, which violates the rules of appellate procedure.)

Therefore, The Third Circuit's June 11, 2026 opinion clearly admitting that PETITIONER has a Constitutional Right to petition the government for the redress of grievances, actually supports PETITIONER's argument that PETITIONER has a Constitutional Right to speak to the FBI and DOJ, have them review evidence and take a criminal complaint so there is a record of these crimes.

There is no precedent in any court that would allow federal judges, the FBI and DOJ to ignore ongoing federal crimes perpetrated against a United States citizen.

Furthermore, whether a federal court can order the DOJ to prosecute someone becomes irrelevant because any federal judge becoming aware of federal crimes has a duty under our law to act, under the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, and can convene a grand jury and assign a special prosecutor.

The Third Circuit stated on page 3 of its June 11, 2026 order "While Givey has a First Amendment right to petition the Government for redress of grievances, this right does not require the Government to act regarding the relief demanded."

Again, the Third Circuit in its opinion ignores federal law that requires under 18 U.S.C. § 3332(a), any United States Attorney receiving evidence of a federal crime is required to report that crime to a grand jury. Therefore, under federal law 18 U.S.C. § 3332(a) PETITIONER requests the Court to require the DOJ to follow the law and federal law does directly require the DOJ to submit the evidence of these crimes to a grand jury.

PETITIONER did not request the Court to order the DOJ to prosecute a certain individual as claimed by the Third Circuit, he requested the Court to order the DOJ to follow clearly established federal law, speak to PETITIONER, review evidence, take a criminal complaint and report these crimes to a grand jury. PETITIONER has a clearly established right under federal law to demand the DOJ to comply with federal law.

**THE COURT DOES HAVE
SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION**

RESPONDENT's have argued that PETITIONER's claims are implausible and therefore the Court does not have subject matter jurisdiction over this case.

The truth is that any crime can be committed against PETITIONER and he has no recourse because law enforcement illegally refuse to take a criminal complaint, contrary to the law, and state and federal courts have illegally dismissed PETITIONER's lawsuits, also contrary to the law.

Under Robert Mueller the FBI reorganized the FBI in 2002 reducing its organized crime task forces by 90% then focused on gangs and not organized crime

(See 2010 report presented to Congress, "Organized Crime in the United States Trends and Issues for Congress") and the DOJ EDPA shut down its organized crime task force in 2008.

According to Gerald Shur, the U.S. Attorney who created the witness protection program, organized crime would always threaten witnesses, their children, their friends and family members as his reason for creating the witness protection program. Today, law enforcement refuses to take a criminal complaint, so there is no record of the crimes, then law enforcement allows victims, their friends and families to be threatened and harmed.

Prior to 2008, when the DOJ shut down its organized crime task force, organized crime has always corrupted government officials and law enforcement (Whitey Bulger¹, an organized crime boss had corrupted local, state and federal law enforcement officials from 1975-1991, including the entire FBI Boston field office), threatened and murdered witnesses and committed various criminal acts such as public corruption.

Every conceivable means to threaten PETITIONER to back down from his criminal complaints has been utilized, including repeatedly tampering with judicial proceedings, repeatedly drugging PETITIONER, threatening PETITIONER's friends and family, attacking PETITIONER financially, removing the custody of his children and threatening PETITIONER to commit perjury, in an attempt to get PETITIONER to testify that he no longer believes in the criminal allegations and when

¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Whitey_Bulger

PETITIONER refused his children were illegally removed from his custody.

With the DOJ's organized crime task force closed for last 18 years, RESPONDENT's have made the stunning claim that it is implausible that organized crime could be doing the same things that organized crime has done for the last 100 years and the same things recently reported that organized crime is doing in other countries.

In the current environment where the DOJ's organized crime task force has been shut down for 18 years it is very likely that organized crime is continuing to do what they have always done, including corrupting government officials and law enforcement, threatening witnesses and committing crimes, now without any interference from the federal government.

The Court should find that the Court does have subject matter jurisdiction over this case.

THIS CASE MEETS THE STANDARD FOR MANDAMUS RELIEF

Mandamus Relief requires a clearly established right and the refusal of the government to perform that right. PETITIONER established he has a clearly established Right to file a criminal complaint and it is not in dispute that the DOJ and FBI have refused to take a criminal complaint.

PETITIONER has a clearly established Right under the First Amendment of the United States Constitution, the Right to Petition the Government for the redress of grievances, which is the Right to speak to the DOJ, have them review evidence and make a criminal complaint. See, e.g., Gable v. Lewis,

201 F3d 769, 771 (6th Cir. 2000); Estate of Morris ex rel. Morris v. Dapolito, 297 F. Supp. 2d 680, 692 (S.D.N.Y. 2004); Lott v Andrews Ctr., 259 F. Supp. 2d 564, 568 (E. D. Tex. 2003); United States v. Hylton, 558 F. Supp. 872, 874 (S.D. Tex. 1982).

The Right to Petition the Government for redress of grievances is fundamental to "the very idea of a government republican in form." United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542, 552 (1875). See also United Mine Workers of Am. V. Illinois State Bar Ass'n, 389 U.S. 217, 222 (1967). Our democracy is premised on the concept that we have fair laws and if those are broken a citizen can go to law enforcement, file a criminal complaint and have the perpetrators brought to justice. By the DOJ refusing to take a criminal complaint, effectively citizens have no protection of our laws and we do not have a democracy.

RESPONDENT's brief before the Third Circuit cites irrelevant court cases claiming PETITIONER does not have an interest in the government prosecuting another citizen, in *Linda R.S. v. Richard D.*, 410 U.S. 614, 619 (1973), a 50 year-old court case where the petitioner wanted the defendant prosecuted for not paying child support with the Court stating "in the unique context of a challenge to a criminal statute, appellant has failed to allege a sufficient nexus between her injury and the government action which she attacks to justify judicial intervention." PETITIONER did not ask for the DOJ to prosecute anyone but to simply follow the law, take a criminal complaint and under 18 U.S.C. § 3332(a) refer that complaint to a grand jury.

In the other case cited *Wheeler v. Ullisny*, 482 F. App'x 665, 669 (3d Cir. 2012), Wheeler was a prisoner who wanted to mail his autobiography. The prison employees air mailed his autobiography, which became lost in the mail and charged his account for the cost of the mail. Wheeler wished to have the prison employees prosecuted claiming they were unauthorized to charge his account for the air mail and responsible for the loss of his items by the postal service. The Court dismissed this clearly frivolous lawsuit.

RESPONDENT's brief before the Third Circuit claims the DOJ has no obligation to listen or respond to a criminal complaint, review evidence or even make record of that complaint, while citing irrelevant court cases like *Rodriguez v. Newsom*, 974 F.3d 998, 1010 (9th Cir. 2020) concerning citizens petitioning the government for changes in the way they select presidential electors, *Smith v. Ark. State Hwy. Emp., Loc. 1315*, 441 U.S. 463, 464 (1979) with the government ignoring a union grievance or *Minn. State Bd. for Cmty. Colls. v. Knight*, 465 U.S. 271, 285-86 (1984) stating that the college can ignore representatives from the faculty that are not designated faculty to engage in union negotiations. Simply put, RESPONDENTS misrepresented these cases to the Court and there is no precedent for the DOJ to refuse to speak to PETITIONER, listen or respond to a criminal complaint, review evidence and investigate those crimes.

In the present case before the Court, there are ongoing crimes being committed against PETITIONER, notably, he has been repeatedly drugged and threatened to interfere with a judicial

proceeding, his post office mail has been interfered with repeatedly to interfere with judicial proceedings and there is evidence that the judges in a court case were switched to interfere with a judicial proceeding, there is evidence a sitting judge is attempting to utilize the abuse of psychiatry to discredit a whistleblower and in state court the filing staff are entering orders into the filing system that have not been signed by the prothonotary as required by law. These all are serious federal crimes.

These are not frivolous accusations such as the court cases cited by RESPONDENTS, they are some of the most serious federal crimes and there is no lawful reason the DOJ would refuse to speak to PETITIONER, take a criminal complaint, review evidence and investigate. RESPONDENT's cite no precedent for a refusal to speak to PETITIONER and take a criminal complaint and review evidence. If the Court finds it cannot force the DOJ under a mandamus petition to take criminal complaint, review evidence and investigate, the Court also holds the power to convene a grand jury or assign a special prosecutor.

RESPONDENT's arguments do not describe a functioning law enforcement agency in any democratic country. The DOJ and FBI are federal law enforcement agencies with a federal mandate to investigate and prosecute federal crimes.

The only time in the history of this country that law enforcement has refused to take a criminal complaint it has been to hide illegal conduct. After former FBI Director Mueller effectively shut down the organized crime task forces across the country, over 1,000 whistleblowers have reported law

enforcement refused to investigate serious crimes, Jeffrey Epstein (254 victims over 10 years), Pennsylvania Kid for Cash scandal (over 400 alleged victims over 10 years), Jerry Sandusky (52 victims over 15 years), Larry Nassar (265 alleged victims over 18 years), Harvey Weinstein (over 100 alleged victims over 10 years), Mike Jeffries (dozens of alleged victims over 20 years).

In those cases, extensive illegal conduct was eventually discovered, sometimes with hundreds of criminal complaints, exposing that illegal conduct had been illegally hidden for years. While RESPONDENTS have argued that the DOJ does not have to listen, review evidence or take a criminal complaint, as ongoing federal crimes are being committed, the important question arises, "Why would the DOJ do that?" And there is no lawful reason why the DOJ would refuse to speak to PETITIONER, review evidence, take a criminal complaint and allow ongoing crimes to be committed against PETITIONER and there is no precedent in any court to support the DOJ's argument.

PETITIONER has repeatedly claimed he has Right to make a criminal complaint with the DOJ and have that criminal complaint investigated, which is codified by federal law under 18 U.S.C. § 3332(a). 18 U.S.C. § 3332(a) requires any United States Attorney receiving evidence of a federal crime to report that crime to a grand jury. It is clear from the plain reading of the text. The Assistant US Attorney does not have the discretion to decide that they are not taking criminal complaints or that they wish to ignore ongoing federal crimes.

The Court should find that the DOJ can be compelled to fulfill its federal mandate to speak to PETITIONER, take a criminal complaint and review evidence and under 18 U.S.C. § 3332(a) they must report those crimes to a grand jury. If the Court finds it cannot force the DOJ under a mandamus petition to take criminal complaint, review evidence and investigate, the Court also holds the power to convene a grand jury or assign a special prosecutor to do the same.

PETITIONER'S CLAIMS ARE NOT BARRED

RESPONDENT's brief before the Third Circuit states that PETITIONER's claims are barred by res judicata because they were already raised in a previous petition.

PETITIONER cited the history of the case of ongoing crimes going back several years. RESPONDENT's request to have the new claims, that have arisen since 2022, barred as a result, simply does not make sense and is not in line with the facts of this case. There are ongoing crimes perpetrated against PETITIONER and PETITIONER has a Constitutional Right under the First Amendment to make a criminal complaint and have those crimes referred to a grand jury.

THREATS AGAINST WITNESSES

Gerald Shur, the US Attorney who invented the Witness Protection Program, detailed in his book WITSEC², how organized crime would always threaten and kill friends, family members and

² Earley, Pete. WITSEC. New York, Bantam Books, 2002.

children of whistleblowers, while stating his reason for creating the US Witness Protection Program and the necessity to immediately provide a witness with protection. PETITIONER has proven through state and federal lawsuits that local, county, state and federal law enforcement and local, state and federal courts have blocked PETITIONER from making a criminal complaint for over a decade, so there is no record of these crimes, while allowing PETITIONER, his family and friends to be harmed and threatened.

PETITIONER was denied witness protection in state and federal courts leading threats against PETITIONER and his family.

Around 2010, local code enforcement officers began writing about a dozen fraudulent violations and citations concerning PETITIONER's rental properties that were all dismissed by the court (See US Supreme Court case 25-6881, p.9-12). Around the same time PETITIONER's uncle (whose daughter was diagnosed with cancer, around this time), who lived nearby and had been a director of mental health facility for years, had never previously had an issue with code enforcement, had code enforcement officers from the state write dozens of violations leading to him resigning from his job before he was fired.

PETITIONER's sister told him in Spring 2015 that she was being threatened and indicated that other family members were also being threatened.

On Christmas day 2023, while PETITIONER had a lawsuit before the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, PETITIONER was illegally drugged and tested positive for Buprenorphine and after PETITIONER told his father, his father immediately called

PETITIONER saying "You know there are drugs that can kill you and are undetectable in your system a few hours later." In the hospital that day PETITIONER's sister told him that she and other family members have also been drugged to threaten them. Court staff at the Third Circuit Court of Appeals blocked PETITIONER from speaking with a judge to request witness protection.

Within about three months of Christmas 2023 PETITIONER's two younger sisters had to be admitted to the hospital and both almost died. PETITIONER believes their food was tampered with drugs to threaten their lives.

Petitioner was threatened before an emergency custody hearing on January 3, 2025 that if he did not commit perjury and testify that he is mentally ill and no longer believes in the criminal allegations then he would never see his children again, then when he refused, his children were illegally removed from his custody. Evidence concerning the hearing appears in US Supreme Court cases 25-6881 and 25-6035.

PETITIONER has been illegally drugged dozens of times since his request for witness protection was denied in 2022, 2024, 2025 and 2026, putting his life in danger.

Their preferred method of threatening a witness is to drug them by tampering with their food because the victim cannot identify the perpetrator and the victim consumes all the evidence, making it the perfect crime and also, they often interfere with the victim's employment and attack them financially, by damaging their car and property causing costly repairs. They can either drug them acutely with psycho-active drugs or expose them to drugs or

chemicals over a long period of time causing health complications, by putting the drugs in your coffee creamer that you drink every morning, then they interfere with your medication and medical treatment.

Around the same time, PETITIONER's favorite uncle, his cousin and his other cousin's wife were all diagnosed with cancer. Then all of PETITIONER's siblings or their children have all been diagnosed with serious health conditions and tampering with their medication, medical treatment or food will cause serious health concerns, including hospitalization.

This is a serious National Security threat considering Tulsi Gabbard's (Trump's former Director of National Intelligence) husband and Pamela Bondi (Trump's former Attorney General) were recently diagnosed with cancer, as well as, Epstein accuser, Maria Farmer.

In district court, RESPONDENTS cited eight other federal lawsuits that have made similar claims of having their food tampered with drugs, causing health conditions, interference with medication and medical treatment, interference with employment and/or the abuse of psychiatry to threaten witnesses to back down from their claims and stated that federal courts consistently dismiss these lawsuits. We simply do not know how common these crimes are because the FBI and DOJ are refusing to take a criminal complaint so there is no record of these crimes.

The most devastating weapon utilized to threaten witnesses today is the electronic pill that was

invented in 2018³, that was used on PETITIONER once. The electronic pill deploys a needle in your stomach where you have no pain receptors and connects to WIFI or Bluetooth to wirelessly administer the drugs. The victim is roofied, to drug them and impair their memory and then made to swallow an electronic pill where they can be threatened, drugged or even murdered at any time in the future. PETITIONER's bedroom door (APPENDIX G) was recently installed at the time that it was damaged after he was roofied and the perpetrators damaged his bedroom door to break into his bedroom while he was unconscious, where he kept an extra supply of food and water.

PETITIONER met R.K. in May 2022 and they began dating. Three times while they were dating R. K. had been illegally drugged. Shortly after PETITIONER and R.K. began dating, her brother in law claimed he was fired under false pretenses and then surveilled at his house and followed when he left his home.

After they began dating R. K.'s sister began having her long-time employment threatened, her oldest brother lost his job and after long-time unemployment had to leave his family in South Carolina and move to New York to find employment, her other brother, a millionaire, who owns a million dollar home in Florida and had been retired for years after a work injury settlement, moved away from his home to Pennsylvania and took a dishwashing job, where he complains of mistreatment, complains that

³ <https://news.mit.edu/2018/ingestible-pill-controlled-wirelessly-bluetooth-1213>

he misses his family and lost fifty pounds in three months, R.K. was diagnosed with a serious medical condition and R. K.'s father was diagnosed with cancer and died.

All of R. K.'s long-time friend group of twenty years began having problems with their employment, separation from their families or developed health concerns before they stopped talking to R. K. for a year.

PETITIONER and R. K. were talking about a Reddit post about the RICO statute. PETITIONER said "Organized crime used to threaten your family to get you to do what they want." R. K. replied "Organized crime still does but they don't threaten your family, they hurt your family over and over again until you do what they want."

PETITIONER, his friends and family have been threatened and harmed and are in need of immediate witness protection.

CUSTODY CASE AS A PRETEXT TO INTERFERE WITH THIS LAWSUIT

A custody case was brought against PETITIONER in December 2024 that ended up before the US Supreme Court that PETITIONER believes was brought to interfere with PETITIONER's criminal complaints.

After Trump won the election in November 2024 PETITIONER stated he will be refiling his federal lawsuits demanding the DOJ take a criminal complaint.

On December 11, 2024 PETITIONER had a lawsuit before the Pennsylvania Supreme Court requesting the Pa Attorney General to take a

criminal complaint and provide witness protection, after his lawsuit was illegally dismissed, in an anonymous, per curiam order by the Pa Commonwealth Court (APPENDIX H) that was illegally entered into the court's filing system without a signature by the prothonotary, stating the Attorney General did not even have to respond to his lawsuit.

The mother of PETITIONER's children is "A.G.". Her Father was one of the most powerful federal law enforcement officers in the country during President Obama and Biden's administrations, who to PETITIONER's understanding worked closely with the FBI and DOJ and was sent around the country to reorganize several federal field offices. A.G.'s father could have helped PETITIONER make a criminal complaint and refused to help him when he had the opportunity.

On December 11, 2024 A.G. filed a petition requesting emergency custody of their children. A.G. was denied emergency custody at that time and requested a two-hour emergency hearing that was scheduled on January 28, 2025 in courtroom 14 before Judge Analisa Sondergaard (APPENDIX I). This occurred at 3:50 pm.

Between 3:50 pm and 4:30 pm on December 11, 2025 the Court improperly transferred the case to Judge Allison Bell Royer, who has a conflict of interest in the case, and rescheduled the case in Courtroom 7 on January 3, 2025 at 9:30 am for a full day hearing (APPENDIX J), where A.G. testified all morning and PETITIONER testified in the afternoon. A typical emergency custody hearing lasts 30-60 minutes. A scheduling conflict would change the date

of the hearing not the judge nor would it change a two-hour hearing to a full day hearing (which requires a formal motion to the court) and PETITIONER was advised by the Court that it would be illegal for a litigant to choose their judge or switch a judge, in order to influence the conditions or outcome of a hearing, as it would be a federal crime. Chester County Court Local Rules of Civil Procedure 200 A requires "when the case is commenced it shall be assigned for trial and pre-trial proceedings to a designated judge. The designated judge shall be responsible for the matter from the time of the initial filing until final disposition".

So, on December 11, 2024 A.G. filed an emergency custody petition and was denied, then the court staff improperly transferred judges, illegally changed the hearing from a two-hour hearing to a full day hearing and rescheduled the hearing from January 28, 2025 to January 3, 2025, before Trump took office.

Petitioner was threatened before the hearing on January 3, 2025 that if he did not commit perjury and testify that he is mentally ill and no longer believes in the criminal allegations then he would never see his children again, then when he refused his children were illegally removed from his custody.

On January 3, 2025 Judge Royer failed to disclose her relationship with Tom Hogan, the former District Attorney for Chester County who endorsed her political campaign for Judge, who's office PETITIONER presented evidence of misconduct (See US Supreme Court case 25-6035, Petition for Rehearing, p.16-22). A separate federal lawsuit by a different party suing Tom Hogan's district attorney's office claimed the district attorney's office refused to

take a criminal complaint when he was illegally drugged, he was fraudulently declared mentally ill, his medication and medical treatment were illegally interfered with and the custody of his daughter was illegally interfered with.

On January 3, 2025, PETITIONER's attorney asked A.G. "so basically you have filed this emergency petition based on solely what you read in the petition that he filed"? A.G. answered, "Correct.", (153 EDA 2025, Transcript p.37 Line 13-18) referring to a petition PETITIONER filed before the United States Supreme Court in May 2024 (Givey v DOJ, Case No. 23-7063) and entered into evidence by A.G., that was an appeal from a case initiated in Federal Court 3 years prior.

On January 3, 2025, A.G. stated "If he keeps filing these cases, that makes me very wary that he is going to have another psychotic break.", falsely claiming that PETITIONER had a psychotic break eleven years ago, while PETITIONER maintains he was illegally drugged that night and demands a criminal investigation into the events that occurred.

PETITIONER's attorney asked "Ma'am, you said one of the last things you said during your direct testimony is that you had concerns about Mr. Givey's health because of what happened last time?", A.G. answered "Yes". (1/3/25 Transcripts p. 34, Line 20-25, p.35)

PETITIONER's Attorney asked "And that last time you are referring to was in 2014?", A.G. answered "Yes", with A.G. admitting there had not been a single incident concerning the children in the last eleven years.

In 2014, after PETITIONER was illegally drugged resulting in a car accident, A.G. prevented PETITIONER's family from getting him at the hospital, during which time A.G. testified that she requested PETITIONER be mentally evaluated, leading to PETITIONER being forced into a mental health facility without a hearing, in violation of the law and A.G.'s testimony confirms that PETITIONER was immediately told he was mentally ill, which was done by an unidentified doctor contrary to the DSM, which is the required criteria in the US to diagnose mental health conditions.

The trial Court stated "There have been no reports or evidence of any violence or assaultive behavior by either of these parties towards each other or the Children." (153 EDA 2025, Opinion Sur rule 1925 (a), p.56).

The trial Court only has emergency jurisdiction under Title 23 Pa Code § 5424 to issue an emergency custody order in the event of an emergency necessitated by abuse or mistreatment to the children. A court needs proof, such as police, Child Protective Services or hospital reports that the children have been harmed to have emergency jurisdiction. The potential that the children could possibly be harmed is not enough to grant the court emergency jurisdiction.

Judge Royer stated that she read PETITIONER's response to Mother's Petition for Special relief, including his allegations of misconduct against Tom Hogan's District Attorney's office (Jan. 3, 2025, Transcripts p. 3).

During the emergency hearing on January 3, 2025 A.G.'s lawyer had A.G. read out loud

PETITIONER's allegations of misconduct against Tom Hogan's office during direct testimony (Transcripts, Jan. 3, 2025, p. 26-27).

Contrary to the evidence presented, Judge Royer called PETITIONER's allegations of misconduct against her political ally, Tom Hogan's District Attorney's Office, a "delusion" and a "conspiracy theory", suspended his custody rights and ordered PETITIONER to undergo a psychological evaluation with a doctor chosen by A.G. (APPENDIX K).

Judge Royer specifically ordered PETITIONER to provide Dr. Gransee, a doctor chosen by A.G. to perform a psychological evaluation, with copies of Exhibits M-3 and M-4, (APPENDIX L) which is his lawsuit (US Supreme Court, Givey v DOJ, 23-7063) to have Dr. Gransee assess PETITIONER's allegations, including allegations of misconduct concerning Tom Hogan's District Attorney's office and ordered PETITIONER to attend therapist and psychiatrist appointments and take medication in violation of his Fourteenth Amendment Rights.

Judge Royer stated she wishes to make the forced psychological evaluation public, stating an "independent medical examiner will not be subject to the confidentiality requirements of 42 Pa C.S. § 5944 because he will have no treatment relationship with Father." (153 EDA 2025, Opinion Sur Rule 1925 (a), p.51).

A.G. and Judge Royer were unable to cite any precedent in any court to support the order to force PETITIONER against his will to undergo a psychological evaluation, which would clearly be a violation of Fourteenth Amendment's protections

against unwarranted and forced mental health evaluations.

On January 3, 2025 Judge Royer suspended PETITIONER's custody rights and ordered him to undergo a psychological evaluation with a doctor chosen by A.G. in an order that clearly violated Pennsylvania Law, under Title 23 Pa Code § 5424, Pa.R.C.P. 1915.8, 42 Pa C.S. § 5944 and the First and Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution (see US Supreme Court case no. 25-6035).

On January 9, 2025 someone filed a false criminal complaint against PETITIONER and he was detained at the courthouse, as he attempted to deliver his notice of appeal, and PETITIONER was criminally investigated by the sheriff's department (See US Supreme Court case no. 25-6881, p. 23). On January 13, 2025 Judge Royer's law clerk emailed PETITIONER's attorney prompting him to demand PETITIONER file a pro se agreement (See US Supreme Court case no. 25-6881, p. 32). PETITIONER wants it investigated to determine if Judge Royer was involved with the false criminal complaint filed against him and if she interfered with his legal representation.

The threats made against PETITIONER in an attempt to have him commit perjury and deny his criminal complaints, A.G.'s own statements, the timing of her petition, the transfer of judges, the illegal change from a 2-hour hearing to a full day hearing, the orders and statements from Judge Royer and the timing of the rescheduled hearing leads PETITIONER to believe the true purpose of the custody lawsuit is to interfere with

PETITIONER pursuing this current petition of his criminal complaint through the courts.

If A.G. had anything to do with PETITIONER being illegally drugged in 2014, illegally forced into a mental facility and fraudulently declared mentally ill she would have an incredible incentive to interfere with his criminal complaints.

PETITIONER's 15 year old son stated that A.G. told him, "Your father wanted to enter the witness protection program and take you away from me, so I took you away from him."; and he stated that when he asks his mother why she took his father's custody time away she repeatedly told him it is because PETITIONER requested to be in the witness protection program and telling him "Your father needs to stop asking to be in the witness protection program."

At the hearing on 1/3/26, A.G.'s lawyer questioned PETITIONER about the witness protection program (Transcripts 1/3/26, p. 82-85) and if A.G. would lose custody of her children, with PETITIONER's understanding of her argument being that since PETITIONER requested witness protection that could result in the removal of A.G.'s custody then the court should grant A.G.'s petition and remove PETITIONER's custody.

Judge Royer wrote as her rationale for entering the 1/3/26 emergency custody order: "Defendant was advancing a complex and wide-ranging conspiracy theory in the State and Federal Courts specifically requesting, without Mother's knowledge or consent, that he and his children be admitted to the Federal Witness Protection Program, an outcome which would surely have had some

detrimental effect of Mother's ability to maintain a relationship with the Children"(p.46). "If Father's allegations are true the Children are not safe with him."(p.47)

Then Judge Royer cited statute 23 Pa C.S. § 5424 which states that emergency jurisdiction is only conferred if the children have been subjected to "mistreatment or abuse", further stating "Father is attempting to obtain admission into the Federal Witness Protection Program for himself and his children. Father's filings in the Federal Courts indicate that he has been poisoned, his home burglarized, his family and friends also poisoned and threatened, and himself constantly surveilled by government agents. If Father's allegations are true, Father has been subjected to or threatened with mistreatment and abuse within the meaning of 23 Pa C.S. § 5424, thus giving the court emergency jurisdiction to enter a custody order to protect the Children."(p.48). "Father's attempts to obtain admittance into the program for himself and the parties Children, if successful, would have a significant impact on the Children's well-being. It would completely alter their day-to-day lives, impair their ability to maintain their current relationships in the community, and place a significant barrier to their ability to maintain a normal relationship with Mother."(p.48). (153 EDA 2025, Opinion Sur rule 1925 (a)).

Judge Sondergaard presided over the pretrial hearing in the summer 2025. Then the custody case was assigned back to Judge Royer. After PETITIONER made allegations that Judge Royer was improperly assigned, she lacked jurisdiction and

violated his rights, the Court again improperly transferred the custody case, this time to Judge Cauley, without explanation, who issued a ruling, that PETITIONER contends, is contrary to federal law violating PETITIONER's rights (see US Supreme Court case 25-6881). Judge Cauley is an expert in mental health litigation and PETITIONER finds it very unlikely he was randomly assigned to this case.

APPEAL 153 EDA 2025

On appeal of the January 3, 2025 order to the Pa Superior Court Judge Sullivan who authored the opinion 153 EDA 2025 (APPENDIX M), contrary to the precedent she cited, denied PETITIONER's appeal and his motion to strike false statements (see US Supreme Court Case 25-6035), worked for the Chester County District Attorney's office from 2002-2012 and from the Pennsylvania Attorney General's office from 2017-2021, years which PETITIONER was blocked from making a criminal complaint. PETITIONER believes that Judge Sullivan should have recused herself due to this conflict of interest. PETITIONER believes it is very unlikely that Judge Sullivan was randomly assigned to this case and wants it investigated to determine if court staff selectively assigned Judge Sullivan, to hide the misconduct from the law enforcement agencies she worked for.

APPEAL 1318 EDA 2025

PETITIONER's court mail was repeatedly interfered with to interfere with his appeal, which is a federal crime, and the prothonotary's office is

required to report this to the FBI but simply refused to do so.

A valid order from the Superior Court must be signed and attested to by the Prothonotary recognizing the order as a valid order of the court, under Pa Code Rule § 2521. Entering an order into the Court's filing system without a signature by the prothonotary is a federal crime. Superior Court Order 1318 EDA 2025 was not signed or attested to by the Prothonotary as a valid order of the Court (APPENDIX N). It was also an anonymous, per curiam order that violated the Pa Supreme Court's rules governing per curiam orders that cannot be traced back to any judge because per curiam orders from the court must indicate which judges did not participate in the decision. According to the Pennsylvania Supreme Court's Rules governing per curiam decisions "5. A per curiam order shall indicate if a Justice did not participate in the consideration or decision of the matter."⁴

The Pa Superior Court has since issued three more anonymous orders which violated our laws and are not signed by the prothonotary, where the Pa Superior Court assigned a lawyer as representing PETITIONER who was not representing PETITIONER, then issued a Sua Sponte show cause order, illegally dismissed a motion to proceed pro se, issued an order to reject all of PETITIONER's filings and then dismissed his appeal, falsely claiming he

4

<https://www.pacourts.us/Storage/media/pdfs/20221215/200130-supremeiopupdate1222.pdf>

did not respond (See US Supreme Court case 25-6881, Petition for Rehearing, p.9 & Appendix B, C, D).

APPEAL 362 MAL 2025

PETITIONER's appeals to the Pennsylvania Supreme Court are also an anonymous, per curiam order, that do not indicate which judges did and did not participate in violation of the Pennsylvania's Supreme Court's rules governing per curiam rulings. Therefore, these orders are invalid.

THIRD CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

In District Court the court staff illegally assigned PETITIONER's case to the same judge from 2022, who dismissed his previous case, contrary to our laws, and granting PETITIONER's petition would lead to an investigation into the district judge's own conduct from 2022.

In 2023, the Third Circuit Court of Appeals authored an outrageous opinion that was published all over the internet and has been quoted and used to discredit PETITIONER in his custody case and appeals and in his federal case and appeals (See US Supreme Court case 23-7063, Appendix D).

In 2025 the Third Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the disqualification of Alina Habba, an honest prosecutor. The same judges have blocked PETITIONER from making a criminal complaint and silencing PETITIONER, a whistleblower, in 2023 and allowed ongoing crimes to be committed against PETITIONER.

There is an ongoing criminal grand jury investigation into Biden's DOJ, overseen by Judge Aileen Cannon, SDF, and AUSA Sherer who worked

for Biden's DOJ is blocking PETITIONER from making a criminal complaint concerning Sherer's own conduct, so there is no record of PETITIONER's complaint and no investigation into Sherer's own conduct.

On 1/24/26, before the Third Circuit PETITIONER filed a motion to disqualify AUSA Mark Sherer from representing Respondents due to a conflict of interest and ethical violations because Sherer filed briefs contrary to RESPONDENT's own words, he was blocking PETITIONER from making a criminal complaint regarding Sherer's own conduct, he personally responded to a motion to disqualify in district court (APPENDIX O) without referring the motion to the DOJ Office of General Counsel in violation DOJ policy (see U.S. Dep't of Just., Just. Manual § 3-1.140) and violations of federal law by allowing ongoing crimes to be committed against PETITIONER. AUSA Sherer filed a Brief for RESPONDENTS on 2/27/26 simply ignoring the motion to disqualify, in violation of DOJ policy and the rules of appellate procedure.

On 4/1/26 Judges Restrepo, Porter and Montgomery-Reeves denied PETITIONER witness protection and dismissed his appeal 25-3575 (APPENDIX P).

On 4/1/26 Judges Restrepo and Porter denied PETITIONER witness protection, denied the motion to disqualify without having Sherer respond in appeal 26-1067 (APPENDIX Q), in violation of DOJ policy and the rules of appellate procedure, which hides Sherer's conduct from the DOJ Office of General Counsel and also hides Judge Restrepo and Porter's conduct from 2023 as well.

PETITIONER filed a motion to disqualify Judges Restrepo and Porter for ethical violations and conflict of interests. Their 4/1/26 order effectively hid their own conduct from 2023 from the DOJ Office of General Counsel, violated the rules of appellate procedure, violated the DOJ policy pertaining to motions to disqualify a government attorney, allowed ongoing federal crimes to be committed to interfere with this federal case before them (allowing PETITIONER's court mail to be repeatedly interfered with, allowing witnesses to be threatened and harmed and allowing a custody case to proceed unobstructed in local court after it was alleged the custody case was brought to interfere with the federal court case before them). On 4/24/26 the motion to disqualify the judges was sent before a Merits Panel (APPENDIX R).

On 6/11/26 an order was issued by Judges Matey, Montgomery-Reeves and Nygaard affirming the district court's opinion and dismissing PETITIONER's motion to disqualify Judge Restrepo and Judge Porter, in violation of the rules of appellate procedure that requires the Merit Panel to issue a decision before a final order is rendered in the case. The order ignored the fact that ongoing federal crimes are being committed, stated that PETITIONER has a Right to Petition and then stated that federal courts cannot order the DOJ to prosecute someone, which is not relief PETITIONER requested. PETITIONER requested the court to enforce his Right to Petition, which is the Right to speak to the DOJ, have them review evidence, make a criminal complaint and under 18 U.S.C. § 3332(a), refer the compliant to a grand jury or in the

alternative convene a grand jury or assign a special prosecutor.

HISTORY OF THIS CASE

A detailed history of the events that led to this case are reported in US Supreme Court cases, (Givey v DOJ, Case No. 23-7063), (Givey v Givey Case No. 25-6035) and (In re Ryan P. Givey Case No. 25-6881).

FRAUD, WASTE OR ABUSE OF FEDERAL TITLE I FUNDS

PETITIONER is a whistleblower. PETITIONER was employed by a large, urban School District from 2005 to 2019, except for one school year.

PETITIONER attempted to report what he believed to be criminal conduct to the Attorney General's office and FBI concerning his previous employer's technology contracts and both law enforcement agencies repeatedly refused to speak to PETITIONER, review evidence or take a criminal complaint for years, so there is no record.

PETITIONER worked for the Technology Department and as part of his job duties was responsible for approving school technology purchases so PETITIONER had close, personal knowledge of the district's technology contracts and school purchases. PETITIONER has a lot evidence including affidavits, contracts and price lists from his employment.

An Administrator (who previously negotiated the district's \$50 million of technology contracts) claimed he was setup, sabotaged at work and then fired. PETITIONER found the newly negotiated contracts

after his departure, that district had a no bid contract on a \$24 million contract (APPENDIX S-1) the price principals were paying for chromebooks went from about \$173 (APPENDIX S-2) to \$328.07 (APPENDIX S-3), the contracts quadrupled the price principals paid for printers, did not always award the contract to the lowest bidder, over paid money more than what was negotiated in the contracts and required millions of dollars in unnecessary work to be performed. Many of these purchases were federal Title I funds.

PETITIONER also had worked in over 50 schools during his tenure and had access to the teachers' schedules and had personal knowledge that hundreds of people were given jobs where they did little to no work including the Democratic Mayor's best friend (assigned to teach one class a day, where he watched television shows every day for fifty minutes), a convicted child murderer appointed to teach one of the district's top schools (bypassing the State's criminal record check due to his connections) and the former mob boss of Philadelphia's son (who was only assigned six students and taught one class a day for twenty minutes then went home), all while earning a full-time salary and being eligible for a State pension.

PETITIONER even knows of a high school setup primarily to cater to illegal immigrant children costing the district millions of dollars in Title I funds.

PETITIONER's previous employer has a history of allegedly firing whistleblowers, exhibited through news articles and court cases filed against his previous employer.

***FRAUDULENT DIAGNOSIS OF
MENTAL ILLNESS***

In the United States there are three things that prevent the abuse psychiatry: 1) Under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution a citizen cannot be forced into a mental facility without a hearing before a judge that finds them to be a danger to themselves or others; 2) The DSM (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders) is the required criteria utilized in the United States to diagnose mental health conditions; 3) a judge's order for a psychological evaluation must state the scope and conditions of the evaluation (PA CODE RULE 1915.18 (a)) which can be reviewed by an appeals court for compliance with our laws.

Around the same time, PETITIONER and three of his friends were fraudulently declared mentally.

1) In 2014, after PETITIONER was illegally drugged resulting a car accident, A.G. prevented PETITIONER's family from getting him at the hospital and she requested PETITIONER be mentally evaluated, leading to PETITIONER being illegally forced into a mental health facility, for nine days, without a hearing or judicial review, in violations of our laws. It is provable that no hearing took place and PETITIONER's containment in the mental facility was provably illegal.

2) Once in the mental facility PETITIONER was told, by an unidentified doctor, that he had schizoaffective disorder, in less than 24 hours (A.G.'s sworn testimony on 1/3/25 confirms this). Prior to telling PETITIONER he was mentally ill, the unidentified doctor did not speak PETITIONER,

administer any kind of assessment, observe PETITIONER or review his mental health history (and PETITIONER had no prior mental health history to review), contrary to the criteria required to diagnose mental illness in the United States by the DSM, which requires a review of the patient's mental health history, an assessment and a 6-month observation period with the patient experiencing delusions and depressive or manic symptoms for a continuous two weeks. It is provable that the required criteria to diagnose Schizoaffective disorder was not followed and the diagnosis is clearly fraudulent.

3) Judge Royer's January 3, 2025 and May 15, 2025 order for PETITIONER to undergo a psychological evaluation does not comply with our laws under PA CODE RULE 1915.18 (a), which requires the scope and conditions to be articulated in the order and the PA Superior Court illegally dismissed PETITIONER's appeal without reviewing the order for compliance with our laws. Also, Judge Royer only has jurisdiction to issue an emergency custody order under Title 23 Pa Code § 5424 in the event of an emergency necessitated by abuse or mistreatment to the children (See US Supreme Court cases 25-6035 & 25-6881) and there were no allegations of abuse or mistreatment of the children.

Judge Royer issued an order for PETITIONER to undergo a psychological evaluation without proper jurisdiction, the order violated our laws pertaining to orders to undergo a psychological evaluation and the Pa Superior Court illegally dismissed PETITIONER's appeals in anonymous orders, that

were illegally entered into the court's filing system without the signature of the prothonotary.

**MAIL TO PAMELA BONDI, KASH PATEL &
ALINA HABBA**

Sharyl Attkisson⁵, an investigative journalist who reported on Obama's Fast and Furious operation, sued the United States Post Office and the DOJ when she claimed her mail and phone were being tampered with in the same way described by PETITIONER. PETITIONER has found his phone hacked, tampering with his internet search results, phone calls, emails, texts, post office mail and he cannot post on social media. By interfering with Petitioner's phone and mail the DOJ has interfered with Petitioner getting into contact with law enforcement, lawyers, journalists, anyone on social media and printers to print his petitions before the US Supreme Court.

Every attempt for PETITIONER to contact prominent lawyers or journalists has been blocked. For example, PETITIONER can go to journalist William Ecenbarger's website, who reported on the Kid's for Cash scandal, and fill out his contact form but an error occurs and PETITIONER cannot submit the form from his phone, iPad or computer. PETITIONER attempted to create a Minnect account online but PETITIONER's emails were interfered with so he could not create and confirm his online account. PETITIONER downloaded the Minnect app (at which point he was able to confirm his account) and requested a video call with journalist Nick

⁵ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sharyl_Attkisson

Shirley but when PETITIONER attempted to finalize the request, the app, which was just downloaded 4 minutes prior forced an update. The app stated that Nick Shirley confirmed the video call (APPENDIX T-1). According to Minnect's Terms a person is only charged for the call after the call takes place and Shirley confirms that the call took place but PETITIONER was charged before the call (APPENDIX T-2), then Shirley did not appear for the video call (APPENDIX T-3).

In February 2025 PETITIONER had sent via Post Office certified mail, copies of his lawsuit addressed to Patel and Bondi to be delivered to the FBI and DOJ office, in Washington, D. C. that was scheduled to be delivered on Monday February 24, 2025. The packages were not delivered on February 24, 2025.

The post office opens at 9:00 am. At 5:28 am and 5:29 am on February 25, 2025, someone collected PETITIONER's lawsuit addressed to Pamela Bondi (APPENDIX U-1) and Kash Patel (APPENDIX U-2) from the post office so it could not be delivered.

Therefore, someone intercepted delivery of PETITIONER's lawsuits and those packages were not delivered directly to the FBI or the DOJ office.

Those packages that were intercepted at the post office and were not delivered and ended up in the hands of the same Assistant US Attorney, who has been blocking PETITIONER from making a criminal complaint for years and filing motions contrary to the stated agenda of President Trump, Bondi and Patel, who are RESPONDENTS in this case and blocking PETITIONER from making a criminal complaint concerning his own conduct.

When PETITIONER tried to contact Alina Habba in 2024 he was unable to call her law firm (PETITIONER has a video of this), email her or complete forms on her website and his certified post office mail was returned (APPENDIX U-3).

If someone is interfering with Pamela Bondi's, Kash Patel's and Alina Habba's mail it is serious National Security risk and a federal crime.

There is incredible evidence that PETITIONER's phone is being tampered with and his post office mail is being illegally interfered with to hide federal crimes, threaten and harm witnesses and block victims from making a criminal complaint. This is a matter of National Security and an investigation is warranted to determine why agents from the FBI, DOJ and federal and state judges are allowing ongoing crimes to take place.

REASONS FOR GRANTING WRIT

This petition presents evidence of ongoing federal crimes. Federal law enforcement and the courts have violated the rules of the court, violated the rules of appellate procedure and our laws to hide illegal conduct, allow ongoing crimes to continue unobstructed, allowed witnesses to be threatened and harmed, violated the integrity of our courts, undermined criminal investigations currently taking place in other jurisdictions, they have undermined the lawfully elected government and have undermined our democracy. The court should grant this writ to uphold the rule of law, restore integrity to our courts and hold those who have violated our laws accountable. The Court should compel the DOJ via writ of mandamus to take a criminal complaint

and provide witness protection to threatened witnesses or convene a grand jury or assign a special prosecutor to do the same.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

The standard of review by this court is strict scrutiny because PETITIONER's clearly established Constitutional Rights are implicated.

CONCLUSION

The petition for writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Ryan P. Givey

Ryan P. Givey, Pro Se Petitioner

428 Hannum Ave

West Chester, Pa 19380

(610)348-5720

Date: 7/20/26