26-516

ORIGINAL

FILED
MAY 04 2026
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

No. 25A864

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ARTHUR LOPEZ – PETITIONER

vs.

UNITED STATES – RESPONDENTS

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

United States Court of Appeals for

the Federal Circuit

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

ARTHUR LOPEZ P.O. Box 13081

Newport Beach, CA 92658 949.278.7793

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. Should Defendant United States be liable for Takings Violations as provided by the United States Constitution Fifth Amendment having methodically and repeatedly taken plaintiff Arthur Lopez's property without Just Compensation?

2. Should Federal Judges within the U.S. Court of Federal Claims and U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit be held to uphold United States 28 U.S. Code § 455 and United States Code of Conduct For Federal Judges to ensure Unbiased Judges are seated on the Bench for Criminal and Civil Case Litigation?

3. Should Political Activist Judges Be Precluded from Executing Their Bias in Case Litigation?

LIST OF PARTIES

[X] All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

Arthur Lopez v. United States of America (U.S. Ct. A.F.C. 2025-2047)

*Takings Violations Under The 5th Amendment of the United States Constitution cases require the United States of America as the only Defendant.

RELATED CASES

U.S. Court of Appeal For The Federal Circuit

Case # 24-1860 [Derived From U.S. Court of Federal Claims Case # 23-cv-00620-SSS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INDEX TO APPENDICES

(c) Leadership Conference – June 2019

(d) Alliance For Justice – Sept. 2017

(e) Yale Daily News Articles – November 2024

(f) Teneo Network – "About" – February 2025

(g) ProPublica.org – March 2023

(h) United States Senate Committee for the Judiciary Questionnaire – 2019 - Judge Ryan Holte

(i) U.S. Court of Federal Claims – Judge Ryan Holte Bio

(j) Newsweek News Release Pentagon Clandestine Operatives – 2021

(k) Leadership Conference Correspondence of February 25, 2020 related to U.S. Court of Federal Claims Judge

Stephen Schwartz's political actions, bias, extreme right-wing activities, Federalist Society and articles from Yale Daily News 2005.

APPENDIX D – U.S. Air Force Department of Defense Civilian Agent Christopher Covarrubias Los Angeles Sheriff Dept Arrest Correspondence for Physical Assault on Female (5/12/2023, 5/26/2023) and Declaration of Christopher Covarrubias Superior Court of CA, L.A. County

APPENDIX E – U.S. Marine Corp Colonel Tipton +Civilian Spouse Julie Tipton attending July 17, 2015 ceremony @ Camp Pendleton (Plaintiff's son's Birthday 7/17) She was posted @ Plaintiff's Church-Preschool as Principal

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Bias Judge:

Parental Rights/Takings

In the Supreme Court of the United States

Petition for Writ of Certiorari

Petitioner respectfully prays that for writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

Opinions below

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

[ ] is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix B to the petition and is

[ ] is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was December 10th, 2025.

[ ] No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

[ ] An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including May 9, 2026 on March 10, 2026 in Application No. 25A864.

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

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY

PROVISIONS INVOLVED

- United States Constitution Civil Rights including 5th, 1th, 7th and 14th Amendments
- Tucker Act of 1887, Title 28 U.S.C. § 1491(a)
- US Title 28 USC 455
- Title U.S. 28 USC 144 and 28 USC 47
- U.S. Code of Conduct for Federal Judges
- Canon 1–5
- California Code of Civil Procedure (Tolling Authority) - CCP
- CCP § 352(a)

INTRODUCTION/ STATEMENT OF FACTS

This Petition derives from the defendant United States deliberate repeated taking violations under the 5th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

Plaintiff-Petitioner has been a target for these taking schemes for many years and specifically in this instance the defendant has executed a taking plaintiff's $500,000,000.00 (Five Hundred Million Dollars Net after taxes plus royalties) property asset related estate claims associated with this real estate property, also known as 11540 Hoxie Dr, Tustin, CA 92782.

Moreover plaintiff property asset related to his claims against MUFG Union Bank, NA including

Royalties due for Their Theft of Trade Secrets, were taken by the defendant's premeditated schemes involving several layers of agents including Civilian staff of the Airforce Department of Defense - Christopher Covarrubias, Civilian staff from the U.S. Marine Corp (Camp Pendleton - Colonel Tipton spouse - Julie Tipton, and Civilian staff from the U.S. Navy (Tom Norris included) and Civilian staff from the U.S. Postal Service (tampering - obstructing Mail delivery to U.S. Courts) Civilian staff from the Pentagon - Homeland Security, and Much More over several years time.

In fact, defendant United States was not satisfied with taking without just compensation his properties related to his private residence but, also schemed and executed the taking of his

Biblical named, two sons and two gifted daughters, which ongoing now for over 10 years. Along the way they orchestrated the taking of Plaintiff's Multi-Million Dollar Auto Supreme Financing Business.

Moreover, this petition will disclose how civilians within the defendant's Congress even omitted a Civil Cause of Action statute for the Theft of Trade Secrets by foreign entities but instead only providing a Criminal cause of action statute, Title 18 USC § 1832.

In addition, this petition also discloses how the U.S.D.O.J. has been complicit in these taking violations and how the judiciary has also participated by these orchestrated taking violations in assigning bias judicial officers-judges to plaintiff's civil lawsuit cases relief resulting in no possible avenue for equal protection under law and all the while, the defendant United States labels these takings without just compensation as legal which in itself also satisfies a prerequisite relief for taking violations under the Tucker Act 5th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

To begin, the first abuse of discretion in this matter from the trial court involve the assignment of this case to a judicial officer who at minimum presented the appearance of a conflict of interest which plaintiff brought to the trial court's review by Request for Reassignment of the case to different judicial officer.

Excerpt of said motion follow these for clarity of the severe appearance of a bias under which plaintiff could not receive a fair trial and in violation of 28 U.S.C. §455(a)(b).

The judicial officer is Judge Ryan Holte.

The Court erred in denied request for transfer of case to a different judge.

The request was brought for transfer of case / disqualification of Judge Ryan Holte for overwhelming good cause, abundant evidence, and pursuant to several Federal statutes/codes. First, Title 28 U.S.C.A. § 455(a). "Disqualification of Justice, Judge, or Magistrate Judge" states: "Any justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall disqualify himself (herself) in any proceeding in which his (her) impartiality might reasonably be questioned."

In this case, this United States Code alone is sufficient to have Judge Ryan Holte disqualified given his enormous ties with the Defendant – United States – Military. Not only with the U.S. Air Force, having been employed as a law clerk in 2006, but also, Partner - General Counsel – Co-

Inventor for United States Military - (Army included)

Contractor - Counter Echo Solutions (See Appendix C) from 2012 through present according to the United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary Questionnaire, completed by Judge Holte as part of his appointment/nomination processes as, see Appendix C- (h), recent as 2019. Moreover, it is conceivable that financial benefits may have been (or ever continue) derived by Judge Holte as a result of the Patent, See Appendix C, Registered Counter Echo Solutions as its application may be for Military Defense since. It is described as a form of countering incoming projectiles to summarize. (See Appendix C). In any regard, even without some form of royalty arrangement, Judge Holte acknowledges being employed/partner with Counter Echo Solutions and the contractor describes itself under the "About" link on their webpage as a U.S. Military partner in providing a variety of advanced technology solutions. Furthermore, given this case specifically involves U.S. Military Civilian Staff Takings Claims Plaintiff is of a strong opinion that Judge Holte's impartiality is definitely and reasonably questionable and as such is subject to disqualification pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. 455(a). Moreover, 28 U.S.C.A. 455(b) goes on to state: "He [She] shall also disqualify himself in the following circumstances:

(1.) Where he has a personal bias or prejudice concerning a party, or personal knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts concerning the proceeding;

(2.) Where in private practice he served as lawyer... has been a material witness concerning it; See Appx C (h)(i)

(3) Where he has served in governmental employment and in such capacity participated... concerning the proceeding... concerning the merits of the particular case in controversy;

(4) He knows that he, individually, or as a fiduciary... has a financial interest in the subject matter in controversy or in a party to the proceeding, or any other interest that could be substantially affected by the outcome of the proceeding;

(5) He or his spouse, … "A judge should inform himself about his personal and fiduciary financial interests, and make a reasonable effort to inform himself about the personal financial interests of his spouse and minor children residing in his household."

Given these additional disqualifying criteria under 28 USC 455(b) and Judge Holte's long association with defendant U.S.-Military, to wit:

i.) employment with U.S. Air Force;

ii.) Co-Inventor – Contractor/Partner of U.S. Military weaponry technology;

iii.) financial interest in party – U.S be it the patented weapon system sale to U.S. as Partner-Counsel of U.S. Contractor "Counter Echo Solutions" or derivatives from such, see appendix

C, C-(h), C-(i), (Patent adjusted Expiration through 8/31/2034 -US20170115397A1, Patent No. US 9,523,773 B2, US 10,338,226 B2, US 10,564,286 B2, US 11,067,696 B2, US 11,762,099 B2), or (iv) In Private Practices as General Counsel for U.S. Contractor "Counter Echo Solutions," Association with U.S. lawyers in transfer/sales of patented weapon system(s) to defendant U.S. processes, and/or such lawyer (judge) has been material witness concerning matter in controversy (i.e. U.S. signal jamming technology), or v.) has served in governmental employment as counsel, adviser or material witness concerning proceeding (any stage of litigation matters) or expressed an (see appendix C) opinion concerning the merits (i.e. U.S. signal jamming technology for instance) of the case in controversy (see appendix C) or (vi.) Judge Holte knowing he individually, or as a fiduciary (i.e. possibly Trustee of Will or Family Trust), or his spouse or child has a financial interest in party - defendant U.S. or in the subject matter, in controversy, or any other interest that could be substantially affected by outcome of the proceeding (ie issues pertaining to signal jamming technology).

More then, it would be beyond Plaintiff's reach to gather all the associations Judge Holte has engaged in with defendant U.S. -Military, but given the undisputable facts related to Judge Holte's role as Counsel, Inventor, Partner Advisor, Patent beneficiary in U.S. Military Weaponry Technology, U.S. employee (including U.S. Air Force and as Partner of U.S. Contractor

– Exclusivity even Patent Expiration of 2036), and possibly even Royalties still being derived; it is abundantly clear that United States Title 28 U.S.C.A.§ 455 provides overwhelming authority for (Recusal)

The Disqualification of Judicial Officer Ryan Holte – Judge given this case specifically involves Takings Claims related to the U.S. – Air Force, Marines, Navy, and Their Civilian Staff and more. Accordingly, Plaintiff's request for Judge Holte's recusal/disqualification pursuant to 28 USC § 455 should have been granted.

Next, the United States Code of Conduct for Judges states:

- Canon 1: "A judge should uphold the integrity and independence of the judiciary"

- Canon 2: "A judge should avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in all activities"
- Canon 3: "A judge should perform the duties of the office fairly, impartially and diligently"
- Canon 5: "A judge should refrain from political activity (compliance with the Code of Conduct)

Despite these basic directives it appears Judge Holte has remained with at least two political organizations for many years:

1.) The Federalist Society (Executive Committee of its Intellectual Property Practice Group)

2.) Teneo Network (alliance defending freedom – deemed "hate" group – founded). See appendix C, C-(a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g).

In the association with the Federalist Society, some of their parameters that can be understood in conflict with the Code of Conduct pertain to its political activism. For instance, the organization is known for and boasts of its influence over certain politicians and their selection of (political nominees) based on political biases traits. This conflicts with Canon #2 at best giving the appearance of impropriety and diminishing public confidence.

Moreover, Judge Holte has held an Exec. Committee of its Intellectual Property Practice Group role @ the Federalist Society with ongoing website presence for advertisement of appearances to include the prestige of the U.S. Court of Federal Claims as a banner title (fedsoc.org) – Washington Hilton November 16, 2024 (Canon 2(B)). In itself this Exec. Committee role promoting law may be viewed as harmless, however, the fact the organization itself is promoting biased activism politically with Judge Holte's full knowledge, at minimum dilutes Equal Protection under law as guaranteed by the United States Constitution, Fourteenth Amendment, especially since the Federalist Society is not merely advocating opposition to the persecution of lawyers and judges.

See "Canon 5 - A Judge Should Refrain from Political Activity" (A) General Prohibitions.

A judge should not:

(1) act as a leader or hold any office in a Political Organization; See appendix C-(e).

(2) make speeches for a political organization…

The Federalist Society hosts political events; in April 1982, it held its first event: a referendum entitled "A

Symposium on Federalism: Legal And Political Ramifications"

Since then, the political evolution of this organization has included former executive vice president and current co-chairman, Leonard Leo, advisor to certain politicians, at times, to pick nominees for said politician(s).

Given these facts, without consideration to the benefits of the nominee selections for politicians, The Federalist Society, regardless of their mission statement(s) publicly released, can and should be accepted as a political activism organization. As such, Judge Holte's close associations at multiple levels is in conflict with Canon 5 and cause for disqualification / recusal from this case.

As to Teneo Network, founded by Alliance Defending Freedom deemed a "Hate group" by The Southern Poverty Law Center – See Appendix C-(d).

Moreover, the Chairman is also Leonard Leo (propublica.org – posts 3/9/23 5 page; See Appendix C-(g), article on the Radical Activism Organization and its Chairman). Consequently, similar to the first Judge Holte's association with The Federalist Society, the same bias, prejudices and violations of Canon Rules under the Code of Conduct for United States Judges are applicable here and as such another substantial ground for Judge Holte's Recusal / Disqualification from this Case, accordingly Plaintiff's Motion / Request should have been granted. Third, See Constitutional Statutory Provision 28 U.S.C.A. § 144 "Bias or Prejudice of Judge" states: "Whenever a party to any proceeding in a district court makes and files a timely and sufficient affidavit that the judge before whom the matter is pending has a personal bias or prejudice either against him [her] or in favor of any adverse party, such judge shall proceed no further there in, that another judge shall be assigned to hear such proceeding...

Despite how straight forward this Federal statute reads on the subject of a United States Judge, it references the District Court not a U.S. Federal Claims Court, thus may be argued as not applicable to Judge Holte. However, the statute specifically references Bias or prejudice which is relevant to the facts pertaining to this Motion and case and to Judge Holte's violations of U.S. Code of Conduct For Judges and Title 28 USCA 455 and as such does serve to reinforce the significance of upholding the U.S.

Constitutional Rights of Plaintiff-Litigants provided by the Fourteenth Amendment as cited by the U.S. Supreme Court in numerous case citation precedents including: Ward v. Village of Monroeville, 409 U.S. 57 (1972)

Moreover, this case involves Takings Claims under the U.S. Constitution, Fifth Amendment involving defendant United States Civilian Staff – Pentagon, see appendix C-(j), deployed undercover domestic civilian operatives and schemes by which the Takings are accomplished.

Which also involve signal jamming technology just as Judge Holte has consulted-advised, see appendix C, defendant United States for many years, even securing patents related to such. In fact, Judge Holte also acted as General Counsel-Advisor-Witness, see Appendix C-(h), during these discussions with lawyers representing defendant United States pertaining to matters involved in this case.

With this backdrop and all of the conflicts Judge Holte's involvement in this case triggers under 28 USCA §455 and the U.S. Code of Conduct for Judges and all of the precedent the Supreme Court of the United States has unambiguously articulated in Ward v. Village of Monroeville, 409 U.S. 57 (1972) and many others,Plaintiff's Motion for Judge Holte's Recusal/Disqualification should have been granted. Plaintiff also requested reassignment of this case to a different judge pursuant to U.S. Court of Federal Claims Rule 40.1.

In addition, Plaintiff requested the court take Judicial Notice of Pending Appeal Case (#24-1860) with the United States Court of Appeals For The Federal Circuit which derives from the USCFC Case

#23-CV-0620 – Stephen Schwartz judge and involved Chief Justice Elaine D. Kaplan, see Appendix C –(k), who denied the Transfer of Case to a New Judge and Reconsideration on 9/11/23. See appendix C-(k).

Therefore, Given Chief Justice Elaine S. Kaplan remained as the designated Judicial Officer to review Transfer of Case Requests/Motions under Rule 40.1 and Title 28 U.S.C.A. § 455 was also applicable for this case related to its Transfer and with a previous related case (albeit indirectly), Rule 40.2 The transfer of case from Chief Judge Kaplan for the requested transfer was also submitted in the Motion given impartiality may be reasonably questioned (455(a)) since the first case 23-0620 involved similar Takings Claims issues as in this case. In addition, maintaining Public Confidence in the impartiality of the court/judiciary (Canon 2(A)) warrants a

New/alternative Chief Judge having been assigned for these aspects as well. In fact, Title 28 U.S.C. § 47 specifically provides the Disqualification of judge to hear Appeal from the decision of a case OR issue Tried by him (HER).

Hence with all due respect due to Judge Ryan Holte and Chief Judge Elaine Kaplan Plaintiff Humbly Petitions For Writ of Certiorari from This Supreme Court for Relief Reversing the lower court's Abuse of discretion Rulings and grant Plaintiff/Petitioner Judgment for damages prayed of $500,000,000.00 Net after Taxes plus Royalties and the immediate Reunification of Plaintiff and his children (minor 14 yr. old Luke).

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

In Fact, the United States Supreme Court has held in Ward v. Village of Monroeville, 409 U.S. 57 (1972):

"Petitioner was denied a trial before a disinterested and impartial judicial officer as guaranteed by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment where he was compelled to stand trial for traffic offenses before the mayor who was responsible for village finances and whose court, through fines, forfeitures, costs and fees, provided a substantial portion of village funds, Tumey v. Ohio, 273 U.S. 510 (1927).

A statutory provision for the disqualification of interested or biased judges did not accord petitioner sufficient safeguard and it is of no constitutional relevance that petitioner could later be tried de novo in another court, as he was entitled to an impartial judge in the first instance. P. 409 U.S. 59-62. Moreover, the U.S. Court of Federal Claims held in Demodulation Inc. v. United States, 114 Fed. Cl. 655 (No. 11-236C) February 10th, 2014: "That judge's recusal for appearance of partiality warranted vacatur of substantive orders." Also, "Thus, the safest course is to vacate Judge Braden's substantive orders because Justice Must Satisfy the Appearance of Justice."

ASSIGNING BIAS JUDICIAL OFFICERS

TO PLAINTIFF'S CASE(S) PRESENTS A SERIOUS QUESTION OF LAW AND INFRINGEMENT ON 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHTS TO EQUAL PROTECTION UNDER LAWS AND DUE PROCESS

This Petition involves the recurring practice of the Trial Courts assigning bias judicial officers to Plaintiff's cases which presents a serious "Question of Law" since Plaintiff is guaranteed Equal Protection under Law by the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution and having a bias presiding judge (or even perceived bias judge) deprives this 14th Amendment right/protection.

Moreover, United States 28 U.S. Code §455 states:

"(a) Any justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall disqualify himself in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned.

(b) He shall also disqualify himself in the following circumstances:

(1) where he has a personal bias or prejudice concerning a party, or personal knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts concerning the proceeding;

(2) Where in private practice, he served... concerning the matter, or the judge or such lawyer has been a material witness concerning it;

(3) where he has served in governmental employment... concerning the proceeding... of the particular case in controversy; Moreover, In This

Court of Federal Claims, in another instant case, Presiding Judge Stephen Schwartz had advocated, see Appendix C-(k), supported, argued and presented opinions on matters related to the case repeatedly related to Anti-Immigration (DACA) and Social Security Benefits/Welfare Benefits and all benefit spending as harmful. See Brewer v. Arizona Dream Act Coalition, Supreme Court Docket No. 16-1180, (U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Cir. Case #15-15307). See Appendix C-(k)."

In another instance, Petitioner was compelled to bring the following matter to this United States Supreme Court following the U.S. Court of Federal Claims Chief Judge Elaine D. Kaplan's June 15, 2023 denial of Plaintiff's Request for Reassignment of Case from Presiding Judge Stephen S. Schwartz due to his bias in favor of defendant United States and bias in favor of:

1. Anti-Immigration causes against children immigrants and in support of deporting adults who entered the United States as children (DACA), Appellant is a U.S. Citizen whose mother immigrated from Mexico as a minor.

2. In addition, Judge Schwartz has clearly expressed his bias in favor of Anti-Social Security cause(s), stating: "Social Security is better left to the private sphere" and conveyed arguments in opposition to vital federal benefit programs.

He's advocated: "All human beings are morally equal in certain respects, but inequality of means and resources is a natural aspect of human condition."

He also advocated: "There is a powerful case to be made that all government spending on social security, welfare, medical insurance and the like is harmful... Social spending programs—including but not limited to Social Security and federal benefits, Medical Benefits—are not the solution, but part of the problem." (Stephen Schwartz, The Yale Herald Opinion, February 18, 2005), See Appendix C-(k).

Moreover, Appellant is permanently disabled following falls in December 22, 2015, and October 22, 2020 after suffering traumatic injuries that included temporary paralysis and several permanent spine compressions, cervical stenosis and various other spine permanent injuries.

As a consequence to these serious permanent disabilities Appellant is not employed, under care of several medical doctors and consulted-evaluated by

Spine Specialist Surgeon Samuel Bederman, Surgeon Ankers.

Moreover, as of December of 2022 Appellant was granted Social Security Disability Benefits – $1250 initially and increased to $1360 as of January 1st, 2026, but remains indigent.

In addition, to U.S. Court of Federal Claims Chief Judge Elaine D. Kaplan's denial of Transfer of Case of June 15, 2023, she also denied Appellant's Request for Reconsideration on 9/11/2023 and furthermore, barred any further filings for the case (#23-0620C).

II – Takings Violations under the V Amendment of U.S. Constitution

In addition, in this Case,

The U. S´s attacks involved the Taking of Plaintiff's asset/property related interest in $500,000,000 net after taxes plus royalties, relief case and Taking of His Children for better than 10 years.

This Petition stems from one of latest attack against Plaintiff by United States Takings violations see United States Supreme Court Precedence in: United States v. Dickinson, 331 U.S. 754 (1947) where they stated: "When dealing with a problem which arises under such diverse circumstances, procedural rigidities should be avoided. All that we are here holding is that, when the Government chooses not to condemn land but to bring about a taking by a continuing process of physical events, the owner is not required to resort either to piecemeal or to premature litigation to ascertain the just compensation for what is really 'taken'."

also stated after citing: Peabody v. United States, 231 U.S. 530, 539

"Of course, payment need not only be made for what is taken, but for all that the Government takes. It must pay. When it takes property by flooding, it takes the land which it permanently floods as well as that which inevitably washes away as a result of that flooding."

The defendant United States has engaged endless number of Civilian Asset Resources to Take Plaintiff's property but also to Take any and all means of obtaining Relief for these Takings violations.

These include Civilian Resources from the United States Pentagon, Civilian Division of the United States Air Force National Defense Department including Christopher Covarrubias, civilian staff of the United States Postal Service, U.S. Treasury, civilian staff with the United States Courts

Judiciary, civilian spouse of United States Marine Corp. Colonel Tipton– Julie Tipton, even involving civilian staff of the U.S. Congress to exclude Civil Cause of Action for Theft of Trade Secrets by (18 USC 1831/32) Foreign Entities like Banking Conglomerate Japanese Mitsubishi UFJ (MUFG Union Bank, N.A.).

Moreover, the United States has also recruited civilian resources from outside the U.S. to target Plaintiff in these Takings schemes.

However, domestically clandestine Pentagon assets have been relentless in these processes for many years to prolong the damage to Plaintiff. See Appendix C-(j).

Plaintiff's minor children have also been taken by these concerted Takings schemes carried out by the United States.

Unfortunately, U.S. Dept. of Defense civilian (USAF) Christopher Covarrubias has conspired to alienate Petitioner's children for over eight years to facilitate the sponsoring of these Takings Violations, utilizing associates to likes of Plaintiff's Children's Mother — Cheryl Lopez, brother-in-laws Robert Valdez and Paul Figueroa.

He has used others who are staffed at Superior and Appellate Courts as administrative staff to hamper custody matters in Family Law Court in Orange and also derail cases in Civil Unlimited Litigation where Petitioner is Plaintiff.

In fact, a first cousin of brother-in-law Robert Valdez is employed at Fresno County Superior Court (Soledad Echeagaray).

In addition, two Family Law Court staff members were also subjects of Civil Restraining Orders Petitioner had petitioned under Superior Court of CA, Co. of Orange Case #30-2022-01260365 and 30-2022-01260360 (Perla Elias and Kristal Gorospe respectively).

Furthermore, Petitioner has been targeted by other U.S. staff associates in intentional harm and physical assault on 10/7/2023 which was reported to local police — Costa Mesa Police Dept. Case #23-014764 and 23-014765 (Hit & Run and Physical Assault Report respectively), the driver's name James Stanfield while the passenger, who committed the assault, remains unnamed Costa Mesa Police Department detectives.

Moreover, Petitioner continues to be harassed and obstructed by way of cell/data remote interference to stifle ongoing litigation and meeting court-imposed deadlines for filings.

In fact, the physical assault on October 7, 2023, involved extensive damage to cell phone Petitioner was holding in his right hand before assailants strike to Petitioner's hand/wrist/arm. Additionally, on August 24, 2023, Petitioner was targeted in another hit and run incident involving a U.S. Post Office white truck on the same day an Opening Brief was due to the Court of Appeals on the matter against this Covarrubias Brother-In-Law Robert Valdez. The incident was reported to Santa Ana Police — Case #2023-19348.

Please note Taylor v. United States, 959 F.3d 1081 (Fed. Cir. 2020) involving a Takings Claim where plaintiffs alleged the U.S. government unlawfully seized property...

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, stating: "We noted that the complaint involved the Takings Clause and sought remedy under that clause, and we concluded:

'That the complaint suggests the United States may have acted tortiously towards the Appellant does not remove it from the jurisdiction of the Court of Federal Claims' id at 1353. We explained that, even if the complaint's tort characterization made the complaint a 'multipurpose' one, the multipurpose nature of the complaint did not deprive the Court of Federal Claims of jurisdiction to entertain the Takings Claim alleged therein' id. 1354. In so ruling, we applied to a tort-Taking overlap the dual wrong rationale of Del Rio Drilling Programs, Inc. v. United States, 146 F.3d 1358, 1363-64 (Fed. Cir. 1998), and Rith Energy, Inc. v. United States, 247 F.3d 1355, 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2001). That precedent applies to this case."

Next, in this Case, Plaintiff has certainly stated sufficient facts to state a claim for which this Court has jurisdiction under the Takings Clause of the United States Constitution's Fifth Amendment:

a.) Value of Property Asset related to Plaintiff's Case against MUFG Union Bank, N.A. et al. $500,000,000.00 (Five Hundred Million Dollars Net after taxes plus royalties) which was compromised by defendants orchestrated purposeful continuous Takings Violations/Schemes with full empowerment of the defendant's organized agents/agencies including Department of Justice, Defense, U.S. Courts Administration, Law Enforcement, Judicial Branches including Homeland (David Maggard Jr) Security, U.S. Marshals and U.S. Post Office, without just compensation.

b.) Value of Property/Asset/Personal Property Ongoing of Rights through Takings (10 years) Violations/Schemes related to Plaintiff's Children (Child)

Please see United States Supreme Court holding in Armstrong v. United States, 364 U.S. 40 (June 27, 1960): "Where terms of contract between contractor and the United States showed conclusively that contractor and not the United States, had title to boat hulls under construction when materialmen furnished materials to contractor, liens of materialmen could attach to boat hulls under construction and manufacturing materials, and that liens gave materialmen compensable property interests."

Just as in this case where Plaintiff is the sole beneficiary/Plaintiff/Owner of the various Takings Violations Cases involved/targeted by Defendant U.S. including Plaintiff's Children. It should also be noted that the Supreme Court of the United States has deemed children a property solely belonging to parents as Parental Right [14th Amend] as has the State of California deemed children property of parents (Shea v. Shea).

See:

Michaell H. v. Gerald D., 491 U.S. 110 (1989)

Darlington v. Turner, 202 U.S. 195 (May 14, 1906)

Astrue v. Capato, ex rel BNC, 566 U.S. 541 (2012)

MLB v. SLJ, 519 U.S. 102 (1996)

Pierce v. Commonwealth of Mass., 321 U.S. 158 (1944) and California Forum State Shea v. Shea, 100 Cal. App. 2d 60 (Oct. 23, 1950)

"Parental Right" CA adopted harsh rule that the right of a fit and proper parent to have custody of his child is in the nature of a Property Right and best interests of child!

See also, Shea v. Shea, 100 Cal. App. 2d 60, (October 23rd, 1950), California Court of Appeal, First District, Division One The Appellate Court holding: "... The right of a fit and proper parent to have custody of his child is in the nature of a Property Right and Paramount to the Welfare and Best Interests of the Child." also, "California has, in effect, adopted the harsh rule that the right of a fit and proper parent to have the custody of his child is somewhat in the nature of a Property Right" And, Astrue v. Capato ex rel. BNC, 566 U.S. 541 (May 21, 2012) and, M.L.B. v. S.L.J., 519 U.S. 102 (Dec 16th, 1996) The Supreme Court holding: Choices about marriage, family life, and upbringing of children are among associational rights ranked as of basic importance in our society, rights sheltered by 14th Amendment against State's unwarranted usurpation, disregard or disrespect.

And, Prince v. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 321 U.S. 158 (January 31st, 1944) And in Meyer v. Nebraska, 262 U.S. 390, And, Darlington v. Turner, 202 U.S. 195 (May 14, 1906) Supreme Court Holding:

And, Guardianship of Joaquin, 168 Cal.App.2d 99First Appellate District, Division Two (February 18th, 1959) The Appellate Court holding: "A fit parent is not to be deprived of his child's custody because he may be unable to furnish the child a home with him; he still has the right to custody..."

The Defendant United States has spared no expense @ Taking Plaintiff's Properties and then attempting to cover it up. The Plaintiff is U.S. born Mexican Heritage, Catholic Christian-Male Heterosexual Father of Four (2 Boys with Biblical names given to them by Plaintiff and Two Daughters), Disabled and 59 years old, receiving Social Security Disability Benefits as the only means of support financially monthly.

Plaintiff's private Residence @ 11540 Hoxie. Tustin, California 92782 (Now with an estimated value of $5 million dollars) provided for the financial basis for the launching of his solely owned auto finance company "Liberty Credit Corp." after a 20 yr. career with his previous employer (founded by Judaism Heritage Canadian Family) based out of So. Ca. came to an abrupt end in 2007 and which also operated in the subprime auto lending industry. In fact, Plaintiff's business was established directly one floor level below the Social Security Field Office in Santa Ana, California in 2009 (at the time this fact seemed insignificant).

However, in retrospect defendant United States was already engaged in their Takings scheme upon Plaintiff from the very onset.

Plaintiff's Home and Business Banking Relationship had been Union Bank of California – later renamed to MUFG Union Bank, N.A., et al as the parent company based out of Tokyo, Japan Mitsubishi UFJ. Then came the F.B.I. probe and U.S. Department of Justice investigation against the bank, culminating in a Multi-Million Dollar fine related to Money Laundering violations. Then came new banking relationship with H.S.B.C. Bank Plaintiff and his family developed as he attempted to grow his business from its very successful launch. But then again came the FBI and the U.S. Department of Justice, with another probe-investigation and multi-million dollar fine to the extent of placing former FBI Director on board of directors.

Then came the establishment of MUFG Union Bank, N.A's Headquarters-Offices in New York City, New York and their Reneging on Financing Expansion of Lines of Credit as promised when they demanded Plaintiff's Business Plan with Confidential Trade secrets related to his Sub-prime Auto Finance Business at the onset.

Then U.S. Trustee pushed Plaintiff's Home into foreclosure by confiscating $53,000 Promissory Note, which represented more than enough to cover Mortgage Arrearage and then Plaintiff learned the U.S. Congress omitted Civil Cause of Action under the "Theft of Trade Secrets" Statute 18 USC §§ 1831/32 preventing Plaintiff from obtaining Relief for MUFG Union Bank, N.A. implementing Plaintiff's Trade Secrets into their Retail Banking Operations in the United States without authorization, through the U.S. District Court. Then, Plaintiff learned U.S. Airforce Dept. of National Defense agent Christopher Covarrubias and two brothers-in-law associates also targeted Plaintiff to also take his Children and Child Mothers to further prevent Plaintiff from obtaining Relief through Civil

Action against MUFG Union Bank, N.A. and derail his case(s).

Next Came the United States Postal Service Civilians creating unnecessary delays in mail delivery so as to cause/facilitate the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals to derail Appeal case(s). In one instance, the U.S. Postal Service took a week to deliver correspondence from Orange County California to San Francisco California, so as to allow the Court to Dismiss Plaintiff's Case.

Then Came The United States Marshall Service who provides security for the Supreme Court and screens incoming mail and who have repeatedly destroyed Plaintiff's filings with the Supreme Court. These Schemes are ongoing!

It should also be noted that the Supreme Court of the United States has also ruled certain rights related to custody and child of parents as Property Rights, see Darlington v. Turner, 202 U.S. 195 (May 14, 1906), holding: and, also, Astrue v. Capato ex rel. BNC, 566 U.S. 541 (May 21, 2012), Also, M.L.B. v. S.L.J., 519 U.S. 102 (Dec 16, 1996) holding: choices about marriage, family life and upbringing of children, are among associational rights ranked as of basic importance in our society, rights sheltered by the 14th Amendment... and also, Prince v. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 321 U.S. 158 (January 31, 1944) holding: "It is cardinal with us that the custody, care and nurture of the child reside first in the parents..."

In addition, Plaintiff clearly stated Takings claims against defendant U.S. pertaining to the taking of Plaintiff's children (4) for over 11 years now through intentional takings schemes involving many United

States Civilian moving, clandestine parties and associates.

These also include Marine; Colonel Tipton Civilian Spouse Julie Tipton, Air Force Dept of Defense Agent Civilian Christopher Covarrubias and Navy (Civilian) associates the likes of Tom Norris and many more.

The value of these Takings Violations exceed the Relief sought through this action case. Moreover, U.S. Pentagon also complicit as to the ongoing U.S. covert action in this regard.

Also, numerous state and federal Appellate Courts have held child-children as property right of parents – see former State of California Appellate Court, First District Division One Holding in "Shea v. Shea",100 Cal. App. 2d 60 (October 23, 1950) "California has in effect adopted the harsh rule that the right of a fit and proper parent to have the custody of his child is in the nature of a property right and paramount to the welfare and best interest of the Child."

Moreover, Plaintiff's Takings Claims are not Time Barred for an abundance of Tolling Authorities (see Table of Authorities attached) including the uncertainty doctrine

"Delayed Accrual" – see this Court's ruling in Yuriy Prakhin v. United States, No. 14-924L (July 29, 2015) 122 Fed. Cl. 483 holding: "Homeowner stated facially plausible claim that the justifiable uncertainty doctrine delayed accrual of his Takings Claim such that dismissal on limitations ground was not warranted."

Just as in this case, Plaintiff discovered U.S. Air Force Dept of Defense Civilian Agent Christopher

Covarrubias' direct involvement in these Takings Claims, not until 2023 (possibly April 12th, 2023) and the associate Cheryl Lopez, Crash landing of a Red Air #203 Originating in Prostitution Haven (including under the age of 18 prostitution) Dominican Republic, occurred June 21st, 2022 – Miami Int'l Airport. These monumental events helped connect the U.S. various participants. Moreover, the alternative 2nd Claims did not prove fruitless and the extent of the U.S. Takings Damage crystalized until October 2nd, 2023. Furthermore, these events are actual facts (evidence) and not implausible but very much plausible. Plaintiff's Arthur Lopez has been repeatedly persecuted by Defendant relentlessly to take his family including four children, so as to profit, self-enrich unjustly, and sponsor Takings Schemes and utilize Plaintiff's children and mother (Cheryl Lopez).

The defendant has utilized whatever resources it deems necessary including staff of Air Force jets to promote these Takings Violations. Coast to Coast California to Florida and beyond.

This case involves civilian Dept of Defense U.S. Air Force agent Christopher Covarrubias and his brother-in-law including Paul Figueroa and Robert Valdez, who resides only three miles away from his "brothel for" home 1863 East 69nd Street, Los Angeles, CA 90001, and Valdez's 40 yr. residence in a decrepit 500 sq. ft. apartment is located @6117 Woodward (Street/Avenue), Apt. G, Maywood, CA 90270, while Figueroa's residence is 11761 Adelle, Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670.

They have colluded with Air Force Dept of Defense Civilian Resources to utilize Cheryl Lopez as part of this elaborate Takings Scheme. See Christopher's declaration filed with the Superior Court, County of Los Angeles, see appendix D.

And also, Los Angeles Sheriff Department arrest correspondence. These demonstrate the extent to which Department of Defense agents would go to cover up Takings Scheme. First the assault on his former spouse Dominique Valdez when caught with associate at their home.

Then, his declaration which misrepresents the facts of his assault (Paragraph 10) and also uses as pretext the cause for his actions his dismay for his spouse not having a job as she was getting an education. This language is precisely the pretext used by Plaintiff's children's mother Cheryl Lopez conveyed to Newport

Beach Police Officers November 2015 as cause for her dismay and catalyst for the altercation that resulted with Plaintiff (for which he was exonerated of any wrongdoing).

These parallel events are a direct link between Covarrubias, Dept. of Defense and Cheryl Lopez and Robert Valdez/Paul Figueroa and Plaintiff Arthur Lopez as a Target for the Takings Violations related to his Children by Defendant U.S.A. – By breaking Plaintiff's Family Unit, they could utilize Cheryl Lopez to alienate Plaintiff and his children ongoing for over ten years now.

Also, in First English Evangelical Lutheran Church of Glendale v. County of Los Angeles, California, 482 U.S. 304 (June 9, 1987), holding:

1) Claim that earlier California Supreme Court decision had improperly held that just compensation

clause did not require compensation as remedy for temporary regulatory 'takings') was properly presented; 2) Under just compensation clause, where government has taken property by land use regulation, landowner may recover damages for taking before it is finally determined that regulation constitutes a 'taking' of his property."

Also, see Lucas v. So. Carolina Coastal Council, 505 U.S. 1003 (June 29, 1992), holding: "Since government regulation required compensation unless certain background principles prohibited use as landowner intended..."

See Attached Parental Rights Precedence Points of Authority.

Ongoing Interference w/ Due Process Plaintiff has uncovered and conveyed to Appellate Court and the Trial Court very significant "Conflict of Interest", standard operating procedures within the Trial Court, United States Court of Federal Claims.

These conflicts not only exist within the intake clerk of court department which has in the past lost/deleted new court filings from Plaintiff (related to the Howard Supv), but also the repeated occurrence of assigning bias judicial officers to Plaintiff's cases, such as in strong political activists against Social Security Benefits – Judge Stephen Schwartz (Member of Federalist Society whose founder provided guidance to political figures & former Vice President of Federalist Society Chapter in School); and Judge Ryan Holte, not only with strong ties with Defendant – Military as Contractor Counter-Echo Solutions (Partner-Counsel) but also remained with at least two political organizations for many years:

1.) The Federalist Society (Exec. Committee of its Intellectual Property Practice Group)

2.) Teneo Network (Deemed Hate Group – founded Alliance Defending Freedom)

Judge Holte who also worked as a law clerk for the Trial Court Judge in this case, SR Judge Loren Smith. These indisputable facts are all basis for disqualification of a judicial officer under Federal Law, Title 28 U.S.C. § 455 and the United States Code of Conduct for Judges Canon 1-5.

In fact, Canon 2 states: "Judge should avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in all activities."

As such, even SR Trial Court Judge Loren Smith actions on February 28th, 2025 would at best appear an act of impropriety given his quick dismissal order

(USCFC 23-1742) on the same day Plaintiff's Motion to Transfer Case (due to Judge Ryan Holte's conflicts of interest under 28 U.S.C. § 455) given he was her former law clerk. This apparent retaliatory act also negated Plaintiff's request for leave to amend complaint to possibly add legal theories, facts, claims...

See U.S. Supreme Court holding in Foman v. Davis, 371 U.S. 178 (1962), "Leave to Amend should be freely given..."

These facts also present abundant good cause to have denied Defendant's Motion To Brush This Case Under The Rug for summary affirmance.

See, Eli Lilly Pharmaceuticals, et al. v. United States, 378 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2004)

We have specifically held that Tucker Act jurisdiction existed over a complaint that asserted a Taking Claim notwithstanding that the complaint also characterized the same government conduct as tortious.

See Complete Points - Table of Authorities.

In this case clear claims involving U.S. divisions such as Pentagon operatives, Homeland Security agents, Department of Defense executing Takings Violations without just compensation are included in the Initial Complaint and furthermore the Trial Court failed to permit Plaintiff to Amend Complaint (Rule 15, Fed. Rule of Civil Procedure), Foman v. Davis, 371 U.S. 178 (1962). It should also be noted that the trial court was made aware of Plaintiff's Motion To Transfer Case (Disqualify Judge Ryan Holte) on Active Case 25-145 on February 28th, 2025. On the same day the

Trial Court dismissed Case 23-1742 by Order of Senior Judge Loren A. Smith, for whom Judge Ryan Holte interned 2008-2009.

Moreover, it is conceivable that as Senior Judge Loren A. Smith may also have been tasked with transfer case decisioning.

In any event Plaintiff also filed a Motion To Transfer Case 23-0620. From Judge Stephen Schwartz for bias and the denial of said motion was cited as a basis for the ensuing Appeal Case to Appellate court under Case # 24-1860 which has proceeded to the United States Supreme Court, for which remains unfinalized.

For these facts related to Defendant USA's Takings violations, Plaintiff remains firm on the facts that supports serious conflict of interest and bias pertaining to Judge Ryan Holte (Stephen Schwartz) which warranted them being recused from Plaintiff's cases. As such, these facts make clear the necessity to have this case petition for Writ of Certiorari granted; Plaintiff reiterates his request for Relief as prayed.

Next, the United States Constitution, Fifth Amendment does not in any way exclude minor children as property of parent, father or mother for that matter, nor does it provide a definition for property. Moreover, children are generally legally and morally the property of their parents at the very least through the age of 18. Even pets and slaves (when it was permitted) were regarded as property.

It's considered normal for adults/parents to dictate to their children what they should believe, what they should wear and how they should act. Pierce v.

Society of Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary. 268 U.S. 510 (1925)

In fact, the Supreme Court of the United States held in Troxel v. Granville, 530 U.S. 57 (2000). Also, in Trimble v. Gordon, 430 U.S. 762 (1977).

Also, in Stevenson's Heirs v. Sullivant, 18 U.S. 207 (1820). Moreover, in M.L.B. v. S.L.J., 519 U.S. 102 (1996) "the interest of parents in their relationship with their children is sufficiently fundamental to come within the finite class of liberty interests protected by the Fourteenth Amendment."

Also, in Lassiter v. Department of Social Services of Durham City, 452 U.S. 18 (1981), the Court characterized the parent's interest as "commanding", indeed far more precious than any Property Right." 455 U.S. at 774.

Furthermore, none of these Taking's violations could go on without full knowledge of the United States Pentagon and Homeland security/FBI as matters related to unconstitutional acts have been ongoing for some time with numerous participants and reported by plaintiff.

These schemes of "Takings" by the U.S. is not new since the Bowman Act of 1883, ch. 116, 22 Stat. 485 addressed similar schemes of "Takings".

In fact, throughout more recent events the U.S. has been involved in several military conflicts one way or another, including Ukraine and Middle East Nations.

Plaintiff and his children are Catholic Christians with well documented religious events for which the defendant has sought to utilize without just compensation.

Therefore, the Truth is Plaintiff has very valid Takings claims under the 5th Amend. of the U.S. Constitution which is money mandating.

Violations by these / this defendant does not invalidate Plaintiff's Takings claims. Neither do the defendant's Tort violations.

UNITED STATES TOLLING AUTHORITIES

Court of Federal Claims ruling in Yuriy Prakhin v. United States, Defendant, 122 Fed. Cl. 483, July 29, 2015 - No. 14-924L; Holding: "The Court of Federal Claims, Braden, J. held that homeowner stated facially plausible claim that the justifiable uncertainty doctrine delayed accrual of his Takings claim, such that dismissal on limitations ground was not warranted."

Also see California's Supreme Court holding in: Fox Brandi v. Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc., 35 Cal. 4th 797 (May 9th, 2005), No. S121173 (and citing Norgart v. Upjohn Co., 21 Cal. 4th 383 (1999)

Ruling:

"(1) We conclude that, under the delayed discovery rule, a cause of action accrues and the statute of limitations begins to run when the plaintiff has reason to suspect an injury and some wrongful cause, unless the plaintiff pleads and proves that a reasonable investigation at that time would not have revealed a factual basis for that particular cause of action, in that case, the statute of limitations for that cause will be tolled until such time as a reasonable investigation would have revealed its factual basis."

Also see attached Table of Authorities and Memorandum In Support.

Just as in this present matter defendant's Takings scheme ongoing carried out in a clandestine created justifiable uncertainty for delayed accrual and suspension of the limitations period.

Firstly, further authority for tolling of the statute of limitations is the Continuing Violations Doctrine and Alternative 2nd Claims Doctrine, see United

States Supreme Court ruling in Amtrak v. Morgan, 536 U.S. 101 (June 2002) which held:

"A Title VII plaintiff raising claims of discrete discriminatory or retaliatory acts must file his charge within the appropriate 180- or 300-day period, but a charge alleging a hostile work environment will not be time barred if all acts constituting the claim are part of the same unlawful practice and at least one act falls within the filing period; in neither instance is a court precluded from applying equitable doctrines that may toll or limit the time period." pp. 108-122. Just as in this present case, the defendant has continuously targeted Plaintiff for Takings schemes whereby all Plaintiff's property - assets, family, money, etc. has been taken by defendant over many years time in clandestine to avoid accountability and just compensation to Plaintiff.

Hence Continuing Violation Doctrine justifiably tolls the limitations period and where at least one Takings act well falls within the 6 yr filing period, having been discovered in 2023.

Also see California Supreme Court holding in Richards v. CH2M Hill, Inc. (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 801 (and Table of Authorities and Memorandum attached).

The Supreme Court concluded: '... we must determine the scope of the "Continuing Violations Doctrine." That doctrine, described at greater length below, allows liability for unlawful employer conduct occurring outside the statute of limitations if it is sufficiently connected to unlawful conduct within the limitations period. Precisely as in this present case, the defendant has continuously carried out Takings Violations against Plaintiff so as to shield associate(s). Moreover, the defendant continues to carry out these schemes to this day, recently two Hit + Run Events against Plaintiff 8/24/2023 and 10/7/2023 (Reported to Santa Ana Police and Costa Mesa Police respectively), the first involving Defendant - US Mail carrier and also Defendant U.S. staff.

See Appendix D & E (Covarrubias- LA Sheriff Dept. arrest reports and Declaration).

Furthermore, US Marine Corp Colonel Tipton's, see Appendix E, (civilian spouse Julie Tipton having been posted @ Plaintiff's Church Parish School —2018— as Principal) to preclude Plaintiff from worshipping/attending mass; following his children being revoked from attending school by breach of contract.

All of which detail further takings schemes by the defendant.

Moreover, Plaintiff cited sound tolling authority such as Equitable Tolling – Continuing Violations / Tolling Doctrines, Alternative (2nd) Claims Doctrine, etc.; See ruling in Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009), holding: "Whereby a Court should accept the facts pleaded in the complaint as true..."

Furthermore, Plaintiff has backed up the facts stated in the complaint with evidence having provided reference to letters to the U.S. Dept. of Justice, names of former Marines, Navy and Air Force agents/civilian, specific events held @ Camp Pendleton, in support of claims related to Takings

Violations, reports to the F.C.C., local LA Sheriff, local police, prostitution rings, taking Violations-Schemes as the mechanism propelling in Takings schemes by the United States-associates/staff etc., videos and more, all of which surpasses plausible standard established by Bell Atlantic v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544 (2007),

Furthermore, alienating Plaintiff's four children by those schemes also constitutes an illegal exaction by the defendant under the Takings Clause of the U.S. Constitution 5th Amendment.

So-called Illegal Exactions or unlawful Exactions are an amorphous category of government activities with two unifying characteristics:

(1) the government act in its sovereign capacity but beyond its authority, and (ie.following reference to letters to the U.S. Dept. of Justice – then

being revoked from attending school by breach of contract.)

(2) its action enriches the Government at a person's or organization expense;

In this case Plaintiff as a person, has also been sole shareholder and founder of an auto finance company "Liberty Credit Corp" which has also been forced out of operation by the defendant's schemes of "Takings" violations; all the while, the defendant has been financially enriched, by these unconstitutional Takings schemes to the detriment of Plaintiff immeasurably. See the attached points of authority and memorandums in support. To be abundantly, clear the defendant has attempted to avoid accountability for their Takings scheme by operating in clandestine, and disguising their covert operations as lawful which in itself satisfies a Takings claim prerequisite

Relief, is sought for these Takings Violations by U.S. Civilian, State affiliate and civilian U.S. Air Force, Marine Navy associates of Department of Defense who have had a hand in these Taking schemes must be held accountable by this court for the Takings Violations without just Compensation as provided by the 5th Amendment.

Also a continuance of this grave charade would be to the detriment of Plaintiff and his children, see Exhibit "C-J" which further supports the widespread origin covert programs being carried out clandestinely just as Plaintiff has described for many years without knowledge of previous reports being issued on.

Furthermore, given the civilian branches signature reduction of the defendant have been involved By High Command, above Colonel, certain.

United States high command regulations – Pentagon Dept being executed is also addressed by U.S. Supreme Court precedent such as in "Horne v. Department of Agriculture, 576 U.S. 350 (June 22, 2015)"

Holding:

1) Regulatory reserve requirement was a physical "taking".
2) Failure to pay plaintiff (Drowers) violated the Fifth Amendment "Takings Clause".
3) Retention of contingent interest in portion (of raising) value did not negate government's duty to pay just compensation.

4) Mandate to reserve raisins as condition to engage in the market, was a per se Taking.

Moreover, in the present case worsening interference/prolonging Taking Violations include defendant U.S.A. enlisting additional allies of foreign governments in Israel, Ukraine, Philippines, Japan, South Korea, United Kingdom, etc.; in fact, even representatives have been afforded impunity in these assaults upon plaintiff.

These domestic and foreign entities include publicly traded enterprises and their staff assisting defendant in these Taking schemes by way of obstruction, delays, severe efforts to compromise deadlines and due process, as such exceptions to res judicata by precedent established by the United States Supreme Court in Taylor v. Sturgell U.S. 880 (2008).

Also see United States Supreme Court holding in Knick v. Township of Scott, Pennsylvania, et al., 139 S. Ct. 2162, No. 17-647 (June 21, 2019), property owner has an actionable Fifth Amendment Takings claim when government takes his property without paying for it and therefore may bring his claim in federal court under §1983; at that time overruling Williamson County Regional Planning Comm'n v. Hamilton Bank of Johnson City, 473 U.S. 172,105 S. Ct. 3108, 87 L. Ed. 2d 126.aking.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Petition Should Be Granted To Uphold United States Constitutional Civil Rights including 5th and 14th Amendments – Takings Clause and Equal Protection – Due Process Under Law, respectively.

Moreover, petition should be granted to maintain neutral judicial officers on the bench for not only criminal but also civil litigation cases as provided by 28 U.S. Code § 455 and United States Code of Conduct for Federal Judges.

In addition, independence of the judicial branch must be ensured and protected by preventing individuals from manipulating the judge selection/nomination processes.

Lastly, plaintiff is due just compensation for defendants Takings Violations, and the

Reunification of Plaintiff and his 14 years son must be permitted without any delay.

Petitioner seeks relief for Monetary Damages of $500,000,000.00 (Five Hundred Million Dollars Net after Taxes) plus royalties equivalent to those due for theft of trade secrets and also seeks immediate reunification with minor child Luke Jesus and restoration of parental rights taken.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 7, 2026