

26-5854

No.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

FILED

JUL 16 2026

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

In Re King Solomon Sekhemre El Neter PETITIONER
(Your Name)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

(RULE 17)/

IN AID OF ITS ORIGINAL JURISDICTION (RULE 10)
"APPELLATE"

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

28 USCS 1651

King Solomon Sekhemre El Neter
(Your Name)

#1008496 H.D.S.P. P.O. BOX 650
(Address)

INDIAN SPRINGS, NEV. (89070)
(City, State, Zip Code)

N/A
(Phone Number)

CASE PRIMAE
IMPRESSIONIS

(ACTUAL INNOCENCE)

ARTICLE III SUBJECT

MATTER T. 1008496

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

Does the State of Nevada have authorization to charge a resident of Arizona State for a alleged criminal speech uttered in Arizona State absent any reference to a specific person, place, or thing?

If the State of Nevada Omits the details of Interstate Commerce activity following an Unconstitutional Extradition by false allegations of jurisdiction, does a Nevada State Court have authority to adjudicate the matter absent Congress Regulation?

If the State of Nevada creates a fraudulent profile and record to persecute a person, is there a remedy to indemnify the entire record and title?

LIST OF PARTIES

U.S.A, STATE OF ARIZONA, STATE OF NEVADA,
GOVERNOR LOMBARDO, GOVERNOR HOBBS, ATTORNEY
GENERAL AARON D. FORD, WARDEN J. BEAN,
SOLICITOR GENERAL VALERIE YANCEY, U.S.
ATTORNEY GENERAL BLANCHE

RELATED CASES

- 1) U.S.D.C., ARIZONA, U.S.A. V. EL NETER, JUDGMENT: 10/26/23
CR-23-01397
- 2) U.S.D.C., ARIZONA, U.S.A V. EL NETER, JUDGMENT: 4/23/24
CR-24-00599
- 3) U.S.D.C., ARIZONA, EL NETER V. PENZONE, JUDGMENT: 6/5/24
CV-24-00186
- 4) DISTRICT COURT CLARK CO., NEVADA, STATE OF NEVADA V.
EL NETER/"BROOKS", # C-24-380654-1, JUDGMENT: 6/5/24
- 5) U.S.D.C., NEVADA, EL NETER V. OLIVER, JUDGMENT: 11/22/24
CV-24-02139
- 6) U.S. COURT OF APPEALS (9th CIR.), EL NETER V. PENZONE,
26-3392, JUDGMENT: 6/17/26
- 7) U.S.D.C., NEVADA, EL NETER V. WOLFSON, REC.: 5/19/26
CV-26-00831
- 8) U.S.D.C., NEVADA, EL NETER V. NEVADA SUP. CT., REC.: 5/19/26
CV-26-01506

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4/4.1
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	5
CONCLUSION.....	7

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	<i>Fugitive From Justice Habeas Judgment</i>
APPENDIX B	<i>Governor's Warrant (Arizona)</i>
APPENDIX C	<i>Executive Demand (Nevada)</i>
APPENDIX D	<i>Nevada's Void Judgment of Conviction</i>
APPENDIX E	<i>(2 pages)</i>
APPENDIX F	<i>Status of an erroneous attempt to cure...</i>
	<i>(2 pages)</i>
	<i>Docket of in forma pauperis status in related matter</i>
APPENDIX G	<i>Misc. (12 Pages)</i>

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

El Neter v. Wolfson	Pg 4
Shabazz v. Carroll	Pg 4
Waugh v. Curtis	Pg 5
United States v. Fortenberry	Pg 6
Abouammo v. United States	Pg 6
United States v. Kammersell	Pg 6

STATUTES AND RULES

F.R.A.P., Rule 23(a)	Pg 4 § 5
28 USCS 2241	Pg 4 § 5
28 USCS 2242	Pg 4
28 USCS 1251	Pg 6
ART. III	Pg 4 § 5
ART. IV	Pg 4
ART. I	Pg 4 § 6

OTHER

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of habeas corpus issue.

OPINIONS BELOW

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

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

☐ reported at N/A; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix N/A to the petition and is

☐ reported at N/A; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the _____ court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

[] For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was N/A.

☒ No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

[] A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

[] An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. A.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § ~~1251~~ ~~1252~~

28 U.S.C. 1251 (b)(3)

[] For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was _____.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix _____.

[] A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

[] An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. A.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The United States Constitution:

Article III, sec. 2, cl. 3 - "Trial shall be held in the State where the said crimes shall have been committed"

Article IV, sec. 2, cl. 1 - "Privileges and Immunities to the Citizens of each State"

Article IV, sec. 2, cl. 2 - "A person must be charged in a State and have fled from justice to be delivered by demand"

Article I, sec. 8, cl. 3 - "Congress holds the power to regulate commerce among the several states"

Title 28 uscs 1251(b)(3) - "The Supreme Court has original jurisdiction over a State and the citizen of another State or alien"

Title 28 uscs 2241(c)(3) - "The Power to grant a writ when he is in custody in violation of the Constitution"

Federal Rules of App. Pr., Rule 23(a) - "Transfer of custody pending habeas review must be authorized"

STATEMENT OF THE CASE
& RULE 20.4(A) STATEMENT

COURSE OF PROCEEDINGS

1) On or about October 18th, 2023 Steven Wolfson and Robert Turner filed false reports in an application for requisition to usurp the Judicial Power of the U.S. District Court for a remand in USA v. El Neter case # 2:23-cr-01397.

NOTE: (SEE) case # 2:26-cv-00881
El Neter v. Wolfson false
allegations of jurisdiction over a
NON-RESIDENT

2) On or about December 13th, 2023 A Governor's Warrant was produced in case # CR2023004012001 of CCB Maricopa County in Arizona.

3) On January 26th, 2024 the U.S. District Court of Arizona filed the Petitioner's Habeas Corpus challenging the Unconstitutional Extradition.

4) On a date between January 26th, 2024 and February 6th, 2024 an unauthorized transfer (Extradition) was conspired through coercion violating Fed. R. App. P., Rule 23(a) to obstruct justice.

(28 USCS 2241) Petitioner is in custody in violation of the U.S. Constitution's provisions of Article III Jurisdiction (sec. 2), Article IV's Comity and Extradition Clause, and Article I's Commerce Clause (sec. 8, cl. 3)

(28 USCS 2242) The U.S.D.C. of Arizona is not divest jurisdiction, yet it lack's remedial guidance of the exceptional circumstance that requires the Court's discretionary powers for an adequate remedy that cannot be obtained in any other form or court.
Shabazz v. Carroll 814 F.2d 1321, 1324 (9th Cir. 1987)

REASONS FOR NOT MAKING
APPLICATION TO THE DISTRICT COURT
WHERE PETITIONER IS UNLAWFULLY
RESTRAINED (RULE 20.4, a)

The Petitioner attempted to file
a Habeas 224.1 following the
unauthorized transfer of U.S.D.C.
Arizona as a successive petition
in the State of Nevada. In the
absence of a transfer from U.S.D.C.
Arizona Case No. : 2:24-cv-00186, The
U.S.D.C. Nevada Case No. : 2:24-cv-02139
refused to entertain the petition.
The transfer is now deemed untimely
and this exceptional matter requires
the supervisory discretion of the U.S.
Supreme Court.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

TITLE 28 USCS 2241 (C) (3) - HE IS IN CUSTODY
IN VIOLATION OF THE CONSTITUTION

I. INTRODUCTION

The State of Nevada procured a special appearance to coerce trial proceedings for a void judgment by fabricating records of a non-resident in want of jurisdiction. A similar occurrence was challenged through the 1983 action of Waugh v. Curtis, 1993 U.S. App. Lewis 1472. In addition the habeas proceedings prior to the unconstitutional extradition were obstructed in violation of Fed. R. App. P., Rule 23(a) to destroy any adequate remedy of a non-resident's misplacement.

In Waugh v. Curtis of the Ninth Circuit the prosecutors filed requisition documents with a rubber stamp to defraud proceedings. In this matter through El Neter v. Wolfson the certification for requisition is stamped with the date of Sept. 14, 2026 which has not yet occurred, and the content states "a crime committed in Nevada" and "...fled from justice", which contradicts the evidence and testimony of the accuser's "out-of-state" placement.

II. VENUE CLAUSE (ART. III, SEC. 2, CL. 3 / 6TH AM.)

The State of Nevada charges the petitioner with "Making Threats Or Conveying False Information Act Of Terrorism" while in the State of Arizona without any mention of a specific person or place in the State of Nevada. In the matter of...

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

United States v. Fortenberry, 89 F. 4th 702 (9th Cir. 2023) it was decided that the location of a crime must be understood to be the place a statement is made. The U.S. Supreme Court further decided that the location of effects into another State's territory through transmission did not establish jurisdiction for Venue purposes in Abouammo v. United States (June 11th, 2026)

III. COMMERCE CLAUSE (ART. I, SEC. 8, CL. 3)

The "Exculpatory Evidence" of Google's international transmission video call services could not be produced in this case due to Nevada's lack of subject matter jurisdiction in Congress regulation of "Interstate Commerce". In United States v. Kammersell, 196 F. 3d 1137, 1999 U.S. App. Lexis 29818, a threat that was unquestionably transmitted over interstate telephone lines falls within the literal scope of 28 USC 1251 and gives rise to federal jurisdiction.

IV. CONCLUSION STATEMENT

The National Importance of The U.S. Supreme Court's decision in this matter will secure Law and Equity in the "Equal Protection Rights" of citizens in each State and deter the abuse of extradition for malicious agendas to usurp the Judicial Power of the United States Exclusive Subject Matter Jurisdiction.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of habeas corpus should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

King Solomon ⁹⁹⁹ TX
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Date: July 16th, 2026