No. 26-5998

ORIGINAL

FILED
JUL 24 2026
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

KENNETH JOHNSON
JACQUELYN JOHNSON

Petitioners, Pro Se

v.

GEORGIA BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION et. al.,

Respondents,

On Petition for Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit

---

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Kenneth Johnson
2800 Tyndall Drive
Valdosta, Georgia 31602
229.560.5555

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

In *Meyer v. Nebraska*, 262 U.S. 390 (1923) the U.S. Supreme Court held that the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment protects a fundamental liberty interest of parents in the care, custody, and control of their children. In *Santosky v. Kramer*, 455 U.S. 745 (1982) the U.S. Supreme Court held that "The fundamental liberty interest of natural parents in the care custody, and management of their child is protected by the Fourteenth Amendment" and in *Troxel v. Granville,* 530 U.S. 57 (2000) the U.S. Supreme Court explicitly reaffirmed that "the interest of parents in the care, custody, and control of their children—is perhaps the oldest of the fundamental liberty interests recognized by this Court"

The question presented is:

Do parents have a fundamental liberty interest under the Fourteenth Amendment, in a state medical examiner accurately reporting the cause of death for the autopsy they performed on the parents minor child found dead inside the school they attended during school hours?

In 1978, the US Supreme Court found congressional abrogation of eleventh amendment immunity in a fourteenth amendment context. Mr. Justice Stevens, writing for the majority in *Hutto v. Finney*, 437 U.S. 678 at 693-94, recognized that the Act's broad language speaking to "any action or proceeding to enforce . . . [42 U.S.C. § 1983]" literally applied to actions against states.

The questions presented are:

Can a State and agents of the State violate individual protected rights under the Fourteenth Amendment, falsify vital statistics records to cover-up a murder then claim immunity under the Eleventh Amendment?

Does a State lose Eleventh Amendment immunity protections when they violate individual protected rights under the Fourteenth Amendment?

In *Clark v. Clabaugh*, 20 F.3d 1290, 1298 (3d Cir. 1994) the Third Circuit Court of Appeals found that a negligent failure to protect by the State, which includes agencies acting as the arm of the State that are in a position to protect victims from the provisions of the statute is actionable.

The question presented is:

Did the Georgia Bureau of Investigation have a legal duty to the Petitioners to provide them with an accurate cause of death in its' autopsy report used for the death certificate cause of death for their minor son Kendrick and protecting them from the conspiracy between Respondents Lowndes County Georgia and the Lowndes County School District concerning Kendrick being murdered at school, during school hours, in an unsupervised school gymnasium?

In *Earle v. McVeigh*, 91 US 503, L.Ed 398, this Court held that "every person is entitled to an opportunity to be heard in a court of law upon every question involving his rights or interests, before he is affected by any judicial decision on the question."

The questions presented are:

Have the Petitioners been given an opportunity to be heard in a court of law upon every question involving their rights and interests when the District Court dismissed their Complaint two separate times without any Due Process?

Did the Circuit Court of Appeals err dismissing the Petitioners appeal in secret and intentionally holding notification of the secret dismissal until after the period to file an *en banc* request had expired?

In *United States v. Throckmorton*, 98 U.S. 61 (1878), this Court held that "There is no question of the general doctrine that fraud vitiates the most solemn contracts, documents, and even judgments." In *Valley v. Northern Fire & Marine Ins. Co.*, 254 U.S. 348, 41 S. Ct. 116 (1920) this Court held that a "void judgment is a nullity from the beginning", and is attended by none of the consequences of a valid judgment.

The questions presented are:

Are the materially false, fraudulent, and felonious May 31, 2024 and March 2, 2026 Orders and Final Judgment "void" vitiated by the materially false, fraudulent, and felonious Orders and Final Judgments themselves?

Are the materially false, fraudulent, and felonious May 31, 2024 and March 2, 2026 Orders and Final Judgments enforceable?

In *United States v. Sciuto*, 521 F.2d 842, 845 (7th Cir. 1996) the Seventh Circuit states "The right to a tribunal free from bias or prejudice is based, not on section 144, but on the Due Process Clause." In *Levine v. United States*, 362 U.S. 610, 80 S.Ct. 1038 (1960), the Supreme Court ruled and reaffirmed the principle that "justice must satisfy the appearance of justice."

The question presented is:

Has Due Process and the "appearance of justice" been satisfied when a District Court enters multiple materially false, fraudulent, and felonious Orders and Final Judgments dismissing the Petition's Complaint without any due process?

The clean hands doctrine is based on the maxim of equity which states that one "who comes into equity must come with clean hands." This doctrine requires the court to

deny equitable relief to a party who has violated good faith with respect to the subject of the claim.[1]

The question presented is:

Did the District Court err when it provided relief to the Defendants in *Kenneth Johnson et. al., v. Georgia Bureau of Investigation et. al.*, who have unclean hands in the murder cover-up of the Petitioners minor son Kendrick Johnson.

LIST OF PARTIES

1) Kenneth Johnson, Petitioner/Plaintiff
2) Jacquelyn Johnson, Petitioner/Plaintiff
3) Georgia Bureau of Investigation, Respondent/Defendant
4) Lowndes County Georgia, Respondent/Defendant
5) Lowndes County School District, Respondent/Defendant
6) Gray Television, Inc., Respondent/Defendant
7) CNHI, LLC., Respondent/Defendant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED.....i

LIST OF PARTIES.....iii

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....iv

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....v

OPINIONS BELOW.....1

JURISDICTION.....1

---

[1] See *Colby Furniture Co. v. Belinda Overton*, 299 So. 3d 259. See also *Manufacturers' Finance Co. v. McKey*, 294 U.S. 442 (1935), *Keystone Driller Co. v. Gen Excavator Co.*, 290 U.S. 240, 245 (1933)

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS, STATUTE AND REGULATIONS AT ISSUE...3

STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....5

A. Facts Giving Rise To This Case.....5

B. The District Court Proceedings.....6

C. The Appellate Court Proceedings.....6

REASONS WHY CERTIORARI SHOULD BE GRANTED.....8

I. Review Is Warranted Because The Eleventh Circuits Tacit Approval Of The District Court Multiple Frauds Upon The Court Disturbs Longstanding Precedence's From This Court.....7

II. Review Is Warranted Because The District Court Proceedings Violate Petitioners Fifth, Seventh, and Fourteenth Amendments Rights And Are A Blueprint For State Sanctioned Federal Court Approved Murder.....11

III. Review Is Warranted Because This Case Does Not Satisfy The Appearance Of Justice And Disturbs This Courts Longstanding Precedence.....12

IV. Review Is Warranted Because The Petitioners Have Not Been Heard Setting A New Precedence That Disturbs Longstanding Supreme Court Precedence.....12

CONCLUSION.....14

APPENDIX

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Meyer v. Nebraska, 262 U.S. 390 (1923).....i

Santosky v. Kramer, 455 U.S. 745 (1982).....i

Troxel v. Granville, 530 U.S. 57 (2000).....i

Hutto v. Finney, 437 U.S. 678 (1978).....i,12

Clark v. Clabaugh, 20 F.3d 1290, 1298 (3d Cir. 1994).....i,11

Earle v. McVeigh, 91 US 503, L.Ed 398.....ii,13

Valley v. Northern Fire & Marine Ins. Co., 254 U.S. 348, 41 S. Ct. 116 (1920).....ii,13

United States v. Throckmorton, 98 U.S. 61 (1878).....ii,8

United States v. Sciuto, 521 F.2d 842, 845 (7th Cir. 1996).....iii

Levine v. United States, 362 U.S. 610, 80 S.Ct. 1038 (1960).....iii,8,12

Colby Furniture Co. v. Belinda Overton, 299 So. 3d 259.....iii,9

Manufacturers'Finance Co. v. McKey, 294 U.S. 442 (1935).....iii,9

Keystone Driller Co. v. Gen Excavator Co., 290 U.S. 240, 245 (1933).....iii,9

Liteky v. U.S., 114 S.Ct. 1147, 1162 (1994).....8

Statutes

18 U.S. Code § 1001. False Statements, Concealment.....3,10

18 U.S. Code § 2. Principals.....4

18 U.S. Code § 3. Accessory after the fact 4

18 U.S. Code § 4. Misprision of felony.....4,7

18 U.S.C. § 1512. Tampering with evidence.....4

18 U.S. Code § 241. Conspiracy against rights.....5

18 U.S. Code § 242. Deprivation of rights under color of law.....5

United States Constitution

Fifth Amendment.....*passum*

Seventh Amendment.....3,5,11

Fourteenth Amendment.....*passum*

OPINIONS BELOW

The Letter and Entry of the secret Dismissal Order on May 8, 2026 by the Clerk of United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit, docketed on May 20, 2026, in direct contravention to Rule 45(c) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure[1] "clearly absent of all jurisdiction" and not received by the Petitioners until after the 14 day time period to set aside the dismissal had expired is attached in the Appendix hereto, pp 1a-2a.

The memorandum opinion and order of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia of March 2, 2026, granting Respondents' Motion to Dismiss, is reported at *Kenneth Johnson et. al. v. Georgia Bureau of Investigation et. al.,* docket number 1:23-CV-04218 and is attached in the Appendix hereto, pp. 3a-60a.

JURISDICTION

On September 19, 2023, Petitioners initially filed suit against the Respondents in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia pursuant to provisions under the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution codified as 42 U.S.C. § 1985 concerning the murder and cover-up of that murder by local, state, and federal authorities.

On May 31, 2024, District Court Judge Leigh Martin May (now chief district court judge), entered a materially false, fraudulent, and felonious Order and Final Judgment dismissing the Petitioners complaint without any due process, to the benefit of the Respondents and detriment of the Petitioners, effectively joining the conspiracy under the Official Code of Georgia

---

[1] Rule 45(c) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure - Notice of an Order or Judgment. Upon the entry of an order or judgment, the circuit clerk must immediately serve a notice of entry on each party, with a copy of any opinion, and must note the date of service on the docket. https://www.law.cornell.edu/rules/frap/rule_45

Annotated § 16-4-8 which states a person commits the offense of conspiracy when "any one or more of such persons does any overt act to effect the object of the conspiracy."[2]

On June 6, 2024, Petitioners appealed the illegal, unconstitutional, void district court Order and Final Judgment dismissing their complaint without any Due Process to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit.

On February 21, 2025, the Eleventh Circuit reversed Judge May's materially false, fraudulent, and felonious Order and Final Judgment and sent the Petitioners case back to the lower court for the proceedings.

After forcing Judge May to recuse herself from the case for prejudice and bias, the Petitioners case was assigned to District Court Judge Sarah Elisabeth Geraghty.

On March 2, 2026, Judge Geraghty would enter a materially false, fraudulent, and felonious Order and Final Judgment dismissing the Petitioners case for a second time without any due process, to the benefit of the Respondents and detriment of the Petitioners, joining the conspiracy under the Official Code of Georgia Annotated § 16-4-8, an undeniable pattern of judicial behavior "clearly absent of all jurisdiction".

On March 3, 2026 the Petitioners would file notice of Appeal in the matter before this Court, however also filed a new lawsuit against Chief Judge May and Judge Geraghty under the provisions from *Bivens v Six Unknown Narcotics Agents*, 403 U.S. 388 (1972).

On May 8, 2026, the Eleventh Circuit dismissed the Petitioners appeal in a secretly filed Order leaving in tact the materially false, fraudulent, felonious, void, and unenforceable March 2,

---

[2] See https://law.justia.com/codes/georgia/title-16/chapter-4/section16-4-8/.

2026, District Court Order and Final Judgment then providing the Petitioners notice of the dismissal by letter dated May 20, 2026. See App., p. 1.

The jurisdiction of this Court to review the Judgment of the Eleventh Circuit is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS, STATUTE AND REGULATIONS AT ISSUE

Fifth Amendment To The United States Constitution

No person shall "be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law;".

Seventh Amendment To The United States Constitution

In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.

Fourteenth Amendment To The United States Constitution

"No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

18 U.S. Code § 1001. False Statements, Concealment

Whoever falsifies, conceals, or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact; makes any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation; or makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or entry;

Shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 5 years.

18 U.S. Code § 2. Principals

Whoever commits an offense against the United States or aids, abets, counsels, commands, induces or procures its commission, is punishable as a principal.

Whoever willfully causes an act to be done which if directly performed by him or another would be an offense against the United States, is punishable as a principal.

18 U.S. Code § 3. Accessory after the fact

Whoever, knowing that an offense against the United States has been committed, receives, relieves, comforts or assists the offender in order to hinder or prevent his apprehension, trial or punishment, is an accessory after the fact.

18 U.S. Code § 4. Misprision of felony

Whoever, having knowledge of the actual commission of a felony cognizable by a court of the United States, conceals and does not as soon as possible make known the same to some judge or other person in civil or military authority under the United States;

Shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

18 U.S.C. § 1512. Tampering with evidence

Whoever corruptly alters, destroys, mutilates, or conceals a record, document, or other object, or attempts to do so, with the intent to impair the object's integrity or availability for use in an official proceeding; or otherwise obstructs, influences, or impedes any official proceeding, or attempts to do so;

Shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

18 U.S. Code § 241. Conspiracy against rights

If two or more persons conspire to injure, **oppress**, threaten, or intimidate any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same;

They shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both.

18 U.S. Code § 242. Deprivation of rights under color of law

Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States;

Shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

A. Facts Giving Rise To This Case

The core basis of the Fifth Amendment, the right to Due Process, the goals, requirements, and process rules are meant to protect persons from the mistaken or unjustified deprivation of life, liberty, and property. In any matter before a court of competent jurisdiction, a party has a constitutionally protected right to full and fair opportunity which includes a trial by jury under the Seventh Amendment.

The Petitioners are the Plaintiffs in the case before this Court and for more than thirteen years have been adversely affected and denied all constitutionally protected due process rights pertaining to the murder of their minor son Kendrick Johnson and subsequent cover-up of that

murder by the Respondents who are the Defendants. The Petitioners have never been given the opportunity for full and fair litigation as required under the United States Constitution, well-settled case law, and longstanding Supreme Court precedence.

The Petitioners initially filed this case on September 19, 2023 with supporting exhibits which under the federal rules are considered part of the Complaint. The District Court refused to require the Respondents to submit answers to the charges in the Complaint pursuant to Rule 8 and Rule 11 of the F.R.C.P. The District has not disposed of the charges against the Respondents or the undeniable evidence.

B. The District Court Proceedings

The District Court proceedings have been non-existent. The issues in the case now being presented to this Court have never been heard by a jury during a trial. The Respondents have never answered the charges against them.

The proceedings have two materially false, fraudulent, and felonious Orders and Final Judgments entered by Chief District Court Judge Leigh Martin May and District Court Judge Sarah Elisabeth Geraghty defiling the court itself with frauds perpetrated by officers of the court preventing the district court from impartially judging this case when it was before it. See *Travelers Indem. Co. v. Gore*, 761 F.2d 1549, 1551 (11th Cir. 1985).

C. The Appellate Court Proceedings

On June 6, 2024, the Petitioners filed the first notice of appeal from the District Court's May 31, 2024 materially false, fraudulent, and felonious Order and Final Judgment. The Petitioner's also filed a judicial misconduct complaint with the Chief Judge for the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals as well as misconduct review with the Eleventh Circuit Court of

Appeals Judicial Council where no action was taken against District Court Chief Judge May for her misconduct and felonious overt acts effectively providing its' approval for the district court to continue the pattern of illegal activity simultaneously exposing the judicial council members to criminal liability.[3]

On February 21, 2025, the Eleventh Circuit reversed Judge May's materially false, fraudulent, and felonious Order and Final Judgment and sent the Petitioners case back to the lower court for the proceedings.

On March 2, 2026, Judge Geraghty would enter a materially false, fraudulent, and felonious Order and Final Judgment dismissing the Petitioners case for a second time without any due process, to the benefit of the Respondents and detriment of the Petitioners, joining the conspiracy under the Official Code of Georgia Annotated § 16-4-8, an undeniable pattern of judicial behavior "clearly absent of all jurisdiction".

On March 3, 2026, the Petitioners would provide notice of appeal to the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals.

On May 8, 2026, the Eleventh Circuit dismissed the Petitioners appeal in a secretly filed Order leaving in tact the materially false, fraudulent, felonious, void, and unenforceable March 2, 2026, District Court Order and Final Judgment then providing the Petitioners notice of the *exparte communication* filing by letter dated May 20, 2026, not received by the Petitioners until May 23, 2026. See App., p. 1.

---

[3] See 18 U.S. Code § 4 - Misprision of felony - Whoever, having knowledge of the actual commission of a felony cognizable by a court of the United States, conceals and does not as soon as possible make known the same to some judge or other person in civil or military authority under the United States, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

REASONS WHY CERTIORARI SHOULD BE GRANTED

I. Review Is Warranted Because The Eleventh Circuits Tacit Approval Of The District Court Multiple Frauds Upon The Court Disturbs Longstanding Precedence's From This Court.

In *United States v. Throckmorton*, 98 U.S. 61 (1878), this Court held that "There is no question of the general doctrine that fraud vitiates the most solemn contracts, documents, and even judgments."

Federal law requires the automatic disqualification of a Federal judge under certain circumstances. In 1994, the U.S. Supreme Court held that "Disqualification is required if an objective observer would entertain reasonable questions about the judge's impartiality. If a judge's attitude or state of mind leads a detached observer to conclude that a fair and impartial hearing is unlikely, the judge must be disqualified." *Liteky v. U.S.*, 114 S.Ct. 1147, 1162 (1994).

In *Levine v. United States*, 362 U.S. 610, 80 S.Ct. 1038 (1960), the Supreme Court ruled and reaffirmed the principle that "justice must satisfy the appearance of justice."

The Petitioners minor son Kendrick Johnson was murdered in an unsupervised gymnasium where he attended high school.

The high school resource Officer Michael Adams reported Kendrick's face "was severely disfigured and swollen. The only identifying feature to the victim that I observed was the long dreadlocks." See App., pp. 61a-66a

Independent autopsies performed by Forensic Pathologist William Anderson determined Kendrick's death was a result of non-accidental blunt force trauma. See App., pp. 67a-70a

Respondent-Georgia Bureau of Investigation (hereinafter "GBI") Medical Examiner Dr. Kraft intentionally with wanton negligence falsified her autopsy report claiming the Petitioners

minor child had "no significant injuries" and suffocated to death, a scientific impossibility given the material facts and physical evidence. See App., pp. 71a-75a

On or about January 25, 2013, the Valdosta-Lowndes Regional Crime Laboratory (hereinafter "RCL) officially reported that "there appeared to be no signs of blunt force trauma on Johnson's face or body. There appeared to be no visible signs of wounds to Johnson's body." See App., pp. 79a-83a

The materially false, fraudulent, and felonious official reports by the GBI and RCL claiming the Petitioners minor son had no injuries or signs of blunt force trauma when the physical and forensic evidence officials collected clearly show significant injuries and blunt force trauma, demonstrates collaboration between the agencies conspiring to cover-up murder!

In *Manufacturers' Finance Co. V. McKey*, 294 U.S. 442 (1935) and *Keystone Driller Co. V. Gen Excavator Co.*, 290 U.S. 240, 245 (1933) the United States Supreme Court determined that a party who comes into a court of equity must come with "clean hands" and is required to deny equitable relief to a party who has acted inequitably with respect to the subject of the claim.[4]

On May 31, 2024, Chief Judge May entered a materially false, fraudulent, and felonious Order and Final Judgment dismissing the Petitioners complaint without any due process, benefiting the Respondents with "unclean" hands in the matter before the district court.

---

[4] See Clean Hands Doctrine - "The clean hands doctrine is based on the maxim of equity which states that one "who comes into equity must come with clean hands." This doctrine requires the court to deny equitable relief to a party who has violated good faith with respect to the subject of the claim. The purpose of the doctrine, as explained in *Colby Furniture Company, Inc. v. Belinda J. Overton* is to prevent a party from obtaining relief when that party's own wrongful conduct has made it such that granting the relief would be against equity and good conscience.

Judge May's hostility towards the Petitioners are fully exposed as she resorted to inventing claims unsupported by the official record, the most blatant and easily refuted as the claim that the Petitioners had "not alleged that these parties have any agreement or understanding with one another, especially not an agreement to violate Plaintiffs' rights."[5]

The official record directly refutes Judge May's claims as the Petitioners allege and/or infer an agreement between the Respondents numerous times in the complaint, explicitly stating an "agreement between the Defendants to violate a multitude of the Plaintiff's civil rights and federal and state criminal statutes." See *Kenneth Johnson, et al v. GBI*, et al case number: 1:23−cv−04218−LMM (Dkt. 43, ¶ 168)

Judge May's materially false, fraudulent, and felonious Order violate both state[6] and federal[7][8] criminal statutes. In spite of Judge May acting outside the boundaries of the law as reported by the Petitioners[9], neither the Chief Judge for the Eleventh Circuit or the Eleventh Circuit Judicial Council[10] would hold Judge May accountable, effectively providing approval for the overt acts and emboldening her and Judge Geraghty to continue to violate the law further depriving the Petitioners of their constitutionally protected rights.

---

[5] See *Kenneth Johnson, et al v. GBI*, et al case number: 1:23−cv−04218−LMM (Dkt. 102, p. 13)
[6] See Georgia Code §16-10-20.1(a) makes it unlawful to alter, conceal, cover-up, or create a document and file, enter, or record in a public record or court of this state or of the United States knowing or having reason to believe the document has been altered or contains materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent information.
[7] See Title 18 U.S.C. § 1001 prohibits knowingly and willfully making false or fraudulent statements, or concealing information, in "any matter within the jurisdiction" of the federal government of the United States, even by mere denial.
[8] See Title 18 U.S. Code § 1018 prohibits "a public officer or other person authorized by any law of the United States to make or give a certificate or other writing, knowingly makes and delivers as true such a certificate or writing, containing any statement which he knows to be false"
[9] See App., pp. 76a-77a
[10] See App., p. 78a

On March 2, 2026, Judge Geraghty entered a materially false, fraudulent, and felonious Order and Final Judgment dismissing the Petitioners case for a second time without any due process, to the benefit of the Respondents and detriment of the Petitioners, joining the conspiracy under the Official Code of Georgia Annotated § 16-4-8, an undeniable pattern of judicial behavior "clearly absent of all jurisdiction".

II. Review Is Warranted Because The District Court Proceedings Violate Petitioners Fifth, Seventh, and Fourteenth Amendments Rights And Are A Blueprint For State Sanctioned Federal Court Approved Murder.

The core precept of the Fifth Amendment is the right to due process. It ensures the government must respect all legal rights owed to a person. It guarantees fairness in both the application of the law and the legal procedures used.

The Seventh Amendment of the U.S. Constitution guarantees the right to a jury trial in federal civil cases and protects jury verdicts from being overturned by judges.

Ratified in 1868, the Fourteenth Amendment is a cornerstone of the U.S. Constitution. Its core precepts guarantees citizenship, due process, equal protection, and federal enforcement codified as 42 U.S.C §1983 - Deprivation of Rights, 42 U.S.C §1985 - Conspiracy to Interfere with Rights, and 42 U.S.C §1986 - Neglect to Protect Rights, implicitly abrogating the states' eleventh amendment immunity. A negligent failure to protect by the State, which includes agencies acting as the arm of the State that are in a position to protect victims from the provisions of the statute is actionable.[11] The statute creates a legal duty!

The purpose and intent of the Congress was to provide a mechanism for redress for victims of State governments, often one and the same as the Ku Klux Klan, practiced policy was

---

[11] See *Clark v. Clabaugh*, 20 F.3d 1290, 1298 (3d Cir. 1994) (finding that negligence is sufficient to maintain § 1986 claim).

to deprive, interfere with, and conspire against African Americans Due Process of law and to deny African Americans equal protection under the law. In spite of the Fourteenth Amendment ratified by the States, and the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1871, the practiced policy by the State of Georgia, including the federal courts in Georgia, was and continues to be, to deny African American's Due Process of law and equal protection under the law.

The United States Supreme Court precedence concerning the Fourteenth Amendment individual rights abrogates Eleventh Amendment state sovereign immunity for violating "any" individual protected rights is not ambiguous.

In 1978, the US Supreme Court found congressional abrogation of eleventh amendment immunity in a fourteenth amendment context. Mr. Justice Stevens, writing for the majority in *Hutto v. Finney*, 437 U.S. at 693-94, recognized that the Act's broad language speaking to "any action or proceeding to enforce . . . [42 U.S.C. § 1983]" literally applied to actions against states.

The materially false, fraudulent, and felonious May 31, 2024 Order and Final Judgment of the District Court, the March 2, 2026 materially false, fraudulent, and felonious Order and Final Judgment of the District Court, the failure of the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals and Judicial Council to uphold the U.S. Constitution and longstanding precedence of this Court, are a blueprint for the state sanctioned murder of the Petitioners minor son Kendrick where all a State has to do is classify a murder as accidental then deny the parents any and all of the aforementioned constitutionally protected rights.

This practice cannot be allowed to stand and not only is review warranted, under this Court's own standards and precedence's, review is mandated!

III. Review Is Warranted Because This Case Does Not Satisfy The Appearance Of Justice And Disturbs This Courts Longstanding Precedence.

The materially false, fraudulent, and felonious May 31, 2024 Order and Final Judgment and the March 2, 2026 materially false, fraudulent, and felonious Order and Final Judgment from the District Court does not meet the U.S. Supreme Court standard of having the "appearance of justice"[12] nor were the counterfeit proceedings a representation of full and fair opportunity to litigate, but instead equate to the antithesis of the appearance of justice[13], equity, and fair play!

Physical evidence collected by the Lowndes County Sheriff's Office and the Valdosta-Lowndes Crime Laboratory conclusively show the Petitioners minor son Kendrick was murdered yet the official reports from these agencies as well as autopsy reports by Respondent-GBI do not reflect the material facts, physical and forensic evidence.

On these grounds alone, review is warranted.

IV. Review Is Warranted Because The Petitioners Have Not Been Heard Setting A New Precedence That Disturbs Longstanding Supreme Court Precedence.

In *Earle v. McVeigh*, 91 US 503, L.Ed 398, this Court held that "every person is entitled to an opportunity to be heard in a court of law upon every question involving his rights or interests, before he is affected by any judicial decision on the question."

In the case before this Court, the letter and entry of the secret dismissal order on May 8, 2026 by the Clerk of United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit, not docketed on May 20, 2026 (See Appendix pp 1a-2a.), directly violates Rule 45(c) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure which requires circuit clerk to immediately serve a notice of entry on each party, with a copy of any opinion, and must note the date of service on the docket.

---

[12] See *Offutt v. United States*, 348 U.S. 11 (1954).
[13] See *Levine v. United States*, 362 U.S. 610, 80 S.Ct. 1038 (1960)

The circuit clerk's actions "clearly absent of all jurisdiction", runs afoul of this Court's findings in *Earle v. McVeigh*, that due notice to an affected party is strictly essential for a court to have the jurisdiction to issue a binding judgment. Any judicial decision or action that affects an individual's rights or property without affording them this notice and opportunity to be heard is absolutely void.

This Court further held that a void judgment is a nullity from the beginning, and is attended by none of the consequences of a valid judgment even before reversal. See *Valley v. Northern Fire & Marine Ins. Co.*, 254 U.S. 348, 41 S. Ct. 116 (1920)

On these grounds review is warranted.

CONCLUSION

Edmund Burke once said that the only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good people to do nothing.

The material facts, physical and forensic evidences in the case before this Court are irrefutable and undeniable. They clearly reveal violations of the Fifth, Seventh, and Fourteenth Amendments.

The proceedings or lack thereof in both lower courts expose a great deception and collusion involving at least two United States District Court Judges joining a conspiracy and using their official capacity as federal judges to assist Respondent-GBI, Respondent-Lowndes County, and Respondent-Lowndes County School District in covering up the murder of Kendrick Johnson and avoid justice.

Based on the foregoing, the Petitioners respectfully submit that this Petition for Writ of Certiorari should be granted.

The Petitioners respectfully requests this Court vacate the Final Order and Judgments in *Kenneth Johnson et. al. v. Georgia Bureau of Investigation et. al.,* docket number 1:23-CV-04218 based on the foregoing.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5 September, 2026

/s/ Kenneth Johnson
Kenneth Johnson

/s/ Jacquelyn Johnson
Jacquelyn Johnson
2800 Tyndall Drive
Valdosta, Georgia 31602
229.560.5555
Mikekjjohnson48@yahoo.com

CamScanner