

ROBERTA HILL <rbhill67@comcast.net>

11/14/2022 4:35 AM

File for Clayton R. Higgins, Jr. to review as to why he ILLEGALLY rejected and returned Certiorari Petition, voicemail box is full cannot leave messages

To PMcCabe@supremecourt.gov <pmccabe@supremecourt.gov> •
swatson@supremecourt.gov <swatson@supremecourt.gov> •
ktershel@supremecourt.gov <ktershel@supremecourt.gov> •
swoessner@supremecourt.gov <swoessner@supremecourt.gov> •
pio@supremecourt.gov <pio@supremecourt.gov> Copy Lin Wood <lwood@linwoodlaw.com> •
Lin Wood <lwood@fightback.law> • stanleybolten@justiceforuswgo.nl <stanleybolten@justiceforuswgo.nl>

Entitled: File for Clayton R. Higgins, Jr. to review as to why he ILLEGALLY rejected and returned Certiorari Petition, voicemail box is full cannot leave messages

Note: Brian requests that his arguments over voicemail with five voicemail recordings be reviewed as well as the sixth recording made in another voicemail box. Clayton Higgins voicemail box was full so my son had to phone call 202-379-3020 to leave the sixth legal argument voicemail as to why his petition was illegally returned to him under an erroneous decision. Brian would like to return the box back to you as return to sender or that you reimburse the expenses or send us a label to return the mailed filings which were compliant when they were first received, so that you can admit your mistake and file the petition and other pleadings in the box as you cited no other rule issues here except one which the rule itself doesn't match the allegation of rule non-compliance. Stanley Bolten was angry at my son's mailing box being returned and I don't think Attorney Lin Wood is happy about this either. Two articles had to be written by Stanley about your Clerk mistakenly returning Brian's filings when they were correct at Brian wasting \$20 postage to get it where by UPS shipping. Brian wants to send them back today or tomorrow and hopes that you will accept them and not return them again or penalize him for a non-existent rule issue. Article 1: A POPULAR TELEGRAM CHANNEL boosts visits to article on the U.S. Supreme Court illegally blocking Brian's filings regarding Attorney L. Lin Wood's claims alleging a blackmail scheme of child rape and murder, and the other article about being blocked by a rule over a "final order" when an interlocutory appeal does not have to be over a final order. Article 2: U.S. SUPREME COURT ATTEMPTING TO BLOCK FILING of Emergency Application asking BLACKMAILED Chief Justice John Roberts to recuse himself and Certiorari Petition for denied motions asking for Special Master to review over blackmail videos alleged by Attorney L. Lin Wood, child rape and murder blackmail

Clayton R. Higgins, Jr.,

Brian David Hill is getting tired of the mind games being played here. He wants to mail them back, even if he has to return to sender because he cannot afford to keep sending off these expensive mailings when you might make an excuse to send them back again illegally, and Brian wants you to accept his valid filings and not play the mind games others in the legal system have played. It was wrong for you to return them only so that my son has to mail them

back again at his expense for an error on your part. This email is necessary and don't just complain about it, as you did illegally return his filings to Brian instead of filing them for an excuse which the rules do not even meet this excuse. This court has accepted decisions from the federal appeals of interlocutory appeals from the U.S. Courts of Appeals. Your asking for orders which are already in the very appendix you claimed the "final order" was not in. Those are the only orders which exist and the appendix had no deficiencies. You missed page 21 of the Joint Appendix. Two of the orders which the U.S. Court of Appeals mentioned in it's order and opinion, are text orders and that was in page 21. The other order referenced in the order from the Fourth Circuit was also in the appendix under page 6.

I am attaching the letter as to why you have illegally rejected my son's petition, and he will not sit there and play letter tag when he broke no rules with his Writ of Certiorari petition, there was no deficiency under Rule 14.1(i), and Rule 14.1(i) has no limitation in it's language to only "final orders". That rule mentions orders, opinions, and pretty much the documents and transcripts needed to point to the very orders being challenged on appeal. All of them were in my son's joint appendix.

Clayton Higgins needs to REVIEW OVER THE ENTIRE APPENDIX before coming to the conclusion that there was a Rule 14.1(i) deficiency.

File: "writ-certiorari-11-7-2022.pdf" - Is what was rejected where at page 46 of the electronic PDF file was the Joint Appendix which you assumed had a Rule 14.1(i) deficiency. Read over what Brian stated over the voicemail and you will find that everything was in order.

File: "uswgo_20221112_220626ocr.pdf" - Letter from Clayton Higgins as to why the filings were not filed and were rejected.

You owe it to us for your mistake, to accept this email to review over what you unlawfully rejected, and costed my son to waste \$20 of his SSI disability money over a wrongful allegation of a deficiency which does not exist. There are no other orders or opinions than what was in the appendix. Your asking him to comply with appending something that does not exist when this is consolidated interlocutory appeals, a pending 2255 case. So interlocutory orders, are the so-called orders. The final order of the Fourth Circuit was in the appendix. This court is supposed to accept filings appealing directly from a decision in the U.S. Court of Appeals, that is the statutory law. If a decision wasn't right, it is supposed to be appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court.

You likely didn't read all of the papers and quickly returned the petition. I am copying and pasting from his appendix what was filed so that you understand that Rule 14.1(i) was complied with.

Judgment/Order in a Criminal/Civil Case of
The United States District Court for
The Middle District of North Carolina
entered March 2nd, 2022..... 6

TEXT Judgment/Order in a Criminal/Civil Case of
The United States District Court for
The Middle District of North Carolina

NOTE: Docket sheet printout of TEXT ORDER with highlight)
entered April 21st, 2022..... 21

Two orders are on page 21, and you missed it assuming that there was a missing order. Only one order was highlighted because Brian was focusing on that one order, as the word limits would be violated if Brian focused on three orders in his petition for rehearing, and Brian would be forced to file a motion for leave of court to exceed word limit or focus on only two court orders in the appeal process, when it went to the next stage such as petition for rehearing. They were text orders because the judge was too lazy to write an actual opinionated order for two different motions being denied. They are text orders and that is all there was. Three orders from the U.S. District Court are in my son's appendix. How is my son not complying with Rule 14.1(i) being told he has to beg the judge to amend to his previous order (already appealed) to simply mark it as a final order when the appeals were during the pending case, and they would be considered interlocutory.

Cohen v. Beneficial Industrial Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541 (1949)

My son's pleadings were correct, they were returned to my son erroneously. Please accept them back and allow Brian to just mail them back or have the Post Office return them back to you, and please acknowledge that you made a mistake.

Please explain how he did not include the correct District Court order when he submitted three District Court orders which the U.S. Court of Appeals made the consolidated decision based on three different orders, and all three of those orders were in his appendix?

If you don't like me sending these emails, Brian can just leave more voicemails to make the appropriate argument as to why there was no deficiency. He can leave a few more voicemails if you don't want to even accept reading this email, and he can call and leave voicemails to read to you each word in the appendix which was rejected, he can leave ten voicemails if need be to prove this to you.

Please allow Brian to mail his pleadings back to your office and just admit that you made a mistake about this rule 14.1(i) thing since all district court orders at issue were in the appendix. Your asking for an order which that rule does not limit its language to final orders only. You know this. You work for the Supreme Court, you know the rules. Brian likes the mind games to stop. No more mind games please.

Thanks,
Roberta Hill

-
- writ-certiorari-11-7-2022.pdf (3 MB)
 - writ-certiorari-11-7-2022.pdf (3 MB)