

**In the United States Court of Appeals
For the Fourth Circuit**

**In re BRIAN DAVID HILL, in
his individual capacity as former
news reporter of USWGO
Alternative News
Petitioner**

No. _____

[No. 1:13-CR-435-1]

v.

**United States of America,
Respondent**

**PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS TO THE UNITED STATES
DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH
CAROLINA AND MOTION FOR STAY OF DISTRICT COURT
JUDGMENT PENDING MANDAMUS OR UNTIL FINAL APPEAL
MANDATE**

Brian David Hill ("USWGO")

Pro Se Petitioner

(276) 790-3505
310 Forest Street, Apartment 1
Martinsville, Virginia 24112

RECEIVED
2019 OCT -2 PM 12: 15
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
FOURTH CIRCUIT

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT3
STATEMENT OF FACTS.....9
ARGUMENT.....12
 **I. THIS COURT SHOULD ISSUE A WRIT OF MANDAMUS
 DIRECTING THE DISTRICT COURT TO ENTER ITS WRITTEN
 JUDGEMENT FOR IMMEDIATE APPELLATE REVIEW**14
CONCLUSION.....15

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

In this extraordinary case, the U.S. Probation Office filed a charge under Document #157 against Petitioner alleging a violation of the Supervised Release conditions (JA 1). Due to ineffective assistance of Counsel Renorda Pryor, the Final Revocation hearing was scheduled for September 12, 2019, despite the ongoing Trial De Novo state appeal going on for the charge of indecent exposure as stated in JA 1. Then the court revoked the Supervised Release of Petitioner and entered an order for Judgment and Commitment, was appealed the same day as judgment but the district court has yet to file a Judgment and Commitment after over two weeks of waiting. This stalling may be an attempt to deprive Petitioner of procedural due process before demanding that he turn himself into Federal prison in order to usurp power of Petitioner's constitutional right to trial de novo and a speedy trial. JA stands for Joint Appendix.

Docket entry (JA 2) (pages 3-15 were omitted as it may not be relevant to the substantial issues raised in this petition) had stated that an oral order was entered on September 12, 2019, finding the Petitioner in violation of his Supervised Release conditions, to be ordered to the maximum imprisonment sentence as permitted by law, no evidence or witnesses was even considered in Petitioner's favor, and an Notice of Interlocutory Appeal was entered before the hearing for Final Revocation (JA 3) due to counsel being ineffective by being unable to file an extension or another continuance after the state Trial De Novo was rescheduled. The Interlocutory Appeal had explained not to have the Final Revocation hearing while the state appeal is still ongoing and that attempting to revoke the Supervised Release and imprison Petitioner while the state Trial-De-Novo case is still pending is an error of law as it is depriving Petitioner of the constitutional right of due

process, the right to a speedy trial, and the right to show the Revocation Court that he is actually innocent of Virginia Criminal Code § 18.2-37, a Class 1 Misdemeanor. Brian had filed a "DECLARATION entitled "June 21, 2019 Declaration of Brian David Hill in Opposition to Government's/Respondent's Documents #156, #157, and #158" filed by BRIAN DAVID HILL." (JA 4). Brian had forewarned the Court that he had case law from the Commonwealth/State of Virginia explaining that he may be actually innocent of the charge of indecent exposure under the issues of Carbon Monoxide Gas Poisoning and three case laws. In all three cases the convictions of indecent exposure were reversed when the conduct did not rise to being obscene, because "it does not rise to the level of obscenity required under Code § 18.2-387, as defined in Code § 18.2-372." 1. Kimberly F. Neice v. Commonwealth of Virginia, Record No. 1477-09-3 in the Circuit Court of Giles County; 2. A.M. v. Commonwealth of Virginia, Record No. 1150-12-4 in the Circuit Court of Shenandoah County; 3. Kenneth Samuel Moses v. Commonwealth of Virginia, Record No. 0985-03-3 in the Circuit Court of Richmond. See pages 9-10 of Joint Appendix 4 (JA 4). It is clear that Brian cannot be convicted of indecent exposure unless he was being sexually aroused or intended to exhibit sexual misconduct which did not happen on the record. Nude beaches and nudism is not considered obscene. It is not sexual and nudity itself does not require a person to be sexual unless they are of the perverted mind.

Nudism/Nudity may be protected by the First Amendment and may not be subject to local obscenity laws or ordinances. The depiction of adults or children nude in the visual media or photographs has enjoyed constitutional protection in the United States since 1958, when the Supreme Court vacated a Court of Appeals finding that Sunshine & Health magazine could be obscene (*Sunshine Book Co. v. Summerfield, Postmaster General*, 355 U.S. 372). The right to depict adults or

children in innocent nude poses has been upheld without a pause for 41 years. In case after case, the Supreme Court and lower courts have always upheld the constitutionality of "nudity without more," specifically referring to the nudist depiction as a fully constitutional form of expression. The supposed violation was that Petitioner was only naked and took photos of himself naked that are not obscene.

It is clear that Brian David Hill Petitioner is legally innocent of indecent exposure and deserves the speedy trial right of Trial-De-Novo to prove his actual innocence in the Commonwealth/State of Virginia before the Federal Court should have made a decision on whether to revoke Petitioner's Supervised Release or continue his Supervised Release and not find the Petitioner in violation.

Actual innocence should not be punishable by any means including imprisonment (even through revocation) because it is cruel and unusual punishment under the Eighth Amendment of the United States Constitution, Bill of Rights.

Anyways, Petitioner had also, that same day, filed a Notice of Appeal (JA 5) after the Final Supervised Release Violation hearing and was timely filed on the same day as the oral judgment that was given. Counsel Renorda Pryor had delivered Petitioner's Notice of Appeal at his request and had been effective in that regard.

On September 20, 2019, the Court of Appeals had notified the U.S. District Court Clerk (JA 6) requesting that the Court notify them upon the entry of the written judgment. Petitioner was told by the Circuit Court Clerk's office that it was a reminder to the Court for the Judge to enter his written judgment.

As of September 29 or 30, 2019, no written judgment has been entered. This may or may not be an intentional delay of Petitioner's Appeal because the Honorable Judge Thomas D. Schroeder had ordered Brian David Hill to turn himself into the

Federal Prison Institution under the Federal Bureau of Prisons by December 6, 2019, giving the Petitioner little to no time to have a chance to prevail on Appeal before having to turn himself in to a Federal Prison facility. It is clear on the record that Petitioner had not violated his bond conditions (JA 7) as set forth by the Western District of Virginia for this case in the Middle District of North Carolina.

If the Honorable Thomas D. Schroeder may be intentionally delaying/stalling the entering of his written judgment to stall or obstruct Petitioner's ability to appeal his judgment to the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals knowing that Petitioner will have to voluntarily surrender to a Federal Prison at a fixed date of December 6, 2019, knowing that Petitioner may prevail on Appeal, is obstruction/deprivation of Petitioner's procedural due process rights and violation of proper constitutional and judicial procedures to block an appeal at the district court level after being informed that Petitioner has only 14 days to file a timely Notice of Appeal. That Appeal was filed as timely as possible, right on the same day as the oral judgment.

Mandamus is a necessary safety valve in the extraordinary situation here, where a district court in the Middle District of North Carolina has insisted on usurping power and authority over jurisdiction in the state case of Commonwealth of Virginia v. Brian David Hill (Case no. CR19000009-00). The U.S. District Court has asserted that Petitioner is guilty of indecent exposure, ignored Petitioner's actual innocence arguments and claims, and is overpowering the State trial de novo before Petitioner can even be found legally innocent of indecent exposure which is actual innocence. Any reasonable jurists would recognize this usurpation as a cause for concern over usurping power to obstruct or interfere with a criminal Defendant's right to due process in the state court while Trial De Novo and any pending appeals is still ongoing. The Western District of Virginia had recognized that Brian David Hill had "the right to Trial De Novo", under the Hon. U.S.

Magistrate Judge Robert S. Ballou of Roanoke, VA. See Documents #3 and #5 of case United States v. Hill (7:18-mj-00149), Western District of Virginia.

Petitioner therefore respectfully asks that this Court exercise its supervisory authority to direct the district court to file its written judgment of the oral order entered on September 12, 2019 to quickly open up the case for a timely direct appeal, because there is no other adequate means to obtain immediate appeal of the written order necessary to prosecute appeal for relief against the "Judgment and Commitment Order" demanding that Brian David Hill turn himself into Federal prison and usurp Petitioner's due process right to a speedy trial and right to Trial De Novo in his state case. The separation-of-powers and the Tenth Amendment of the United States Constitution gives states the right to have their own separate process of Government while holding the State Governmental authorities to the Constitution. A state criminal trial is given the same due process protections as with federal criminal trials. Unless the circumstances make it necessary and is constitutionally necessary, the Federal Court should not usurp power away from a criminal defendant to enjoy and exercise his right to a speedy trial, the right to appeal Trial De Novo, and the right to prove that he was legally innocent of indecent exposure before the Final Revocation hearing and issues of violation should be addressed thereafter to preserve Petitioner's entitled constitutional rights. There are no issues involving Petitioner's compliance with the federal and state bonds. Petitioner should not be compelled to turn himself into a Federal Prison until his state appeals had been exhausted and his timely Notice of Appeal for this Circuit Court to also be exhausted. That is why the direct appeal needs to be docketed, but the district court has not filed the written Judgment and it has been over two weeks since the bench verdict of the hearing on September 12, 2019.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1651 and Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 21, the Petitioner Brian David Hill of USWGO Alternative News respectfully requests that this Court issue a writ of mandamus directing the district court to enter an order requesting that the Hon. Judge Thomas D. Schroeder put in the written Judgment for Petitioner's appeal to finally be docketed and that request for relief can ensure due process protections for Petitioner. In addition, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court promptly stay enforcement of the district court's oral Judgment until disposition of this petition or even after the mandate after disposition of Petitioner's timely filed appeal.

Pursuant to Federal and Local Rules of Appellate Procedure Rule 8(a)(2)(A)(i), Petitioner requests that the Court of Appeals consider Petitioner's motion for Stay of Judgment Pending Appeal (JA 8) since the "*moving first in the district court would be impracticable*" because Petitioner is still out on the release conditions as set forth by the Western District of Virginia and is also on State Bond conditions pending the final appeals of the state criminal case in the Martinsville Circuit Court in Virginia (Case no. CR19000009-00). The Hon. Judge Thomas D. Schroeder was made aware of Petitioner's state criminal appeal under Trial De Novo, but his Judgment of imprisonment interferes with Petitioner's speedy trial rights in the state court, wrongfully usurps power away from the state criminal court proceedings, and supersedes that Brian must surrender to Federal Prison to prevent him from timely filing any further appeals in his criminal case for the Commonwealth/State of Virginia when Trial De Novo and any higher appeals may be necessary in order for Petitioner to be found actually innocent (legally innocent) of his State charge of indecent exposure. Because the Federal Imprisonment order conflicts with the State appeal and Trial De Novo, this motion needs to be acted upon more quickly to protect Petitioner's right to dispose of his state case and all

pending appeals before having to turn himself into a Federal Prison or be afforded a new Final Revocation hearing upon prevailing on appeal.

A party seeking mandamus must demonstrate that it has a “clear and indisputable” right, there are “no other adequate means” of relief, and the writ is otherwise “appropriate under the circumstances.” *Cheney v. United States Dist. Court for D.C.*, 542 U.S. 367, 380-81 (2004).

If there is no time limit set for the Hon. Judge Thomas D. Schroeder to file his written judgment on the Supervised Release Violation of Petitioner, then Petitioner is blocked and deprived from appealing the decision of the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina after filing a timely Notice of Appeal.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

In November 13, 2018, the U.S. Probation Office had filed a petition to revoke Petitioner’s Supervised Release over the allegation that Brian David Hill had engaged in criminal conduct that had violated the Virginia Code § 18.2-387 “Indecent exposure”, and had been arrested on September 21, 2018. To Petitioner’s knowledge, this is the first Supervised Release Violation that had been filed based upon an alleged technical violation of state law, even though the state court may rule that Petitioner is legally innocent of indecent exposure because his conduct was not obscene and was not sexual in nature. When this charge was filed, Petitioner had no knowledge of carbon monoxide gas poisoning until 2019. If carbon monoxide gas poisoning had anything to do with the alleged violation, then it further justifies that Petitioner had no intent to violate state law and the U.S. District Court should have investigated this issue before the revocation order.

The U.S. Probation Office had also filed Documents #156 and #158 on November 13, 2018.

Petitioner had filed a lot of Documents attempting to explain to the U.S. District Court why he was allegedly arrested for the state charge. Pro Se filings cumulatively under Documents #152, #153, #154, #155, #161, #162, #163, #164, #165, #169, #172, #173, #174, #178, #179, and #181. Those docket entries should be listed under Joint Appendix 2 of the case Docket report.

On July 22, 2019, Renorda Pryor, the counsel of Brian David Hill at the time, filed a Motion to Continue Revocation of Supervised Release Hearing and was granted by the district court a day later and was rescheduled to September 12, 2019.

Renorda had failed to file another Motion to Continue and neither a Motion to Extend the Time to file any motions relevant and necessary to the final hearing regarding "Revocation of Supervised Release". For the reasons she did not do so is unclear but deprives Petitioner of his constitutional due process right to a speedy trial in the state court, his right to Trial De Novo concerning the very charge that led to Petitioner's arrest which also triggered the Supervised Release Violation charge under Document #157 (JA 1).

Minute order was entered on September 12, 2019 hearing:

Minute Entry for proceedings held before CHIEF JUDGE THOMAS D. SCHROEDER in WS-2:FINAL HEARING RE REVOCATION OF SUPERVISED RELEASE as to BRIAN DAVID HILL held on 9/12/2019. AUSA Anand Ramaswamy present for the Government. Attorney Renorda Pryor present for the Defendant. Defendant present on bond. Defendant moves for a continuance. Government opposes the motion. Court DENIES motion. Defendant denies violation 1 of 157 Petition. Matter is contested (see Witness and Exhibit List) The Court finds the defendant in violation and Supervised Release is revoked. The defendant is REMANDED to the Bureau of Prisons for 9 months, followed by 9 years of Supervised Release (see Judgment and Commitment). Defendant

permitted to self-report directly to the institution designated by the BOP or to the USMS in Greensboro, NC by 12:00 PM on 12/6/2019. Defendant's Release Conditions modified to include GPS location monitoring to begin within 7 days and a curfew at the probation officer's discretion.(Court Reporter Briana Bell.) (Engle, Anita) Modified on 9/13/2019 to correct typographical error. (Engle, Anita) (Entered: 09/12/2019)

On September 12, 2019, Notice of Interlocutory Appeal was filed before the hearing had even begun to protect Petitioner's right to state Trial De Novo criminal proceedings, right to a Speedy trial, right to be found actually innocent to prevent cruel and unusual punishment, and any other due process rights prior to the Final Revocation hearing. Government objected to that Notice of Interlocutory Appeal and the hearing had begun while ignoring the Notice of Interlocutory Appeal to the Fourth Circuit to raise the substantial constitutional issues involving due process.

Renorda Pryor had also orally asked for a continuance but had failed because of the subpoenaed witnesses and the cost of having them appear at the hearing. That again was ineffective counsel as Renorda Pryor knew she should have asked for a continuance earlier than the actual hearing date of September 12, 2019.

Notice of Appeal had been filed after the hearing on the same day which explains why two Notice of Appeals had been docketed and filed on the same day.

The appeal that had been filed should have caused the written judgment to be filed shortly thereafter but the Court still has not and has been over two weeks. If any further weeks go by without the written judgment, then the district court may be attempting to block the appeal or control the ability to have the appeal docketed and may be a judicial activism by resistance to the Court of Appeals to prevent any favorable ruling that may impact the district court's decision on September 12, 2019.

ARGUMENT

An appellate court has the power under 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a) to issue a writ of mandamus directing the conduct of a district court where (1) the petitioner has a “clear and indisputable” right to relief; (2) there are “no other adequate means to attain the relief”; and (3) mandamus relief is otherwise “appropriate under the circumstances.” *Cheney v. United States Dist. Court for D.C.*, 542 U.S. 367, 380-81 (2004).

The district court should have quickly filed the Judgment and Commitment Order since the direct appeal may be the only available mechanism to overturn a wrongful judgment, a judgment that was based on any errors of law. The longer the district court does not enter a written judgement, the less of a chance at Petitioner can prevail on appeal before being imprisoned wrongfully and serving an invalid sentence because the district court will take its time in entering the very same written judgment ordering Petitioner’s imprisonment on September 12, 2019.

The district court cannot validly argue an excuse that it needed more time to prepare the Judgment and Commitment Order because a document had been filed on June 26, 2019 under Document #180, see Joint Appendix 9 (JA 9), before it was modified a day later. The original docket entry showed that the Hon. Judge Thomas D. Schroeder had originally planned to revoke Petitioner’s Supervised Release and order his imprisonment based on the hearing that would have taken place on August 9, 2019. The Court of Appeals should view the original filing on the record if the Court CM/ECF system has a revision history system where original documents can still be located despite any replaced documents or modified documents. The originally filed Document #180 on the record was likely a premeditated imprisonment order based on a future hearing that hadn’t even

happened yet. That alone may prove that the district court had planned to revoke his Supervised Release no matter what evidence or witnesses were offered and presented at the revocation hearing because the Judge had already made up his mind that Petitioner will go to Federal Prison no matter what. That is even more dangerous than usurping power away from the state trial court and Trial De Novo in the state court. This is constitutional structural defect and is very dangerous in a democratic republic type of Government. If the district court already had the time and energy to file a premeditated Document #180 ordering the imprisonment of Brian David Hill (Petitioner) based upon a future court hearing, why didn't they enter the Judgment and Commitment Order sooner than two or three weeks when the district court had ordered the imprisonment of Petitioner against his state appeal still pending before Martinsville Circuit Court over the very charge that triggered the Supervised Release Violation. If Petitioner is found actually innocent aka legally innocent of his state charge, then the Federal Court is willing to punish and imprison an innocent man once again while ignoring Petitioner's 2255 Motion (See Document #125 and #128 in the criminal case) that was filed since November, 2017. Petitioner is repeatedly being punished over and over again in a retaliation campaign against his claims of actual innocence. Petitioner's constitutional rights have been deprived so many times in the district court, Petitioner does not know what else to do except ask the media for help or asking attorneys to help him pro bono but to no avail because of the subject matter of his original criminal charge in Federal Court. People do not want to fight for a supposed "child pornographer" even if that person is actually innocent of that charge, because of the societal ramifications and reputation ramifications of helping somebody accused of such charge, it is unfair. All Petitioner has is his Pro Se filings and his court appointed counsels who also does not seem to care about his constitutional rights being deprived over and over again.

In short, only “exceptional circumstances amounting to a judicial ‘usurpation of power’” or a “clear abuse of discretion” will “justify the invocation of this extraordinary remedy.” *Id.* at 380; accord, e.g., *In re Catawba Indian Tribe of S.C.*, 973 F.2d 1133, 1136 (4th Cir. 1992). Although the standard for mandamus is, and should be, a high one, it is satisfied in the extraordinary circumstances presented here.

I. THIS COURT SHOULD ISSUE A WRIT OF MANDAMUS DIRECTING THE DISTRICT COURT TO ENTER ITS WRITTEN JUDGEMENT FOR IMMEDIATE APPELLATE REVIEW

If the Petitioner has a “clear and indisputable right” to appeal that was timely filed but the appeal is to be stalled indefinitely until the district court ever decides to file the written judgment, the other two elements for mandamus plainly are satisfied: There is “no other adequate means to attain the relief” of immediate appeal. *Cheney*, 542 U.S. at 380. And this is a manifestly “appropriate” circumstance for mandamus relief because proceeding to stall the appeal indefinitely “would threaten the separation of powers” and Tenth Amendment right between the state and the federal courts as well as threaten the due process rights of Petitioner.

Accordingly, the sole remaining question is whether the Petitioner has a “clear and indisputable right” to direct appeal of the district court when the appeal was timely filed but is indefinitely awaiting a written judgment, the “Judgment and Commitment Order”.

As demonstrated below, in these “exceptional circumstances,” he is entitled to mandamus to obtain that written judgment: although a district court has the ability and right to ensure that the written judgment is entered correctly and should exercise enough time reasonable to enter in a valid “Judgment and Commitment

Order” for the appeal to be docketed, if the court is stalling the entering of it’s written order then the court may be committing such a “clear abuse of discretion” that its stalling of a criminal appeal necessary for relief against any constitutional error of law for retention of jurisdiction in the Middle District of North Carolina indefinitely to prevent the appeal from proceeding amounts to “a judicial ‘usurpation of power.’”

Because the statutory “preconditions for § 1292(b) review” are indisputably satisfied in this case, which additionally “involves an important constitutional legal question” and “is of special consequence,” the district court “should not [have] hesitate[d] to file the written judgment to commence the timely appeal.”

The court’s refusal to file the written judgment as soon as possible after ordering imprisonment over a possibly actually innocent person but the state court has to confirm Petitioner’s actual innocence is such a clear abuse of discretion, error of law and is a usurpation of jurisdiction that it warrants an exercise of this Court’s mandamus authority.

CONCLUSION

This Court should issue a writ of mandamus directing the district court to immediately file the written judgment within a fixed time period concerning the oral Judgment on September 12, 2019 concerning the wrongful imprisonment of Petitioner and violating Petitioner’s right to direct appeal and Petitioner’s right to state Trial De Novo. Additionally, this Court should stay district court proceedings or judgments, pending resolution of this petition.

Respectfully filed with the Court, this the 30th day of September, 2019.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian D. Hill
Signed

Signed

Brian D. Hill (Pro Se)

310 Forest Street, Apartment 1

Martinsville, Virginia 24112

Phone #: (276) 790-3505

U.S.W.G.O.

Former U.S.W.G.O. Alternative News reporter

I stand with QANON/Donald-Trump – Drain the Swamp

I ask Qanon and Donald John Trump for Help (S.O.S.)

Make America Great Again

Petitioner also requests with the Court that a copy of this pleading be served upon the Government as stated in 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d), that “The officers of the court shall issue and serve all process, and preform all duties in such cases. Witnesses shall attend as in other cases, and the same remedies shall be available as are provided for by law in other cases”. Petitioner requests that copies be served with the U.S. Attorney office of Greensboro, NC via CM/ECF Notice of Electronic Filing (“NEF”) email, by facsimile if the Government consents, or upon U.S. Mail.

Thank You!

However the Petitioner will still serve copies of this pleading with the (1) U.S. Attorney Office of Greensboro, NC, the (2) U.S. District Court in Greensboro, NC to file with the Clerk of the Court to put on the record and then serve the paper copy with the trial judge the Hon. Thomas D. Schroeder.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Petitioner hereby certifies that on September 30, 2019, service was made by mailing the original of the foregoing:

“PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS TO THE UNITED STATES
DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

AND MOTION FOR STAY OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGMENT PENDING MANDAMUS OR UNTIL FINAL APPEAL MANDATE”

by deposit in the United States Post Office, in an envelope (certified mail), Postage prepaid, on September 30, 2019 addressed to the Clerk of the Court in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, 1100 East Main Street, Suite 501, Richmond, VA 23219.

Copy (1) of the original pleading has been served with the party of the United States of America through the United States Attorney office located at 101 South Edgeworth Street, 4th Floor, Greensboro, NC 27401. That shall satisfy requirement of service. Proof of service by stamped Certified Mail receipt shall serve as proof to satisfy the rules of the Court. Since Petitioner is indigent and does not have a lot of money to be printing too many copies of costly paper filings, Petitioner is serving a copy of this pleading on a CD-ROM with the entire pleading in PDF format. Cert. Mail tracking no. 7019-1120-0001-4751-4795

Copy (2) of the original pleading has been served with the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to request filing on the record and then serve the copy of the paper pleading with the trial judge the Honorable Thomas D. Schroeder. The Clerk’s office is located at 324 West Market Street, Greensboro, NC 27401. That shall satisfy requirement of service. Proof of service by stamped Certified Mail receipt shall serve as proof to satisfy the rules of the Court. Cert. Mail tracking no. 7019-1120-0001-4751-4788

Then pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1915(d), Petitioner requests that the Clerk of the Court move to electronically file the foregoing using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the following parties to be served in this action:

Anand Prakash Ramaswamy U.S. Attorney Office 101 South Edgeworth Street, 4th Floor, Greensboro, NC 27401 Anand.Ramaswamy@usdoj.gov	Angela Hewlett Miller U.S. Attorney Office 101 South Edgeworth Street, 4th Floor, Greensboro, NC 27401 angela.miller@usdoj.gov
JOHN M. ALSUP U.S. Attorney Office 101 South Edgeworth Street, 4th Floor, Greensboro, NC 27401 john.alsup@usdoj.gov	

This is pursuant to Petitioner's "In forma Pauperis" ("IFP") status, 28 U.S.C. §1915(d) that "The officers of the court shall issue and serve all process, and perform all duties in such cases ... "the Clerk shall serve process via CM/ECF to serve process with all parties.

<p>Date of signing:</p> <p><u>September 30, 2019</u></p>	<p>Respectfully submitted,</p> <p><u>Brian D. Hill</u></p> <p><i>Signed</i> Signed</p> <p>Brian D. Hill (Pro Se)</p> <p>310 Forest Street, Apartment 1</p> <p>Martinsville, Virginia 24112</p> <p>Phone #: (276) 790-3505</p> <p>U.S.W.G.O.</p> <p>I stand with QANON/Donald-Trump – Drain the Swamp</p> <p>I ask Qanon and Donald John Trump for Assistance (S.O.S.)</p> <p>Make America Great Again</p> <p>JusticeForUSWGO.wordpress.com</p>
--	--

Certified Mail tracking no: 7019-1120-0001-4751-4726

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT
Effective 12/01/2016

No. _____ Caption: In re BRIAN DAVID HILL (Writ of Mandamus)

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH TYPE-VOLUME LIMIT
Type-Volume Limit, Typeface Requirements, and Type-Style Requirements

Type-Volume Limit for Briefs: Appellant's Opening Brief, Appellee's Response Brief, and Appellant's Response/Reply Brief may not exceed 13,000 words or 1,300 lines. Appellee's Opening/Response Brief may not exceed 15,300 words or 1,500 lines. A Reply or Amicus Brief may not exceed 6,500 words or 650 lines. Amicus Brief in support of an Opening/Response Brief may not exceed 7,650 words. Amicus Brief filed during consideration of petition for rehearing may not exceed 2,600 words. Counsel may rely on the word or line count of the word processing program used to prepare the document. The word-processing program must be set to include headings, footnotes, and quotes in the count. Line count is used only with monospaced type. See Fed. R. App. P. 28.1(e), 29(a)(5), 32(a)(7)(B) & 32(f).

Type-Volume Limit for Other Documents if Produced Using a Computer: Petition for permission to appeal and a motion or response thereto may not exceed 5,200 words. Reply to a motion may not exceed 2,600 words. Petition for writ of mandamus or prohibition or other extraordinary writ may not exceed 7,800 words. Petition for rehearing or rehearing en banc may not exceed 3,900 words. Fed. R. App. P. 5(c)(1), 21(d), 27(d)(2), 35(b)(2) & 40(b)(1).

Typeface and Type Style Requirements: A proportionally spaced typeface (such as Times New Roman) must include serifs and must be 14-point or larger. A monospaced typeface (such as Courier New) must be 12-point or larger (at least 10 1/2 characters per inch). Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(5), 32(a)(6).

This brief or other document complies with type-volume limits because, excluding the parts of the document exempted by Fed. R. App. R. 32(f) (cover page, disclosure statement, table of contents, table of citations, statement regarding oral argument, signature block, certificates of counsel, addendum, attachments):

- [x] this brief or other document contains 4881 [state number of] words
[] this brief uses monospaced type and contains _____ [state number of] lines

This brief or other document complies with the typeface and type style requirements because:

- [x] this brief or other document has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word 2013 [identify word processing program] in 14 Times New Roman [identify font size and type style]; or
[] this brief or other document has been prepared in a monospaced typeface using _____ [identify word processing program] in _____ [identify font size and type style].

(s) Brian D. Hill Signed

Party Name Brian David Hill

Dated: Sept. 30, 2019

7019 1120 0001 4751 4788

U.S. Postal Service™
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT
 Domestic Mail Only

For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com®.

GREENSBORO, NC 27401

OFFICIAL USE

Certified Mail Fee \$3.50

Extra Services & Fees (check box, add fee if appropriate)

Return Receipt (hardcopy) \$0.00

Return Receipt (electronic) \$0.00

Certified Mail Restricted Delivery \$0.00

Adult Signature Required \$0.00

Adult Signature Restricted Delivery \$0.00

Postage \$7.35

Total Postage and Fees \$10.85

Sent To *Clerks of the Court, U.S. District Court*
 Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No. *324 West Market St.*
 City, State, ZIP+4® *Greensboro, N.C. 27401*

PS Form 3800, April 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9047 See Reverse for Instructions



7019 1120 0001 4751 4795

U.S. Postal Service™
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT
 Domestic Mail Only

For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com®.

GREENSBORO, NC 27401

OFFICIAL USE

Certified Mail Fee \$3.50

Extra Services & Fees (check box, add fee if appropriate)

Return Receipt (hardcopy) \$0.00

Return Receipt (electronic) \$0.00

Certified Mail Restricted Delivery \$0.00

Adult Signature Required \$0.00

Adult Signature Restricted Delivery \$0.00

Postage \$1.15

Total Postage and Fees \$4.65

Sent To *U.S. Attorney Office, Middle District of N.C.*
 Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No. *101 South Edgeworth St. 4th Flr.*
 City, State, ZIP+4® *Greensboro, NC 27401*

PS Form 3800, April 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9047 See Reverse for Instructions



MARTINSVILLE
 1123 SPRUCE ST
 MARTINSVILLE, VA 24112-9998
 515652-0362
 (800)275-8777
 09/30/2019 01:09 PM

Product	Qty	Unit Price	Price
PM 2-Day (Domestic) (GREENSBORO, NC 27401) (Weight:0 Lb 15.30 Oz) (Expected Delivery Day) (Wednesday 10/02/2019)	1	\$7.35	\$7.35
Certified (USPS Certified Mail #) (70191120000147514788)			\$3.50
First-Class Mail® Large Envelope (Domestic) (GREENSBORO, NC 27401) (Weight:0 Lb 1.10 Oz) (Estimated Delivery Date) (Wednesday 10/02/2019)	1	\$1.15	\$1.15
Certified (USPS Certified Mail #) (70191120000147514795)			\$3.50
Total:			\$15.50

Cash \$20.00
 Change (\$4.50)

Includes up to \$50 insurance

Text your tracking number to 28777 (2USPS) to get the latest status. Standard Message and Data rates may apply. You may also visit www.usps.com USPS Tracking or call 1-800-222-1811.

Save this receipt as evidence of insurance. For information on filing an insurance claim go to <https://www.usps.com/help/claims.htm>

Preview your Mail
 Track your Packages
 Sign up for FREE @ www.informedelivery.com

All sales final on stamps and postage. Refunds for guaranteed services only. Thank you for your business.

HELP US SERVE YOU BETTER
 TELL US ABOUT YOUR RECENT POSTAL EXPERIENCE

Go to: <https://postalexperience.com/Pos>
 840-5250-0004-001-00035-40048-02

or scan this code with your mobile device



Proof of Service to:

(1) U.S. District Court: Fwd to trial Judge.

(2) Party: United States of America

Brian David Hill
 Petitioner

PRESS FIRMLY TO SEAL

PRESS FIRMLY TO SEAL

POSTAL SERVICE

PRIORITY MAIL

PLACE STICKER AT TOP OF ENVELOPE TO THE RIGHT OF THE RETURN ADDRESS, HOLD AT DOTTED LINE
CERTIFIED MAIL



7019 1120 0001 4751 4725



1021



23219

U.S. POSTAGE PAID
P.M. 2-DAY
MARTINSVILLE, VA
24112
SEP 30, 19
AMOUNT
\$10.85
R2304N117627-19

FROM:

U.S.W.G.O.
Brian D. Hill - Ally of QANON
310 Forest Street, Apt. 1
Martinsville, VA 24112


INSPECTED

OCT 02 2019

TO:

Clerk of the Court
U.S. Court of Appeals
1100 East Main Street, Suite 501
Richmond, VA 23219

Proof of delivery specified *
PS TRACKING™ included to many major international destinations.
International insurance.
Ship available. *
Supplies online. *
When used internationally, a customs declaration label may be required.
Domestic only



EP14F Oct 2018
OD: 12 1/2 x 9 1/2



To schedule free Package Pickup, scan the QR code.

USPS.COM/PICKUP