

Subject: Fw: Request for Amicus brief for Supreme Court case
From: Stanley Bolten <StanleyBolten@[REDACTED]>
Date: 6/18/2020, 12:48 AM
To: "lauriea@firemail.cc" <lauriea@[REDACTED]>

Sent with [ProtonMail](#) Secure Email.

----- Original Message -----

On Thursday, June 18, 2020 12:45 AM, Stanley Bolten <StanleyBolten@[REDACTED]> wrote:

Annaliese F. Fleming,

On behalf of Brian David Hill, as his agent and owner of the [Justice for Brian D. Hill of USWGO Alternative News website campaign](#), I hereby submit this application for an amicus brief on his behalf. If you want the signed legal document as proof that I am authorized to act as his agent for these matters, I can send you that upon request.

Copied and pasted from the Microsoft word form. Will answer questions below each question. Every question has been answered to address the application requesting a amicus brief from the American Bar Association for a Supreme Court case, decision pending.

APPLICATION FORM

FOR ABA AMICUS CURIAE BRIEFS

To request the filing of an ABA amicus brief, please complete this application form and send it to Annaliese F. Fleming, staff for the ABA Standing Committee on Amicus Curiae Briefs, at Annaliese.Fleming@americanbar.org. For questions and information, please contact Annaliese by e-mail or by telephone at 312-988-5777.

1. Full Caption of the Case & Question(s) Presented. State the full case name and citation of the opinion in the last court to render an opinion in the case, and the question or questions to be addressed by the court.

I'll make things easy.

<https://www.supremecourt.gov/search.aspx?filename=/docket/docketfiles/html/public/19-8684.html>

Brian David Hill, Petitioner

v.

United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina

case name changed from the original which is "in re: Brian David Hill", writ of mandamus petition.

Clerk's office of the Supreme Court conducted an investigation and got the opinions they are using in their own filed appendix different from Brian's proposed appendix:

http://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/19/19-8684/145441/20200612153240444_20200612-151749-00000342-00001116.pdf

This is not the original appendix submitted by Brian David Hill. This appendix was put together by the court.

Questions are pasted from the pdf version of the filed petition:

I. Questions Presented

Where the U.S. Court of Appeals didn't think that the Petition for Writ of Mandamus should apply to the case of multiple pending motions not being acted upon by the judicial officer of the U.S. District Court for months and months after being filed?

Where the U.S. District Court failed or refused to act on multiple motions that asked to vacate an unconstitutional judgment or judgment(s) over the basis of the United States Attorney lying, deceiving, and filing or submitting false facts to the U.S. District Court in a criminal case, even though jurisdiction had already been challenged?

Where the U.S. Court of Appeals dismissed the Petition for the Writ of Mandamus even though it was originally asking for mandating that the U.S. District Court act upon the motions asking for vacatur of null and void judgments that were produced out of frauds upon the court by the United States Attorney?

Where case law precedent in this very Court and the lower Courts all held that petitioning for the Writ of Mandamus relief is only reserved to special circumstances including but not limited to Judges that act in excess of jurisdiction by failing to act or refusing to act on pending motions?

Where the "due process of law" clause of the U.S. Constitution, Amendment V, is being deprived and ignored by the U.S. District Court in North Carolina and where judgments/orders that may not even have valid jurisdiction to have ever been entered is being allowed when frauds upon the court have been proven by the Defendant?

Petition: http://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/19/19-8684/145441/20200612153240101_20200612-151749-00000342-00001115.pdf

2. Filing Date of the Proposed Brief.

Docketed: June 12, 2020
 Lower Ct: United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit
 Case Numbers: (19-2338)
 Decision Date: February 10, 2020
 Rehearing Denied: April 28, 2020

3. Drafters and Their Experience. List the contact information of the proposed drafters and their relevant experience in the applicable court. Please link to their online bios.

Brian David Hill may be a pro se filer, but he has filed seven federal appeals, more than three state appeals in the Court of Appeals of Virginia. He has learned law on his own and can properly argue the facts, evidence, and add exhibits in an organized fashion. Brian can probably pass the BAR exam if he isn't required to go to law school. If you see his petition for writ of certiorari, then that is the extent of how professional his pleadings have gotten. The only reason he isn't an attorney yet is because of his wrongful conviction. He is fighting right and left to overturn it, then plans on becoming a lawyer or at least push to be licensed as an attorney. Abraham Lincoln also taught himself law and he became a lawyer as well as one of our great Presidents of the United States.

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE
Attorneys for Petitioner		
Brian David Hill	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Party name: Brian David Hill

4. Entities and Contacts. List the ABA entity(ies) submitting the application, with the name, telephone number and e-mail address of at least one contact person for each entity.

List any other sections, divisions, or committees that may have an interest in the position to be asserted, state whether they have been given a copy of this application and provide a brief summary of their responses. (Please note that, under ABA policy, neither the application nor the proposed brief may be sent to any of the constituent groups of the Judicial Division).

I, Stanley Bolten and Brian David Hill are not ABA accredited. This request is being submitted for an amicus curiae over the issues of a licensed attorney perpetuated frauds upon the court and judge's refusal to act any action on pending motions which is malfeasance by allowing frauds to contaminate the entire federal case filings and proceedings on record..

5. Statement Describing Why the ABA Should File an Amicus Brief. Please submit a 2-3 page statement that sets out the following:

- a. A brief summary of the facts and procedural history of the case that is relevant to the position to

be asserted.

The facts are simple in this supreme court case. That Brian David Hill, in 2013, was charged with a federal crime for a charge that he did not commit according to his pro se filings for years on record. He was never allowed to ever review over the entire criminal case discovery evidence material and even his own court appointed lawyer blocked him from seeing all of the discovery evidence material. He was allowed to review over the entire discovery evidence material after he falsely plead guilty and was released from jail on a sentence of time served. Here is why:

The forensic report actually contradicts the confession of Brian David Hill. It proves that his confession was not credible and could have been impeached on its face as an inaccurate confession and not an honest confession. Each statement can be disproved of his own confession. He stated in multiple affidavits along with his family that he only confessed because the police threatened to hold his mother responsible for his charge if he did not "fess up". So his confession is a fraud upon the court that was perpetuated by the United States Attorney as a factual basis in his case.

The U.S. Attorney office admitted in the FOIA lawsuit to have destroyed the forensic report in regards to his seized computer. It said that files were downloading from his laptop with eMule.exe program between July 20, 2012, and July 28, 2013. Those dates were brought up pro se by Brian and Brian had sent faxes and emails to the North Carolina State Bureau of Investigation as well the State Crime Laboratory about those download dates, and was filed with the court in various filings since his release in November (2014). They were never refuted, even though they understand and are aware that the very same computer that was seized by law enforcement was seized by search warrant and inventory on August 28, 2012. So for exactly eleven months, supposedly alleged illegal files had downloaded onto Brian David Hill's computer when he did not have his computer after it was seized by law enforcement. In addition to that, according to the information in the 2255 brief, no victims were ever identified by the federal prosecutor and so no victims are even known, what does that even mean if Brian supposedly victimized someone or multiple people by his alleged actions that may or may not have happened according to the conflicting evidence? The forensic report only stated numbers of supposedly illegal files but do not go into any details. They never confirm whether each file was the so-called illegal file that was alleged by the federal prosecutor. There are no file lists, no blurred thumbnails and no thumbnails at all. There is no details at all which would be required for the forensic report to have even passed credibility standards under the Federal Rules of Evidence. The forensic report procedure does not seem to follow any rules or guidelines, it is another fraud upon the court. They never proved that each file of interest was of the illegal images/videos that was alleged to have been found. It is fraud, pure and simple.

The U.S. Attorney claimed that Brian was running around naked (even though at nighttime, late at night) on a "public park trail" as to make it appear that he would encounter children to give a false presumption of any kind of dangerous conduct worthy of revocation of supervised release. The police officer corrected the federal prosecutor and said that it was a walking trail, and did not agree with the prosecutor's theory/opinion that it was a public park trail. That allegation was also fraudulent. That fraud was documented but not corrected by the federal judge upon request in a pending motion.

The U.S. Probation Office and U.S. Attorney coordinated together to say that Brian was behaving in a way that is dangerous to the community. Brian filed evidence with the federal court prior to the supervised release violation hearing that proves he had experienced different symptoms of what he allegedly claimed was carbon monoxide poisoning. The technical terms of carbon monoxide poisoning symptoms are (1) sinus tachycardia which is abnormally high blood pulse while resting (100+ resting blood pulse), (2) abnormal White Blood Cell (WBC) count and abnormal lymphocytes levels, (3) making statements that officer claims or may claim do not prove to be in any way credible or factual like claiming to have met a man in a hoodie threatening to kill Brian's mother late at night if he did not take his clothes off and run down the hiking trail naked. The man in the hoodie was never located. Carbon monoxide can cause hallucinations; (4) and the fact that a forensic psychiatrist diagnosed Brian weeks after his arrest as to be experiencing a psychosis when Brian told him about the man in the hoodie threatening Brian to get naked on a hiking trail at night. Psychosis is also a symptom of carbon monoxide poisoning according to the National Institutes of Health, a federally accredited health research agency. Brian had no prior history of running around naked at night in 28 years at the time that he was alive. No prior behavior of such and the multiple symptoms which match the symptoms of carbon monoxide poisoning. Even if Brian didn't have the levels of carbon monoxide necessary to factually prove to a court upon preponderance of the evidence/facts, his attorney Renorda Pryor had failed to bring up those carbon monoxide facts as a reasonable doubt for a jury trial he was supposed to have been given but the judge did not give Brian a jury trial but a bench trial in violation of last year's supreme court case law. Also the federal court ruled that he violated state law while the state case was still pending for a jury trial. Any of the facts or claims used to revoke Brian's probation were fraudulent and unlawfully usurped power away from the state court conducting a jury trial. That interference led to Brian falsely pleading guilty in state court in his own filing asking the state court to withdraw his appeal and accept the decision in the General district court. He said that his attorney kept begging him to withdraw his appeal in state court because his federal probation was already revoked. So that federal court's decision had interfered with the state tribunal of trial de novo and led to ruining his actual innocence defense for his state charge. It was all based on fraud. The federal court ruled that he was already convicted in state court but was not true at the time such judicial opinion was filed and ordered. It was that judicial opinion that he had been convicted in state court and his probation was revoked which led to him being convicted in state court by withdrawing his appeal. The facts of the revocation judgment were artificially created to induce a guarantee that Brian would be convicted in state court by using the federal revocation as leverage to persuade his court appointed lawyer in state court to refuse to fight for his innocence to the state charge. The timely appeal which triggered the state trial de novo renders the lower court's conviction as null and void unless the court conducting the trial de novo renders the verdict of guilty. So the federal court revoked probation based on fraudulent pretenses and unfairly triggered an action which ruins acquittal in state court. Using fraud to make more fraud happen, using one constitutional violation to obtain more violations and deprivations.

Last but not least, the revocation stemmed from the first probation violation charge in 2015 over Brian David Hill having an autistic meltdown where he reportedly threw things on the floor when he was sitting in a chair on the other side of the room in front of his federal probation officer Kristy Burton. She knowingly was proven to have made 3 or 4 or more false statements under oath when she testified in June 30, 2015. Those false statements were documented by Brian as well as his

family members, and was filed in 2017-2018. That is perjury. Since she made not one but over 3 or 4 false statements while under oath in federal court, her testimony was not credible and never should have been treated as credible with any judge that has a lick of common sense and no probation violation ever should have been found on the record in 2015. That probation violation judgment was also fraudulent. Attorney Renorda Pryor went along with the fraud and refused to challenge that fraud.

So that is as brief as it could be. Brian David Hill had proven different frauds, lies, and even caught lies by the federal prosecutor before the U.S. Court of Appeals. Brian keeps proving that the federal prosecutor Anand Prakash Ramaswamy was dishonest and deceiving the court and knowingly deceiving the court to obtain favorable judgments for the Government. That is the cold hard facts and have not been disproved because they are the facts. Anand Prakash Ramaswamy never filed any response contesting the allegations on District Court record, even till this day. They are the facts.

Brian filed a writ of mandamus to ask the supervisory court, the U.S. Court of Appeals in Richmond, Virginia, to compel the lower court to enter a judgment on the pending motions asking to vacate fraudulent begotten judgments that were before it. Three different motions attacking three different fraudulent begotten judgments and the Hon. Thomas David Schroeder did not act upon any of those motions, even when they were uncontested by Anand Prakash Ramaswamy by the response due dates. The PACER'S docket notice of electronic filing would have also said in email notices sent to AUSA Ramaswamy that he had until this date or that date to file a response to the allegations and evidence of fraud upon the court committed by him, the allegations alleged by Brian David Hill. Those were not contested and no response was ever entered in the lower court regarding those motions. That means the allegations were in-fact true. Allegations this serious would have harmed his career and would normally ruin his reputation, so for him to not file any contest to the allegations in the District Court record and the lies further, it is malfeasance, misconduct, and is unethical. He should not be getting away with this in this SCOTUS case.

However the judge has till this day still refused to act upon the pending motions, they were never granted or denied, just no action taken.

The U.S. Court of Appeals refused to grant the writ of mandamus and did not consider the purpose of acting upon pending motions to being of merit, and instead stated that Brian had only used mandamus to circumvent going through the direct appeal process. Brian argued back in his petition for rehearing that the panel's decision was erroneous because the mandamus was appropriately used to compel a decision to act on pending motions because direct appeals cannot be possible unless a judge acts on a pending motion. If a motion is never acted upon, it cannot be directly appealed so the writ of mandamus was appropriate. Those arguments were denied and the petition for rehearing was denied.

He is petitioning the Supreme Court as of recent to undo these erroneous decisions by the Court of Appeals.

- b.** The position to be asserted and an outline of the arguments to be made in the proposed brief.

Brian is attempting to ask the Supreme Court to enforce it's earlier stances on fraud upon the court

and the appropriate usage of the writ of mandamus and prohibition under special circumstances which apply judiciously to situations where judges refuse or fail to act upon pending motions which were appropriately filed by the clerk on docket and submitted to the judge for a decision.

Brian's position is asking to make the Court of Appeals grant the mandamus relief to compel the lower court to render decisions on the pending motions before it and then Brian can simply appeal those future decisions if unfavorable. That is the way the legal system is supposed to work.

- c. A brief summary of the ABA policies (including Standards and Model Codes) supporting the position to be asserted, and how they are directly relevant to the issue(s) being considered by the court.

Violation of ABA bar rule 3.8 and 4.1 on an attorney not acting truthful but deceptive on federal court pleadings/proceedings, prosecutor knowingly convicting an innocent man and prosecuting a case that he knew was not founded by probable cause, and was founded upon fraud. Then when the pro se criminal defendant properly addresses those frauds and proves each fraud by the U.S. Attorney, the prosecutor should have apologized to the court for the fraudulent evidence. Instead the prosecutor had doubled down and committed more fraud, more lies, and perpetuated dishonest claims in further pleadings.

Anand Prakash Ramaswamy, an officer of the court and licensed attorney, had engaged in fraud, fraud, and more fraud. Refused to rectify the perjury of one of his witnesses Kristy L. Burton. Also the judge failed and refused to fulfill his ministerial duties to act upon pending motions before him/her. It violates ethics and professional conduct. The activities of both Thomas David Schroeder and Anand Aprakash Ramaswamy at issue throughout the Supreme Court petition and filings before the U.S. Court of Appeals, both have likely violated ABA rules. Especially bar rules 3.8 and 4.1.

https://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional_responsibility/policy/ethics_2000_commission/e2k_rule38/

https://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional_responsibility/publications/model_rules_of_professional_conduct/rule_4_1_truthfulness_in_statements_to_others/comment_on_rule_4_1/

- d. How an ABA brief will make a significant contribution to the court's consideration of the issue(s) it must address. The mere existence of ABA policy on the issue is insufficient. The proposed brief must also make a significant contribution to the court's consideration of the questions presented. Another way to think of this requirement is to answer the question "why is this the appropriate case for the ABA to offer its expertise and a discussion of its policy?"

It will help the U.S. Supreme Court to restore credibility and integrity within our federal courts, it will restore integrity which has been lost in one of nation's our federal courts.

I have written articles and so has Laurie Azgard on justiceforuswgo.wordpress.com on the issues that were raised throughout the entire federal case.

The issues of judicial malfeasance of refusal to act when necessary when that is acting in excess of jurisdiction and deprives due process. Refusal to act upon pending motions with allegations with evidence which are uncontested. In the normal legal course, such motions would have been

granted. Had they been granted, Brian David Hill would no longer be convicted and would no longer have his two probation violation charges when they have no merit. Both were adjudged on fraudulent pretenses, perjury, shaky evidence, and the judge skewered the facts to represent the prosecutor's views to justify the probation violation when the facts and law do not match his judgment.

For example another fraud was that the judge claimed in his legal opinion that Brian had threatened his probation officer with harm and she was scared and ran away, the way he portrayed it. The testimony by probation officer Kristy L. Burton said nothing of threats anywhere in the transcript. All she said was that Brian never tried to hurt her, she admitted that when Brian had his autistic meltdown, she felt unsafe and left the residence. She admitted that Brian faxed her, called her, and kept apologizing and did everything he could to remain compliant, and that too shows a lack of intent of an autistic individual to have even backed any notion of supporting the Judge's claim of "threatening conduct" to support the probation violation judgment. She even granted his request to travel to another state after stating in the arrest warrant under penalty of perjury that Brian was a danger to society. So Brian is a danger to society by arrest warrant testimony of Kristy Burton and then days later she filed a approval for his request to travel outside the state and was never arrested on that date that request to travel was even approved. So she claims Brian is dangerous but allowed him to travel outside of his state after making such claims. She even admitted that she didn't know or even tried to understand about Brian's autism when that affects his behavior. She replaced her incompetency to do her job with Brian being the dangerous man, the allegedly horrible violent criminal over an autistic meltdown sitting in the chair and having the meltdown on the chair and she admitted that Brian never approached her during that incident.

The issues that are raised before the Supreme Court is judicial corruption and malfeasance. A judge refusing to do his/her job and openly lie about the criminal defendant, same with the federal prosecutor Anand Prakash Ramaswamy and even Kristy L. Burton. Brian's future probation officer Jason McMurray was not treated with the same respect with the second probation violation hearing according to one of the fraud upon the court vacatur motions by Brian Hill. So when a probation officer is not willing to lie about his/her probationer, the judge treats that probation officer with scorn, ignores him, or shows disrespect or disapproval. What a biased individual, pure bias and prejudice.

This ultimately affects ABA policies, rules, ethics, and guidelines affecting all licensed attorneys. On a professional scale and a legal scale. It is criminal malfeasance with issues such as criminal defamation of character, allowing frauds and obstruction of justice by the attorney, and dereliction of duty.

- e. The expertise that the ABA brings to the position to be asserted. Please note that ABA amicus briefs must be based on the experiences and distinct perspective of ABA lawyers and other legal professionals working in the relevant field or on the relevant issue. In addition, the fact that the ABA has policy may not be persuasive unless the court is convinced that the policy is based on and consistent with ABA expertise in the relevant field or on the relevant issue.

It is over the issues of fraud upon the court, and that an attorney who is caught engaging in

defrauding the court doesn't just violate ABA rules 3.8 and 4.1, but also is unethical and unprofessional to engage in obstruction of justice and fraud. The ABA needs to deter their licensed attorneys from openly committing fraud before federal courts, by filing amicus briefs when the supreme court cases are centered on the unprofessional misconducts by a licensed attorney.

- f. Please note that the ABA typically files amicus briefs only in the highest court likely to hear a matter. If the case is not presently in the highest court, please explain why the ABA should file at this level. If the proposed brief is to support a petition for writ of certiorari in the United States Supreme Court, please explain why the ABA should file now rather than wait until the writ has been granted.

Because the Solicitor General did not want to respond to the petition, because the allegations against the United States were uncontested and a lot of attorney misconduct was done. The waiver of filing a response by Noel Francisco may be a ploy to make the Supreme Court feel that the petition isn't worthy of being granted. However the petition addresses issues that the U.S. Court of Appeals had ignored and the relevant case law that was ignored. Denial of such Supreme Court brief will bring permanent irreparable harm and will permanently legitimize the frauds and the frauds will be part of court record permanently and those frauds being accepted and enforced by a judge of a court, the lies will always look credible when in reality lies are not credible.

All it takes is one outside party to file an amicus brief and it would justify the need for the Supreme Court to scold Anand Prakash Ramaswamy for his fraud and address the issues of a federal judge not acting upon pending motions asking to vacate fraudulent begotten judgments when the frauds were proven and were uncontested by the accused (referring to AUSA Ramaswamy as accused). If Noel Francisco had filed his letter to weasel the United States attorneys from being held accountable for defrauding the court multiple times, lying and filing false evidence and false facts, and committing obstruction of justice. When it is proven, the federal court should have acted upon it but they didn't, they refused to do so. Even after being served with the writ of mandamus, the judge still refused to act upon the pending motions till even this day. That means the judge likely would have had to grant those motions to vacate all fraudulent begotten judgments as a lawful matter of course, and would make such judgments voidable. The judge did not want to act on those motions because there is no proof of valid jurisdiction to have entered fraudulent judgments, the earlier judgments were null and void. They hold no merit in a credible legal system.

By taking no action, it sends a message to the lower court that lying and perjury is okay in federal courts, that is okay to break the law if your an attorney, that you can lie in federal court and make stuff up and have people commit perjury if it supports the Fed's case for conviction of a criminal charge. It allows malfeasance and misconduct to go unchecked and to become a usual thing, become a usual form of activity in the legal process. The American Bar Association has a duty to protect it's rules from being violated openly in federal court filings by licensed attorneys. When fraud is proven, the court must sanction that attorney for his/her fraud to protect the integrity and credibility of that courthouse.

The BAR needs to protect the integrity of the Middle District of North Carolina and the Fourth Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals by making sure that the Supreme Court conducts a review over the

allegations of fraud being perpetuated by an officer of the court (attorney) when proven and uncontested.

1. Required Attachments. Please include copies of the relevant court opinions, briefings (including petitions for writs of certiorari and responses, where available), and ABA policies.

Citation

The [U.S. Supreme Court](#) occasionally mentions the MRPC when considering cases that involve attorney conduct in some way. For example, in 1986, the Court in [Nix v. Whiteside](#) cited several of the Rules to support the general proposition that an attorney must not assist a client in "conduct that the lawyer knows to be illegal or [fraudulent](#)," and furthermore must take steps to prevent clients from offering [false testimony](#) to a court.^[50]

ABA rules:

https://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional_responsibility/policy/ethics_2000_commission/e2k_rule38/

https://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional_responsibility/publications/model_rules_of_professional_conduct/rule_4_1_truthfulness_in_statements_to_others/comment_on_rule_4_1/

U.S. Supreme Court pleadings:

Waiver of United States of
right to respond submitted.

[Main Document](#)

Petition: http://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/19/19-8684/145441/20200612153240101_20200612-151749-00000342-00001115.pdf

Appendix (submitted by SCOTUS and not petitioner): http://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/19/19-8684/145441/20200612153240444_20200612-151749-00000342-00001116.pdf

U.S. Court of Appeals:

Petition for rehearing: <https://archive.org/download/HillvUSA/Appeal-19-2338-Document-21.pdf>

Reply to Government's response asking to deny emergency motion for stay of judgment or writ of mandamus: <https://archive.org/download/HillvUSA/Appeal-19-2338-Document-18.pdf>

Government's response asking to deny emergency motion for stay of judgment or writ of mandamus: <https://archive.org/download/HillvUSA/Appeal-19-2338-Document-17.pdf>

Petition for writ of mandamus: <https://archive.org/stream/HillvUSA/Appeal-19-2077-Document-2-Writ-of-Mandamus>

Joint Appendix: <https://archive.org/stream/HillvUSA/Appeal-19-2077-Document-3-Joint-Appendix>

That should fulfill all requirements of the application. If there are any further issues or concerns,

please feel free to contact me at the email address [stanleybolten@\[REDACTED\]](mailto:stanleybolten@[REDACTED])

If you wish to contact Brian David Hill who I represent as an Agent, his contact information is attached here:

Brian D. Hill

[REDACTED]

I do request that you confirm receipt of this email by reply, accepting requested read receipt, or both. Thanks.

Best regards,
Stanley Bolten

Sent with [ProtonMail](#) Secure Email.