

No.19-8684

In The Supreme Court Of The United States

BRIAN DAVID HILL,
Petitioner,

vs.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE
DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to
the United States Court of Appeals for
the Fourth Circuit

CONSENT FOR AMICUS CURIAE/BRIEF – LETTER ADDRESSED
TO THE CLERK AND ALL JUSTICES IN THE SUPREME COURT
OF THE UNITED STATES AND RESPONDENTS – SIMPLE
LETTER

Brian David Hill

Pro Se

Ally of QANON

Former USWGO Alternative News Reporter

310 FOREST STREET, APARTMENT 2

MARTINSVILLE, VIRGINIA 24112

Tel.: (276) 790-3505

E-Mail: No Email

U.S.W.G.O.

Friend of justice



JusticeForUSWGO.wordpress.com

The Petitioner hereby gives written consent to this Court for any outside attorney, law school, legal advocacy organization, or party/officer to file an Amicus Curiae/brief under Rule 37 of the rules of this Supreme Court.

Petitioner also likes to raise the important issues of why he consents and encourages the Solicitor General to also consider whether or not he/she will be giving consent for an Amicus Brief to be filed with the Court by an outside party/officer/attorney as to why the petition should be granted as a matter of national importance and prevent any conflicts with precedential case law.

The issues of fraud upon the court and a Judge acting in excess of jurisdiction by not acting upon pending motions where Mandamus relief is an appropriate vehicle for these types of situations in our judicial system.

Petitioner recommends in this simple letter and copy to all Respondents that the filing period deadline of 30 days for filing an Amicus Curiae/Brief be extended to give these legal institutions more time to consider filing an Amicus Curiae/Brief over the important issues raised in the original petition.

Petitioner plans on calling legal advocacy groups, fax them and call or leave voice mail messages for any of these legal advocates to consider filing an Amicus Brief in this Court for this particular case.

The petition was distributed for the Conference dated September 29, 2020 according to the docket on record. The extension for filing an Amicus Curiae/Brief will not inconvenience this Court as the Supreme Court has a lot of time to consider the petition and any legal arguments from any outside attorneys before the scheduled conference date of September 29, 2020.

The petitioner is putting his reputation on the line and has already proven his claims. The U.S. Attorney Office for the Middle District of North Carolina did not file any contest/responses to Petitioner's motions for sanctions for frauds upon the court. That same U.S. Attorney Office did not file any response to the fraud upon the court claims of Petitioner in his objections to the U.S. Magistrate Judge's order and recommendation to dismiss Petitioner's 2255 case. All of that was raised on the record within the Writ of Mandamus at issue in this Supreme Court case, and none of these are new and are completely within the "Record On Appeal" ("ROA"). Usually motions that bring forth allegations against an officer of the court

have to be true or the Movant can be subject to some form of sanctions and penalties to protect the Court as per its inherent or implied powers. When the officer refuses to respond or ignores the response deadline as if it doesn't exist, that is at their own peril. If somebody filed allegations against me and I didn't respond timely, it would be at my own peril. Usually when a motion is not contested in the District Court, the claims are usually true, it should have been granted if it is well-grounded in law and in evidence.

The Writ of Mandamus was appropriate and the petition for Writ of Certiorari was appropriate under the ROA, and will not waste the time of this Court. An Amicus Curiae/Brief will help with any relevant documented research into case law necessary to show that the non-favorable decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals at issue in the Writ of Certiorari in this case won't just conflict with the case law precedent by this Supreme Court, but also may go into conflict with state and federal District Courts, Circuit Courts and Courts of Appeals that all made different rulings on the issues of "fraud upon the court" and judges not acting upon properly filed motions referred to him/her by the Clerk of that Court. Both of those issues deal with the integrity and responsibility of the judicial officers of each respective court.

The issues of being allowed to lie, subornate perjury, or commit any kind of fraud in the U.S. District Court sets the precedent throughout the entire Fourth Circuit and beyond even that Circuit of appellate Courts, that it is okay to commit fraud in court, it is okay to lie to Federal/State Judges, that it is okay as an officer of the court to be deceptive in the prosecution of a case, and that nobody will ever get in trouble for defrauding the court and breaking any kinds of laws that would make Al Capone blush, yes that Al Capone referenced in the historic case: *United States of America v. Alphonse Capone*, October 17, 1931. This case will affect the cases of Roger J. Stone, Lt. General Michael Thomas Flynn, and other high profile cases if any criminal prosecutions against them were done via any fraud/frauds upon the court.

Petitioner wants to make this letter with the least amount of pages possible while bringing up the issues of why Petitioner's consent is given so that it is easy to read and understand the issues that this letter raises.

Petitioner will also serve a copy of this signed letter with all Respondents and will file an Affidavit of Service in regards to this very letter being served with all Respondents. It is not ex parte.

