

Judicial Council of the Fourth Circuit

COMPLAINT OF JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT OR DISABILITY

To begin the complaint process, complete this form and prepare the brief statement of facts described in item 4 (below). The Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings, adopted by the Judicial Conference of the United States, contain information on what to include in a complaint (Rule 6), where to file a complaint (Rule 7), and other important matters. The Rules are available in federal court clerks' offices, on individual federal courts' Web sites, including [www.ca4.uscourts.gov](http://www.ca4.uscourts.gov), and on [www.uscourts.gov](http://www.uscourts.gov).

Your complaint (this form and the statement of facts) should be typewritten and must be legible. If filing by email, your complaint and any attachments must be in PDF format. Please email to [4CCA-JudicialComplaints@ca4.uscourts.gov](mailto:4CCA-JudicialComplaints@ca4.uscourts.gov).

In the alternative you can mail it to Clerk, United States Court of Appeals, 1100 East Main Street, Suite 501, Richmond, VA 23219-3517. **Do not put the name of any judge on the envelope.** Only the original is required to be filed if mailed.

1. Name of Complainant: Brian David Hill  
Contact Address: 310 Forest Street  
Apartment 2  
City, State, Zip: Martinsville, Virginia 24112  
Email address: c/o: Roberta Hill at rbhill67@comcast.net  
Daytime telephone: ( 276 ) 790-3505

2. Name(s) of Judge(s): Thomas David Schroeder, William Lindsey Osteen Jr.  
Court: Middle District of North Carolina

3. Does this complaint concern the behavior of the judge(s) in a particular lawsuit or lawsuits?

Yes  No

If "yes," give the following information about each lawsuit:

Court: Middle District of North Carolina

Case Number: 1:13-cr-435-1, 1:17-CV-1036

Docket number of any appeals to the Fourth Circuit: 19-7755, 20-6034, 20-7737

Are (were) you a party or lawyer in the lawsuit?

Party  Lawyer  Neither

If you are (were) a party and have (had) a lawyer, give the lawyer's name, address, and telephone number:

Was not appointed a lawyer in 2255 civil case  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

4. **Brief Statement of Facts.** Attach a brief statement of the specific facts on which the claim of judicial misconduct or disability is based. Include what happened, when and where it happened, and any information that would help an investigator check the facts. If the complaint alleges judicial disability, also include any additional facts that form the basis of that allegation.

5. **Declaration and signature:**

I declare under penalty of perjury that the statements made in this complaint are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

(Signature)   
Signed  
Brian D. Hill (Date) 10/25/2021

COMPLAINT DATED OCTOBER 25, 2021

---

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

**STATEMENT OF FACTS REGARDING  
COMPLAINT OF JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT OR DISABILITY  
Judicial Council of the Fourth Circuit**

**STATEMENT OF FACTS**



**Brian David Hill – Ally of QAnon  
Founder of USWGO Alternative News  
310 Forest Street, Apt. 2  
Martinsville, Virginia 24112  
(276) 790-3505**



*Pro Se Appellant*

**JusticeForUSWGO.wordpress.com  
JusticeForUSWGO.NL/Pardon**

---

Filed October 25, 2021, through c/o Roberta Hill by rbhill67@comcast.net

## **I. INTRODUCTION AND RULE 35(b)(1) STATEMENT**

Petitioner Brian David Hill (“Petitioner”) requests investigation and the appropriate sanctions by this Judicial Council against the foregoing Judge(s) listed in the foregoing Statement of Facts and the COMPLAINT OF JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT OR DISABILITY submitted to the Judicial Council of the Fourth Circuit on October 25, 2021, by the c/o Roberta Hill by the email address of [rbhill67@comcast.com](mailto:rbhill67@comcast.com) filing this complaint to the Judicial Council on Petitioner’s behalf.

This is pursuant to the authority of the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980 (“Act”), under 28 U.S.C. §§ 351–364, and Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings (“Rules”), as amended on March 12, 2019.

Here are the statements of FACTS referencing the Exhibits attached thereto. All are included in the PDF files submitted in the email by Roberta Hill. Petitioner cannot use email due to his federal probation conditions and does not use the internet, but his family member can email documents to the Federal Courts and Administrative Offices when authorized to do such (such as when the Court or Council allows a document or complaint to be emailed instead of mailed in paper form). Such as for example Roberta Hill emailing the monthly probation reports to Brian Hill’s Probation Officer or filing in the Virginia Courts electronic filing system to conduct

authorized court business on behalf of Brian David Hill.

Here are the Statement of Facts as to why this COMPLAINT and all attached Exhibits should be thoroughly investigated as to why Judge William Lindsey Osteen Junior, and Thomas David Schroeder may have committed misconduct or disability in the performance of their duties under the color of law. If the Judges have ever engaged in any criminal activity and it may ever be proven, then those Judges should be sanctioned and given the appropriate punishment if such criminal activities are ever proven. Especially if Attorney L. Lin Wood's public statement regarding the blackmail videos are proven true.

1. Judge Thomas David Schroeder refuses to enforce the Local Rule 7.3 equally upon his Court on all officers of the Court and all parties. That rule was passed by the Local Rule-making committee for the Middle District of North Carolina. Local Rule 7.3 says outright that any valid motions with briefs which were uncontested, meaning undisputed, are ordinarily granted by the Court without further notice. When a judge enforces that rule on Petitioner but not the Respondent to ensure equal footing, that shows partiality, selective enforcement of the Court's own rules, or both. It is discrimination when Petitioner is directed to file a response to the U.S. Attorney's motion in 21 days as prescribed by presumably Local Rule 7.3 (See pages 3-5 of **EXHIBIT INDEX**, known as **EXHIBIT 1**), and that if Petitioner doesn't respond by the deadline, then the Respondent's contentions are undisputed, and the Court may rule against Petitioner

against him (See **EXHIBIT 1**). However, when six of Petitioner's contentions in his motions are uncontested and undisputed as a matter of law and/or matter of fact, his motions are discriminately DENIED and then wrongfully labeled as meritless and frivolous even though Petitioner's uncontested motions were well evidenced, well-grounded in the law. The uncontested motions filed in case no. 1:13-cr-435-1 during the pending civil 2255 action were docketed under Documents #151, #169, #199, #206, #217, #222.

Citation of LR 7.3 MOTION PRACTICE; paragraphs (f) and (k):

(f) Response to Motion and Brief. The respondent, if opposing a motion, shall file a response, including brief, within 21 days after service of the motion (30 days if the motion is for summary judgment; see LR 56.1(d)) (14 days if the motion relates to discovery; see LR 26.2 and LR 37.1). If supporting documents are not then available, the respondent may move for an extension of time in accordance with section (g) of this rule. For good cause appearing therefor, a respondent may be required to file any response and supporting documents, including brief, within such shorter period of time as the Court may specify

(k) Failure to File and Serve Motion Papers. The failure to file a brief or response within the time specified in this rule shall constitute a waiver of the right thereafter to file such brief or response, except upon a showing of excusable neglect. A motion unaccompanied by a required brief may, in the discretion of the Court, be summarily denied. A response unaccompanied by a required brief may, in the discretion of the Court, be disregarded and the pending motion may be considered and decided as an uncontested motion. If a respondent fails to file a response within the time required by this rule, the motion will be considered and decided as an uncontested motion, and ordinarily will be granted without further notice.

2. Judge Thomas David Schroeder's unconstitutional and/or unethical discrimination is obvious. The rules and laws are enforced on Petitioner Brian David Hill, but those same rules and laws are not enforced upon the

U.S. Attorney Office in the exact same case and in the exact same way. The Local Rule 7.3 did in fact say that uncontested motions with briefs with undisputed claims and evidence exhibits are ordinarily granted without further notice. So, the Petitioner is compelled by the Rules to respond or lose the case or that the motion is granted in the Respondent's/Movant's favor. Yet when Respondent refuses to respond at all, there are no sanctions against the Respondent and neither any legal victories for Petitioner. This doesn't make any sense that the rules are all being conducted on a one-sided basis, a one side scale which is broken justice. No Federal Judge is supposed to have a one-sided Courtroom or a one-sided litigation always favorable to the U.S. Attorney Office. That isn't following the U.S. Constitution's legal standard that all judges and triers of fact (jurists) must always remain impartial throughout a civil case and/or criminal case. It is a Judge's obligation under 28 U.S. Code § 455 to recuse himself/herself from a case when exhibiting any symptoms of a "personal bias or prejudice concerning a party", or "personal knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts concerning the proceeding"; as well as any proceeding in which his "impartiality might reasonably be questioned". Judge Schroeder had refused to recuse himself but instead had doubled down and exhibited more discriminatory or biased or prejudice type behavior. Impartiality no longer exists in the civil case of Brian David Hill v. United States of America under civil case no. 1:17-CV-1036, and criminal case no. 1:13-cr-435-1.

Petitioner tried to resolve the issue first by filing the Document #195: "MOTION entitled "Motion to Disqualify Judge" filed by BRIAN DAVID HILL. Responses due by 10/21/2019. (Attachments: # 1 Envelope - Front and Back) (Civil Case number: 17CV1036) (Garland, Leah) (Entered: 10/01/2019)". The Judge denied that motion and remained in the case while further conducting discriminatory and/or prejudice and/or bias type behavior against Petitioner. It is discriminatory when the Court's own Local Rules prescribed and had been passed by the Rule-making committee is only enforced on civil Petitioners in a civil/criminal 2255 case but is not being enforced equally on all officers of the Court who were trained as lawyers to obey all rules of the Court. That any rules not obeyed can lead to sanctions. This judge refuses to sanction an officer of the Court who defrauded the court and refuses to enforce the same Local Rules on the officer of the Court, the same rules enforced on Petitioner. It is discriminatory when a Judge always takes the side of the U.S. Attorney Office. Judge Schroeder does not always take the side of the U.S. Probation Officer when that officer does not lie about Petitioner under oath. For example, When United States Probation Officer Kristy L. Burton had lied on the stand in Federal Court on June 30, 2015, in front of Judge Thomas David Schroeder, **See Document Declaration — Document #137, "fifth Additional Evidence Declaration" filed by BRIAN DAVID HILL re 128 Memorandum. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit 1, # 2 Exhibit 2, # 3**



**Exhibit 3, # 4 Exhibit 4, # 5 Exhibit 5, # 6 Exhibit 6, # 7 Exhibit 7, # 8 Certificate of Service, # 9 Envelope - Front and Back) (Civil Case number: 17CV1036) (Garland, Leah) (Entered: 12/06/2017)”. Judge Schroeder was okay with her perjury, permitted her perjury before his Court even though perjury is defrauding the court aka fraud on the court. Yet when U.S. Probation Officer Jason McMurray of Roanoke, Virginia, had testified under oath on September 12, 2019, he was treated differently than with Kristy L. Burton. The Judge didn’t like how Jason McMurray would not lie on the stand against Brian David Hill. In fact, Jason McMurray’s testimony in 2019 was treated less important or more differently than the testimony of Kristy L. Burton in 2015. His discrimination has injured Petitioner repeatedly (over and over again) over the years, that Petitioner felt that he had no choice, no other recourse but to file a Petition in the U.S. Supreme Court requesting Writs of Mandamus and/or Prohibition to nullify all of Judge Schroeder’s excesses in jurisdiction by his defective orders. See **Exhibit 2**. Exhibit pages 6-59.**

3. It is obvious that something is wrong here, that Judge Schroeder has ignored the Local Rules of his own Court when favorable to Petitioner, but always wishes to enforce the rules on Petitioner with any possible threats of sanctions if Petitioner files anything not well-grounded in law. So, his Court is always set to punish Petitioner and threaten to punish Petitioner, keep throwing him in jail over and over again, while allowing the Corrupt U.S.

Attorney Office to break Court Rules, defraud the Court repeatedly, and/or just not follow Court Rules. This Judge even allowed repeated patterns of fraud to be perpetuated upon his Court and its record. So, he will allow one lie after another, one fraud after another against Petitioner. Then not allow Petitioner to prove otherwise even when he has the proof of his claims. Either not allow Petitioner to prove otherwise or just not accept otherwise. Petitioner's uncontested motions under Documents #151, #169, #199, #206, #217, #222. All were filed in the civil 2255 case but were not actually filed in the docket of civil case no. 1:17-CV-1036 itself but was mainly used as a reference civil case number but kept all civil 2255 case filings under criminal case no. 1:13-cr-435-1. So, the documents can be found there but were filed in the 2255 case and/or while the 2255 civil case was pending at that time. It is obvious that this Judge is ignoring the law when favorable to a criminal defendant and 2255 case civil Petitioner. It is all one-sided which warrants automatic recusal under 28 U.S. Code § 455. However, he refuses to leave the case, refuses to leave residing over Petitioner's criminal case and any 2255 motions Petitioner may ever file in the future. Judge Schroeder controls the entire case and continues injuring Petitioner over and over again without any means of relief or remedy. See Document #195, Motion to Disqualify/Recuse.

4. The misconduct or disability is simple. Judge Schroeder does exhibit selective enforcement of the rules and laws, prejudice, bias, and/or

discrimination against Brian David Hill the Petitioner. Judge Schroeder knows that Petitioner has Autism Spectrum Disorder a mental disability and yet has repeatedly and actively discriminated against Petitioner which violates his Federal Civil Rights. This discrimination is odd and is not the normal behavior of a rule enforcing and law obeying Federal Judge. Which leads Petitioner to the remaining statement of facts below which Petitioner would like to file in this COMPLAINT requesting investigation, intervention, and possibly prosecution against the Hon. Thomas David Schroeder, and/or the Hon. William Lindsey Osteen Junior. This is where both judges come in and the investigation needs to be conducted to resolve the issue which will be cited below. Judge Schroeder ignores the Actual Innocence exception to AEDPA under the U.S. Supreme Court's controlling law of *McQuiggin v. Perkins*, 569 U.S. 383, (2013). Judge Schroeder ignores the inherit or implied powers of *Chambers v. Nasco, Inc.*, 501 U.S. 32 (1991); when favorable to the Petitioner. Judge Schroeder ignored the jury trial right in the ruling of *United States v. Haymond*, 588 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (2019). His discrimination is obvious that he does not want Petitioner to ever be afforded any legal victories in which can relieve Petitioner of being defrauded against, of having the fraudulent criminal conviction overturned. This Judge does not want to follow the Haymond decision of giving Petitioner a jury trial for his supervised release violation. He completely ignores the Supreme Court case laws when they are not

favorable to the U.S. Attorney Office. It is all discriminatory and Petitioner does not see how he had not shown this in just this one COMPLAINT. It is discrimination which violates Federal Criminal Code such as deprivation of due process of law, and impartiality of all jurists. When any judge or official attempts to deprive an American citizen of his constitutional and civil rights under the color of law, then even a Federal Judge is violating criminal code such as Deprivation Of Rights Under Color Of Law under TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242. The U.S. Department of Justice had argued that this Federal Law includes judges as well. Petitioner's family gave him the link to cite in this COMPLAINT such as:  
<https://www.justice.gov/crt/deprivation-rights-under-color-law>

Citation of TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 and Department of Justice's interpretation of the law cited herein:

Section 242 of Title 18 makes it a crime for a person acting under color of any law to willfully deprive a person of a right or privilege protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

For the purpose of Section 242, acts under "color of law" include acts not only done by **federal**, state, or local officials within their lawful authority, but also acts done beyond the bounds of that official's lawful authority, if the acts are done while the official is purporting to or pretending to act in the performance of his/her official duties. Persons acting under color of law within the meaning of this statute include police officers, prisons guards and **other law enforcement officials, as well as judges**, care providers in public health facilities, and **others who are acting as public officials**. It is **not necessary that the crime be motivated by animus toward the race, color, religion, sex, handicap**, familial status or national origin of the victim. **The offense is punishable by a range of imprisonment up to a life term, or the death penalty, depending upon the circumstances of the crime**, and the

resulting injury, if any.

TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242

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; and if bodily injury results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include the use, attempted use, or threatened use of a dangerous weapon, explosives, or fire, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death.

**ATTORNEY L. LIN WOOD'S PUBLIC STATEMENTS OF OFFICIALS  
AND JUDGES ENGAGED IN BEING TARGETS OF BLACKMAIL  
VIDEOTAPE RECORDINGS OF ALLEGED CHILD RAPE AND MURDER**

**Disclaimer: Brian David Hill the Petitioner does not have access to the physical or digital blackmail videotapes mentioned by Attorney L. Lin Wood. It is obvious that Attorney L. Lin Wood had proclaimed that he has the access to the physical or digital blackmail videotapes. He cannot review over the blackmail footage as that may violate federal law by viewing such material as videotapes of child rape may constitute child pornography by legal definition, however this evidence of the blackmail videotapes is retained by this attorney according to his claim, and he claimed to keep them under an encryption key and is careful as to who he will disclose the encryption key to. This Judicial Council should take note that any claims regarding L. Lin Wood by the Petitioner are of only**

**of Petitioner's assumptions or perceptions of what Attorney Lin Wood had claimed himself on Twitter or any other public statement in regards to blackmail. Petitioner does not know which judges or officials are on the blackmail videotapes but had inquired as to whether any of the Federal Judges involved in Petitioner' case could have been involved in the blackmail tapes or is not involved in the blackmail tapes.**

5. It is obvious that when a Federal Judge does not wish to conduct impartiality and he is allowing a repeated pattern of fraud upon his Court which contaminates the entire record as questionable and non-credible. It is obvious when actual discrimination occurs where a Judge cannot and will not afford equal protection under the laws, will not provide equal application of the Court's local rules, and will not provide equal application of the law. It is obvious when a Federal Judge is depriving Petitioner of his Constitutional and Legal rights including Due Process of Law guaranteed by the U.S. Supreme Court as well as the Court's local rules under the color of law. It is obvious that something is wrong here and that the fraud goes deeper than just the U.S. Attorney Office. The fraud goes beyond just the U.S. Attorney Office. It is possible collusion with the fraudster and subornation of a perjurer. Working together to keep the fraud going.
6. This leads me to produce to this Judicial Council, a copy of a letter filed with the U.S. District Court Clerk's office. A 16-page letter regarding the service of the Petition for a Writ of Mandamus and/or Prohibition on the

Judges Hon. William Lindsey Osteen Junior, Hon. Thomas David Schroeder, and Hon. Magistrate Joe L. Webster. See **Exhibit 3**, Exhibit Index pages 60-76. It doesn't just serve the purpose to service the three copies of the Mandamus relief petitions with the Clerk's office to forward to the appropriate Judges of the Court, but also to assert the tweets of Attorney L. Lin Wood, asserting that any of the Court's judges may or may not be blackmailed with child rape and murder.

7. Attorney L. Lin Wood had claimed publicly that “the blackmail targets are approached with a gun, a child, & a camera. The target is ordered to rape the child on video. The target is then ordered to shoot the child on video. The target is then owned & controlled by the blackmailers until blackmail evidence loses its value.” Statement made on 2:22 AM - Jan 4, 2021.
8. Attorney L. Lin Wood had claimed publicly that “Many issues in our world may be tied to blackmail scheme I described tonight, including **bizarre behavior of officials & judges** in recent election. @realDonaldTrump **must appoint special prosecutor to thoroughly investigate**. We need answers. **We must investigate. For the children.**”
9. Attorney L. Lin Wood did mention the word “judges” in regard to the child rape and murder blackmail scheme. Petitioner was angry that Roger Stone failed to have U.S. President Donald John Trump to grant him a full unconditional pardon to reverse the wrongful conviction by Hon. Thomas

David Schroeder prior to leaving office in January, 2021, Petitioner filed a letter with Attorney L. Lin Wood inquiring on the blackmail videotapes. Asking if certain named individuals were being possibly blackmailed with child rape and murder. The names in such inquiry letter with Lin Wood are the named suspects of Chief Judge Thomas David Schroder, and former Chief Judge William Lindsey Osteen Junior of the Middle District of North Carolina, as well as other named individuals. See **Exhibit 4**, pages 77-85 of Exhibits Index. They are only suspects in that letter and Petitioner was inquiring to see if they could be in the blackmail scheme videotapes. Some of the claims made in that letter may sound crazy but Petitioner did receive anonymous text messages including threatening text messages meant to intimidate and made claims and somehow knew things that could not have been possibly known publicly, so Petitioner assumed it may be the Government intelligence agencies named in that letter. That's off-topic but the main issues in this COMPLAINT are Petitioner's request and inquiry to Attorney L. Lin Wood to inquire as to whether the Hon. William L. Osteen Junior and Hon. Thomas David Schroeder may or may not be in the claimed blackmail tapes.

10. Attorney L. Lin Wood had not sent a written response to that letter in **Exhibit 4** and no response had ever been made by Attorney L. Lin Wood in response to that **Exhibit 4** letter as far as to the knowledge of Petitioner. So, Lin Wood is not confirming or denying whether or not the Federal



Judges named, and other individuals may or may not be in the blackmail videotapes of child rape and murder. The blackmail scheme mentioned and described by Attorney L. Lin Wood in his various tweets referenced in the **Exhibit 3** and **Exhibit 4** letters.

11. Petitioner does not have subpoena power. Petitioner does not have supreme investigative powers compared to that of a Law Enforcement Agency. Petitioner does not have the powers of the U.S. Attorney Office. Petitioner does not have the power and authority to compel Attorney L. Lin Wood to answer Petitioner's inquiry on whether any of the individuals involved in his criminal case may or may not be in the blackmail videotapes.
12. The Judicial Council of the Fourth Circuit may have the subpoena power, the investigator(s) can serve a subpoena or Warrant or Order on Attorney L. Lin Wood to produce any records or videos involving whether the Hon. William L. Osteen Junior and Hon. Thomas David Schroeder may or may not be in the claimed scheme of the blackmail tapes mentioned by Lin Wood in his tweets.
13. Lin Wood's statements regarding judges and officials are vague. They do not restrict itself to simply one level of Government here. It can mean Federal, State or Local. It can mean Federal Judges, State Judges, or Local Judges. It can include any class of politicians or Judges. That is why Petitioner is making sure to mention the Lin Wood blackmail claim and

information in this COMPLAINT, because an investigation is needed and warranted in this situation. Especially “for the children”.

14. The Judicial Council of the Fourth Circuit can compel an order to mandate that Attorney L. Lin Wood turn over all blackmail videotapes to determine whether the Hon. William L. Osteen Junior and Hon. Thomas David Schroeder may or may not be in the claimed blackmail video tapes, and whether they may or may not be in such videotapes.
15. In the event if it is ever proven as to whether the Hon. William L. Osteen Junior and Hon. Thomas David Schroeder may or may not be in the claimed blackmail tapes, then this creates a serious issue regarding an officer of the Court being possibly engaged in criminal activity so heinous that law enforcement must arrest those Federal Judges if they had ever been placed in such a blackmail scheme operation where they could have been compelled to rape a child which is statutory rape, and murder the child which is murder of a child. Both are serious crimes, and one is considered a SEX OFFENSE when the murder of the child was done after the rape, it aggravates the sexual offense of rape of a minor.
16. Petitioner is attempting to figure out whether both named Judges were being blackmailed because that would explain why Petitioner kept failing in his criminal case, why his civil 2255 case didn't work out.
17. It is the biggest fraud on the Court when a judge may have been bribed,

blackmailed, or threatened into making an adverse decision in a criminal and/or civil case. In fact, it deprives a Federal Court of due process of law, and entitles the victim to relief and remedy, no matter what. It deprives a Federal Court of jurisdiction; it is in absence of lawful jurisdiction.

18. Petitioner only wishes to file this COMPLAINT to attempt to prove whether the Hon. William L. Osteen Junior and Hon. Thomas David Schroeder may or may not be in the claimed blackmail tapes since Attorney L. Lin Wood's claim of judges being blackmailed are so vague that it can include any Judge inside of the United States of America. Petitioner would like this ongoing issue to be resolved once and for all. If those judges were blackmailed, then the Judicial Council should inquire as to when this may have happened, and whether Brian David Hill's cases were affected negatively against Brian David Hill as a result of the blackmail if it exists. Attorney L. Lin Wood claimed to have this evidence and mentions about the need for a Special Prosecutor to review over the blackmail videotapes. The Judicial Council can save innocent lives and hold the blackmailed Judges accountable by investigating the STATEMENT OF FACTS of this COMPLAINT. Investigating the Exhibits and finding out directly from Attorney L. Lin Wood which Federal or State Judges may be blackmailed with child rape and murder concerning possibly the Middle District of North Carolina and/or possibly other United States Court Districts within the Fourth Circuit.

Morally it is the right thing to do for the Judicial Council of the Fourth Circuit to investigate all Statement of FACTS, as well as the Exhibits, and how it pertains to this COMPLAINT. It is of moral obligation to take action on this COMPLAINT.

The Attorney L. Lin Wood can be contacted and subpoenaed at the following:

L. LIN WOOD, P.C.  
1180 West Peachtree Street, Ste. 2400  
Atlanta, GA 30309  
P.O. Box 52584  
Atlanta, GA 30355-0584  
Telephone: (404) 891-1402  
Facsimile: (404) 506-9111  
Email: lwood@linwoodlaw.com

## **II. CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons stated above, the Petitioner urges this Judicial Council to investigate Petitioner's COMPLAINT and examine the Exhibits, as well as contacting Attorney L. Lin Wood to make a determination on whether any Federal Judges involved in any District of the United States District Court within the Fourth Circuit regions could be involved in a blackmail videotape described by Attorney Lin Wood.

For the foregoing reasons stated above, the Petitioner urges this Judicial Council to investigate Petitioner's COMPLAINT and examine the Exhibits, to determine if the Hon. Thomas David Schroeder and/or Hon. William Lindsey Osteen Junior were ever engaging in bias, prejudice, discrimination, and partiality behavior where it can reasonably be questioned.

For the foregoing reasons stated above, the Petitioner urges this Judicial Council to investigate Petitioner's COMPLAINT and examine the Exhibits, to determine if the Hon. Thomas David Schroeder and/or Hon. William Lindsey Osteen Junior may or may not be involved in any of the blackmail videotapes mentioned by Attorney L. Lin Wood.

For the foregoing reasons stated above, the Petitioner urges this Judicial Council to take any other appropriate actions to remedy the situation.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Dated: October 25, 2021

**BRIAN DAVID HILL**  
**Pro Se**

*Brian D. Hill*  
*Signed*

**Brian D. Hill**

Brian David Hill – Ally of Qanon  
Founder of USWGO Alternative  
News

310 Forest Street, Apt. 2  
Martinsville, Virginia 24112  
(276) 790-3505

*Pro Se Appellant*

**JusticeForUSWGO.wordpress.com**

**U.S.W.G.O.**



**CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this 25th day of October, 2021, I caused this COMPLAINT; STATEMENT OF FACTS; and EXHIBITS to be served by c/o Roberta Hill through her email address [rbhill67@comcast.net](mailto:rbhill67@comcast.net) upon the following Attorney(s) and Court Official(s):

Attorney L. Lin Wood  
L. LIN WOOD, P.C.  
1180 West Peachtree Street, Ste. 2400  
Atlanta, GA 30309  
P.O. Box 52584  
Atlanta, GA 30355-0584  
Telephone: (404) 891-1402  
Facsimile: (404) 506-9111  
Email: [lwood@linwoodlaw.com](mailto:lwood@linwoodlaw.com)

Judicial Council of the Fourth Circuit  
[4CCA-JudicialComplaints@ca4.uscourts.gov](mailto:4CCA-JudicialComplaints@ca4.uscourts.gov)  
United States Court of Appeals  
1100 East Main Street  
Suite 501  
Richmond, VA 23219-3517

  
Signed  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Brian D. Hill



Brian David Hill – Ally of Qanon  
Founder of USWGO Alternative  
News  
310 Forest Street, Apt. 2  
Martinsville, Virginia 24112  
(276) 790-3505

*Pro Se Appellant*

# EXHIBIT LIST

For the Judicial Council of the Fourth Circuit in reference to:  
COMPLAINT files by Brian David Hill on October 25, 2021.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
**EXHIBITS**

|  | <b><u>Exhibit Page</u></b> |
|--|----------------------------|
| LETTER FROM US DISTRICT COURT CLERK<br>entered November 12, 2014.....                        | 3                          |
| COPY OF SUPREME COURT PETITION<br>entered November 12, 2014.....                             | 6                          |
| LETTER TO US DISTRICT COURT CLERK<br>entered November 12, 2014.....                          | 60                         |
| LETTER TO ATTORNEY L. LIN WOOD RE:<br>BLACKMAIL VIDEOTAPES<br>entered November 12, 2014..... | 77                         |



# **EXHIBIT 1**

**for**

STATEMENT OF FACTS REGARDING  
COMPLAINT OF JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT OR DISABILITY

Judicial Council of the Fourth Circuit

Filed on October 25, 2021

by Brian David Hill

**United States District Court**

Middle District of North Carolina  
324 W. Market Street  
Greensboro, North Carolina 27401-2544

John S. Brubaker, Clerk

TELEPHONE: (336) 332-6000

January 10, 2018

BRIAN DAVID HILL  
310 FOREST STREET, APT. 2  
MARTINSVILLE, VA 24112

Re: Case: 17CV1036/13CR435; HILL v. USA

Dear BRIAN DAVID HILL:

The respondent has filed a Motion to Dismiss on 1/10/2018, which may or may not be supported by an affidavit.

You have the right to file a 20-page response in opposition to the respondent's motion. Your response may be accompanied by counter affidavits or you may submit other responsive material. Ordinarily, uncontested motions are granted. Therefore, your failure to respond or, if appropriate, to file counter affidavits or evidence in rebuttal within the allowed time may cause the court to conclude that the respondent's contentions are undisputed. As a result, the court may dismiss your suit or render judgment against you. Therefore, unless you file a response in opposition to the respondent's motion, it is likely your case will be dismissed or summary judgment will be granted in favor of the respondent. Any response or counter affidavits or other responsive material to a Motion to Dismiss must be filed within 21 days from the date of service of the respondent's motion upon you.

Any response you file should be accompanied by a brief containing a concise statement of reasons for your opposition and a citation of authorities upon which you rely. You are reminded that affidavits must be made on personal knowledge, contain facts admissible in evidence and be made by one shown to be competent to testify. A false statement under oath or under penalty of perjury may be a crime punishable as provided by law.

The original of your response should be mailed to this office and a copy served upon the respondent. Any pleadings presented to this court for filing must be accompanied by a certificate stating that you have served copies on the respondents.

Sincerely,

JOHN S. BRUBAKER, CLERK

By: /s/Leah Garland

Deputy Clerk

# **EXHIBIT 2**

**for**

STATEMENT OF FACTS REGARDING  
COMPLAINT OF JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT OR DISABILITY

Judicial Council of the Fourth Circuit

Filed on October 25, 2021

by Brian David Hill

Supreme Court, U.S.  
FILED  
OCT 08 2021  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

21-6038

No.21-

In The  
Supreme Court Of The United States

In Re: BRIAN DAVID HILL,  
Petitioner,

On Petition for a Writ of Mandamus or Prohibition to  
the United States District Court for the Middle  
District of North Carolina and the United States  
Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF  
MANDAMUS OR PROHIBITION

Brian David Hill  
*Pro Se*  
Ally of QANON, and General Flynn  
*Former USWGO Alternative News Reporter*  
310 FOREST STREET, APARTMENT 2  
MARTINSVILLE, VIRGINIA 24112  
Tel.: (276) 790-3505  
E-Mail: No Email



*Friend of justice for all*  
Dated: October 12, 2021



JusticeForUSWGO.wordpress.com  
JusticeForUSWGO.NL,  
USWGO.com

ORIGINAL

**I. Questions Presented**

Where the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina had systematically and repeatedly deprived a Petitioner of Due Process of Law under the Constitution, allow the multitudes of Fraud on the Court upon its record and repeatedly refused to correct its record after the proven fraud upon its record proven by the Uncontested Motions of the Petitioner?

Where the U.S. District Court and U.S. Court of Appeals have acted autonomously by ignoring the Supreme Court case law authorities, controlling case law. Not just repeatedly ignoring or disregarding evidence, witnesses, and proper legal rules and procedures to bully an innocent man for years?

Where the U.S. District Court had deprived the Petitioner of rights guaranteed and enumerated by United States Constitution and of the U.S. Supreme Court ("SCOTUS") by bucking this highest Court's authoritative laws of the Court, acting in REBELLION against SCOTUS?

Where the U.S. Court of Appeals had repeatedly over ten times had protected the repeated Constitutional violations of law and Due Process violations by rubber stamping every appeal to be favorable to the offending District Court and always favorable to the prosecuting attorney of the United States of America?

Where the U.S. Court of Appeals knew that the SCOTUS had ruled differently regarding different matters concerning Constitutional rights such as (#1) the right to a Jury Trial for Federal Supervised Release Violation charges carrying imprisonment terms; (#2) such as the right for a criminal defendant and 2255 Petitioner to bring forth the ground of Actual Innocence to overcome a one year statute of limitations time bar; (#3) such as regarding the inherit or implied powers concerning valid uncontested or proven Fraud on the Court claims?

Where both the U.S. Court of Appeals and the U.S. District Court had acted in REBELLION against SCOTUS authoritative case laws not just once but

multiple times and so remedy cannot be obtained in the lower Courts anymore or any further?

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 the Middle district of North Carolina and the supervisory Court known as the U.S. Court of Appeals by denying uncontested Hazel Atlas motions?

Where the errors have piled up throughout the U.S. District Court criminal case, 2255 civil case, and have done nothing to correct the fraud. They have done nothing to correct the errors, and they have done nothing to correct their autonomous decisions contrary to SCOTUS on multiple occasions. Will the Supreme Court grant extraordinary relief to strike down those null and void decisions?

Where relief cannot be obtained by direct appeal, by Habeas Corpus, by the Court’s inherit or implied powers? Where no relief can be obtained at all no matter what evidence, witnesses, and expert witnesses is ever offered or submitted?



Where the bias and prejudice are well within the record of the District Court, that the treatment and respect for U.S. Probation Officer Jason McMurray the truthful officer differs from the treatment and respect of U.S. Probation Officer Kristy L. Burton the perjurer?

Where due process had been completely deprived with no fairness, no impartiality under the adversarial system?

Where both Courts are engaging in excess of jurisdiction by depriving Petitioner of due process systematically as it is shown on the record how it is systematically being conducted?

Where both Courts are systematically ignoring evidence and witnesses when favorable to the criminal defendant even when the Federal Criminal Prosecutor's evidence which was reviewed by the Grand Jury actually may also be favorable to the criminal defendant that it also gets ignored and disregarded by both Courts acting in rebellion against common sense and the law?

II. Table of Contents

I

**I. Questions Presented..... ii**

**II. Table of Contents ..... v**

**III. Table of Authorities ..... vi**

**IV. Petition for Writ Of Certiorari ..... 1**

**V. Opinions Below..... 5**

**VI. Jurisdiction ..... 7**

**VII. Constitutional Provisions Involved ..... 8**

**VIII. Statement of the Case ..... 8**

**1. All unlawful, null and void judgments acting in excess of jurisdiction ..... 13**

**2. The Court of Appeals, which is the supervisory Court refuses to hold the U.S. District Court accountable under any appeal and refuses to Order and Remand anything; even if well-grounded in law and fact..... 17**

**IX. REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .. 24**

**A. To hold the District Court and Appeals Court accountable for Not following the Laws, Not Following SCOTUS authoritative case laws; acting in repeated excess of jurisdiction..... 24**

**B. To keep in uniformity with all Courts, the Supreme Court needs to make an example out of the District Court and the Fourth Circuit Appeals Court to make sure that they fully comply with the decisions of this Supreme Court. That they cannot render decisions contrary to this Supreme Court. .... 29**

**C. No other adequate remedy is available..... 33**

**X. CONCLUSION ..... 34**

III. Table of Authorities

Cases

Mallard v. U.S. Dist. Court for S. Dist. of Iowa, 490 U.S. 296,  
309,  
(1989).....  
.....7

United States v. Haymond, 588 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (2019).....15,  
 19, 20, 27

Chambers v. Nasco, Inc., 501 U.S. 32  
(1991).....24

Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v Hartford-Empire Co., 322 U.S. 238  
(1944).....  
.....24

Whiteside v. United States, 775 F.3d 180, 182-83 (4th Cir.  
2014)..... (en  
banc).....  
.....22, 35

Bolling v. Sharpe, 347 U.S. 497  
(1954).....27

Johnson v. Zerbst, 304 U.S. 458 S Ct.1019  
(1938).....26

Klugh v. U.S., 620 F. Supp., 892 (D.S.C.  
1985).....26

Marshall v. Jerrico, 100 S. Ct. 1610, 446 U.S. 238  
(1980).....25

Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963)  
.....17, 18

Giglio v. United States, 405 U.S. 150 (1972)  
.....17

Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668 (1984)  
.....  
.....17

In re Murchinson, 349 U.S. 133, 136  
(1955).....  
.....25

Hanson v Denckla, 357 US 235, 2 L Ed 2d 1283, 78 S Ct 1228 (1958)  
.....  
.....25

OLD WAYNE MUT. L. ASSOC. v. McDonough, 204 U. S. 8,27  
S. Ct. 236 (1907)  
.....  
.....26

Giglio v. United States, 405 U.S. 150  
(1972).....18

Pure Oil Co. v. City of Northlake, 10 Ill. 2D 241, 245, 140 N.E.  
2D 289

(1956).....  
 .....26

Bousley v. United States, 523 U.S. 614  
 (1998).....21, 35

Murray v. Carrier, 477 U.S. 478  
 (1986).....21, 35

McQuiggin v. Perkins, 569 U.S. 383  
 (2013).....21, 35

Schlup v. Delo, 513 U. S. 298  
 (1995).....21

House v. Bell, 547 U. S. 518  
 (2006).....21

Herrera v. Collins, 506 U. S. 390 -405  
 (1993).....21

Hallberg v. Goldblatt Bros., 363 Ill. 25  
 (1936).....26

Rules

Local Rule 7.3(k) and (f) of the Middle District of North  
 Carolina.....16-17, 20-21,  
 23

Appellate Rule  
 10(e).....23

Fed. Rules Civ. Proc., Rule 60(b)(4), 28 U.S.C.A.; U.S.C.A.  
 Const. Amend.  
 5.....26

Supreme Court Rule  
20.....13

Statutes

28 U. S. C. §1651(a), the All Writs Act.....7  
Section 242 of Title 18.....31

Constitutional Provisions

United States Constitution, Amendment V ..... 8  
United States Constitution, Amendment I ..... 8  
United States Constitution, Article III ..... 8  
Due Process of Law under the Fifth Amendment..... 6

Petition seeking Mandamus and/or Prohibition  
relief against the following Null and Void  
Judgment(s)

U.S. District Court for the Middle District of North  
Carolina; case no. # 1:13-cr-435-, 1:17-cv-01036:

Documents #54; #122, #200, #236

U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit:

Null and void Judgments under case nos. # #19-7756,  
#15-4057, #17-1866, #18-1160, #19-2077, #19-4758,  
#19-7483, #19-2338, #19-7755, #20-7737 and #20-  
6034

**IV. Petition for Writ Of Mandamus or Prohibition**

Brian David Hill ("Petitioner"), a criminal defendant and civil case 2255 Petitioner respectfully petitions this court for an Extraordinary Writ of Mandamus or Prohibition to review over all illegal, unlawful, invalid, null and void judgments, mainly of the U.S. District Court. The null and void judgments of both the party #1: U.S. District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina ("District Court") and party #2: the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit ("Appeals Court"). The main party is the District Court as the Appeals Court is being referenced to show cause proving that all other possible relief was attempted but have failed, that no other adequate relief can be obtained. Not just, review but mandate corrective action(s) against one or both parties in this case and prohibit any illegal/unlawful actions by one or both Courts in which had repeatedly deprived the Petitioner of Due Process of Law for years and years; as well as prohibit any actions by both parties from further violating the Constitutional rights of Petitioner. Petitioner asks this Court to mandate vacatur and nullification of all offending Judgments by one or both Courts, which had deprived Petitioner of Due Process of Law; violated multiple





controlling case laws from SCOTUS, which had not been overruled by this very Court; and had violated the U.S. Constitution to such an egregious extent. To the extent, which includes a repeated pattern of frauds, abuses, and miscarriages of justice can no longer be ignored by any credible Constitutional Court of Law with any integrity. Both Courts are acting autonomously outside of law as if SCOTUS does not exist anymore. This Court must act to correct all miscarriages of justice and to correct all autonomous court rulings from the inferior Courts which keep piling up. These autonomous rulings, which keep piling up one on top of the other. All in favor of the corrupt United States Attorney Office for the Middle District of North Carolina ("U.S. Attorney Office") who originally had prosecuted a fraudulent criminal case from the very beginning and destroyed discovery material.

The officers of the District Court at issue in this writ are #1: Hon. William Lindsey Osteen Junior, #2: Hon. Thomas David Schroeder, #3: Hon. Magistrate Joe L. Webster. All are officers working at the District Court.

The officer of the Appeals Court at issue in this writ are #1: Hon Patricia S. Connor, Clerk. This is an officer working at the Appeals Court. In the event that SCOTUS feels and



requests that any other possibly applicable officer be served a copy of this Petition when evaluating over this Petition, this Court can request any additional parties and Petitioner will comply with such an order. If this Court finds it necessary.

The judgments in which this Petitioner seeks relief have all deprived Petitioner of Due Process of Law under the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution and have allowed a repeated pattern of fraud, lies, and abuses by the U.S. Attorney Office without any remedy. All remedies have been exhausted. Please help me SCOTUS. I have no hope left. Petitioner cannot obtain any relief no matter what evidence and witness testimony is brought up, no matter what evidence or witnesses is offered or submitted, and no matter what authoritative case law is brought up in arguments. This Court's laws are ignored.

This is a very complex situation but with the page/word limits, Petitioner asks this Court to allow further filing of arguments/pleadings or requests Oral Argument for clarification when considering this Petition on its merits, to review over its merits. It does have merit. There are many legal and Constitutional issues, which were never resolved in the District Court and Appeals Court when brought to their attention. The inferior Courts are completely broken.

The District Court had filed multiple null and void judgments, which are subject to lack of jurisdiction or excess of jurisdiction; and thus this Court has the Constitutional right and original legal authority. This legal authority of this Court is to undo a repeated pattern of non-jurisdictional orders against Petitioner, which are all supposed to be null and void.

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit ("Appeals Court") have created judgments contrary to the evidence on the record, contrary and contradictory to the authoritative case laws by this very Court. Petitioner shows from the judgments and records of all Appeals Court cases Petitioner was involved with that no relief can be obtained by the Appeals Court, and no remedy can be obtained by the Appeals Court. They rubber-stamp every final judgment against Petitioner and always in favor of the U.S. Attorney Office. Thus, Petitioner has no other avenue to obtain any Constitutional/Legal relief or remedy no matter the merits. The District Court admitted in its own opinion that even if Petitioner had any merit at all, it would deny them. Thus, Petitioner is subject to an unlawful and unconstitutional Kangaroo Court, which had deprived Petitioner of all remedies under the Laws of the Land. Even the famous celebrities Bill

Cosby and Michael Jackson were acquitted of their charges because of either being found innocent in the case of Michael Jackson, or prosecutorial misconduct as found in the case of Bill Cosby. If both can be legally acquitted, so must Brian David Hill a victim of a repeated pattern of miscarriages of justice.

The Appeals Court offending case nos. are #1: 20-7737, #2: 20-1396, #3: 20-6034, #4: 19-7756, #5: 19-7755, #6: 19-2338, #7: 19-7483, #8: 19-4758, #9: 19-2077, #10: 18-1160, #11: 17-1866, #12: 15-4057. No matter what arguments were brought up, every Appeal affirms the decision of the District Court no matter what was in the record, no matter the argument, no matter what the law says or what SCOTUS says. It is virtually impossible for a valid Appeals Court of Law to deny every appeal ever consecutively from a single criminal defendant or civil litigator. When many appeals are denied and dismissed with all having an unpublished opinion no matter the argument, it should have drawn the Court into serious question as to whether it had failed to properly administer justice under the Law. **Are they compromised? Were they blackmailed?**

The District Court offending case nos. are 1:13-cr-435-1, and 1:17-cv-1036.

## V. Opinions Below

There are many judgments and the opinions would exceed the page and word limits set by the Rules of this Court. Read all offending judgments of the District Court and Appeals Court as outlined in the Joint Appendix. They are offending judgments because they were all made in deprivation of Due Process of Law (excess of jurisdiction) and decisions were made in contradiction to the Case Laws set by this authoritative Supreme Court.

However, one opinion made by the officer: Hon. U.S. Magistrate Judge Joe L. Webster of the Middle District of North Carolina. This Magistrate said and I quote:

“g. The Merits As explained above, all of Petitioner’s grounds are time-barred. However, if the Court were to reach the merits of Petitioner’s grounds for relief, it would deny them.” Citation from Document #210, Page 19, Case no. 1:13-cr-435.

This opinion was affirmed by officer: Hon. Chief Judge Thomas David Schroeder (JA 35-37), and so they were both colluding to deprive Petitioner of Due Process of Law under the Fifth Amendment. See Document #236, #237, Case no. 1:13-cr-435. The point I am making is that the District Court does not care about the merits and would deny any relief even if merits or the law allow such remedy and relief. It is a kangaroo court, and that short sentence of Hon. Mag. Judge Joe Webster’s opinion had shown that the District

Court never cared about the merits, never cared about any evidence or witnesses actually filed with the Court. Never cared about appointment of impartial expert witnesses. It was all one sided and always will be one sided (in violation of the adversarial system, impartiality, fairness) unless this Supreme Court takes action and mandates an end to this endless judicial nightmare of miscarriages of justice that keeps going and going like an Energizer Battery.

## **VI. Jurisdiction**

Mr. Hill's petition for Mandamus and Prohibition is a request for Extraordinary Relief and all other attempts to obtain relief have been exhausted. Mr. Hill invokes this Court's jurisdiction under 28 U. S. C. §1651(a), the All Writs Act. Mandamus is appropriate where petitioner "lack adequate alternative means to obtain the relief they seek", *Mallard v. U.S. Dist. Court for S. Dist. of Iowa*, 490 U.S. 296, 309, (1989). Petitioner had been shut out of his Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus (JA 35-37 and JA 69-74). Petitioner's Hazel Atlas motions were all denied despite being uncontested and undisputed (JA 78-80) and proven the frauds on the Court by an officer of the Court. Therefore, Petitioner had been shut out of all Hazel Atlas remedies under the Court's inherit or implied powers. His appeals have all

been closed with the exception of his remaining two Petitions for Writs of Certiorari to be filed in this Court on October 11, 2021, accompanying this Petition. The two to-be-filed Petitions regarding case nos. 19-7755, 20-6034, and 20-7737. Since a large majority of Writs of Certiorari is usually denied without an opinion, and the right to relief is discretionary, Petitioner is only left with Mandamus relief if those two Petitions are denied. If those two remaining Petitions for Writ of Certiorari are denied, then Petitioner has no other adequate remedy left and thus Mandamus is the appropriate relief. Therefore, Petitioner asks that this Mandamus Petition be acted upon last of all three Petitions to be filed with this Court on October 11, 2021. That includes this petition in all three.

## **VII. Constitutional Provisions Involved**

United States Constitution, Amendment V:

“No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be put twice in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.”

United States Constitution, Amendment I:



“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”

United States Constitution, Article III:

“Section 1. The judicial power of the United States, shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish...” (citation partially omitted)

“Section 2. The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority;--to all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls;--to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction;--to controversies to which the United States shall be a party...” (citation partially omitted)

#### VIII. Statement of the Case

We are now faced with a situation of jurisdictional defect upon jurisdictional defect. Where many errors come together throughout the entire case of United States of America v. Brian David Hill (case no. 1:13-cr-435-1); Brian David Hill v. United States of America (case no. 1:17-cv-01036); and Brian David Hill v. Executive Office for United States Attorneys, et al (case no. 4:17-cv-00027, **Western District of Virginia**). **NOTE: The Western District of Virginia case is not being prosecuted in this Mandamus Petition but is only used for reference as it involved the other two cases and the U.S. Attorney Office. The**

corruption and criminality of the United States Attorney Office for the Middle District of North Carolina. They had become so corrupted that they would not even contest the Fraud on the Court claims in the District Court. One fraud for example: regarding perjury of their key-witness Kristy L. Burton, and regarding other ethical issues. See Petition for Writ of Certiorari filed with this Court for appealing Appeals Court case no. # 20-7737. They never contested the claims of fraud under Documents #169, #171, #199, #206, #222, and #217. See case nos. 1:13-cr-435-1 and 1:17-cv-01036, Middle Dist. Of North Carolina.

In addition to that, it was admitted by the U.S. Attorney Office in Greensboro, NC, in the Western District of Virginia lawsuit under case no. 4:17-cv-00027 that they had destroyed evidence such as:

(#1) The State Bureau of Investigation forensic case file which had download dates of July 20, 2012, to July 28, 2013, after being seized by police on August 28, 2012;

(#2) The false confession audio file of Brian David Hill on August 29, 2012, and compiled by Mayodan Police Department;

(#3) any other evidence that should have been protected under Giglio v. United States, 405 U.S. 150 (1972) and Brady

v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963). See the admissions by the U.S. Attorney Office under oath/affirmation and in their pleadings (case no. 4:17-cv-00027, Western District of Virginia) in Document #48, Document #49 in Hill v. EOUSA, et al. Citation: "ECF NOS. 49-3, 49-6 and 49-7 WERE STRICKEN FROM THE DOCKET PURSUANT TO DOCUMENT 54 Brief / Memorandum in Support re 48 MOTION for Summary Judgment . filed by Executive Office for United States Attorneys, United States Department Of Justice. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A - Princina Stone Declaration, # 2 1, # 3 2, # 4 3, # 5 4, # 6 5, # 7 6, # 8 7, # 9 8, # 10 Exhibit B - Carolyn Loye Declaration)(Sloan, Cheryl) Modified on 1/4/2018. Modified docket text to reflect exhibits stricken from the docket. (mlh)". They admitted to evidence being destroyed.

Here are the links to the destroyed evidence pages leaked regarding the destroyed evidence by an anonymous concerned whistleblower:

See <https://wearechange.org/case-brian-d-hill/> - WRC EXCLUSIVE: Alternative Media Writer Brian D. Hill Setup On Child Pornography Possession: | We Are Change (web link citation)

See <https://archive.org/details/LeakedSbiDocsProveUswgoFramedWithChildPorn> - Leaked SBI Docs prove USWGO framed with child porn : Anonymous : Free Download, Borrow, and Streaming : Internet Archive (web link citation)

In fact, the District Court and Appeals Court have gotten so brazen with their deprivation of Due Process of Law against Petitioner that online YouTube videos have been uploaded by friends or family in regards to Brian Hill being held hostage by the District Court. Thousands have seen the videos according to Petitioner's family giving Petitioner screen captures of the reported view counts. Petitioner's family confirmed that view counts were being manipulated to being lowered than the true view counts. Therefore, the view counts may be higher than what YouTube had reported. I was given the link texts:

See [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yrLahE\\_2Zm4](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yrLahE_2Zm4) - Proof that Brian D. Hill; USWGO Alt. News, was TORTURED into Falsely Pleading Guilty. (Video stream citation); <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GkvLiooKltY> - Proof that Brian D. Hill; USWGO Alt. News, is INNOCENT, being HELD HOSTAGE by Corrupt Federal Court (Video stream citation) See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Nlasri7JRag> - The Federal Courts and Fourth Circuit US Court IGNORES THE LAW - Brian D Hill Interview/Statement (Video stream citation)

The fact those videos are coming out showing the lies and frauds by the U.S. Attorney Office, leaked SBI document photo pages, the alleged claim of possible child pornography with the download dates as to being 11 months, 8 days after the computer was seized by the Town of Mayodan Police Department. Its corrupt Mayodan Town lawyer Philip Edward Berger Senior also allowed the corruption in the Town of

Mayodan Police Department by depriving Petitioner of Brady Material for his 2255 Motion. See Document #2-2, pages 18-19, Western Dist. Of Virginia, case no. 4:17-cv-00027-JLK-RSB, Filed 04/25/17. The U.S. Attorney Office destroyed the confession audio. This helped Town of Mayodan and its corrupt lawyer violating Brady v. Maryland named Philip E. Berger Senior so that Brian would be prevented from proving that his confession was a false confession and that the audio was botched up and altered in violation of the Federal Rules of Evidence. It is obvious that when the claimed download dates are between July 20, 2012, and July 28, 2013; the computer was seized on August 28, 2012, that something criminal and sinister was going on here. The U.S. Attorney Office never refuted those download dates in the SBI forensic report by SBI Special Agent Rodney V. White, ever. They never claimed those download dates had never existed in their own evidence used for the Grand Jury indictment of Brian David Hill on November 25, 2013. It is clear that there is fraud, abuse, and corruption by the U.S. Attorney Office, no doubt about that. They are being protected by officer: Hon. Thomas David Schroeder, and officer: Hon. Mag. Judge Joe L. Webster. They all rather push this

fraud under the rug. That the fraud continues and deny every motion Petitioner had ever filed requesting any kind of relief.

This case presents very important questions of exceptional circumstances warranting "Extraordinary Relief" as required by Rule 20. "Procedure on a Petition for an Extraordinary Writ."

As to Supreme Court Rule 20: *"the petition must show that the writ will be in aid of the Court's appellate jurisdiction, that exceptional circumstances warrant the exercise of the Court's discretionary powers, and that adequate relief cannot be obtained in any other form or from any other court."* Petitioner had demonstrated that no other adequate relief could be obtained in any other form or from any other court. The only Court that can provide relief for these extraordinary jurisdictional defects is this Supreme Court, as Petitioner cannot obtain any relief in the District Court and in the Appeals Court.

Here are the facts for the Justices to consider:

1. All unlawful, null and void judgments acting in excess of jurisdiction

The judgments by the District Court in case no. 1:13-cr-435-1 which are acting in deprivation of Due Process of Law; permitting Frauds on the Court; and acting in excess of jurisdiction from the District Court are as follows. Those

judgments are acting autonomously and in repeatedly contradiction to SCOTUS.

Document #54: JUDGMENT as to BRIAN DAVID HILL (1), Count(s) 1, Ten (10) months and twenty (20) days imprisonment, but not less than time served; ten (10) years supervised release; \$100.00 special assessment. Filed on November 12, 2014 – Note from Petitioner: This judgment was grounded on fraud by U.S. Attorney Office by the uncontested Motions filed at a later time in the case under Documents numbered: #169, #199, #206, #222, #264 and #217. See JA 5-10.

Document #122: ORDER Supervised Release Violation Hearing signed by JUDGE THOMAS D. SCHROEDER on 7/23/2015. Defendant's supervised release is not revoked and the Defendant is to remain on supervised release. The Defendant shall participate in a cognitive behavioral treatment program and location monitoring home detention program as set out herein. All other terms and conditions of supervised release as previously imposed remain in full force and effect in case as to BRIAN DAVID HILL (1). (Daniel, J) - Filed on July 24, 2015 – Note from Petitioner: This judgment was grounded on fraud by U.S. Attorney Office by the uncontested Motions filed at a later time in the case under Documents numbered:

#169, #199, #206, #222, #264 and #217. Not just fraud but deprivation of Petitioner's constitutional right to a TRIAL BY JURY as set forth in SCOTUS case United States v. Haymond, 588 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (2019). See JA 11-18.

Document #200: JUDGMENT ON REVOCATION OF PROBATION/SUPERVISED RELEASE. The Defendant's supervised release is revoked. Nine (9) months imprisonment. Nine (9) years supervised release is re-imposed under the same terms and conditions as previously imposed. The Defendant shall surrender to the U.S. Marshal for the Middle District of N.C. or to the institution designated by the Bureau of Prisons by 12:00 p.m. on 12/6/2019 as to BRIAN DAVID HILL. Signed by CHIEF JUDGE THOMAS D. SCHROEDER on 10/4/2019. (Daniel, J). Filed on October 4, 2019 – Note from Petitioner: This judgment was grounded on fraud by U.S. Attorney Office by the uncontested Motions filed at a later time in the case under Documents numbered: #169, #199, #206, #222, #264 and #217. Not just fraud but deprivation of Petitioner's constitutional right to a TRIAL BY JURY as set forth in SCOTUS case United States v. Haymond, 588 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (2019). See JA 19-34.



Document #236: ORDER signed by CHIEF JUDGE THOMAS D. SCHROEDER on 12/31/2019, that the Government's motion to dismiss (Doc. [141]) be GRANTED, that Petitioner's motion to vacate, set aside or correct sentence (Doc. [125]) be DISMISSED, and that this action be DISMISSED. FURTHER that Petitioner's motion to file under seal (Doc. [140]), motion for a psychological/psychiatric evaluation (Doc. [151]), motions for the appointment of counsel (Docs. [153] and [169]), motion to continue supervised release (Doc. [154]), motion to dismiss (Doc. [165]), motion for copies (Doc. [168]), and request for transcript (Doc. [194]) all be DENIED. A judgment dismissing this action will be entered contemporaneously with this Order. Finding neither a substantial issue for appeal concerning the denial of a constitutional right affecting the conviction nor a debatable procedural ruling, a certificate of appealability is not issued. Civil Case 1:17CV1036.(Taylor, Abby). Filed on December 31, 2019. See also the JUDGMENT on Document #237. – Note from Petitioner: This judgment was grounded on fraud by U.S. Attorney Office by the uncontested Motions filed at a later time in the case under Documents numbered: #169, #199, #206, #222, #264 and #217. That judgment was acting in excess of

jurisdiction as the Motions under: #169, #199, #206, #222 were uncontested as a matter of law under Local Rule 7.3(k) and (f) of the Middle District of North Carolina. Uncontested and thus those motions had proven enough fraud that those uncontested motions should have been granted on its face. See JA 35-37.

2. The Court of Appeals, which is the supervisory Court refuses to hold the U.S. District Court accountable under any appeal and refuses to Order and Remand anything; even if well-grounded in law and fact

On April 7, 2015, Appeals Court in case no. 15-4057, affirms in part and dismisses in part Petitioner's appeal due to Ineffective Assistance of Counsel in violation of Due Process of Law under the Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and Effective Assistance of Counsel under the Sixth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. See *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668 (1984). See JA 38-41.

On October 9, 2017, Appeals Court in case no. 17-1866, dismisses the interlocutory appeal. That appeal was to protect Petitioner's right to discovery in his criminal case and to prove that the U.S. Attorney Office was covering up and destroying evidence then refusing to turn over a copy to the criminal defendant. In sheer violation of a criminal defendant's rights under *Giglio v. United States*, 405 U.S. 150 (1972) and *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963). This was done intentionally by the U.S. Attorney

Office to cover up any evidence proving the Actual Innocence of Brian David Hill. Again,

See the evidence documented under <https://archive.org/details/LeakedSbiDocsProveUswgoFramedWithChildPorn> - Leaked SBI Docs prove USWGO framed with child porn : Anonymous : Free Download, Borrow, and Streaming : Internet Archive (web link citation).

The Appeals Court knew from the record in the Western District of Virginia FOIA lawsuit civil case that Petitioner was a criminal defendant in the Middle District of North Carolina. They totally violated his rights under Brady v. Maryland and Giglio v. United States. See JA 42-47.

On July 24, 2018, Appeals Court in case no. 18-1160, dismisses the appeal. That appeal was to protect Petitioner's right to discovery in his criminal case and to prove that the U.S. Attorney Office was covering up and destroying evidence then refusing to turn over a copy to the criminal defendant. In sheer violation of a criminal defendant's rights under Giglio v. United States, 405 U.S. 150 (1972) and Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963). This was done intentionally by the U.S. Attorney Office to cover up any evidence proving the Actual Innocence of Brian David Hill. Again, See the evidence from the following: <https://archive.org/details/LeakedSbiDocsProveUswgoFramedWithChildPorn> - Leaked SBI Docs prove USWGO framed with

child porn : Anonymous : Free Download, Borrow, and Streaming : Internet Archive (web link citation). Link text from Brian's family. The Appeals Court knew from the record in the Western District of Virginia FOIA lawsuit civil case that Petitioner was a criminal defendant in the Middle District of North Carolina. They totally violated his rights under Brady v. Maryland and Giglio v. United States. That decision also protected Mayodan Police Department who, through its corrupt Town Attorney Philip Edward Berger Senior, deprived Petitioner of his CONSTITUTIONAL right to obtain a copy of his false confession by the audio recording recorded on August 29, 2012 by Detective Christopher Todd Brim and/or Detective Robert Bridge. See JA 48-53. See Document #2-2, pages 18-19, Western Dist. Of Virginia, case no. 4:17-cv-00027-JLK-RSB, Filed 04/25/17. Any legalize in that letter would be by a lawyer.

On October 17, 2019, Appeals Court in case no. 19-2077, dismisses the appeal. However, the reason for that dismissal was that after Petitioner had served a copy of his Petition for a Writ of Mandamus in the Fourth Circuit upon the District Court, the judge had been moved to put in his final written judgment. That was after stalling/stonewalling for weeks, relief was obtained not in the Appeals

Court but that Petitioner was given relief by that pressure put on the District Court. See JA 54.

On October 16, 2020, Appeals Court in case no. 19-4758, affirms the entire judgment of the District Court in an unpublished opinion. Attorney Edward Ryan Kennedy had pushed for Certiorari relief in case no. 20-6864 before this Court but had failed due to it being denied. However, the Appeals Court had deprived Petitioner of his Constitutional right to TRIAL BY JURY as outlined in SCOTUS case *United States v. Haymond*, 588 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (2019). The Appeals Court had rebelled against giving Petitioner his Constitutional Due Process right to Trial by Jury. They had rebelled against SCOTUS. See JA 55-61.

On March 17, 2020, Appeals Court in case no. 19- 7483, affirms the entire judgment of the District Court in an unpublished opinion. The appeal was over the District Court denying Petitioner's motion for stay of judgment pending appeal. They not only had deprived Petitioner of his Constitutional right to trial by jury but had deprived Petitioner of staying out of Imprisonment at the time in 2019 knowing the Supreme Court had ruled that Supervised Release Violators are guaranteed a right to Trial by Jury. Again, see SCOTUS case *United States v. Haymond*, 588 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (2019). The Appeals Court and District Court had rebelled against giving Petitioner

his Constitutional Due Process right to Trial by Jury. They had rebelled against SCOTUS. See JA 62-64.

On February 10, 2020, Appeals Court in case no. 19-2338, dismisses the Petitions for Writs of Mandamus and Prohibition against the District Court in an unpublished opinion. That Mandamus and Prohibition appeal was over the District Court not acting upon uncontested Hazel Atlas Motions regarding proven Fraud on the Court claims against Officer of the Court: Anand Prakash Ramaswamy, Assistant U.S. Attorney for the Middle District of North Carolina aka the U.S. Attorney Office. At that time when it was denied, Motions under #169, #199, #206, #217, and #222 were all uncontested in accordance with Local Rule 7.3 of the Middle District of North Carolina. Fraud was proven, Mandamus should not have been denied, and Prohibition should not have been denied. Any time periods set by the Local Law of that Court were all passed the deadlines. Therefore, Petitioner had won his cases and won his claims but the Appeals Court and District Court had refused to hand Petitioner over that victory. As a matter of law, Petitioner was entitled to relief. Both Courts are REBELLING against the Law; they are working AGAINST THE LAW. Lower inferior Courts are not supposed to rebel against SCOTUS and they are not supposed to rebel against the law even if they disagree with it. If they feel that a law is

unconstitutional or not legally valid, then they should make a legal opinion and ruling deciding such. None of that was done in the decisions against Brian David Hill, the law was ignored by the District Court and Appeals Court; and the law was not followed by the District Court and Appeals Court. See JA 65-68.

On December 18, 2020, Appeals Court in consolidated case nos. 19-7755 & 20-6034, denies the Certificate of Appealability despite raising very important issues of both a Constitutional and Legal nature. The issues of both Actual Innocence and Fraud on the Court, both of them were not subject to being time barred. See SCOTUS cases *Bousley v. United States*, 523 U.S. 614 (1998); *Murray v. Carrier*, 477 U.S. 478 (1986); *McQuiggin v. Perkins*, 569 U.S. 383 (2013); *Schlup v. Delo*, 513 U. S. 298 (1995); *House v. Bell*, 547 U. S. 518 (2006); and *Herrera v. Collins*, 506 U. S. 390 –405 (1993). Not just actual innocence but fraud was proven by the uncontested motions filed by Petitioner. Petitioner had shown and proven the issues of fraud and that the fraud was perpetuated by an officer of the Court who indicted, arrested, and wrongfully convicted Petitioner. That was by Officer of the Court: Anand Prakash Ramaswamy, Assistant U.S. Attorney for the Middle District of North Carolina aka the U.S. Attorney Office. The proof is that the Motions under #169, #199, #206, #217, and #222 were all uncontested in accordance with Local Rule

7.3 of the Middle District of North Carolina. Petitioner had won his cases as a matter of law and won his claims by those being uncontested, but the Appeals Court and District Court had refused to hand Petitioner over that victory. As a matter of law, Petitioner was entitled to relief. Both Courts are REBELLING against the Law, they are working AGAINST THE LAW. Lower inferior Courts are not supposed to rebel against SCOTUS, and they are not supposed to rebel against the law even if they disagree with it. In the decisions made against Brian David Hill, the law was ignored by the District Court and Appeals Court; and the law was not followed by the District Court and Appeals Court. Even created autonomous case law authority *Whiteside v. United States*, 775 F.3d 180, 182-83 (4th Cir. 2014) (en banc); contradicts with SCOTUS. See JA 69-74.

On March 17, 2020, Appeals Court in case no. 19-7756, affirmed the District Court and dismissed the Appeal without any remedy. That is concerning Document #216: "MOTION entitled "Petitioner's and Criminal Defendant's Motion to Correct or Modify the Record Pursuant to Appellate Rule 10(e) (Doc. #[215])"...". That had brought up very concerning information from four Affidavits and brought up suggestion of additional witnesses including Renorda Pryor an officer of the Court, as well as Jason McMurray a Probation Officer that is an officer of the Court. This is regarding information



factually omitted from official Court Transcript, which again is covering up evidence or covering up testimony, which may be favorable to the Petitioner. Regardless, purposefully omitting information from an Official Court Transcript of the Record of a Court may be a Federal Crime or malfeasance when the intent is proven. The Appeals Court refused to correct the transcript of the record, and the District Court refused to correct such omissions from the record. That is a serious violation of proper Judicial Procedure. The Appeals Court let them get away with it. See JA 75-77.

Last one that is being cited. On April 27, 2021, Appeals Court in case no. 20-7737, affirmed the District Court and dismissed the Appeal without any remedy. That is appealing the wrongful denial of all uncontested Hazel Atlas Motions. The Appeals Court had refused to provide relief as a matter of law despite Local Rule 7.3 MOTION PRACTICE. That local rule with the 21-day deadlines. That all motions, which are uncontested, would ordinarily be granted without further notice. That also contradicts the SCOTUS case laws of *Chambers v. Nasco, Inc.*, 501 U.S. 32 (1991); and *Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v Hartford-Empire Co.*, 322 U.S. 238 (1944). See JA 78-80.

*II II II*

#### IX. REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

A. To hold the District Court and Appeals Court accountable for Not following the Laws, Not Following SCOTUS authoritative case laws; acting in repeated excess of jurisdiction

The District Court is holding Petitioner hostage to fraudulent begotten judgments not caring about whatever witnesses, whatever evidence, and whatever case law Petitioner introduces in the District Court. Petitioner cannot obtain any relief no matter the argument. That itself shows an inherit bias or prejudice on its face. Not one person can be 100% wrong all of the time. When all appeals by one person are denied, dismissed or affirming the original judgment, then something is clearly wrong here with that Court of Appeals. The Appeals Court is depriving Petitioner of due process of law because every single appeal had been denied. Even Appeals backed by Affidavits, witnesses, properly cited authoritative case law. Any well-grounded pleading Petitioner files is usually all systematically denied.

Petitioner is being held hostage by an unreasonable District Court, biased District Court, prejudiced District Court against Petitioner, defrauded District Court, and a District Court acting with repeated excesses to its own jurisdiction.

See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GkvLiooKltY> - Proof that Brian D. Hill; USWGO Alt. News, is INNOCENT,

being HELD HOSTAGE by Corrupt Federal Court (Video stream citation) – Link text, provided by Family

The limitations inherent in the requirements of due process and equal protection of the law extend to judicial as well as political branches of government, so that a judgment may not be rendered in violation of those constitutional limitations and guarantees. *Hanson v Denckla*, 357 US 235, 2 L Ed 2d 1283, 78 S Ct 1228 (1958). In this case for example, Judge Bjork refused to hear what the Defendant had to say. (**Note: Sounds similar to officer: Judge Thomas David Schroeder of the U.S. District Court**) “Defendants who have been treated with unfairness, bias and the appearance of prejudice by this Court, and the opposing counsel, leaves open the question of how an uninterested, lay person, would question the partiality and neutrality of this Court.” **...our system of law has always endeavored to prevent even the probability of unfairness.**” In *re Murchinson*, 349 U.S. 133, 136 (1955). This court had a duty to ensure fairness. This Court failed, or refused to ensure that fairness. *Marshall v. Jerrico*, 100 S. Ct. 1610, 446 U.S. 238 (1980) **Judgment is a void judgment if court that rendered judgment lacked jurisdiction of the subject matter, or of the parties, or acted in a manner inconsistent with due process**, Fed. Rules Civ. Proc., Rule 60(b)(4), 28

U.S.C.A.; U.S.C.A. Const. Amend. 5 - Klugh v. U.S., 620 F. Supp., 892 (D.S.C. 1985). Where Due Process is denied, the case is void, Johnson v. Zerbst, 304 U.S. 458 S Ct.1019; Pure Oil Co. v. City of Northlake, 10 Ill. 2D 241, 245, 140 N.E. 2D 289 (1956) Hallberg v. Goldblatt Bros., 363 Ill. 25 (1936). "A court cannot confer jurisdiction where none existed and cannot make a void proceeding valid. It is clear and well established law that a void order can be challenged in any court". OLD WAYNE MUT. L. ASSOC. v. McDonough, 204 U. S. 8,27 S. Ct. 236 (1907).

Again, see all of the Supreme Court cases referenced above, See sections "1. All unlawful, null and void judgments acting in excess of jurisdiction" and "2. The Court of Appeals, which is the supervisory Court refuses to hold the U.S. District Court accountable under any appeal and refuses to Order and Remand anything; even if well-grounded in law and fact". Both Courts have acted in rebellion against the authoritative rulings of the Supreme Court without a valid reason as to why. They have done so to deprive Petitioner of due process of law in every way, shape or form. It no longer matters about the one-year statute of limitations under the Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act ("AEDPA") or any of it. Petitioner was deprived of evidentiary hearings for his Actual Innocence claim. Petitioner was deprived of evidentiary hearings for his uncontested fraud on the

court claims. Petitioner had been deprived of his Constitutional right to a Trial by Jury in both Supervised Release Violation hearings. Whenever Petitioner timely appealed that decision, the Appeals Court refused to apply the Supreme Court's holding under *United States v. Haymond*, 588 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (2019). Petitioner was again deprived of due process and was being deprived of Trial by Jury.

Petitioner had been deprived of all Constitutional rights by the District Court and Appeals Court. They are likely doing this to other civil litigants and criminal defendants. They should not be getting away with breaking the laws. They should not be ignoring the laws. The officers need to be sanctioned and the only applicable remedy for this Mandamus and Prohibition Petitions is to rule those offending judgments are null and void, that they no longer carry the weight and force of law.

Equal Protection under the Laws must apply to the U.S. District Court and the Fourth Circuit Appeals Court. This Supreme Court held in *Bolling v. Sharpe*, 347 U.S. 497 (1954), that the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment nonetheless imposes various **equal protection requirements on the federal government via reverse incorporation**. All laws must be enforced and be equally enforced, that is why we even have laws. If an officer fails or refuses to fulfil his duty, then he has

become essentially a useless official, wasting the resources, time, and legitimacy of his respective office. Integrity lost.

The inferior Courts have now acted in such a way as to become either Rebellious Courts or Runaway Courts. A "Runaway Court" is a Court, which is running away from complying with the laws of the land. The officials and officers of a Court who ignore the laws, ignore its own rules when its favorable to a stigmatized person such as for example: a criminal defendant, and ignore evidence and everything else for its own benefit to do whatever it well pleases, then it acts in excess of jurisdiction. It is a runaway Court and it is running away from any proven evidence. It runs away from any laws favoring somebody who the Court does not like. A "Rebellious Court" is a Court, which acts in rebellion against a higher Court, refusing to follow newer or even older but valid Supreme Court decisions. Creates autonomous case law directly contradicting the case law of the Supreme Court. Like Whiteside v. US in the Appeals Court for example. It acts in rebellion and refuses to render a lawful decision from a superior Court. Acting in sheer disrespect to the officials and officers of a superior Court. The U.S. District Court is acting in disrespect to the Supreme Court, and so is the Appeals Court. The lower Courts no longer wish to bring any remedy to Brian David Hill and never wanted to bring any remedy. If this is being done to Brian

Hill, a criminal defendant, then it is being done to others in the Fourth Circuit and the District Court. It can be proven if others speak out.

The U.S. Court of Appeals is refusing to actually do their job and reverse an erroneous decision of an inferior Court as a matter of law. The U.S. District Court is refusing to actually do their job and reverse clearly fraudulent begotten judgments and erroneous decisions as a matter of law. When inferior Courts refuse to obey the law repeatedly, they need to be punished and sanctioned. Criminals are punished for breaking the law. Then why not the inferior Courts???

- B. To keep in uniformity with all Courts, the Supreme Court needs to make an example out of the District Court and the Fourth Circuit Appeals Court to make sure that they fully comply with the decisions of this Supreme Court. That they cannot render decisions contrary to this Supreme Court.

This Court has the ability to use its authority to grant the Petition for Mandamus and Prohibition, then order, Mandate, and order Prohibition to keep the uniformity of the Courts across this country to continue following the authoritative and controlling Supreme Court decisions to prevent the entire legal system from going into disarray. When courts do not have to follow what the Supreme Court says, then it creates rebellious or runaway courts. Judges can just cover their eyes, cover their ears, and cover their

mouths. They no longer have to follow any laws. They do not have to follow Due Process of Law. They do not have to look at any evidence, quite the opposite. They can treat evidence as if it does not exist. They can treat credible witnesses as if they do not exist either. Then whenever a party to a case brings up the law, the Judge can simply act as if the law does not exist either. Then the Appeals Court rubber stamps the inferior Court decisions, and no remedy can ever possibly happen, ever. Then the law no longer exists in our Courts. Then they can choose which laws to obey and which ones to ignore. This is very dangerous for any of our courts to be doing this type of behavior in the United States of America. It upsets the chain of command. It becomes a CONFEDERACY, an autonomy zone. Courts can act as "Rebellious Courts" or "Runaway Courts". The law no longer applies to the inferior Courts. If the Justices of this Great Court do not want this precedent being set where rebellious behavior by activist judges gets rewarded while the American people suffers greatly with repeated abuses and miscarriages of justice until death, then they can set an example by making an example out of those rebellious Courts. They are rebel courts and no longer follow the Constitution or its own rules or any laws or rules. They selectively enforce the laws and rules while ignoring the rest. This is



unlawful behavior. This is Deprivation of Rights under Color of Law. See <https://www.justice.gov/crt/deprivation-rights-under-color-law>. Link text provided by family of Petitioner.

The U.S. Department of Justice had held under its position regarding Section 242 of Title 18 of Federal Law. The District Court and Appeals Court are depriving Petitioner of SCOTUS guaranteed rights under the Constitution, and those officers are violating that law and depriving Petitioner of all rights under the color of law.

The Department of Justice ("DOJ") held that "Section 242 of Title 18 makes it a crime for a person acting under color of any law to willfully deprive a person of a right or privilege protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States. For the purpose of Section 242, acts under "color of law" include acts not only done by federal, state, or local officials within their lawful authority, but also acts done beyond the bounds of that official's lawful authority, if the acts are done while the official is purporting to or pretending to act in the performance of his/her official duties. Persons acting under color of law within the meaning of this statute include police officers, prisons guards and other law enforcement officials, as well as judges, care providers in public health facilities, and others who are acting as public officials. It is



not necessary that the crime be motivated by animus toward the race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status or national origin of the victim." Since the DOJ held what that law had said, it is clear that the District Court and U.S. Attorney Office is acting in rebellion against the laws of the land to deprive their enemy: "the Petitioner" of all Constitutional and Legal reprieves. Petitioner only wants justice and does not want to make enemies with anybody. Petitioner did not start this fight; it was started by the U.S. Attorney Office under Document #1 and prosecuting a fraudulent case against him.

It is time for this great Supreme Court to hold the inferior Courts to the letters of the law. The District Court and Appeals Court had ignored the Supreme Court one too many times. If they do not like the decisions of the Supreme Court, then they can quit their jobs and resign from the Offices of the Courts. They can even request to become a candidate for the President's next appointment of a Supreme Court justice if they so disagree. Then they can add dissenting views and get the well respect that they deserve. It is time for the Supreme Court to make an example out of the Rebel Courts or Runaway Courts. Hold the District Court accountable as well as the Appeals Court. Hold them all accountable for acting in rebellion against the law, against the



rules, and acting against the evidence and witnesses. A Court with such a disregard for due process should be vacated of all of its improper judgments. First of all, starting with the null and void judgments against Petitioner. Any decisions made by the District Court and Appeals Court contrary to controlling case law by this Supreme Court should be vacated as a matter of law. Mandamus is appropriate. Prohibition is appropriate. Relief is necessary.

C. No other adequate remedy is available.

The Appeals Court threw away every Appeal by Petitioner. Petitioner had been deprived two times of trial by jury. Petitioner had been deprived of Due Process of Law. Petitioner had been deprived of his Actual Innocence and evidentiary hearings and discovery. Petitioner has exhausted all remedies. 2255 Motion had been exhausted and dismissed. Hazel Atlas motions which were uncontested were exhausted and dismissed. All appeals in the Appeals Court for the Fourth Circuit were dismissed without any remedy no matter what was argued.

There is no other remedy available except the U.S. Supreme Court. Mandamus is appropriate.

Under the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, Petitioner petitions this Court for a redress of the foregoing grievances.

The Probation Office of the Western District of Virginia was so concerned about the officer Hon. Thomas David Schroeder's disregard for the testimony of USPO Jason McMurray on Document #215, case no. 1:13-cr-435-1. They were so concerned about the District Court's bias, prejudice, that USPO Kristy Burton was allowed to commit perjury and Hon Schroeder was happy about Kristy Burton's perjury, yet was not as respectful to USPO McMurray in 2019. Didn't want to accept his testimony the same way as with USPO Burton. They were so concerned that they had petitioned the District Court to move the Supervised Release case to the Western District of Virginia. See Document #260: "USPO PROB 12B - Modification to Conditions as to BRIAN DAVID HILL. (Attachments: # (1) Prob 49) (Grassmann, Shaelynn)". See Documents 261, 262: " Probation Jurisdiction Transferred to Western District of Virginia as to BRIAN DAVID HILL Transmitted Transfer of Jurisdiction form, with certified copies of indictment, judgment and docket sheet. (Garland, Leah)", and Document #263: "Notice to Western District of

Virginia of a Transfer of Jurisdiction as to BRIAN DAVID HILL...”.

## X. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Mr. Hill respectfully requests that this Court issue a writ of Mandamus and/or Prohibition to review over the null and void judgments of the U.S. Court of Appeals and mainly of the U.S. District Court. Mr. Hill respectfully requests that the Honorable Justices of this Court issue a writ of Mandamus and/or Prohibition to Mandate that the District Court vacate all judgments, which are considered null and void, and which are in excess of jurisdiction. Since the District Court had repeatedly acted in excess of its own jurisdiction by depriving Petitioner of due process; and allowed uncontested frauds by the U.S. Attorney Office against Petitioner; Petitioner requests that this Court enter a Mandate vacating any or all Judgments in the Joint Appendix of the Orders #54, #122, #200, #236, #237, and #268. Petitioner requests that the criminal action since Document #1 be dismissed with prejudice.

Petitioner furthermore requests that the District Court and Appeals Court prove that they had jurisdiction for all of

their orders being challenged by this Petition for Writs of Mandamus and Prohibition.

The Appeals Court offending case nos. are #1: 20-7737, #2: 20-1396, #3: 20-6034, #4: 19-7756, #5: 19-7755, #6: 19-2338, #7: 19-7483, #8: 19-4758, #9: 19-2077, #10: 18-1160, #11: 17-1866, #12: 15-4057. If any of those decisions are contrary to controlling case law set by this Supreme Court, those decisions are clearly erroneous, null and void. Petitioner requests that this Court sanction the Appeals Court for repeatedly rendering judicial decisions contrary to SCOTUS. When SCOTUS clearly made decisions and if they were made aware of those SCOTUS decisions prior to rendering decisions contrary to those SCOTUS decisions, then those cases need to be sanctioned by this Supreme Court. Petitioner asks for sanctions.

Petitioner, last of all, requests nullification or modification of contrary decision: *Whiteside v. United States*, 775 F.3d 180, 182-83 (4th Cir. 2014) (en banc) which contradicts with this Court's holdings under *Bousley v. United States*, 523 U.S. 614 (1998); *Murray v. Carrier*, 477 U.S. 478 (1986); *McQuiggin v. Perkins*, 569 U.S. 383 (2013); and any others.

*II*

DATED this 12th day of October, 2021.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian D. Hill  
*Signed*

Brian D. Hill

Brian David Hill

Pro Se

Ally of QANON and General Flynn

Former USWGO Alternative News Reporter

310 FOREST STREET, APARTMENT 2

MARTINSVILLE, VIRGINIA 24112

Tel.: (276) 790-3505

E-Mail: No Email

JusticeForUSWGO.wordpress.com

**U.S.W.G.O.**



# **EXHIBIT 3**

**for**

STATEMENT OF FACTS REGARDING  
COMPLAINT OF JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT OR DISABILITY

Judicial Council of the Fourth Circuit

Filed on October 25, 2021

by Brian David Hill

LETTER TO CLERK OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA  
IN REGARDS TO FORWARDING OF PETITIONS/MOTIONS IN RE:  
BRIAN DAVID HILL, U.S. SUPREME COURT (SCOTUS)

NOTIFICATION OF MANDAMUS / PROHIBITION PETITION IN THE  
U.S. SUPREME COURT.

Case no.: 1:13-cr-435-1 (Please File on Docket, so that Brian's family can check PACER.GOV and confirm that you had received this letter and the three (3) copies of Petitions for Writs of Mandamus and Prohibition)

Saturday, October 9, 2021

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b><u>ATTN: Clerk of the Court</u></b><br><b>Telephone: 336-332-6000</b> | U.S. District Court<br>Middle District of North Carolina<br>L. Richardson Preyer Courthouse<br>324 W. Market Street<br>Greensboro, NC 27401-2544 |
|--|--|

Dear Clerk of the U.S. District Court,

I really hated that it had to come to this point. I didn't want to have to go this far. However, I have no choice at this point with the high amount of corruption that has escalated since the Obama Administration after I was framed with child pornography and cheated out of nullification of my wrongful conviction, being deprived of due process of law systematically by a few Judges of your Court. Cheated out of default judgment. I wanted to just live my life and not bother anybody. I just wanted to run a news organization back in 2009. That is the past and I have no choice but to risk my life.

Anyways enough bantering. The purpose of this letter is simple. In the envelope with Certified Mail tracking number ID #: 9402 8368 9523 2448 4674 48 contains three (3) copies of Petitions for Writ of Mandamus or Prohibition. As well as three (3) copies of the filed Motions to Proceed In Forma Pauperis. Each copy of the Motions and Petitions have the individual Judge's name on it, as officers of the Court, named.

One Motion and Petition is to be served with the Hon. Chief Judge Thomas David Schroeder. The second Motion and Petition is to be served with the Hon. Judge William

Lindsey Osteen Junior. The third Motion and Petition is to be served with the Hon. Magistrate Judge Joe L. Webster. There should be a sticky note on each copy.

That is simple and easy to forward to the proper officers of the Court.

Anyways, I did like to thank your deputy Clerk for adding the response deadlines under Documents #169, #199, #206, and #217 in my criminal case 1:13-cr-435-1 noted herein. I always like to give personal written thank yous to those who do the right thing. Thanks to you construing my letter as a motion under Document #169, that compelled Anand Prakash Ramaswamy the corrupt Assistant U.S. Attorney to have 21 days to respond. I also like to thank you for the Roseboro letter under Document #142. That letter gave me real insight into Local Rule 7.3, paragraphs (f) and (k). I didn't realize that each and every motion I had ever filed accusing Ramaswamy of defrauding the Court or each uncontested motion is ordinarily supposed to be granted without further notice.

I have everything I need thanks to your Local Rule of this respectable U.S. District Court. The Local Rule which says if I didn't respond in 21 days, that I would lose my 2255 case. However the AUSA Ramaswamy didn't respond to a good number of motions which means that my contentions in every single one of those were undisputed.

My contentions that I was factually innocent of possession of child pornography were undisputed. That Motion number is cited in the Petition for the Writ of Mandamus or Prohibition being filed in the U.S. Supreme Court. The Supreme Court is being made aware of Brian David Hill's factual contentions of being innocent. Didn't you know...

Copied from Petition for Writ of Certiorari:

On January 30, 2019, The Petitioner had filed his second uncontested motion under Document #169 in his § 2255 case such as “MOTION for Hearing and for Appointment for Counsel filed by BRIAN DAVID HILL. **Responses due by 2/20/2019.**” That motion made claims, uncontested claims and I quote that:

Doc. #169 Citation: “I won't let a guy in a hoodie...stop me from proving my factual innocence in this case...The fraud upon the Court is caused by both ineffective assistance of Counsel forcing me to falsely plead guilty under Oath, and a fraud upon the Court by a false factual basis of guilt in this criminal case...The fraud in the fact that I never got to review over the entire discovery evidence with Attorney Eric David Placke, before he

persuaded me to falsely plead guilty under Oath means I had plead guilty without understanding the full weight of the very evidence that the prosecution had used against me in my case...The "Factual Basis" of my guilt provided by the Government prior to sentencing was Fraudulent. My confession statements were proven to be inaccurate and false, a false confession caused by my Autism because of the way I was interrogated... The SBI, that is the State Bureau of Investigation and through their Case File (forensic report) reported files/images/videos of interest but there was NO affidavit verifying/confirming whether each such file could have been actual child pornography. In addition to that, the SBI case file said that 454 files had been downloaded with the eMule program between July 20, 2012, and July 28, 2013, while my computer was seized on August 28, 2012. The criminal Judgment of guilty on November 12, 2014, was a fraudulent Judgment based upon fraud on the Court. Letter respectfully filed with both the Hon. Magistrate Judge of the Court and the AUSA Ramaswamy on this the 24th day of January, 2019." (Citations omitted)

Like catching somebody stealing cookies out of the cookie jar. That single Document #169 that your deputy Clerks had made very well sure to add a 21-day response date since it is law that Courts can liberally construe pro se documents and letters as actual Motions. Because your Clerks considered Document #169 as a motion and referred such motion, gave the Government lawyers 21 days to respond and they did not, further proves my cause in the U.S. Supreme Court. Brian David Hill = Innocence.

The Government did in fact defraud the Court, that is why I had filed this Petition for Writs of Mandamus or Prohibition against Hon. Judge Osteen, Hon. Chief Judge Schroeder, and Hon. Joe Webster. They all knew I had won my case under Local Rule 7.3. They all knew I found those alleged SBI eMule (if it is child porn????) download dates and saw no affidavits verifying every file to being of actual child porn. Then the Pre-Sentence Investigation report saying no victims by name, unknown series. The whole entire case is a fraud, a sham, a frame up, and that normally happens when somebody pisses off a powerful corrupt politician who may have been involved with the Pedophile Rings like Jeffrey Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell. Attorney L. Lin Wood was right, and I feel like sharing with the Clerk's office my family's screenshot captures of Attorney L. Lin Wood from Georgia claiming that Politicians and Judges may have raped children and were blackmailed with this child rape and murder into being compromised any Federal Judges and any State Judges. This should scare everybody at your Clerk's office knowing that any of the Judges in your Court could have been compromised and if proven would reveal a terrible pattern of fraud and miscarriages of

justice. I hope none of this is true. I hope L. Lin Wood is wrong about any of the Judges and Politicians anywhere could be engaged in being a target of blackmail.

← **Tweet**



**Lin Wood**  
@LLinWood

...

The blackmail targets are approached with a gun, a child, & a camera. The target is ordered to rape the child on video. The target is then ordered to shoot the child on video. The target is then owned & controlled by the blackmailers until blackmail evidence loses its value.

2:22 AM · Jan 4, 2021 · Twitter for iPhone

**34.7K** Retweets   **4.4K** Quote Tweets   **75.3K** Likes

Feel free to see if any of the U.S. Marshals are willing to investigate the Lin Wood revelations. I mean, this is huge if this kind of criminal activity is going on in our Government. This completely will destroy the integrity of our Federal and State Governments. This Jeffery Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell stuff including the Lin Wood Lizard Squad revelations will destroy people's faith in our legal system as well as people's respect for the law will be gone. The corruption is already eroding people's faith in our legal processes. Pedos can frame me and anybody with child porn. That's scary.

If Lin Wood is right, the Clerks need to be initiating the Judicial Councils and any Law Enforcement groups including INTERPOL to be investigating these Lizard Squad blackmail videotapes leaked from the Federal agencies to determine how many Federal Judges and State Judges may be compromised. This is not good for America.

← **Tweet**



**Lin Wood**  
@LLinWood

⋮

Many issues in our world may be tied to blackmail scheme I described tonight, including bizarre behavior of officials & judges in recent election.

[@realDonaldTrump](#) must appoint special prosecutor to thoroughly investigate. We need answers. We must investigate. For the children.

4:01 AM · Jan 4, 2021 · Twitter for iPhone

**31.5K** Retweets   **1.4K** Quote Tweets   **95.5K** Likes



Officials and Judges????? Hmmm who could that be I wonder?????????

Because Joe Biden the pedophile creepy uncle Joe is our President, we will never find out which judges of the State or Federal may be raping kids and are blackmailed for the rest of their lives, thus compromising our Federal and/or State Judges anywhere or Nationwide or anywhere, whatever the case may be. We will never find out under the corrupt Attorney General and pedophile President Joe Biden. It's clear he is, Hunter Biden with the child porn on his laptop according to former U.S. Attorney and Mayor of New York named Rudy Giuliani and never gets arrested, never arrested by the U.S. Marshals Service but I am called a danger to society when I am a virgin, I never raped, I never molested anybody, and I am called a danger to society while some real powerful child molesters never get Federally Indicted. People with child porn like Hunter Biden, oh because indicting Hunter Biden would make Joe Biden angry and Joe Biden could probably file a pardon on his son to release him from any potential imprisonment.

My family has all of the special Lin Wood tweets before they were censored. I do not need to use the internet, my family has all of them and gave me the screenshot files so I can bring up these very important issues concerning the Judiciary and Politics.

 **Tweet**



**Lin Wood**  
@LLinWood

⋮

If asked to turn over the encryption key & other information I have to law enforcement, I will only agree to provide it directly to [@realDonaldTrump](#), [@GenFlynn](#) or [@SidneyPowell1](#).

I trust them.

Again, please pray for my family.

Thank you. - Lin 🙏❤️🇺🇸

4:07 AM · Jan 4, 2021 · Twitter for iPhone

**36.7K** Retweets   **2.7K** Quote Tweets   **129K** Likes





← **Tweet**



**Lin Wood**  
@LLinWood



This tweet was an insurance policy. The evil forces behind this blackmail scheme of child rape & murder need to know that others have encryption key. I have procedure in place if I die in near term or any member of my family is harmed or threatened, key will be released by many.



**Lin Wood** @LLinWood · Jan 1

I have always seen myself as more of a giver of gifts than a receiver of them. If I had key to a treasure trove, I would share the key or the treasure with others. But I always try to give to others with discernment.

"For many are called, but few are chosen."  
- Matthew 22:14 [twitter.com/LLinWood/statu...](https://twitter.com/LLinWood/status...)

2:54 AM · Jan 4, 2021 · Twitter for iPhone

**26.7K** Retweets   **1.6K** Quote Tweets   **66.1K** Likes



← **Tweet**



**Lin Wood**  
@LLinWood

⋮

This blackmail scheme is conducted by members of 10 of world's most well-known & "elite" intelligence agencies.

One of those groups was hacked by a group known as Lizard Squad. The blackmail files of rape & murder were obtained by this group & copy was provided to Isaac Kappy.



**Lin Wood** @LLinWood · Jan 4

I believe Chief Justice John Roberts & a multitude of powerful individuals worldwide are being blackmailed in a horrendous scheme involving rape & murder of children captured on videotape.

I have the key to the files containing the videos. I have also shared this information.

2:17 AM · Jan 4, 2021 · Twitter for iPhone

**24K** Retweets   **1.4K** Quote Tweets   **50.9K** Likes

Clerk, please file this letter in color to ensure that the Lin Wood screenshots show up really good and detailed in the docket. There needs to be special investigations into whether any judges of the Middle District of North Carolina could have been compromised. Special counsels needed to investigate the videos, subpoena Lin Wood.

Anyways, that is all I have for you Clerk of the U.S. District Court. Please reply to this letter with acknowledgment of receipt of this letter, as well as receipt of the three copies of both the Mandamus Petitions and Motions to Proceed In Forma Pauperis.

I was too afraid to bring up this blackmail tweet screenshots from Attorney L. Lin Wood in case anyone who may or may not be compromised in your U.S. District Court, but since this is simply a letter to the Clerk of the Court, not naming names or anything, I'd thought I'd share this information with you. It should concern you too if anybody in the Judiciary had raped children and became compromised to blackmail. Fraud.

I do not like doing this kind of stuff like revealing the truth this dangerous as it could get me killed or kidnapped, but I am being held hostage to the Fed corruption that is holding me hostage. The political corruption. I am being held hostage to an illegal sentence, an fraudulent prosecution, and a repeated lack of due process of law.

**Please do not construe this letter as a motion. Please do not forward this letter to any Judge. If any are compromised and read this letter, I'm a dead man.**

I respectfully request that you only forward the petitions and motions to the Judges named in the sticky notes on all three of both the Motions and Petitions.

I hope to get a good outcome in the U.S. Supreme Court. I am grateful to your deputy Clerks for all of the hard work and effort throughout the years in my criminal case. I hope to get justice someday. I hope the Supreme Court does grant Mandamus relief and orders all null and void judgments to be vacated. I hope for remedy that I cannot obtain in this very Court no matter what evidence or witnesses that I ever had.

*Brian D. Hill*  
*Signed*

Brian D. Hill

Brian D. Hill  
Appellant

Former news reporter of U.S.W.G.O. Alternative News  
Ally of QANON

310 Forest Street, Apartment 2  
Martinsville, Virginia 24112  
(276) 790-3505

JusticeForUSWGO.NL or JusticeForUSWGO.wordpress.com

**U.S.W.G.O.**



L. LIN WOOD, P.C.  
1180 West Peachtree Street, Ste. 2400  
Atlanta, GA 30309  
P.O. Box 52584  
Atlanta, GA 30355-0584  
Telephone: (404) 891-1402  
Facsimile: (404) 506-9111  
Email: [lwood@linwoodlaw.com](mailto:lwood@linwoodlaw.com)

← **Tweet**



**Lin Wood**  
@LLinWood

⋮

The blackmail targets are approached with a gun, a child, & a camera. The target is ordered to rape the child on video. The target is then ordered to shoot the child on video. The target is then owned & controlled by the blackmailers until blackmail evidence loses its value.

2:22 AM · Jan 4, 2021 · Twitter for iPhone

**34.7K** Retweets   **4.4K** Quote Tweets   **75.3K** Likes

← **Tweet**



**Lin Wood**  
@LLinWood

⋮

Many issues in our world may be tied to blackmail scheme I described tonight, including bizarre behavior of officials & judges in recent election.

[@realDonaldTrump](#) must appoint special prosecutor to thoroughly investigate. We need answers. We must investigate. For the children.

4:01 AM · Jan 4, 2021 · Twitter for iPhone

**31.5K** Retweets   **1.4K** Quote Tweets   **95.5K** Likes



← **Tweet**



**Lin Wood**  
@LLinWood



If asked to turn over the encryption key & other information I have to law enforcement, I will only agree to provide it directly to [@realDonaldTrump](#), [@GenFlynn](#) or [@SidneyPowell1](#).

I trust them.

Again, please pray for my family.

Thank you. - Lin 🙏❤️🇺🇸

4:07 AM · Jan 4, 2021 · Twitter for iPhone

**36.7K** Retweets   **2.7K** Quote Tweets   **129K** Likes



← **Tweet**



**Lin Wood**  
@LLinWood



This tweet was an insurance policy. The evil forces behind this blackmail scheme of child rape & murder need to know that others have encryption key. I have procedure in place if I die in near term or any member of my family is harmed or threatened, key will be released by many.



**Lin Wood** @LLinWood · Jan 1

I have always seen myself as more of a giver of gifts than a receiver of them. If I had key to a treasure trove, I would share the key or the treasure with others. But I always try to give to others with discernment.

“For many are called, but few are chosen.”  
- Matthew 22:14 [twitter.com/LLinWood/statu...](https://twitter.com/LLinWood/status...)

2:54 AM · Jan 4, 2021 · Twitter for iPhone

**26.7K** Retweets   **1.6K** Quote Tweets   **66.1K** Likes



← **Tweet**



**Lin Wood**  
@LLinWood

...

Now you have greater context for the message I tweeted below on January 1.

I had hoped that this revelation would trigger resignations & confessions. Unsure of that result, I had to reveal full extent of my knowledge. I am doing so now.



**Lin Wood** @LLinWood · Jan 1

On 5/13/19, Actor Isaac Kappy died after he "forced himself off" a bridge in Arizona. He was 42.

His last post on Instagram was "Beware the man that has nothing to lose, for he has nothing to protect."

Isaac knew the lies. I know the key to his treasure trove of TRUTH.





← **Tweet**



**Lin Wood**  
@LLinWood

⋮

This blackmail scheme is conducted by members of 10 of world's most well-known & "elite" intelligence agencies.

One of those groups was hacked by a group known as Lizard Squad. The blackmail files of rape & murder were obtained by this group & copy was provided to Isaac Kappy.



**Lin Wood** @LLinWood · Jan 4

I believe Chief Justice John Roberts & a multitude of powerful individuals worldwide are being blackmailed in a horrendous scheme involving rape & murder of children captured on videotape.

I have the key to the files containing the videos. I have also shared this information.

2:17 AM · Jan 4, 2021 · Twitter for iPhone

**24K** Retweets   **1.4K** Quote Tweets   **50.9K** Likes

 **Tweet**

**Lin Wood**  
@LLinWood



I would never make an accusation without having reliable source for it. Stakes are too high. So I did due diligence to validate the accuracy of the shocking information I am revealing tonight. I am entirely comfortable that you are learning the truth. A truth that explains much.

3:01 AM · Jan 4, 2021 · Twitter for iPhone

**36.6K** Retweets   **1.6K** Quote Tweets   **113.5K** Likes



**Sidney Maratty**  @SidneyMaratty · 16h  
Replying to @LLinWood



Yes, I took liability courses, doctors, lawyers have a higher duty of care. I know this I to be true normally went application came in for Liability insurance we had to get special permission from higher ups..for hockey players. I believe you I discern people. Trolls so perfec



# **EXHIBIT 4**

**for**

STATEMENT OF FACTS REGARDING  
COMPLAINT OF JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT OR DISABILITY

Judicial Council of the Fourth Circuit

Filed on October 25, 2021

by Brian David Hill

EMERGENCY LETTER TO ATTORNEY L. LIN WOOD ON TWEETS  
CONCERNING BLACKMAILED FEDERAL/STATE JUDGES AND  
POLITICIANS, INQUIRY THAT COULD SAVE MY LIFE FROM BEING  
TARGETED BY THE CIA/NSA DEEP STATE THUGS

Wednesday, January 20, 2021 18:03

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b><u>ATTN: L. Lin Wood</u></b><br>Law Office of L. Lin Wood, P.C.<br><b><u>Please CC to Sidney Powell</u></b> | P.O. Box 52584<br>Atlanta, GA 30355-0584<br>Telephone: (404) 891-1402<br>Facsimile: (404) 506-9111 |
|--|--|

Dear L. Lin Wood,

This is in reference to YOUR tweets. My family took screenshots and gave them to me to use as reference in this EMERGENCY LETTER. These are YOUR tweets.

Here they are:



**Tweet**



**Lin Wood**  
@LLinWood



The blackmail targets are approached with a gun, a child, & a camera. The target is ordered to rape the child on video. The target is then ordered to shoot the child on video. The target is then owned & controlled by the blackmailers until blackmail evidence loses its value.

2:22 AM · Jan 4, 2021 · Twitter for iPhone

**34.7K** Retweets   **4.4K** Quote Tweets   **75.3K** Likes

← **Tweet**



**Lin Wood**  
@LLinWood

⋮

This tweet was an insurance policy. The evil forces behind this blackmail scheme of child rape & murder need to know that others have encryption key. I have procedure in place if I die in near term or any member of my family is harmed or threatened, key will be released by many.



**Lin Wood** @LLinWood · Jan 1

I have always seen myself as more of a giver of gifts than a receiver of them. If I had key to a treasure trove, I would share the key or the treasure with others. But I always try to give to others with discernment.

“For many are called, but few are chosen.”  
- Matthew 22:14 [twitter.com/LLinWood/statu...](https://twitter.com/LLinWood/status/1318111111)

2:54 AM · Jan 4, 2021 · Twitter for iPhone

**26.7K** Retweets   **1.6K** Quote Tweets   **66.1K** Likes



 **Tweet**

**Lin Wood**  
@LLinWood

...

Many issues in our world may be tied to blackmail scheme I described tonight, including bizarre behavior of officials & judges in recent election.

[@realDonaldTrump](#) must appoint special prosecutor to thoroughly investigate. We need answers. We must investigate. For the children.

4:01 AM · Jan 4, 2021 · Twitter for iPhone

**31.5K** Retweets   **1.4K** Quote Tweets   **95.5K** Likes



I like to bring to your attention the following individuals who have been targeting me or have been getting the CIA/NSA to target me, and if they are compromised as you have been saying on Twitter, then I like to have an inquiry on possible blackmail targets who have been making my life a living hell and almost caused me to kill myself back in 2013. Receiving threatening CIA text messages, CIA greeting cards with terms such as “SNOW WHITE” an intelligence Supercomputer, receiving threatening emails in 2013. This involves pedophilia and they set me up with child porn and I suspect that the following individuals have been blackmailed with child rape and murder, and that would give them access to those materials used to try to set me up back in July, 2012.

**INDIVIDUALS SUSPECTED OF BEING BLACKMAILED WITH CHILD RAPE AND MURDER:**

- Philip Edward Berger Senior, NC State Senator and President Pro Tempore
- Philip Edward Berger Junior, former Rockingham County District Attorney
- Federal Judge William Lindsey Osteen Junior, Middle Dist. North Carolina
- Federal Judge Thomas David Schroeder, Middle Dist. North Carolina
- SBI Agent Rodney V. White
- NC Reidsville Detective Robert Bridge
- Any or All listed Federal Appellate Court Judges of the Fourth Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals in Richmond, Virginia.
- Charles J. Caruso, Mayodan Police Chief
- Christopher Todd Brim, Detective Sergeant, Mayodan Police
- Attorney Mark Jones, Bell Davis and Pitt law firm

I have photographs of criminal case discovery materials that prove alleged child porn was downloading from July 20, 2012, to July 28, 2013. My computer was seized on August 28, 2012. So for 11 months it was downloading to my computer when I didn't even have my computer while it was supposedly in secure law enforcement custody. **I have been set up here and I have evidence of it but the CORRUPT JUDGE Thomas David Schroeder ignores it all. He is probably being blackmailed too like John Roberts.**

Look sir, I am willing to be executed, murdered, to prove my actual innocence. I am willing to risk my life and my families lives to clear my name. I need to give these individuals names to you and if they are in any of the child rape blackmail schemes evidence that you were tweeting about, then they are the SUSPECTED #1 culprits who SET ME UP WITH CHILD PORN. President Trump would not pardon me even though Roger Stone agreed to get this information to President Trump. He told me through text message today that he was unable to have me on Trump's final pardon list. So now my only option is to prove that any of these individuals were pedophiles blackmailed child rapists being videotaped by the blackmailers of the Deep State Swamp. Compromised.

You have information that may very well embarrass the corrupt compromised Judges or the corrupt NC State Senator, if any of it is even remotely true. **I can use this information to prove my Actual Innocence if Pedophiles or Child Rapers were in charge of investigating me in 2012.** Any of that can be useful in embarrassing the corrupt Judges and then they would no longer hold unlawful control over me and I can finally be acquitted because I AM ACTUALLY INNOCENT.

I need to know. You have the evidence of blackmail by the blackmailers of child

rape and murder. That gives them the child porn materials used to set me up and ruin my life. They have the child porn materials, they set me up. Your evidence can help me prove it.

I ran a blog named “USWGO Alternative News” at USWGO.COM. Check the Wayback Machine from 2009 to 2012. My stuff is also located at archive.org and you can search up “uswgo” keyword and find the articles I had done which had made me a TARGET.

I always knew I pissed off State Senator Phil Berger Senior. His son was involved in the child porn investigation against me and they admitted to it in Affidavit and his name was in the federal discovery papers, knowing that it would already be a conflict of interest for somebody I written bad articles about on my news blog to be involved in any criminal investigation against me because of the high risk of evidence planting, evidence tampering, and foul play.

Cheryl King knew what was going on but she mysteriously died while in Georgia and the SBI said to me she was six feet under. So they were tracking her and she died without explanation. I suspect she was murdered. The FBI was sent this information and the FBI refused to do anything about any of it and refused to even interview me over any of it. I did get one FBI Agent to look at some of my papers, he began to open up a criminal investigation file and asked me to come down to the FBI Office in Greensboro, NC to give a statement. I have this evidence. Then the investigation was halted and called meritless by his boss. The Agent was Jerry Pickford in Greensboro, NC.

Look I know by writing you this letter I may end up dead like Cheryl King of the NC SBI but I have nothing left to lose now that President Trump left office without giving me a FULL UNCONDITIONAL PARDON. Joe Biden and his son are both pedophiles, compromised. They hold the nuclear football and can nuke whoever they please. For GODS SAKE PEDOPHILES NOW HOLD the HIGHEST OFFICE in the United States of America and Trump wouldn't pardon an innocent man like me. I no longer respect the Sex Registry because I am innocent and a pedophile is our Fake President now.

Another one of your Tweets, next page:



← **Tweet**



**Lin Wood**  
@LLinWood

⋮

This blackmail scheme is conducted by members of 10 of world's most well-known & "elite" intelligence agencies.

One of those groups was hacked by a group known as Lizard Squad. The blackmail files of rape & murder were obtained by this group & copy was provided to Isaac Kappy.



**Lin Wood** @LLinWood · Jan 4

I believe Chief Justice John Roberts & a multitude of powerful individuals worldwide are being blackmailed in a horrendous scheme involving rape & murder of children captured on videotape.

I have the key to the files containing the videos. I have also shared this information.

2:17 AM · Jan 4, 2021 · Twitter for iPhone

**24K** Retweets   **1.4K** Quote Tweets   **50.9K** Likes

I need to know L. Lin Wood if any of the following individuals were blackmail targets:

- Philip Edward Berger Senior, NC State Senator and President Pro Tempore
- Philip Edward Berger Junior, former Rockingham County District Attorney
- Federal Judge William Lindsey Osteen Junior, Middle Dist. North Carolina
- Federal Judge Thomas David Schroeder, Middle Dist. North Carolina
- SBI Agent Rodney V. White
- NC Reidsville Detective Robert Bridge
- Any or All listed Federal Appellate Court Judges of the Fourth Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals in Richmond, Virginia.
- Charles J. Caruso, Mayodan Police Chief
- Christopher Todd Brim, Detective Sergeant, Mayodan Police
- Attorney Mark Jones, Bell Davis and Pitt law firm

**If any of them were actually involved in pedophilia, child rape and murder, then they were compromised at the time and during the time child pornography investigation retaliation and set up operations against me and my mother. They threatened to set up my mother if I did not falsely confess. Any evidence that they were involved in pedo stuff even before they targeted me would nullify my false confession and nullify my false guilty plea. I NEED HARD EVIDENCE or at least something like a smoking gun. That is my only way I can be acquitted as Joe Biden will never pardon me. Like a giant arrow pointing to them as the possible culprits.**

I am risking being murdered as they monitor my mother's internet access and they are monitoring my phone calls. **I am risking my life but I must do so because President Trump never granted me a full unconditional pardon. I must risk my life. That is my only way, I have no other recourse.**

COPY

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <p>File No:</p> <p><b>SEARCH WARRANT</b></p> <p>IN THE MATTER OF</p> <p>Roberta Hill and Brian Hill</p> <p>Date Issued: 8/28/12 Time Issued: 11:30 AM <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AM <input type="checkbox"/> PM</p> <p>Name Of Applicant: Todd Brim</p> <p>Name Of Additional Agent: Robert Bridge</p> <p>Name Of Additional Agent:</p> <p><b>RETURN OF SERVICE</b></p> <p>I certify that this Search Warrant was received and executed as follows:</p> <p>Date Received: _____ Time Received: _____ <input type="checkbox"/> AM <input type="checkbox"/> PM</p> <p>Date Executed: _____ Time Executed: _____ <input type="checkbox"/> AM <input type="checkbox"/> PM</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I made a search of _____</p> <p>_____ as commanded.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I seized the items listed on the attached inventory.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I did not seize any items.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This Warrant WAS NOT executed within forty-eight (48) hours of the date of issuance and</p> | <p><b>STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA</b></p> <p>Rockingham County</p> <p>To any officer with authority and jurisdiction to</p> <p>I, the undersigned, find that there is probable cause to issue this Search Warrant and make due return to the Clerk of the Superior Court.</p> <p>You are commanded to search the premises, vessels, vehicles, and other places, and the person in question, and keep the property subject to Court Order and return to the Clerk of the Superior Court.</p> <p>You are directed to execute this Search Warrant and make due return to the Clerk of the Superior Court.</p> <p>This Search Warrant is issued upon information from _____</p> <p>Source: Federal Docket on <a href="http://archive.org/details/LeakedSbiDocsProveUswgoFramedWithChildPorn">http://archive.org/details/LeakedSbiDocsProveUswgoFramedWithChildPorn</a> (Case sensitive) Document 84-2</p> <p>Date: 8/28/12 Name (Type Or Print): Todd</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Deputy CSC <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant CSC <input type="checkbox"/> CSC <input type="checkbox"/> Magistrate</p> <p>This Search Warrant was delivered to me on the _____ of _____ at _____ of Superior Court is closed for the transaction of business.</p> | <p>Area Search Keywords: One search keyword "very sexy"</p> <p>Source: <a href="https://archive.org/details/LeakedSbiDocsProveUswgoFramedWithChildPorn">https://archive.org/details/LeakedSbiDocsProveUswgoFramedWithChildPorn</a></p> <p>eMule Known.net: The Known.net saves all files eMule knows of whether they are shared files, files currently in the download list, or downloaded in the past. For every file, information like file size, file name, hash sets, hash values, and some statistics are saved. From the analysis, this record showed that 454 files had been downloaded with the eMule program between July 20, 2012, and July 28, 2013. This record also showed that files were shared with other users and the number of times each file was shared.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>eMule virus?</b></p> <p><b>Former USWGO Alternative News reporter Brian D. Hill was hacked into by Win32/MoliVampire.A (or variant B) before his Laptop was seized by Search Warrant. Child porn continued downloading for exactly eleven months while under the custody of Mayodan Police and State Bureau of Investigation.</b></p> |
|--|---|---|

I have no hope left after President Trump left office. The CIA/NSA is going to WAR WITH ME. The attacks and traps have been coming for days. They are trying to hurt me.

I may probably need to be placed under protection of General Michael Flynn and be placed in a safe house if they come after me with guns and abduction squads. I have even tried to get this information to Attorney Sidney Powell, Pentagon.

I have been targeted by these pedophile SCUM since 2012. The corrupt CIA and NSA people. I need some kind of evidence. YOU Have this evidence. Your likely the ONLY ONE among few others who has this evidence. I need something to prove if any of them are compromised. I need the smoking gun to get my wrongful conviction overturned and YOU HAVE THIS EVIDENCE.

I will probably ask my Attorney involved in my criminal case to subpoena you for the evidence if necessary. I don't want to put you in that position. Please help me NOW. I cannot get pardoned anymore, President Trump is GONE FOREVER. They will probably arrest him and give him a felony. Your my only hope left.

I already informed a corrupt Federal Judge that I know they are compromised and told them about your tweets. They will likely have me targeted and who knows what they will do to me now. I am at high risk if they are compromised as you have claimed. I need actions now, The Swamp must be DRAINED or they will drain all of us instead in Concentration Camps or CIA black sites. The SWAMP must be drained. That was why I mailed Chris Miller of the U.S. Pentagon, Secretary of Defense. There must be action taken on those who have framed me with child porn and those SWAMP enemies. The invisible enemies.

Brian D. Hill  
*Signed*

Brian D. Hill

God bless you,  
Brian D. Hill  
Former news reporter of U.S.W.G.O. Alternative News  
Ally of QANON

