



Ally of QAnon – Justice – God – Jesus – No Corruption

OFFICE OF USWGO,
Brian D. Hill

November 2, 2021

Hon. Scott S. Harris, Clerk
Supreme Court of the
United States
1 First Street N.E.
Washington, DC 20543

**Re: *Brian David Hill, Petitioner,
v. United States, No. 21-6037***

Dear Mr. Harris,

In Response to the U.S. Solicitor General's office filing a Waiver of right to respond unless the Court requests a response as stated in the waiver letter dated October 25, 2021. The Petitioner in the above-captioned case respectfully requests that the Court delay distribution of the Petition for Writ of Certiorari in the above-captioned case to the Justices; and request or order a response from the Attorney for Respondent for the Party: United States of America.

The acting United States Solicitor General Brian H. Fletcher, Esquire had filed on record that they are the counsel of record, which represents the Respondent: United States of America in the case for the Petition for Writ of Certiorari, the instant case. They are essentially filing the formalized automated yet formal waiver letter (the "standard waiver letter") with many Certiorari petitions and Mandamus petitions to make it appear that Petitioner's petitions are insignificant to make it appear that the Petition should be denied as per the usual procedure with a majority of Certiorari petitions.

The copies of the Petition were scheduled for distribution to the Conference set for the date of Friday, November 12, 2021. Petitioner again requests two things from the Clerk's Office of the Court, under

Rule 15.5 and any other applicable rule. First of all: Petitioner would like the distribution to the Conference delayed until the United States responds to the Certiorari Petition, since they agreed to do so if requested by this Court from their waiver letter. If the Petitioner has to file a Motion for Leave of Court to request that this Supreme Court request or compel the Government to respond to Petitioner's petition with an opposition brief; then Petitioner needs an additional 14 or 21 days to file such a motion. That is if required by the Rules of this Court. Second of all: Petitioner wishes the Government to file an opposition brief or proper response instead of the standard waiver letter which is exactly the same as some automated formal letter mailed by the staffers of the members of the U.S. Congress who do not wish to respond personally to constituents. Yes, The same automated formal letter when they don't actually write a personalized response but simply some template created type formal letter by staffers mailed to many constituents but does not actually have any personalized response. It is exactly that, a standard formal letter by the Government acting as though this case is insignificant to be denied without an opinion as with many Certiorari petitions. Petitioner is NOT stupid. Petitioner is aware that the Government is trying to throw the Petition for this case under the bus like so many others, like nobody matters to the Corrupt U.S. Attorney Offices.

Petitioner has compelling reasons why the Government should in fact file an opposition brief or response, so that if the Petitioner catches the Government in any falsehoods or wrongful legal arguments, then Petitioner can file a reply (Petitioner plans on filing a reply to any opposition brief) again asserting why Certiorari should be granted in the above-captioned case.

First reason, the U.S. District Court had inappropriately denied Petitioner's uncontested motions all alleging that the Respondent had defrauded the U.S. District Court and contaminated its Judicial Machinery with lies and falsehoods. With evidence contradictory to the Government's own alleged facts. The U.S. District Court had mislabeled that the uncontested motions were not properly filed as 2255 motions because they were filed in a pending 2255 case before it was dismissed and the Court never acted upon those uncontested motions. The Court should not have mislabeled or misconstrued the Hazel Atlas Motions in the pending 2255 case as inappropriately filed 2255 motions not in the right form. This contradicts it's Local Rule 7.3 and contradicts the inherit powers of the Court under this Court's holding under *Chambers v. Nasco, Inc.*, 501 U.S. 32 (1991) and *Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co.*, 322 U.S. 238 (1944).

This Certiorari petition is Petitioner's only remedy left in regard to his Constitutional rights under *Chambers v. Nasco*; *Hazel-Atlas*

Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co.; to prove fraud was perpetuated upon the Court by an officer of the Court which was Respondent: United States of America. No remedy is left if the Petition is not granted. Fraud would be allowed without any means to challenge it.

The Respondent had defrauded the Court, did not even care so they did not file any 21-day or 30-day responses to Petitioner's contentions. Petitioner's contentions of fraud were undisputed. Petitioner was given a Roseboro letter (as Petitioner is pro se and not a lawyer) stating in English and less legalese that if Petitioner did not respond to the Government's motion in 21 days then the Government's contentions in that motion would be undisputed and the Court may rule against Petitioner. The Roseboro letter to Petitioner had all stated the exact same type of language as in Local Rule 7.3, which would apply to all civil motions in a 2255 case. Therefore, in Petitioner's reasoning and the Roseboro Letter's reasoning, Petitioner's uncontested Hazel Atlas motions should have been granted as part of the usual course as a matter of law.

Petitioner had proven that as outlined in the Petition for Writ of Certiorari. The record on appeal will prove this as outlined in the Petition for Writ of Certiorari.

It is fact that Petitioner had filed under Document #169 in the 2255 case, uncontested claims that Respondent had defrauded the entire Court. That the criminal prosecution was entirely fraudulent.

It said in page 28 of the Petition for Writ of Certiorari a citation of Document #169 and I quote: *"...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."* That itself was uncontested, undisputed. As Petitioner was incarcerated at the time, that letter was hand written and the case laws were properly cited in that letter. That letter would be considered both a pro se brief and motion with proper citations of the law. Everything claimed in the Petition for Writ of Certiorari is well grounded, prima facie, unless proven otherwise. Uncontested motions are normally honored in Federal Courts, which implement the proper rules before their respectable Courts. Petitioner had proven fraud and the Respondent had not contested the proof, had not contested Petitioner's contentions. Petitioner was allowed to review over the criminal case discovery materials after he had

falsely plead guilty. He was allowed to review over this discovery evidence with his family on January 22, 2015. That itself sounds ridiculous when Petitioner was coerced to falsely plead guilty before fully reviewing over the discovery evidence materials. Which was why Petitioner had made such claims in Document #169, again, nevertheless that motion was never contested at all. Never disputed. It is pure and simple; Respondent had defrauded the Court and never even disputed any of it when argued by Petitioner on the record.

Respondent defrauded the Court, Respondent should not be allowed by this Supreme Court to simply get away with this fraud by simply filing some standard waiver letter so that Petitioner's petition is just denied like hundreds of other Certiorari petitions. Petitioner's petition has a lot at stake here; Petitioner cannot let this go without at least a proper response from Respondent.

The fraud is so bad that Petitioner had mailed evidence in 2017 and had texted messaged evidence to Roger Stone, the former U.S. President Donald Trump's confidant and friend. Roger Stone had reviewed over enough pleadings in the Petitioner's criminal and civil case being appealed to this Supreme Court from the Fourth Circuit. Roger Stone was compelled that Petitioner was being given a repeated pattern of miscarriages of justice and frauds being perpetuated on the Court without right or remedy. Petitioner almost succeeded by use of the uncontested motions argument and Roger Stone was supposed to disseminate that evidence to President Trump in January of 2021 or December of 2020 in order to ask Donald Trump to grant Brian David Hill a full unconditional pardon. That had failed when Roger Stone was able to get Brian's innocence evidence and fraud information proof to the President or his White House counsel but had condensed the list and Brian David Hill's name was not in the final list of pardoned individuals. Brian may never be able to be this close to getting a full pardon from the President of the United States ever again. The Department of InJustice is corrupt and they (Corrupt Pardon Attorney) will never recommend granting Brian Hill a full unconditional pardon despite the Government defrauding the court repeatedly and getting away with it.

This Petition for Writ of Certiorari is all Brian has left for remedy other than begging President Joe Biden in the future for years and years for a full unconditional pardon, which Petitioner will likely never get. All because the Corrupt Pardon Attorney will never recommend that Brian Hill be given a reprieve or pardon. Petitioner must insist that this Supreme Court request a response from the Respondent in this case.

The U.S. District Court and Court of Appeals are ignoring and/or

erasing this Court's holdings under *Chambers v. Nasco, Inc.*, 501 U.S. 32 (1991) and *Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co.*, 322 U.S. 238 (1944). There are likely other cases ruled as law by this Supreme Court that all Federal Courts must vacate its fraudulent begotten judgments when proof of clear and convincing evidence shows that an officer of the Court had defrauded the Court to obtain favorable judgment(s). That the officer of the Court had deceived the Court, and prejudiced the other party or parties of a case with its fraud. That it contaminates the Court's judicial Machinery, where it threatens the integrity and credibility of a Court when claiming to make any sound judgments. How can a lower Court just decide to overwrite the Supreme Court and make decisions, which are completely contrary to this Court's holdings under the Law?

The Government did not contest the fraud allegations that U.S. Probation Officer Kristy L. Burton had lied under oath in a Supervised Release Violation final hearing, which is perjury. The Government did not contest the fraud allegations that they forced Petitioner to falsely plead guilty or face 20 years in prison with ineffective counsel to cover up their fraudulent prosecution. According to the Government's own discovery evidence paperwork, claiming that for 11 months and 8 days supposedly illegal files were downloading to Petitioner's computer when not in Petitioner's custody on the record. The Certiorari petition and the record all support this claim. They had 21-days or 30-days (summary judgment motions) to respond to a motion under Local Rule 7.3 of the Court. They never disputed Petitioner's contentions of fraud. Petitioner is entitled to relief no matter what the Respondent argues in its reasoning, in its arguments, and in its own defense. Even after Petitioner falsely plead guilty due to coercion from the ineffective counsel all documented in the record of the 2255 case and the Hazel Atlas motions which were uncontested, the Pre-Sentence Report acknowledged Petitioner had no victims. The report admitting that the so-called supposed child pornography was of an unknown series, which contradicts the claim of the police detective Robert Bridge of Reidsville, NC of files being downloaded from eMule, which were known to him. They would not admit any of this until after Petitioner had falsely plead guilty to bolster their successful fraudulent prosecution. So the Government should be compelled or requested to respond to all of the proven uncontested, undisputed contentions of fraud which had been perpetuated upon the U.S. District Court by the party: United States of America, and that fraud carried on to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. The United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was prejudiced by that fraud and allowed this fraud to be kept protected, and to protect the fraud from ever being challenged. This is a terrible form of prejudice and bias caused by the fraud and deceit of the Respondent.

Respondent defrauded the Court. They know that they did. That is why the Respondent did not contest the Petitioner's motions under "Documents #169, #199, #206, #217, and #222" (page 12 of Certiorari Petition). It is because they had the discovery evidence; it came directly from the Government, and directly from the U.S. Attorney Office aka the Government. The same evidence fully reviewed by Petitioner after he had no choice but to falsely plead guilty, that is the fraud here. Their own evidence said it was downloading for 11 months and 8 days while in Law Enforcement custody. That is admission to evidence planting and tampering. That is obstruction of justice, manufacturing evidence. Then their own discovery evidence having no affidavit and no affidavit of any forensic specialist. Did not even comply with North Carolina forensic standards or rules. All of that was documented in the 2255 case, which was further outlined in the Hazel Atlas motions, which again were all undisputed, and what was cited from the record of what was argued in the Certiorari petition.

Therefore, it is in this Court's best interest as well as in the best interest of justice of the entire country to compel a request to respond from the Counsel of Respondent. The Government should respond to Petitioner's petition for Writ of Certiorari. Innocent criminal defendants who were victims of fraud on the Court should not be sitting on a Sex Offender Registry. That itself makes the entire Registry as fraudulent as the cases contaminated with prosecutorial fraud. Then the entire Registry is unreliable, has no integrity, and cannot protect the public with false registrants.

Therefore, Petitioner requests that the Clerk of this Supreme Court request the Respondent: United States of America to file an opposition brief or response to the Certiorari Petition. Not just some standard waiver letter. The Government cannot get away with its fraud and depriving a criminal defendant of being permitted to completely prove his Actual Innocence, which would reveal the entire fraudulent prosecution on public record. Petitioner should not be blocked from requesting that the Court rightfully exercises its inherit or implied powers of a Federal Court to deter fraud, and to deter deceit upon its own record as outlined in *Chambers v. Nasco, Inc.*, 501 U.S. 32 (1991) and *Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co.*, 322 U.S. 238 (1944).

Therefore, Petitioner requests from the counsel of the Respondent: Brian H. Fletcher, Esquire, which is the acting Solicitor General that they respond to the uncontested/undisputed fraud arguments and a few mentioning of Actual Innocence claims in the Petition for the Writ of Certiorari. So that the Petitioner can file his reply brief and prove to this Court that the record supports granting the Writ of Certiorari. That the interest of justice nationwide supports granting the Writ of Certiorari. That this Court's best interest is


preserving their holdings under *Chambers v. Nasco, Inc.*, 501 U.S. 32 (1991) and *Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co.*, 322 U.S. 238 (1944). It is best that this Court preserve its original holdings concerning that regardless of whether this is a criminal and civil case, that it is a Court's duty to provide legal safeguards against fraud being perpetuated on the Court by an officer of the Court. A Court cannot just allow fraud on its record and not do anything about it as it will contaminate the Judicial Machinery and destroy its own integrity. For the interest in justice by keeping the District Court's integrity, the Respondent should answer for the claims made in the Petition for Writ of Certiorari. That way Petitioner can file his reply and make a showing to this Court that Certiorari need to be granted as necessary for justice and public safety.

Petitioner will direct Roberta Hill (rbhill67@comcast.net) on the same day of this letter to email/contact Brian H. Fletcher, Esquire (SupremeCtBriefs@USDOJ.gov), Counsel for Respondent, and Petitioner will also mail a copy (*in a prepaid envelope mailed, though Petitioner has limited resources due to living off of his Supplemental Security Income disability*) of this letter to Brian H. Fletcher, Esquire. Petitioner is not aware of whether counsel for the Respondent opposes, supports, or has any other position as to this letter. Therefore, the Clerk can directly request a response from the Respondent's counsel. Petitioner will direct Roberta Hill to mark the email with read receipt request to confirm instant receipt.

Petitioner does request that this letter be placed on the Supreme Court's public docket in PDF Format for case no. 21-6037 and send a mailing acknowledging receipt of this letter. Thank You for your time and attention to this matter. God bless you.

DATED this 2nd day of November, 2021.

Respectfully submitted,


Signed

Brian D. Hill

Brian David Hill
Pro Se
Ally of QANON
Former USWGO Alternative News Reporter
310 FOREST STREET, APARTMENT 2

MARTINSVILLE, VIRGINIA 24112

Tel.: (276) 790-3505

E-Mail: c/o: Roberta Hill at
rbhill67@comcast.net



Tracking number: 7019-1120-0002-2387-1583

Cc:

Brian H. Fletcher, Esquire (Counsel of Record) Acting Solicitor General
United States Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001
Email: SupremeCtBriefs@USDOJ.gov