

No.22-6123

---

In The  
Supreme Court Of The United States

---

BRIAN DAVID HILL,  
Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Respondent,

---

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

---

**MOTION FOR REVIEW AND DISQUALIFICATION OF  
ANY AFFECTED HONORABLE JUSTICES WITH  
ACTUAL OR PERCEIVED CONFLICTS**

---

Brian David Hill

*Pro Se*

Ally of Q, and Atty. Lin Wood

*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](mailto:rbhill67@comcast.net)

---

Dated: January 31, 2023



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

[JusticeForUSWGO.wordpress.com](http://JusticeForUSWGO.wordpress.com)

[JusticeForUSWGO.NL](http://JusticeForUSWGO.NL) //

[USWGO.COM](http://USWGO.COM)

**MOTION FOR REVIEW AND DISQUALIFICATION OF  
ANY AFFECTED HONORABLE JUSTICES WITH  
ACTUAL OR PERCEIVED CONFLICTS**

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 21.2(c) and 28 USC § 455, Petitioner Brian David Hill hereby move for review and disqualification of any Justices with actual or potential conflicts of interest (or the appearance of same) “however small” as the statute reads, with supported evidence in the attached DECLARATION OF BRIAN D. HILL IN SUPPORT OF THE MOTION FOR REVIEW AND DISQUALIFICATION OF ANY AFFECTED HONORABLE JUSTICES WITH ACTUAL OR PERCEIVED CONFLICTS with attached “*Pete Santilli: “Evan Neumann has corroborated everything that’s in here.” referring to U.S. Supreme Court case 22-6123 regarding blackmail scheme of child rape and murder including Chief Justice John Roberts”*. See attached unsworn Affidavit/Declaration from Brian David Hill in support of this motion.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> 28 U.S.C. § 455 and its case law show that any personal interest including any financial interest “however small” at issue in the litigation (It personally benefits John Roberts to deny Certiorari) requires recusal. Since the DOJ is corrupt and the U.S. Intelligence agencies are allegedly involved in blackmailing people including allegedly Chief Justice Roberts, the judge must still recuse himself “if the outcome of the proceeding could substantially affect the value of the securities” or income or if the judge or justice has a personal vested interest in the outcome of the litigation or has any knowledge of the disputed evidentiary facts. Here, the Motion Requesting a Special Master to review over the alleged blackmail scheme video files or videotapes, which Attorney Lin Wood alleged that he believed also includes Chief Justice Roberts, and petition for certiorari could not be

See *Ketchup v. United States*, 4:94-cr-00025-CDL-MSH, (M.D. Ga. May. 19, 2022) (“Additionally, disqualification is required when the judge knows of “a person within the third degree of relationship to” him who has “an interest that could be substantially affected by the outcome of the proceeding” or is “likely to be a material witness in the proceeding.” *Id.* § 455(b)(5)(iii), (iv).”). *Ketchup v. United States*, 4:94-cr-00025-CDL-MSH, 1 (M.D. Ga. May. 19, 2022) (“The pervasive bias exception supports disqualification if the Court's predisposition is “so extreme as to display clear inability to render fair judgment.” *Liteky v. United States*, 510 U.S. 540, 551 (1994). “Thus, a motion for disqualification may not ordinarily be based on the judge's rulings in the same case.” *Meester*, 762 F.2d at 884; see also *Liteky*, 510 U.S. at 555 (“[J]udicial rulings alone almost never constitute a valid basis for a bias or partiality [recusal] motion.”).”)

---

more damning to John Roberts or any federal judge or even a magistrate who may or may not be in the blackmail videos, and this will personally affect Justice Roberts if a Special Master investigates the alleged blackmail videos then happens to find John Roberts in one of those rape videos. Again as alleged by Lin Wood. That would personally hurt John Roberts and hurt him financially with requests for impeachment or resignation. It would ruin his reputation overnight, as well as his career and any financial securities he has. That is why he must step aside from the foregoing case in the Supreme Court as a matter of law. This case affects him one way or another. <http://web.archive.org/web/20210104072352/https://twitter.com/LLinWood/status/1345991175690457091> “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.”

The argument made by the U.S. Supreme Court in a previous ruling (*Liteky v. United States*, 510 U.S. 540, 551 (1994)) regarding requirement for disqualification is quite clear. “The pervasive bias exception supports disqualification if the Court's predisposition is “so extreme as to display clear inability to render fair judgment.””. A person accused of being blackmailed (by any credible attorney) will not render a fair judgment or fair impartial decision in CONFERENCE as to a decision on the Petition for the Writ of Certiorari. There is a reason why Certiorari was denied without comment. It isn't just information alleged by Attorney Lin Wood as originally outlined in Petitioner's filed “MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL MASTER FOR PROCEEDINGS AND FINDINGS OF FACT OF GROUND VII "...BLACKMAIL SCHEME INVOLVING CHILD RAPE AND MURDER..." Concerning "JUDGES" MOTION AND BRIEF/MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF MOTION by BRIAN DAVID HILL. (1:22CV74) (Butler, Carol) Modified on 1/28/2022 to reflect civil case number.” Again, this was the very motion being referenced and brought up in Petitioner's petition for the Writ of Certiorari. See pages 13 through 16 of the Petition for the Writ of Certiorari. There are one or more other witnesses who seem to be corroborating the Lin Wood claims filed by Petitioner in his EMERGENCY APPLICATION to Chief Justice John

Roberts, which also include evidence of the claims of Attorney Lin Wood regarding Chief Justice Roberts.

### SUMMARY OF MOTION

1. The U.S. Supreme Court has the authority under federal law to require recusal of a justice with a conflict of interest, and/or, an appearance of the same, and/or has a personal interest in the outcome of a litigation and may have any knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts; which is pursuant to 28 U.S. Code § 455 - Disqualification of justice, judge, or magistrate judge. Congress created this law specifically to recuse or disqualify a justice, judge, or magistrate judge under specific circumstances as required by law. Says in section “(a) **Any justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall disqualify himself in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned.”**; as well as “(iii) **Is known by the judge to have an interest that could be substantially affected by the outcome of the proceeding;**” and “(1) Where he has a personal bias or prejudice concerning a party, or personal knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts concerning the proceeding...”.

2. Petitioner had given this Court ample notice and opportunity multiple times to make conflict disclosures and proactively recuse as needed, especially in light of the Court’s internal conflicts check

procedure prior to conference. Obviously, it strains credibility that this Court would have zero potential conflicts of interest to report to me and to the American people that the acrobatics are indeed aligned rightly (legal acrobatics). As required by 28 USC § 455(e) (“a full disclosure on the record of the basis for disqualification”), this Court should review its potential conflicts, and fully disclose to me the outcome of that review, to ensure not only the impartiality of the Court, but the perception of the same. The disqualification Emergency Motion and EMERGENCY APPLICATION were both filed by Petitioner after reading Chief Justice Roberts’ year-end report addressing federal judges not recusing themselves from cases where they had a financial conflict of interest. See Roberts, J. 2021 Year-End Report on the Federal Judiciary, U.S. Supreme Court (December 31, 2021). <https://www.supremecourt.gov/publicinfo/year-end/2021year-endreport.pdf>. Roberts addressed others for having a conflict-of-interest regarding judges not recusing themselves when they have a conflict of interest but is not recusing himself when the American people are seeing this case as a conflict of interest for Roberts to even be involved in this Certiorari case. He has never recused himself in this case.

3. This motion will not address all of the same issues as was previously addressed in the Emergency disqualification Motion and

EMERGENCY APPLICATION. See the Petitioner's previously filed "EMERGENCY MOTION FOR REVIEW AND DISQUALIFICATION OF AFFECTED HONORABLE CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN ROBERTS WITH ACTUAL OR PERCEIVED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST", filed on December 06 2022. See the Petitioner's previously filed "EMERGENCY APPLICATION TO CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN ROBERTS TO RECUSE HIMSELF FROM ALL PROCEEDINGS INVOLVED IN CERTIORARI PETITION CASE", filed November 21, 2022.

4. The new issues which are being addressed, as outlined in the "DECLARATION OF BRIAN D. HILL IN SUPPORT OF THE MOTION FOR REVIEW AND DISQUALIFICATION OF ANY AFFECTED HONORABLE JUSTICES WITH ACTUAL OR PERCEIVED CONFLICTS", as well as the material evidence which is part of the Declaration attached thereto as: "Pete Santilli: "Evan Neumann has corroborated everything that's in here." referring to U.S. Supreme Court case 22-6123 regarding blackmail scheme of child rape and murder including Chief Justice John Roberts".

5. Attorney Lin Wood had said the following which was referenced in both the EMERGENCY APPLICATION to John Roberts and in Appendix pages 13-14 of "APPENDIX TO EMERGENCY MOTION FOR REVIEW AND DISQUALIFICATION OF AFFECTED

HONORABLE CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN ROBERTS WITH ACTUAL OR PERCEIVED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST":

CITATION OF Appendix pages 13-14:

Lin Wood

@LLinWood

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.

11:11 PM - 3 Jan 2021

6. After the Petition for the Writ of Certiorari was denied on January 9, 2023, EMERGENCY MOTIONS were not acted upon, Pete Santilli that same day put on a broadcast telling his audience that **“BREAKING! U.S. Supreme Court is OFFICIALLY CAPTURED | EP 3274-6PM”**. See pages 4-7 of “DECLARATION OF BRIAN D. HILL IN SUPPORT OF THE MOTION FOR REVIEW AND DISQUALIFICATION OF ANY AFFECTED HONORABLE JUSTICES WITH ACTUAL OR PERCEIVED CONFLICTS”. Not only that but he had revealed that somehow, without specifying the methods, Pete had been in contact with a witness named Evan Neumann as well as somebody known as the “Grim Reaper”. See the transcription on pages 8-10 of the same DECLARATION in support of this motion. Pete Santilli said and I quote from the supporting Declaration that:



CITATION of page 9 of the same DECLARATION in support of this motion:

Speaker Pete Santilli 27:58

very believable. Not only very believable, but Evan Neumann has corroborated everything that's in here. (Displays on video first page of emergency application, case no. 22-6123, filed by Brian D. Hill in the Supreme Court) Okay. And that is, and by the way, I have multiple sources. We got Lin Wood. We have my source the Grim Reaper, right. Correct. You know what I'm talking about? "I do." (Deb Jordan (Co-Host) Yep. Think Grim Reaper. I know. Okay. And now, Evan Neumann, Evan Neumann, was a January 6. protester, right. And he was there was good reason for it, because he's working for the CIA and the FBI. And then they wanted to bring an indictment. The FBI showed up when he was at the airport. And not just questioning him, they actually threatened him. And they said, incarceration is going to be the least of your worries here, whereas keep your frickin mouth shut. And I know the FBI does this because they've done people we know, threatening them with obstruction of justice. Right. But Evan Neumann is a little bit different. The FBI set out to threaten him, okay. They threatened him with his life. And then he was let go, how many January 6. defendants are people that show up on the FBI's most wanted list, get let go at the airport? How many? How many of them? Do you know of?

7. What Attorney Lin Wood had claimed about John Roberts is being corroborated by one or more other sources. As claimed by Pete Santilli on his Pete Santilli Show. Pete shows on that particular episode and video, a printed photocopy of the "EMERGENCY APPLICATION TO CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN ROBERTS TO RECUSE

HIMSELF FROM ALL PROCEEDINGS INVOLVED IN CERTIORARI PETITION CASE”, filed on November 21, 2022.

8. It appears that where there is smoke, there is fire, as the saying goes. John Roberts is definitely in conflict of interest here, and has a personal benefit or personal interest in the outcome of the Petitioner’s filed Petition for the Writ of Certiorari, which was denied on January 9, 2023, after John Roberts was participating in the CONFERENCE on January 6, 2023. John Roberts refused to recuse himself and had caused or had somehow caused the DENIAL of the Petition for the Writ of Certiorari on January 9, 2023. This creates an appearance to the average American citizen and truth seeker that John Roberts will not comply with federal law aka 28 U.S. Code § 455 - Disqualification of justice, judge, or magistrate judge.

9. Now that new evidence has surfaced from a political talk show in Cincinnati, Ohio corroborating the claims in Petitioner’s previously filed EMERGENCY APPLICATION about Chief Justice John Roberts beyond just simply the claims of Attorney L. Lin Wood of Georgia, it is clear that John has a predicament where people may now have the belief that John Roberts is being blackmailed with a heinous crime or heinous crimes. It is clearly a non-compliance issue with 28 U.S. Code § 455. It creates an issue with at least some of the American people.

10. The facts mentioned in the DECLARATION accompanying this MOTION further bring out new evidence which corroborates the claims of Attorney Lin Wood, at issue in the entire case of the Petition for the Writ of Certiorari as to why recusal and disqualification are necessary at this point and were necessary before the wrongful denial of the Petition. New evidence of John Roberts visiting 300+ child pornography websites. See page 9 of the supporting DECLARATION.

**CITATION of Page 9 of DECLARATION (referring to what Pete Santilli had said in transcript):**

Right. So it has to do with with the Supreme Court being corrupt. You know why? Because Chief Justice Roberts has basically evidence that's in the possession of the CIA OIG over 300 websites, child porn websites, okay.

(Pete Santilli appearing to be reviewing over contents of EMERGENCY APPLICATION case no. 22-5123)

11. Whether this is true or not what Pete Santilli is alleging, the Supreme Court's denial of the Petition for the Writ of Certiorari on January 9, 2023 and ignoring Petitioner's repeated written requests for recusal is creating the impression and perception to the American people that Roberts is guilty or may be guilty of the crimes he is being accused of. If Chief Justice Roberts is not guilty, he should at least step aside from this case, and let the allegations not be fettered with by a conflict of interest or at least the potential of such conflict of

interest. He is clearly giving off the wrong signals by not recusing himself. He needs to recuse himself to at least demonstrate that he is indeed in compliance with 28 U.S. Code § 455.

12. If this Court were to recognize the truth of Petitioner's staggering claims as to why a Special Master is needed, as well as the allegations of blackmail originating from Attorney Lin Wood and had recently been corroborated by Evan Neumann, then this could expose who has been blackmailed in those alleged videos. It could expose who has been blackmailed in the federal judiciary which such exposure is needed to bring back the American people's confidence in our federal judiciary. Otherwise, people will believe that the Federal Courts are almost entirely rigged or at least mostly rigged. Rigged in favor of the United States Government and its corrupt actors. Either way, the blackmail allegations issues are not being resolved but instead are being ignored, they are being swept under the rug, and are being treated as though they do not exist, which will further exacerbate the belief (even if it appears delusional on its face at face value) of Americans that the federal judiciary is broken and/or corrupt. That does not need to happen in a free society, in a Constitutional republic, in a society of liberty, justice, and equal application of the laws.

13. John Roberts can still do the right thing, he can still recuse himself and allow all other eight (8) justices to be voting on the

Petition for Rehearing of the Petitioner without Chief Justice Roberts being involved to at least create the appearance of fairness, the appearance of impartiality, and the appearance of integrity. He can still do the right thing and show Pete Santilli that he will at least comply with 28 U.S. Code § 455. Q Research of 8Kun (*evidence of what was found and given to the Petitioner by Roberta Hill who can use the internet to find evidence for Petitioner to use*) had also been concerned about the case no. 22-6123. See pages 19-20 of supporting DECLARATION.

14. In the rare case where a plaintiff or petitioner makes a credible (references of any credible witness or attorney) and yet comprehensive legal challenge to an entire blackmail scheme conspiracy where judges and officials were targets of blackmail where each target is ordered to rape a child and shoot that child on videotapes or video files as alleged by a credible Attorney Lin Wood and was recently corroborated by Evan Neumann according to Pete Santilli, this Court must comply with 28 U.S.C. § 455(e) (“a full disclosure on the record of the basis for disqualification”) by proactively disclosing its potential conflicts.

15. Petitioner’s previous EMERGENCY MOTION and EMERGENCY APPLICATION requesting recusal of John Roberts

have not succeeded. This means, so far, zero disclosures or recusals have issued from this Supreme Court.

16. With the utmost respect for this high Court and its honorable Justices, Petitioner respectfully move for an openly published review of this Court's conflicts, and issue any recusals/disqualifications as required to ensure not only this Court's fair discussion in the next conference behind closed doors, but the appearance of the same to those outside the doors.

17. Nothing in this motion should be interpreted to disparage this high Court or suggest any impropriety whatsoever unless fully proven by the facts and proven by any evidence beyond a reasonable doubt as alleged not only by Attorney L. Lin Wood, but Evan Neumann and based on one or more sources of Pete Santilli. The goal is to assure that Petitioner and the public can access a written record of this Court's compliance with 28 USC § 455, which is also a matter of procedural due process.

18. This Court may subpoena or Court Order the following witness on record to establish the credibility of the source or sources of Pete Santilli's claims about John Roberts and his conflict of interest or conflicts of interest in this case:

The Pete Santilli Show:  
P.O. Box 30122

Cincinnati, Ohio 45230

19. Pete Santilli is willing to testify under oath or to provide an affidavit to his claims. So, this Court should feel free to have its staff or aides contact the following individual Pete Santilli by Court Order or subpoena or have the U.S. Department of Justice contact this individual if SCOTUS feels that it does not have the resources to conduct an investigation or contact this person to verify Pete's claims about John Roberts by and through one or more of his sources. This Court can still contact Attorney L. Lin Wood to verify his claims.

20. In November, 2022, Petitioner filed a petition for writ of certiorari, which cited the facts of what was alleged by Attorney Lin Wood and why a Special Master was necessary. On January 9, 2023, this Court denied the petition for writ of certiorari after the conference on January 6, 2023. That was without the recusal of John Roberts.

21. Together with this motion for review and disqualification, Petitioner are concurrently filing a petition for rehearing on the order denying the petition for writ of certiorari.

## ARGUMENT

### A. Applicable Law on Disqualification

The applicable law for judicial disqualification is 28 U.S.C. § 455:

(a) Any justice, judge, or magistrate [magistrate judge] of the United States shall disqualify himself in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned.

(b) He shall also disqualify himself in the following circumstances:

(1) Where he has a personal bias or prejudice concerning a party, or personal knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts concerning the proceeding;

(2) Where in private practice he served as lawyer in the matter in controversy, or a lawyer with whom he previously practiced law served during such association as a lawyer concerning the matter, or the judge or such lawyer has been a material witness concerning it;

(3) Where he has served in governmental employment and in such capacity participated as counsel, adviser or material witness concerning the proceeding or expressed an opinion concerning the merits of the particular case in controversy;

(4) He knows that he, individually or as a fiduciary, or his spouse or minor child residing in his household, has a financial interest in the subject matter in controversy or in a party to the proceeding, or any other interest that could be substantially affected by the outcome of the proceeding;

(5) He or his spouse, or a person within the third degree of relationship to either of them, or the spouse of such a person:

(i) Is a party to the proceeding, or an officer, director, or trustee of a party;

(ii) Is acting as a lawyer in the proceeding;

(iii) Is known by the judge to have an interest that could be substantially affected by the outcome of the proceeding;

(iv) Is to the judge's knowledge likely to be a material witness in the proceeding. (c) A judge should inform himself about his personal and fiduciary financial interests, and make a reasonable effort to inform himself about the personal financial interests of his spouse and minor children residing in his household.

(e) No justice, judge, or magistrate [magistrate judge] shall accept from the parties to the proceeding a waiver of any ground for



disqualification enumerated in subsection (b). Where the ground

for disqualification arises only under subsection (a), waiver may be accepted provided it is preceded by a full disclosure on the record of the basis for disqualification.

22. This statute and its case law show that any personal interest in the issues and any personal interest or personal knowledge of any disputed evidentiary facts require that the judge or justice must recuse himself “if the outcome of the proceeding” could substantially affect the personal interest or outcome of the case personally affects the affected justice.

23. Accordingly, if this Court were to rule in Petitioner's favor on the petition for writ of certiorari, it would open the door to a federal court filing an order for a Special Master to review over the alleged blackmailed videos after subpoenaing Attorney L. Lin Wood to compel his source or sources to produce a copy of all of the alleged encrypted blackmail video files or even videotapes to be turned over to the Special Master for review and investigation, produce a copy to the Government attorney(s) as well as a copy to the Petitioner and/or Petitioner's appointed counsel, that can possibly create a finding where Chief Justice Roberts could be found in one of those alleged videos and could create quite a scandal which could lead to possibly impeachment or resignation of John Roberts for the allegation of rape

of a child, and eventually may lead to his indictment and arrest for what Attorney Lin Wood had alleged as Roberts participating in child sexual abuse of rape and murder. The argument is that if John Roberts doesn't try to block or have denied in any way, shape, or form the Petitioner's petition for writ of certiorari, it will personally affect him, and cause his life to be ruined by any future criminal indictment or indictments, and his reputation may fall into ruin if he does not use his power and authority to try to prevent the petition for writ of certiorari from being granted. This is exactly why he needs to recuse himself and is supposed to be disqualified from every stage of participation in the foregoing petition for writ of certiorari. He should have recused himself before the conference on January 6, 2023, but he did not. He caused what benefitted him, the denial of the petition for writ of certiorari on January 9, 2023, without a record as to what he had said in the conference behind closed doors. He did not comply with 28 U.S. Code § 455. The damage had already been done, but the damage he had done by violating 28 U.S. Code § 455, that damage could be undone if he can simply recuse himself after the filing of Petitioner's petition for rehearing.

24. Title 28 U.S.C. § 455(b)(1), 28 U.S.C. § 455 (b)(5)(iii), and 28 U.S.C. § 455 (b)(5)(iv) is clear that recusal is necessary where a Judge/Justice or family member "(iii) Is known by the judge to have

an interest that could be substantially affected by the outcome of the proceeding;” or “(iv) Is to the judge’s knowledge likely to be a material witness in the proceeding.” There are too many variables one way or another that suggest as a matter of law that recusal is required.

25. See an example about financial securities requiring recusal. Personal interest in the outcome of a case is similar as it would negatively and personally affect the life and financial livelihood of the judge/justice if the outcome is favorable to the petitioner of the case. Case law does not require the Judge’s/Justice’s at issue to be an actual defendant in the litigation. Whether or not the government is the defendant in the litigation, the judge must still recuse himself “if the outcome of the proceeding could substantially affect the value of the securities.” See e.g., *Shell Oil Co. v. United States*, 672 F.3d 1283 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (Where trial judge discovered that judge’s spouse owned stock in parent company of certain oil companies in action against government, and judge severed affected companies from action and entered judgment in favor of non-severed companies, recusal of judge was required from entire proceeding; because stock was not divested, recusal was mandatory and could not be waived, and trial judge was required to recuse judge from entire proceeding rather than severing affected companies). *United States v. Wolff*, 263 F. App’x 612, 613, 615 (9th Cir. 2008) (judge abused his discretion by failing to recuse in case

where judge owned stock in “unindicted co-conspirators”; as the appellant alleged, “the district judge was required to recuse himself because he owned stock in a company that was connected to the scheme”). **Financial interests are similar to as bad of an effect as a personal interest of the disputed evidentiary facts or has a personal interest where the Judge or Justice may be dragged into a criminal investigation and/or indictment if the affected Judge or Justice does not recuse himself but rather participate in the litigation at the Supreme-Court level. There is no Court higher than the SCOTUS.**

26. What paragraph 25 means is that Roberts would benefit more from participating in the litigation rather than recuse himself to protect himself from any possible criminal investigation if he is indeed in one of the alleged blackmail videos, if Certiorari were granted. Roberts fears this if he is in one of those alleged videos. He fears of the potential issue of Petitioner’s petition for writ of certiorari being granted which would cause the videos to be reviewed over by a Special Master which such investigation would not be under the authority of a possibly affected blackmailed judge. This could increase Robert’s fears that he may be in one of those alleged videos and such Special Master could find Roberts in one of those videos, the fear that it would cause him to be charged with a sex offense, a felony, or multiple felonies. His life would be ruined if he is found in one of those alleged

videos. He has both a personal interest in the outcome of the foregoing case and has a personal interest in the disputed evidentiary facts of the appealed case. He needs to recuse himself, and this motion is his last chance in this particular case to do what is ethically right, morally right, and legally required under the law. Pete Santilli already said publicly a comment directed to John Roberts on his show that he was given his last chance to do what is right. Petitioner is giving John Roberts one more chance to do what is right, one chance more than Pete Santilli is willing to give him. Petitioner wanted to see true justice, not fake justice in the federal courts, and wanted to see things done right in the Supreme Court. Petitioner hopes Roberts can prove Brian Hill the Petitioner wrong. Petitioner wants to be proven wrong with any real proof. Roberts has one last chance to do what is right pursuant to law, pursuant to the Due Process Clause of the U.S. Constitution. Otherwise the American people will always feel that Roberts is compromised or blackmailed, that feeling will never go away, these issues will never go away, we will all feel that something is wrong here without ever any resolution to these fears.

27. Though it may be unwanted here, § 455 operates as a check and balance on the judiciary. Art. I and II have political checks and balances not present upon judges/justices appointed for life.

28. Petitioner understands the claims by Attorney L. Lin Wood and the recent claims by Pete Santilli are shocking, and that the evidence presents such a need for the Petitioner's request for comprehensive federal relief in this case is a tall order even with the shocking evidence in support. But Petitioner respectfully requests the dignity of a response and a remedy, to ensure that procedural due process under 28 U.S.C. § 455 has been performed and documented with the rigor deserved of this intense subject matter, for today and for posterity.

29. This case affects every other federal court case across the country where criminal defendants/plaintiffs/petitioners/respondents and civil defendants/plaintiffs/petitioners/respondents, all have fears that the judge or judges involved in those cases may be affected by the blackmail scheme alleged by Attorney L. Lin Wood. These blackmail videos can be investigated by law enforcement or reviewed by somebody who is an officer of the Court. As far as Petitioner is aware of, Attorney Lin Wood has made no indication publicly or in writing that the alleged blackmail videos have ever been investigated or reviewed over by any officer or law enforcement or by any Court. This is concerning for the American people of the United States of America. There needs to be an investigation into the alleged blackmail scheme by Attorney Lin Wood and corroborated by Evan Neumann, with regard to the heinous acts of children being raped by somebody in a position of power or authority and then that target is ordered to shoot that child until

death which is murder. These documented heinous acts do not need to be sitting in just some office of a U.S. Intelligence Agency. Attorney Lin Wood had claimed that the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and the U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) are part of this heinous blackmail scheme which seems to be involving John Roberts. Roberta Hill gave Petitioner this link and text from that link to put in here as evidence. See <http://web.archive.org/web/20210104080854/https://twitter.com/LLinWood/status/1346005416677928960>

CITATION of link (Copy and pasted text from the above link Roberta Hill who obtained this information from that url link since Petitioner cannot use the internet):

“The 10 intelligence agencies who have members employing this blackmail scheme include CCP, CIA, Mossad, FBI, MI6. The others are easily identifiable.”

“The agencies do not which of them was hacked by Lizard Squad.”

“@realDonaldTrump”

“12:07 AM - 4 Jan 2021”

30. The U.S. Government should not be engaged in a criminal blackmail scheme involving Americans, this violates the charter of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) to be engaging in domestic operations against the American people, against American politicians, against American judges and against any American Justices. To essentially be engaging in federal crimes as far as blackmailing judges and officials including John Roberts. This violates many facets of the U.S. Constitution, not just violating 28 U.S. Code § 455. Substantial due process, procedural

due process, right to an impartial judge or jury when charged with a crime, the right to a speedy trial. Every constitutional right can be violated and deprived with blackmail of judges and officials. **It is the ULTIMATE FRAUD ON THE COURT, FRAUD UPON THE COURT.**

**PRAYER TO GOD AND JESUS CHRIST FOR THIS COURT TO  
BRING EQUITABLE RELIEF, PRAYER FOR RELIEF TO ALL  
JUSTICES TO CONSIDER THIS MOTION BEFORE  
CONSIDERATION OF THE PETITION FOR REHEARING**

Wherefore, Given the importance of the appearance of justice, before any denial or granting of rehearing, SCOTUS must provide full written disclosure of its own personal conflicts of interest concerning any Justice including being any person of interest of any criminal matter (concerning the blackmail scheme alleged by Lin Wood) or any matter concerning the very evidentiary facts and issues brought up in the U.S. District Court in the foregoing appealed Supreme Court case, and then recuse or disqualify per the rule of law.

Wherefore, in the best interest of justice and for good cause shown, Petitioner Brian David Hill respectfully request that all justices of this Court consider this MOTION to compel any affected Justices to recuse themselves including Chief Justice John Roberts of this Court before making any decision on the Petition for Rehearing.



Wherefore, in the best interest of avoiding conflicts of interest whether perceived or actual conflicts of interest, Petitioner Brian David Hill respectfully requests from this Court from the honorable justices that Chief Justice John Roberts of this Court recuses himself from all future proceedings, pursuant to 28 USC § 455.

Wherefore, Petitioner requests any other relief that this Court finds to be appropriate or necessary to attain the ends of justice.

God Bless You all. Where We Go One We Go All.

DATED this 31st day of January, 2023.



Respectfully submitted,

  
*Signed*

Brian D. Hill

---

Brian David Hill  
Pro Se Petitioner  
Ally of Q and Atty Lin Wood  
Former USWGO Alternative News Reporter  
310 FOREST STREET, APARTMENT 2  
MARTINSVILLE, VIRGINIA 24112  
Tel.: (276) 790-3505  
E-Mail: c/o Roberta Hill rbhill67@comcast.net  
[JusticeForUSWGO.wordpress.com](http://JusticeForUSWGO.wordpress.com)  
[JusticeForUSWGO.NL](http://JusticeForUSWGO.NL)

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

**CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL/PRO SE FILER**

I hereby certify that this motion is presented in good faith and not for delay.



Respectfully submitted,

*Brian D. Hill*  
*Signed*

Brian D. Hill

---

Brian David Hill  
Pro Se Petitioner  
Ally of Q and Atty Lin Wood  
Former USWGO Alternative News Reporter  
310 FOREST STREET, APARTMENT 2  
MARTINSVILLE, VIRGINIA 24112  
Tel.: (276) 790-3505  
E-Mail: c/o Roberta Hill rbhill67@comcast.net  
[JusticeForUSWGO.wordpress.com](http://JusticeForUSWGO.wordpress.com)  
[JusticeForUSWGO.NL](http://JusticeForUSWGO.NL)

