

#19-5616

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Russell Rope,

Petitioner,

vs.

Facebook, Inc., Apple, Inc., Alphabet, Inc., Twitter, Inc.,
JPMorgan Chase & Co., & John Does 1 to 10,

Respondents,

On Petition for Extraordinary Writ
Specifically for Writs of Mandamus & Prohibition
The United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit &
The United States District Court for the Central District of California
#18-55782 & #2:17-cv-04921

IN RE RUSSELL ROPE. [EMERGENCY] PETITION FOR EXTRAORDINARY WRIT

Russell Rope

#1607 POB 1198
Sacramento, CA 95812
(310) 663-7655

Petitioner In Pro Per

Originally Submitted @ 2/4/2020
Not Received/Resubmitted @ 2/20/2020
Corrected & ReResubmitted @ 4/14/2020
Corrected & ReReResubmitted @ 5/8/2020
Corrected & ReReReResubmitted @ 6/10/2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

★ CASE SUMMARY.....	3
★ LIST OF PARTIES.....	5
★ QUESTIONS PRESENTED.....	7
○ & “THE RELIEF SOUGHT”	
★ INDEX TO APPENDICES.....	7
★ TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED.....	10
★ OPINIONS BELOW.....	13
★ JURISDICTION.....	16
★ CONSTITUTIONAL & STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	18
★ STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	21
○ “THE ISSUES PRESENTED”	
○ “THE FACTS NECESSARY....”	
★ REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT(s).....	26
○ “THE REASONS WHY THE WRIT[(s)] SHOULD ISSUE”	
★ CONCLUSION.....	30

CASE SUMMARY

Proper Pro Per Complaints; Terminate Obstruction

Petitioner is filing this *Petition for Extraordinary Writ(s)* seeking multiple mandates; as many as SCOTUS is willing to issue, individually given consideration, requested with hope and intent for an as prompt and peaceful as possible resolution to a complicated conflict that has for too long been relentlessly and criminally attacking Petitioner through a pattern of racketeering activity evolving into toxic culture as coercion and bribes are suspected to have obstructed justice thereby permitting evil to grow. Petitioner requires relief from SCOTUS that terminates hate with what is good and legal.

Briefly and distinctly stated, this Petition is necessary, not limited to grounds not previously presented, but delivered in a remixed fashion and minus pages of words, cut back so SCOTUS can focus on progress first, but also including a new Appendix H in support of the urgent need for SCOTUS to step in, is based on constitutional due process rights being violated, by extraordinary discretion affording more leniency to the impractical situation, life still in danger, and humanitarian rights of citizens at stake. Petitioner stands by the previous statement about anything that cannot be explained is usually wrong, or worse being deceptive concealment aka fraud. Petitioner knows that no explanation is often the case when denied in SCOTUS, and while The Court probably tends to be correct, this “extraordinary” crisis situation demands attention from the

Justices in direct communication with Petitioner; electronic filing, and if necessary oral argument, are again requested over further blocks because there is immediate reliance on communication and concealment of requested information and neglect for relief sought are causing damage. Moreover, this Petition is accompanied by a separate but connected Emergency Application, which according to SCOTUS rules, requires the assigned Justice to make specific notations thereby rendering explanation mandatory.

The Complaint is REAL and Petitioner has been following the rules. No one has questioned or directly criticized the authenticity of claims, accusations have not been denied by Respondents, and continuous violations have not stopped. Petitioner hardly reported all the terrible things Respondents have done, tried to do, caused, or tried to cause. Due Process must trump obstruction. Incessant attacks technically continue to extend the process and statutes of limitations where evolution calls for emergency resolution. Respondents keep using the same tactics with different actors, expecting different results, but mostly indicating an inevitable error causing tragedy, and their incompetence is truly insanity not generating results other than leaving a trail of clear and convincing facts and evidence proving the obvious pattern of racketeering activity. The entire defense, not limited to what is docketed, is fraud; a misdirecting framework based on bluff fluff and criminality such as trying to make the witness/Petitioner disappear by false imprisonment. The framework of The Constitution is what matters. Justice has been obstructed on every level and the highest court must overrule all the lies. What is to stop Respondents from obstructing justice again in another case?

SCOTUS needs to end the cycle before it restarts. Enough is enough. The Petition(s), Complaint(s), & Appeal are not “frivolous” and claims were successfully stated in the FAC if not Complaint, certainly well enough for a judge to recognize a right to legal remedy. SCOTUS must grant progress now, which is in the best interest of the USA because it will be an example of civil resolution that also sets questionable truths regarding our rights in stone. Denying this case is like killing the American Dream, which is still kicking and screaming for a fresh breath of justice. Modern issues regarding this case that also affect society need to be addressed by law. Very serious problems require no less than thorough investigation, which would certainly turn up more evidence in support of existing claims and give way to possible solutions regarding not limited to additional issues raised in the *Petition for Rehearing* and draining “The [Not Limited To Fake News] Swamp,” which is connected to relevant abuses of power. This Petition is presented in great faith. Please grant fair and vital justice as proposed.

LIST OF PARTIES

Requires Option to Amend if Necessary

A. PETITIONER:

Russell Rope is an honest, hardworking, law-abiding citizen fighting for our rights, introduced himself in the previous Petition for Writ of Certiorari, and has a blog with more relevant information in the about section @ russellrope.com/blog/?=30.

B. RESPONDENTS:

1. ABSOLUTELY “IDENTIFIED” & FILED AGAINST RESPONDENTS:

- Facebook, Inc. is located in Menlo Park, CA.
- Apple, Inc. is located in Cupertino, CA.
- Alphabet, Inc. is located in Mountain View, CA.
- Twitter, Inc. is located in San Francisco, CA.
- JPMorgan Chase & Co. is located in New York, NY.
- John Does Possibly To Be Amended (Sealed Exhibit 52)

2. MORE THAN SUSPECT & UNKNOWN DEFENDANTS:

- Suspect John Doe Mark Zuckerberg, CEO @ Facebook, Inc.
- Suspect John Doe Sean Parker of Not Limited to @ Facebook, Inc.
- Suspect John Doe Peter Thiel of Not Limited to @ “PayPal Mafia”
- Suspect John Doe Tim Cook, CEO @ Apple, Inc.
- Suspect John Doe Larry Page & Sergey Brin @ Alphabet, Inc.
- Suspect John Doe Jack Dorsey, CEO @ Twitter, Inc.
- Suspect John Doe James Diamon, CEO @ JPMorgan Chase
- Suspect John Doe Tom Tate allegedly located in Sunnyvale, C
- Possibly To Be Amended HP, Inc. is located in Palo Alto, CA
- Possibly To Be Amended Anonymous For Security & Pending Discovery

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Whether the Law Extends to All Citizens & Corporations in Modern Times?

- ★ Whether SCOTUS is ready to take action with integrity to thoroughly answer all of the questions presented in the *Petition for Writ of Certiorari*, to investigate issues raised in the *Petition for Rehearing*, and/or to award justice to progress?

RELIEF SOUGHT:

- ★ SCOTUS Takeover by Granting Not Limited to One of These Options for Progress:
 - Writ for Local (in Los Angeles) Alternative Dispute Resolution (“ADR”)
 - Or Temp. Relocate Petitioner to Washington DC; Through Trial @ SCOTUS
 - Or Preferably Writs for Award of The Proposed Relief Sought from ADR
- ★ *Plus Original Relief that does Not Directly Involve Respondents as Follows*

Immediately Requested Writ(s) for Relief from Government Entities:

- ★ Writ of Mandamus for CalVCB to Provide \$100,000,000 of Victim Compensation
 - Discretionarily please, but a lawsuit was filed for this in 2014. It is only a loan based on inevitable justice funded by money taken from criminals. Fair regardless of a final civil decision on the case.
- ★ Writ of Mandamus for SSA to Provide Choice of Custom New Confidential SS#
- ★ Writ of Mandamus for CIA to Release of Information
 - To Petitioner Any & All Information Pertaining to Petitioner &/or This Case

- ★ Writ of Mandamus for Exemption from Pacer Fees
- ★ Writ of Mandamus for Electronic Filing Access @ SCOTUS
- ★ Writ of Prohibition to Terminate Obstruction; Recusal of Previous District Judges
- ★ Writ of of Mandamus Requiring Reversal of Quashed Subpoenas
 - To Be Served By The Court

- ★ Writ of Prohibition for “Any & All Law Enforcement” to Terminate Obstruction
 - Symbolic Do Your Job or SCOTUS Recognizes The Right To Arrest Anyone
- ★ Writ of Mandamus to DOJ for Restoration of Right to Bear Arms
 - & For Preferable Federal / International CCW / Security Clearance
- ★ Writ of Mandamus to LASD for Return of Small Pistol & Issuance of CCW Permit
 - LASD to Provide Cash for Equal Replacement if Destroyed
- ★ Writ of Mandamus to Superior Court of California for Termination of both Cases #ZM025125 and #ZM029514 &/or Anything Mental Health Related
 - Copy of All Records, Reports, Transcripts, Evidence, etc. to be Delivered to Petitioner & Then Permanently Destroyed
 - Petitioner Deserves to Know What They Lied About & A True Clean Slate

- ★ Writ of Mandamus for International Security & Investigation/Support from Secret Service In Direct Communication with Petitioner; 18 USC §§ 3056 & 1030

- ★ Writ of Prohibition for Terminate Obstruction @ 9th Circuit
- ★ Writ of Mandamus for Appointment of Pro Bono (Assistant/Stand By) Counsel To Assist Petitioner in Either ADR & Discovery @ Central District or @ SCOTUS.

- ★ *Plus Relief or Progress Towards Relief From Damages & Punitive as Follows*

Immediately Requested Writ(s) for Discretionary Relief from Non-Government Entities:

- ★ Writ of Mandamus for Transfer of Domain Name “rise.com”
 - From [Any Party] to Petitioner; or for Their Arrest Under RICO

- ★ Writ of Mandamus for Fair Sale of Real Estate Known as “The Mountain” of BH
 - Located @ 1652 Tower Grove Dr., Beverly Hills, CA 90210
 - or From [Any Party] to Petitioner Upon Legal Victory

Reduced from Complaint/FAC Relief Proposed as Settlement Offer for ADR:

- ★ Writ of Mandamus for District Court to enter Judgement in favor of Petitioner and against Respondents jointly & severally, in the total amount of \$100,000,000,000.00 to be transferred via direct deposit(s) into Petitioner’s bank account(s).

- ★ Writ of Mandamus for 24/7/365 Petitioner access to Respondent system admins for purpose of stopping violations alleged by Petitioner; to reset settings preventing users from seeing Petitioner posts; to stop sabotage, hacks, censorship, and interference with connections, communications, business and personal life; to permit Petitioner access to private data based on probable cause.

- ★ Writ of Mandamus or injunction preventing Respondents from doing business with or providing service to or receiving goods or services from alleged by Plaintiff to be conspiring directly or indirectly with the criminal racket in any way Petitioner deems to be an illegal conflict of interest. Mostly referencing suspects identified in Exhibit “52” and anything questionable to be presented directly to Petitioner because discovery post Petitioner victory voids agreement.

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: 18-55782 (Cited & Attached)

- **Main Judgment for Supreme Review**
- United States Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals
- Dismissed As “Frivolous” On 12/18/2018 @ Docket #24 (or #267 @ CACD)
- Out of Order / Before Appointment of Counsel & Filing Appeal/Brief
- Intentionally Neglecting/Obstructing Emergency Motion For Reconsideration, Requests For Explanation, & Corrected Filings

APPENDIX B: 2:17-cv-04921 (Cited & Attached)

- **Most Relevant Judgment for Additional Supreme Review**
- United States Central District Court of California
- FAC Illegally Dismissed Without Leave To Amend On 5/14/2018 @ Docket #247
- Dismissed With Leave To Amend/Requests Denied 12/20/2017 @ Docket #114
- Entire Docket/All Opinions Should Be Reviewed (Too Much To Print & Mail)
- Failure to State Claim & *Res Judicata* (Both Lies)

***NEW* APPENDIX H: Neglected Police Reports & False Arrest (Cited & Attached)**

- Defense Report Regarding False Arrest By UCLA PD
 - Charges(UCLA PD) Rejected by City Attorney’s Office
- Neglected Reports(& Supplemental) to Hollywood LAPD, OIG @ LAPD, BHPD
 - Followed Up w/Retaliation Attempted Entrapments/Stalking

Referenced Not Attached; Original Copy Can Be Provided Per Request:

APPENDIX C: BC607769 (vs. Tech/Comm)

- Stanley Mosk Courthouse / Los Angeles Superior Court of California
- Sustained Demurrer Without Leave To Amend On 9/14/2016
- Because Petitioner Was Falsely Imprisoned & Missed Court

APPENDIX D: BC608501 (vs. JPMorgan Chase & Co.)

- Stanley Mosk Courthouse / Los Angeles Superior Court of California
- Defendants Dismissed With Prejudice On 5/23/2016
- Because Petitioner Was Falsely Imprisoned & Missed Court

APPENDIX E: 2:14-cv-04900-VBK-GHK < FMM-UA &

APPENDIX F: 2:14-cv-04232-VBK-GHK < FMM-UA &

APPENDIX G: 2:14-cv-04002-VBK-GHK < FMM-UA

- United States Central District Court of California
- Erroneously Dismissed w/Out Definitive Reason; Because *In Forma Pauperis*

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

RICO - 18 USC § 1962(a)(c)

- 18 USC § 1964 – Civil Remedies
- Johnson v. GEICO Cas. Co., 516 F. Supp. 2d 351 (D. Del. 2007)
- Cited in FAC at Pages 1-4, 70-74

RICO/Civil Conspiracy - 18 USC §§ 1962(a)(b)(c)(d) & 1349

- Doctors' Co. v. Superior Court (1989) 49 Cal.3d 44, citing Mox Incorporated v. Woods (1927) 202 Cal. 675, 677-78.)' (Id. at 511.) & (Allied Equipment Corp. v. Litton Saudi Arabia Ltd., supra, 7 Cal.4th at 510-11.)
- Cited in FAC at Pages 74-76

FRAUD - PEN § 470, 18 USC § 1001, CIV § 1710, CIV § 3294

- Computer Fraud - 18 USC § 1030 (a)(2)(c) & (a)(4), 18 USC § 1030(b), 18 USC § 1030(g)
- Computer Fraud & Abuse Act (CFAA) § 1030(a)/(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)-(V)
- 18 USC §1961 Definitions (1)(B)(5)
- Cited in FAC at Pages 77-79

Fraud by Wire, Radio, or Television - 18 USC § 1343

- Manual of Model Criminal Jury Instructions for the District Courts of the 8th Circuit 6.18.1341 (West 1994)
- Cited in FAC at Pages 81-82

Mail Fraud: 18 USC Ch. 63 & Other Fraud Offenses § 1341

- Cited in FAC at Pages 81-83

Criminal Threats - PEN § 422

- Cited in FAC at Pages 84-86

Obscene, Threatening, & Annoying Communications - PEN § 653m

- Cited in FAC at Pages 86-87

Stalking - PEN § 649(.9)

- Cited in FAC at Pages 87-89

Assault & Battery - PEN §§ 240 & 242

- Lowry v. Standard Oil Co. of California (1944) 63 Cal.App.2d 1, 6—7 [146 P.2d 57]
- Cited in FAC at Pages 89-90

Espionage - Economic & Personal - 18 USC § 1831

- Cited in FAC at Pages 91-92

Theft of Trade Secrets - 18 USC §§ 1832 & 1836

- Cited in FAC at Pages 92-94

Obstruction of Justice - 18 USC §§ 1510, 1513, & 1985

- Cited in FAC at Pages 94-96

False Imprisonment - 1240-1: PEN §§ 210.5, 236; 42 USC § 1983

- Cited in FAC at Pages 98-99

Perjury –18 USC § 1621; CPC § 118(a)

- Cited in FAC at Pages 99-101

Robbery & Theft/Burglary - 18 USC § 2113; PEN §§ 211, 484, & 458

- Cited in FAC at Pages 101-103

Attempted Murder (Assault & Battery) - 18 USC §§ 1113 & 113

- Cited in FAC at Pages 103-105

Defamation - CIV §§ 44(a)(b); 45-46

- Smith v. Maldonado (1999) 72 Cal.App.4th 637, 645 [85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 397]
- Cited in FAC at Pages 106-107

Unfair Competition - CBPC § 17200-17210

Intentional Interference with Economic Relations

- Unfair Competition Law (UCL) 288. CBPC § 17200 et seq.
- (UCL) (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 17200)
- Levine v. Blue Shield of California, 189 Cal. App. 4th 1117, 1136 (2010)
- Schwartz v. Provident Life & Accident Ins. Co., 216 Cal. App. 4th 607, 611 (2013)
- Cited in FAC at Pages 107-108

Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress - Civil Tort

- Hughes v. Pair (2009) 46 Cal.4th 1035, 1050—1051 [95 Cal.Rptr.3d 636, 209 P.3d 963]
- Cited in FAC at Pages 108-113

Cybersquatting - ACPA @ USC 15 § 1125(d)

- Anticybersquatting Consumer Protection Act: 15 USC § 1125(D) Sec. 1125
- False Designations of Origin, False Descriptions, and Dilution Forbidden
- [Fraudulent Misrepresentation]
- Cited in FAC at Pages 111-113

EEO Violations 42 USC § 2000e-2(a)

- Title VII of Civil Rights Act of 1964
- Cited in FAC at Pages 113-114

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
EMERGENCY PETITION FOR EXTRAORDINARY WRIT(s)**

To Be Granted for The Best Reasons

Petitioner respectfully demands, by law and based on life-threatening emergency, not only that several writs issue for expedited progress in this collective case, but also for any relief SCOTUS is able to provide without further ado.

OPINIONS BELOW

Facts Above & Throughout

CASE # 18-55782: Most relevant to this Petition is the erroneous opinion of the United States Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, which appears at Appendix A to the Petition, is available at Docket Entry #24, and was filed on 12/18/2019. The not yet existent “Appeal” was criminally delayed then dismissed as “frivolous” without any explanation because there was no true justification for that act of inaction. Dismissal in the Ninth Circuit

should not be considered a final judgment because something that does not yet exist cannot be described or labeled as anything dismissable. The appellate court went out of order to obstruct justice before the actual appeal/opening brief was written let alone filed because going in order and granting counsel would have made it harder to try and defraud a pro se litigant with a slam dunk case.

CASE # 2:17-cv-04921: The erroneous opinion of the United States Central District Court appears at Appendix B to the petition, is available at Docket Entry #114, and was filed on 12/20/2017. Petitioner did everything right, or at least well enough in pro per, proved everyone wrong, made necessary corrections in the FAC, did everything right again, proved everyone wrong again, and everything was corrupt. Moreover, the upgraded FAC and progress with this Petition are proof that Petitioner was and is capable of continuing to correct alleged deficiencies had they existed in reality. Circuit obstruction supports District allegations.

CASE # BC607769: The opinion of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles, Stanley Mosk Courthouse, for a similar but different case against the Technology Defendants, CEOs, and John Does, appears at Appendix C to the Petition and was dismissed by sustained Demurrer without leave to amend on 9/14/2016 because Petitioner was falsely imprisoned, missed court dates. An appeal was not filed on the

state level because it made more sense to file a single new federal case for everything. The opinion is easily available on The Court website via civil case search for #BC607769.

CASE # BC608501: The opinion of Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles, Stanley Mosk Courthouse for a similar but different case against JPMorgan Chase & Co., CEO, and John Does appears at Appendix D to the Petition and was dismissed by sustained Demurrer without leave to amend on 5/23/2016 because Petitioner was falsely imprisoned and missed court dates. An appeal was not filed on the state level because it made more sense to file a single new federal case for everything. The opinion is easily available on The Court website via civil case search for #BC608501.

CASE # 2:14-cv-04900: The opinion of United States Central District Court for a similar but different case against The Technology Defendants and John Does appears at Appendix E to the Petition and was illegally dismissed in 2014 through the screening process for cases filed *in forma pauperis* with no specific or definitive reason given and explanation intentionally neglected. The frivolous opinion of the court is available on the docket. This case was not dismissed with prejudice.

CASE #2:14-cv-04232: The opinion of United States Central District Court for a similar but different case against John Doe Domain Name Frauds appears at Appendix F to the Petition and was illegally dismissed in 2014 through the screening process for cases filed

in forma pauperis with no specific or definitive reason given and explanation intentionally neglected. The frivolous opinion of The Court is available on the docket. This case was not dismissed with prejudice.

CASE #2:14-cv-04002: The opinion of United States Central District Court for a similar but different case against CalVCB and justice obstructing John Does appears at Appendix G to the Petition and was illegally dismissed in 2014 through the screening process for cases filed *in forma pauperis* with no specific or definitive reason given and explanation intentionally neglected. The frivolous opinion is available on the docket. This case was not dismissed with prejudice.

JURISDICTION

The Highest Court Has It

The jurisdiction of **SCOTUS** is invoked under not limited to **28 USC §1254(1)**.

Article III, Section II of The Constitution establishes the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. The Court has original and appellate jurisdiction because the case involves points of constitutional and federal law, and the United States is a party on some levels.

The best-known power of the Supreme Court is the doctrine of judicial review established in the case of **Marbury v. Madison (1803)**. **The Judiciary Act of 1789** gave the Supreme Court original jurisdiction to issue Writs of Mandamus compelling government officials to act in accordance with the law. **Article VI of The Constitution** establishes the Constitution as the Supreme Law of the Land thereby establishing authority to strike down judgements made in state and subordinate courts.

The Fourteenth Amendment (1869) makes provisions of the Bill of Rights applicable to the federal and state government not limited to DUE PROCESS and **28 USC § 1651**: "(a)The Supreme Court and all courts established by Act of Congress may issue all writs necessary agreeable to the usages and principles of law."

SCOTUS Rule 20: "1. Issuance by the Court of an extraordinary writ authorized by 28 U. S. C. §1651(a)..." is justified by "exceptional circumstances warrant[ing] the exercise of the Court's discretionary powers, and [] adequate relief cannot be obtained in any other form." 2. Petitioner in forma pauperis is exempt from fees and copies. 3. (a) Petition seeks both writs of prohibition and mandamus, identifies court actors against whom relief is sought, and details relief sought and not/immediately available in any other court. Copies of the worst judgments with respect to writs sought, including reference to related opinions, are appended with other essential documents. (b) Petition was served with respect to relief sought.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Justice's Job is to Preserve Our Rights

First Amendment:

“freedom of speech... of the press.... right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”

Respondents have been trying to use religion as behind the back false justification and not limited to judges are suspected of being cast like actors to block this very fundamental right and as previously explained and described in Exhibit 52. Petitioner is the modern press(media); which has been his primary business for over a decade, two plus decades upon consideration of work in college and high school. Not only have Respondents been censoring Petitioner, but obstruction of justice is resulting in a censorship where the press as a whole should be taking this very seriously. By cutting reach and communications, Respondents at this point are being enabled by justice obstructing judges thereby disrupting the ability to peacefully assemble and petition for not limited to possible redress from unfortunate corruption.

Second Amendment:

“...the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.”

The Respondent racket falsely imprisoned Petitioner on a 5150 hold not limited to for purpose of infringing on the right to bear arms after illegally delaying a carry concealed weapon permit Petitioner at the time only tried to acquire because law enforcement was neglecting serious criminal death threats, all of which resulted in Petitioner being kicked out of his home and forced to move thereby causing an entire chain reaction of racketeering activity not limited to additions to FAC since Complaint was filed in 2014.

Fourth Amendment:

“...against unreasonable searches and seizures...”

Petitioner’s firearm was illegally seized. On separate notes: not only did illegal search and seizure result in more false imprisonments, but obstruction led to illegal searches, to illegal seizure of Petitioner’s car, which caused grand theft of other physical property not limited to devices containing intellectual property, and to an illegal arrest at UCLA who was enabling violations while Petitioner was rightfully using library computers.

Fifth Amendment:

“...nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without **DUE PROCESS** of law...”

Respondents were originally enabling John Does, then considerably stating Respondents “coerced” over probably bribed, justice obstructors enabled Respondents, and now

SCOTUS until taking just action, is obstructing and enabling justice obstructors, all of which has been holding Petitioner captive through poverty, denial of service attacks (hacks), stalking, stealing property, not only on a literal level of false imprisonment, but stalling and obstructing, which is also depriving Petitioner of normal life and liberty.

Sixth Amendment:

“...and to have the assistance of counsel for his defence...”

Petitioner was criminally denied real representation from public defenders when falsely imprisoned and has only been defending against evil unjustifiable attacks since day one. Justice is also being obstructed not only by preventing private counsel, but also through blocking pro bono assistant/stand by counsel for that “defence” by the Ninth Circuit who should have appointed requested counsel before considering dismissal.

Eighth Amendment:

“Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.”
Obstruction of justice is inflicting cruel and unusual punishment considering all previous statements and not limited to new and recent violations all of which have resulted in damages. False imprisonment included excessive bail instead of own recognisance.

Fourteenth Amendment:

“...nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without **DUE PROCESS** of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”

The big one appears again meaning “due process” is a right so important that it has two amendments, either of which on their own merit are significant enough reason to issue a writ. Each time Petitioner mentions obstruction of justice or obstructors, on federal or state levels, Constitutional violations of DUE PROCESS should be inferred as no court or attorney has been able to provide a logical explanation for obstruction at any stage.

Case Law: Exception To Res Judicata:

“The United States Supreme Court has stated for at least ninety years that only ‘in the absence of fraud or collusion’ does a judgment from a court with jurisdiction operate as res judicata... The exception mentioned by the 4th Circuit in Resolute Ins. Co.—one for fraud, deception, accident, or mistake—is a classic example...”

The *res judicata* claim was a deceptive defense that did not fail because of fraud not regarding crooked judges. Ignoring Petitioner’s response to bogus MTDs based on the doctrine of *res judicata* was failure to recognize precedents already set by SCOTUS.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Honest Like Abe; Not Frivolous

THE ISSUES PRESENTED:

- ★ Obstruction of Justice; Not Limited to Due Process Rights are Being Violated
 - All Lower Court Judges Conspired to Obstruct Justice

- Law Enforcement Conspired to Obstruct Justice
- Filing New Case(s), w/Arrest Warrants, Could Bring Us Back Here
 - Then Justices Could Inevitably Become Defendants
- ★ Respondents Have Not Stopped Violating Petitioner's Rights
 - New Issues Requiring Amendment or Progress of Justice Leveling the Playing Field Thereby Creating Leverage for Fair Resolution
 - Specifically, but Not Limited to Real Estate Related Fraud
 - Respondents are Connected to Fake News Swamp FYI

**THE FACTS NECESSARY
TO UNDERSTAND THE ISSUE(s) PRESENTED BY THE PETITION:**

- ★ Justice is Mandatory as Petitioner is Being Honest
- ★ Complaints (Circuit Appeal Not Permitted = Obstructed) & Petitions = Legitimate
- ★ Justice is Being Obstructed on Every Level
- ★ The Laws Are Straightforward; All Elements Alleged
- ★ Clear & Convincing Evidence Supports Claims (Successfully Stated)
- ★ There is Nothing Frivolous About These (Forewarned) Complaints for Justice
- ★ *Res Judicata* is Irrelevant @ SCOTUS Has Overruled As Previously Cited
- ★ SCOTUS has a Responsibility to Grant Writs for Justice

Petitioner realleges that through an obvious pattern of racketeering activity, conspiring Respondents, and John Does who have not been dismissed by any court and are possibly pending amendment into this case, have continued attacking Petitioner and are and defrauding him of life, liberty, freedom, rights, time, money, relationships, and interstate

to international business. Respondents have directly and indirectly caused serious injury and irreparable damage. The root claim is brought pursuant to The Racketeer Influenced and **Corrupt Organizations Act of 1970 (RICO)**, Title 18 USC §§ 1961 et seq., and more specifically under the civil law cause of action at § 1964(a)(c). Evolving in severity over at least a decade, Respondents have literally been terrorizing Petitioner in their intent to sabotage and steal/control both business and personal life through incessant and illegal actions not limited to fraud, espionage, defamation, grand theft, harassment, stalking, threats, physical assault, entrapment, false imprisonment, and obstruction of justice. Multiple reports have been criminally obstructed and neglected at pretty much all law enforcement agencies and for no good reason. Irreparable damages to Petitioner include but are not limited to the killing of relationships, loss of business, money, property, time, opportunity, and creation and exacerbation of health related issues. Respondents more recently caused Petitioner to break his foot and interfered with the healthcare process, then essentially stole his car before stealing his backpack with laptop, camera, wallet, etc. They have also stolen two smart-phones, are interfering with carriers' deliverance of communications, and all devices contained some data that had not been backed up because Petitioner regularly creates so much it that it becomes more difficult to keep up on all the little things, which in some instances are big things, and everything is both connected and adds up. Respondents are intentionally trying to bleed Petitioner to death by a thousand cuts in the back while forcing him to watch as others abduct and rape his pioneering claims where starving him into submission has proved to be impossible. This

is much more serious than many instances of attempted murder. Bad karma for what? Greed and envy are sins not excuses. Respondents/John Does have received money not only through unfair competition, but also from abuse of power theft exhibited in but not limited to a very easy to follow paper trail of cash being stolen directly from the Petitioner's illegally "terminated" Chase bank account. That money still has not been returned and damage to excellent credit at the time remains another undeniable proof of a downward trending non-pre existing condition rooted in Respondent misbehavior. They have also invested money and other resources into unfair competition connected to the enterprise and relevant to intellectual property claims, which has caused serious problems for Petitioner. Injury is of a personal, social, and commercial nature. The enterprise affects interstate commerce in that both parties conduct business nationwide to internationally. Direct causation of damages is proven by clear and convincing facts and evidence. The injuries were proximately caused and would not have occurred but for the activity of the enterprise first noticed at Facebook, which is where the nexus to affairs connecting the conspiracy and pattern of racketeering activity appears to have emerged and spread to neighboring Respondents. Regardless of where attacks may have technically started, Facebook was the first recognizable trigger pulling enabler, and the main connection between Petitioner's layers of personal and professional networks, all of which have been affected. Respondent John Does have only been able to commit many or most if not all offenses solely by virtue of their positions in the enterprise and connections to Respondent (inclusive to other John Doe) corporations where power is

still being criminally abused. The case is currently in a frozen state here in SCOTUS because of DUE PROCESS disruption as if both Respondents and obstructors think Petitioner is going to tragically more than magically disappear or forgive the unforgivable while submitting to peonage with Respondents not getting out of the way of this goodness. Respondents and corrupt court actors have been trying to cheat Petitioner out of his days in court through trickery that has probably plagued less intelligent pro se litigants for too long; beyond time to move forward.

Further Satisfying Rule 20: All judges assigned to this case appear not only to have been individually cast like bad actors based on what was labeled "name hacks" corresponding to evidence linked to the FAC, but also to act like a jury of one-sided attorneys protecting Defendants with stall tactics and illegal dismissals. Please recuse relevant judges and take over @ SCOTUS or issue Writs of Mandamus and Prohibition for recusal and relief, or progress as requested, appointment of standby counsel @ 9th Circuit and Discovery and ADR @ Central District. Judges who should be no less than removed from this case should include all who touched any of Petitioner's cases not limited to the following most relevant and served:

- Edward Leavy, Senior Circuit Judge @ 9th Circuit
- Jay Scott Bybee, Senior Circuit Judge @ 9th Circuit
- Andrew David Hurwitz, Circuit Judge @ 9th Circuit
- Michael Walter Fitzgerald, District Judge @ Central District
- Paul Lewis Abrams, Chief Magistrate Judge @ Central District

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Human Rights + The Law of Our Land & Beyond

WHY THE WRIT(s) SHOULD ISSUE:

- ★ This is the LAW & it is JUST
- ★ A Purpose of RiCO Permits Civilians to End a Majority Criminal/Corrupt Mob
- ★ Original SCOTUS & Lower Court Denials Were Not Supposed to be Discretionary
- ★ This is Extraordinary Over Discretionary
- ★ Obstruction of Justice is Criminal; Not Discretionary @ Any Level
- ★ Save Time.... is Life & Liberty Depend On It
- ★ Set Good Example of Peaceful Conflict Resolution

DUE PROCESS deals with the administration of justice and acts as a safeguard from arbitrary denial of life, liberty, or property by the government outside the sanction of law. Not limited to Central District and Ninth Circuit violated this Constitutional right through unacceptable obstructions. No one should ever be victimized by The Court or other authorities like this, and punishment for obstructors should be a precedent setting deterrent; could become an arbitrary decision that ADR or orders granting relief leave solely to discretion of the government. Additionally, the court should enable e-filing for pro se Petitioner(s), for reasons not limited to *in forma pauperis* not undergoing impractical financial burden of unnecessarily printing and mailing documents. Petitioner filed documents and motions for not limited to e-filing access that are not on the docket. There is too much room for interference in obsolete ways that need digital upgrades @ SCOTUS; simultaneously, it is outrageous that Petitioner has not been able to have a

face-to-face conversation with a judge in four separate courts over six years of suffering since filing with countless pleas for support from all authorities and evidence on the docket since day one. WTF!? SCOTUS needs to create or sustain a precedent that people in positions of power and authority have to follow, for the wellbeing of The People, all of whom have a reliance upon an untainted justice system, secure communications, and honest information technology. The law needs to be applied equally to all including corporations. The odds of a squeaky wheel getting oiled and entertained by SCOTUS become more favorable to Petitioner in the escalation of levels from Certiorari to Rehearing to Extraordinary and not only because the rules give priority to the extraordinary based on the Emergency Application. Factor in quality, divided by the effect of limited resources, plus pro se, multiplied by *in forma pauperis* status, and please terminate any doubt of righteousness. Conflicts of law are present and SCOTUS has to step in and decide this case not only so all areas of the country can then operate in unison, but to stop the powers that should not be from abusing others, and also so we do not end up here again because Petitioner had to refile against other Respondents connected to the enterprise. This case is most important, a major social issue, and more pertinent than unusual. SCOTUS should also hear it because lower courts exhibited disregard for past decisions and Constitutional rights. This Court is supposed to liberally construe pro se allegations as the **1972 SCOTUS precedent Haines v. Kerner** dictates. The **Judiciary Act of 1789** states that "in all courts of the United States, the parties may plead and manage their own causes personally." It follows that

federal judges must respect the pro se litigants' right to represent themselves. Thus, SCOTUS has means to remedy the problems with judges who disrespect and ignore the aforementioned rights. By law, every federal judge takes an oath affirming to "administer justice without respect to person [or government employee, or corporation], and do equal right to the poor and to the rich," and to "faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties incumbent upon me as judge under the Constitution and laws of the United States." Petitioner took the right actions to secure a position that must be honored. SCOTUS needs to disrupt violators for reasons not limited to what was referenced in prior Petitions inclusive to this "extraordinary" and fine tuned straight to the point version. Petitioner still believes in writing the future can create change, that this case can be used as foundation for ridding our society of evil while making a statement that the American dream is still very much alive. Petitioner and Respondents in collaboration could end and prevent both present and future crimes not limited to online. SCOTUS can affirm that all citizens have equal rights while shedding new lights on grey areas of the law where discrimination such as false entitlement based on birth order, ageism, relationship or parental status, and religious intolerance; none of which are acceptable. Much of this can be accomplished simply by granting relief and permitting Petitioner's success. There is much more to possibly discuss or amend, some of which has been previously mentioned elsewhere as a prequel to elaboration, is pending Discovery, or we can preferably end conflict by focusing on solutions. Do not deny this moral excellence. Trust the OG to MAGA. Petitioner originally proposed a

very thoughtful solution in Complaint and has offered Respondents generous equity in exchange for what are going to be record breaking direct deposits. A new and more enticing offer was also laid out on the settlement table that enables Respondents to share financial losses with Does while conditionally relieving amenable parties from adverse action, but that offer has an expiration date of when Petitioner can see the finish line being any progress in this has been an inevitable Petitioner win since the beginning; also excludes new violators post cease and desist attached to said offer. Respondents are encouraged to file support for this as Petitioner does not intend to settle for anything less than not filing for arrest warrants and is presenting viable solutions. Respondents should be punished from no less than the equivalent of their own perspectives as to deter from future wrongdoing; and faced with a choice between losing their business and freedom, or in taking serious dents to finances and power; plus loss of the domain name that should not be in possession of anyone other than Petitioner, and now real estate that would have been afforded to Petitioner if not for finance, real estate, and justice obstructing RICO fraud in play since before the property hit the market. Respondents and John Doe for no legit reason more than tried to take the Petitioner's life, time, freedom, business, money, relationships, physical and intellectual property. They tried to steal everything and therefore should be required to give up anything. Petitioner, unlike other parties, is always good, a proven provider of solutions, and will put the money, domain name, land, and power to honorable use. Please open the flood gates of communication, ask your own questions, or simply permit access to progress.

CONCLUSION

Due Process & Justice For All

Times have changed, and precedences must be set or maintained in order to uphold the sanctity of our Constitution and liberty. There are real solutions to big problems with a vision greater than presented, in this instance coming from Petitioner in pro per who also happens to be an expert witness with an elite foundation. Our government would be foolish not to align with rare expertise and a once in a lifetime opportunity for truly representative of The People access that is unique to Petitioner's self-made independence. We need modern checks and balances that extend to Respondents' corporations. This case can create at some order where it does not but should exist, and with relief sought being granted, will do so while remaining above any influence. Petitioner can go into detail regarding any statement or claim with a preponderance of proof in support of this reality. Years of legal work could take much longer if this goes through trial and there is no excuse for delay. Time is most precious. Please immediately terminate obstruction of justice and exercise your discretionary power by granting as much relief as possible. There may not be a time limit on a Petition for Extraordinary Writ, but there is a time limit on life. Please reconsider previous Petitions, the FAC, everything on the dockets/lodged, and issue writs for the extraordinary rise to success.

/s/ **RUSSELL ROPE** 6/10/2020
Petitioner & Petitioner In Pro Per

#19-5616

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Russell Rope,

Petitioner,

vs.

Facebook, Inc., Apple, Inc., Alphabet, Inc., Twitter, Inc.,
JPMorgan Chase & Co., & John Does 1 to 10,

Respondents,

Attachment to [Emergency] Petition for Extraordinary Writ(s)
Over The United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit &
The United States District Court for the Central District of California
#18-55782 & #2:17-cv-04921

APPENDIX A

Cover Sheet & Copy of Original 1 Page Justice Obstructing Order/Opinion of 9th Circuit

/s/ **RUSSELL ROPE** 4/10/2020
Petitioner & Plaintiff In Pro Per

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

DEC 18 2018

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

RUSSELL ROPE,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

FACEBOOK, INC.; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 18-55782

D.C. No.

2:17-cv-04921-MWF-PLA

Central District of California,
Los Angeles

ORDER

Before: LEAVY, BYBEE, and HURWITZ, Circuit Judges.

Upon a review of the record and the responses to the court's July 31, 2018 order, we conclude this appeal is frivolous. We therefore deny appellant's motion to proceed in forma pauperis (Docket Entry No. 2), *see* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a), and dismiss this appeal as frivolous, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) (court shall dismiss case at any time, if court determines it is frivolous or malicious).

All other pending motions are denied as moot.

DISMISSED.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

MAY 8 2019

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

RUSSELL ROPE,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

FACEBOOK, INC.; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 18-55782

D.C. No.

2:17-cv-04921-MWF-PLA

Central District of California,
Los Angeles

ORDER

Before: LEAVY, BYBEE, and HURWITZ, Circuit Judges.

The filings at Docket Entry Nos. 28, 29, and 31 are construed as motions for reconsideration of this court's December 18, 2018 order.

Appellant's motions for reconsideration (Docket Entry No. 26, 27, 28, 29, and 31) of this court's December 18, 2018 order are denied. *See* 9th Cir. R. 27-10.

No further filings will be entertained in this closed case.

#19-5616

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Russell Rope,

Petitioner,

vs.

Facebook, Inc., Apple, Inc., Alphabet, Inc., Twitter, Inc.,
JPMorgan Chase & Co., & John Does 1 to 10,

Respondents,

Attachment to [Emergency] Petition for Extraordinary Writ(s)
Over The United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit &
The United States District Court for the Central District of California
#18-55782 & #2:17-cv-04921

APPENDIX B

Cover Sheet & Copy of Justice Obstructing Order/Opinion(s) of Central District Post

FAC

/s/ **RUSSELL ROPE** 4/10/2020
Petitioner & Plaintiff In Pro Per

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JS-6

CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. CV17-04921-MWF (PLAx)

Date: May 14, 2018

Title: Russell Rope -v- Facebook, Inc., et al.

Present: The Honorable MICHAEL W. FITZGERALD, U.S. District Judge

Deputy Clerk:
Rita Sanchez

Court Reporter:
Not Reported

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff:
None Present

Attorneys Present for Defendant:
None Present

Proceedings (In Chambers): ORDER GRANTING MOTIONS TO DISMISS
[222] [224]; PLAINTIFF'S VARIOUS REQUESTS
RE: MOTIONS [237] [242] [243] [244] [245]

Before the Court are two motions to dismiss Pro Se Plaintiff Russell Rope's First Amended Complaint ("FAC"), which was filed on February 19, 2018. (Docket No. 136). Defendant JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. ("JPMorgan"), filed a Motion to Dismiss (the "JPMorgan Motion") on March 16, 2018. (Docket No. 222). Plaintiff filed an Opposition on April 23, 2018 (Docket No. 238), to which JPMorgan replied on April 30, 2018. (Docket No. 240).

On March 19, 2018, Defendants Apple Inc., Facebook, Inc., Alphabet, Inc., and Twitter, Inc. (together, "Tech Defendants") also filed a Motion to Dismiss (the "Tech Motion"). (Docket No. 224). Plaintiff filed an Opposition on April 23, 2018 (Docket No. 239), and the Tech Defendants filed a Reply on April 30, 2018. (Docket No. 241).

Plaintiff also sought leave to file sur-replies to JPMorgan's and the Tech Defendants' Replies. (Docket Nos. 242, 243, 244, 245). Those requests are **DENIED**. Plaintiff already filed over-sized Oppositions of at least 50 pages each to each Motion, and the proposed sur-replies are not necessary for the Court's determination of the Motions.

In connection with his Oppositions, Plaintiff also requested that the Court consider all of the exhibits filed in connection with his initial Complaint as

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. CV17-04921-MWF (PLAx)

Date: May 14, 2018

Title: Russell Rope -v- Facebook, Inc., et al.

incorporated into the FAC. (Docket No. 237). The Court considers the exhibits as necessary to determine the Motions; the request is **GRANTED**.

Pursuant to Rule 78 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rule 7-15, the Court determined that the Motions were appropriate for submission on the papers, and vacated the hearing set for May 14, 2018. (Docket No. 246). The Court has read and considered the papers filed on the Motions, and for the reasons set forth below, the JPMorgan Motion and the Tech Motion are both **GRANTED without leave to amend**. Plaintiff's FAC suffers from the same defects as his initial Complaint.

I. DISCUSSION

First, like the initial Complaint, the FAC fails to meet the requirements of Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The initial Complaint was 100 pages long (without the 66 exhibits), and contained 310 paragraphs of "rambling, unrelated allegations against the named Defendants as well as his doctors, strangers on the street, law enforcement officers, doormen at night clubs, his brothers, his landlords, and myriad other companies and individuals." (Order re Motions to Dismiss at 7 (Docket No. 114)). In the Court's prior Order granting Defendants' Motions to Dismiss the Complaint, the Court afforded Plaintiff *one* opportunity to "remove excessive redundancy, allegations irrelevant to the claims for relief, and conclusory or excessively argumentative allegations" such that the amended Complaint conformed to the Rule 8. (*Id.*).

Plaintiff has failed to comply with the Court's directives in this regard. The FAC is now 126 pages (without exhibits) and contains 365 paragraphs in which Plaintiff doubles down on the conclusory, unrelated allegations asserted in the initial Complaint. The allegations in the FAC do no more to put Defendants on notice of the nature of the claims against them than did the allegations in the initial Complaint. Indeed, Plaintiff's failure to comply – or even attempt to comply – with the Court's order is itself reason to dismiss the FAC. *See Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. CV17-04921-MWF (PLAx)

Date: May 14, 2018

Title: Russell Rope -v- Facebook, Inc., et al.

(9th Cir. 1992) (stating that district court may dismiss action for failure to comply with any order of the court).

Again, it is not the Court's responsibility to "expend time and effort searching through large masses of conclusory, argumentative, evidentiary and other extraneous allegations in order to discover whether the essentials of claims asserted can be found in such a *mélange*." *Jacobson v. Schwartzenegger*, 226 F.R.D. 395, 397 (C.D. Cal. 2005) (citation omitted) (dismissing 200-page complaint for failure to comply with Rule 8); *Hatch v. Reliance Ins. Co.*, 758 F.2d 409, 415 (9th Cir. 1985) (affirming district court's dismissal of complaints that "exceeded 70 pages in length, were confusing and conclusory, and not in compliance with Rule 8"); *McHenry v. Renne*, 84 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 1996) (affirming dismissal of complaint that was "argumentative, prolix, replete with redundancy, and largely irrelevant").

Second, as with the initial Complaint, it appears that at least some, if not all, of Plaintiff's claims are barred by the doctrine of res judicata, although the confusing nature of the FAC makes it impossible for the Court to determine conclusively that the claims are barred. In the FAC, Plaintiff himself refers to and incorporates by reference his multiple prior actions in federal and state court against Defendants. (See, e.g., FAC ¶¶ 41, 85, 321). Regardless of how Plaintiff now styles his claims for relief, even he acknowledges that they are based on the same facts and issues – for example, JPMorgan's allegedly wrongful closing of Plaintiff's bank account, theft of his money, and attempts to thwart his job searches. The "true inquiry" for res judicata purposes is whether the "claims arose from the same transactional nucleus of facts." *United States v. Liquidators of European Fed. Credit Bank*, 630 F.3d 1139, 1151 (9th Cir. 2011); *Turtle Island Restoration Network v. U.S. Dep't of State*, 673 F.3d 914, 918 (9th Cir. 2012) (holding that where claims arise out of "same transactional nucleus of facts" res judicata may apply even if actions present different legal claims).

In the Court's prior Order dismissing the Complaint, the Court ordered Plaintiff to amend his Complaint to ensure that it raised "only claims that have not already been dismissed on the merits" in Plaintiff's prior actions against Defendants. (Order re Motions to Dismiss at 10). Although the Court does not conclusively determine

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. CV17-04921-MWF (PLAx)

Date: May 14, 2018

Title: Russell Rope -v- Facebook, Inc., et al.

which claims are barred by res judicata – nor does it need to do so, in light of its determination that the FAC fails under Rule 8 – it is apparent that Plaintiff has not complied with the Court’s instructions with respect to amending his Complaint.

Third, Defendants correctly argue that no one of Plaintiff’s 22 claims is properly pled. Although the Court need not reach this issue in light of its conclusion under Rule 8, it is apparent that Plaintiff’s claims fail under Rule 12(b)(6) as well. For example, 11 of Plaintiff’s claims are brought pursuant to the California Penal Code or federal criminal statutes that do not create private rights of action. (*See* JPMorgan Mot. at 12-15; Tech Mot. at 16-20). In his Opposition to the JPMorgan Motion, Plaintiff admits he is not seeking liability pursuant to these claims, and instead pleads them as “prerequisite[s]” for the alleged RICO conspiracy. (Opp. at 25).

In another example, Plaintiff’s various fraud claims (fraud, computer fraud, wire fraud, and mail fraud) all fail to meet the heightened pleading standards of Rule 9(b). “Rule 9(b) demands that, when averments of fraud are made, the circumstances constituting the alleged fraud be specific enough to give defendants notice of the particular misconduct so that they can defend against the charge[.]” *Vess v. Ciba-Geigy Corp. USA*, 317 F.3d 1097, 1106 (9th Cir. 2003) (internal citations omitted). Under Rule 9(b), fraud allegations must include the “time, place, and specific content of the false representations as well as the identities of the parties to the misrepresentations.” *Swartz v. KPMG LLP*, 476 F.3d 756, 764 (9th Cir. 2007) (citing *Edwards v. Marin Park, Inc.*, 356 F.3d 1058, 1066 (9th Cir. 2004)). In his Opposition to the Tech Motion, Plaintiff points to the timeline in Exhibit 39 and the “broad factual allegations stated throughout the body of the complaint” as satisfying this heightened standard. (Opp. at 27). But Exhibit 39 is a long list of vague, cryptic line items such as “Loan Fraud” and “Continuous Housing Fraud++ @ Hollywood”. Neither Exhibit 39 nor the allegations in the FAC state the necessary time, place, specific content, or specific parties involved in any misrepresentations.

In response to the Court’s grant of leave to amend the initial Complaint, Plaintiff ignored the Court’s directives regarding Rule 8 and res judicata. It is apparent that permitting Plaintiff another opportunity to amend would be futile. *See*,

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. CV17-04921-MWF (PLAx)

Date: May 14, 2018

Title: Russell Rope -v- Facebook, Inc., et al.

e.g., Plumeau v. School Dist. No. 40 County of Yamhill, 130 F.3d 432, 439 (9th Cir. 1997) (affirming district court's denial of leave to amend where "any such amendment would have been futile"); *Hawkins v. Thomas*, No. EDCV 09-1862 JST (SS), 2012 WL 1944828, at *1-2 (C.D. Cal. May 29, 2012) (dismissing pro se plaintiff's complaint with prejudice where "the dismissed claims could not be cured by any amendment"). Plaintiff acknowledges as much in his Opposition to the Tech Motion, stating, "Further amendment of the FAC at this point would mostly be a waste of time." (Opp. at 53).

II. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, the Motions are **GRANTED** *without leave to amend*.

This Order shall constitute notice of entry of judgment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 58. Pursuant to Local Rule 58-6, the Court **ORDERS** the Clerk to treat this Order, and its entry on the docket, as an entry of judgment.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. CV17-04921-MWF (PLAx)

Date: December 20, 2017

Title: Russell Rope -v- Facebook, Inc., et al.

Present: The Honorable MICHAEL W. FITZGERALD, U.S. District Judge

Deputy Clerk:
Rita Sanchez

Court Reporter:
Not Reported

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff:
None Present

Attorneys Present for Defendant:
None Present

Proceedings (In Chambers): ORDER RE MOTIONS TO DISMISS [67] [88];
PLAINTIFF'S VARIOUS REQUESTS RE
MOTIONS [85] [94] [111] [112]

Before the Court are two motions to dismiss. Defendant JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. ("JPMorgan"), filed a Motion to Dismiss Complaint (the "JPMorgan Motion") on August 29, 2017. (Docket No. 67). Pro Se Plaintiff Russell Rope filed an Opposition on September 8, 2017 (Docket No. 76), to which JPMorgan replied on September 29, 2017. (Docket No. 92). Plaintiff filed an unsolicited Response in Opposition to that Reply on October 30, 2017. (Docket No. 105).

On September 28, 2017, Defendants Apple Inc., Facebook, Inc., Alphabet, Inc., and Twitter, Inc. (together, "Apple Defendants") also filed a Motion to Dismiss (the "Apple Motion"). (Docket No. 88). Plaintiff did not timely file an Opposition to the Apple Motion, as the Apple Defendants point out in their Response in Support of Motion to Dismiss, filed on October 13, 2017. (Docket No. 98). After the Apple Defendants' Response was filed, Plaintiff filed what appears to be an Opposition, also dated October 13, 2017. (Docket No. 100). He filed another Opposition on October 30, 2017. (Docket No. 108).

The Court determined that these Motions were appropriate for submission on the papers without oral argument, and vacated the hearings on the Motions. (See Docket No. 103).

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. CV17-04921-MWF (PLAx)

Date: December 20, 2017

Title: Russell Rope -v- Facebook, Inc., et al.

Under Local Rule 7-12, Plaintiff's failure to file an Opposition in response to the Apple Motion within the deadline may be deemed consent to the granting of the Apple Motion. However, as the Court indicated in its Order Denying Plaintiff's Ex Parte Application, dated October 30, 2017, the Court will consider all the papers filed on the Motions, including Plaintiff's untimely and unsolicited additional filings. (Order Denying Ex Parte Application at 2 (Docket No. 109)).

For the reasons set forth below, the Court **GRANTS** the JPMorgan Motion and the Apple Motion *with leave to amend*. The Complaint fails to comply with the pleading requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8. Moreover, although the Court cannot determine it conclusively at this time due to the confusing nature of the Complaint, it appears that Plaintiff has already brought similar actions in state and federal court against the same defendants, such that his claims in this action are barred by res judicata.

Plaintiff also filed various other requests related to the Motions: Request for Order and Explanation (Docket No. 85); Request and Notice of Opposition (Docket No. 94); Request for Order for Opposition Against Defendants' Motions to Dismiss (Docket No. 111); and another Request for Order for Opposition Against Defendants' Motions to Dismiss. (Docket No. 112). These Requests are all **DENIED as moot**.

I. BACKGROUND

Plaintiff initiated this action in July 2017 against Defendants JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A., Apple Inc., Facebook, Inc., Alphabet, Inc., and Twitter, Inc. (See Complaint (Docket No. 17)). The 166-page Complaint contains 310 paragraphs, 66 exhibits and sets forth 20 claims for relief against all Defendants, each of which incorporates all the preceding paragraphs: (1) RICO violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1962(c); (2) RICO conspiracy of 18 U.S.C. § 1962(d); (3) fraud; (4) computer fraud; (5) wire fraud; (6) criminal threats; (7) obscene, threatening, and annoying communications; (8) stalking; (9) assault and battery; (10); espionage; (11) theft of trade secrets; (12) obstruction of justice; (13) false imprisonment; (14) perjury; (15) grand theft &

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. CV17-04921-MWF (PLAx)

Date: December 20, 2017

Title: Russell Rope -v- Facebook, Inc., et al.

robbery; (16) defamation; (17) unfair competition; (18) intentional infliction of emotional distress; (19) cybersquatting; (20) employment discrimination.

Plaintiff describes this action as “a mashup and major update of three separate but connected and originally incorrectly filed cases.” (Compl. ¶ 1). He alleges that Defendants are “criminals breaking the law not limited to abusing power Internet and technology corporations to defraud Plaintiff of life, freedom, business, a domain name, and perssonal relationships [sic].” (*Id.*). Essentially, Plaintiff claims that “Defendants engaged in a multi-district conspiracy to defraud Plaintiff of money and property.” (*Id.* ¶ 11). Plaintiff refers to Defendants as the “Bad Karma Enterprise” (*Id.* ¶ 13), and alleges they have been “terrorizing” Plaintiff for over a decade. (*Id.* ¶ 35). It appears that the conspiracy reached all aspects of Plaintiff’s life.

The Defendants have allegedly “attempt[ed] to steal, sabotage, and control business [and] gone so low as to interfere with personal relations.” (Compl. ¶ 30). Defendant JPMorgan is allegedly withholding money after tricking Plaintiff into signing an indemnity agreement, and engaged in employment discrimination by removing job postings from its website before Plaintiff could apply to them. (*Id.* ¶¶ 33, 84–86). Defendant Facebook and its subsidiary, Instagram, are sabotaging Plaintiff’s accounts by interfering with friend requests and censoring posts, and is “get[ing] away with cyber murder over and over.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 50, 52, 53). Apple has disabled Plaintiff’s accounts and webpages and interfered with his smart phone connectivity and social media life. (*Id.* ¶ 51). Defendant Alphabet and its subsidiaries likewise have terminated and sabotaged Plaintiff’s accounts. (*Id.* ¶ 54). Defendant Twitter is also accused of “name and number hacks including cryptic message harassment such as modifying URLs or hyper links in tweets to form harassing messages.” (*Id.* ¶ 55).

Plaintiff appears to allege that Defendants have somehow conspired to steal the “rise.com” domain name that Plaintiff intended to purchase by leaking the name to people in the entertainment industry, even though Plaintiff had only told a few family members about his intentions. (Compl. ¶¶ 65–76). Now, despite Plaintiff’s secrecy, the word “rise” is appearing in various movies, television shows, and advertisements.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. CV17-04921-MWF (PLAx)

Date: December 20, 2017

Title: Russell Rope -v- Facebook, Inc., et al.

(*Id.*). People have allegedly attempted to kill Plaintiff in attempts to steal this domain name. (*Id.* ¶ 149). Defendants are alleged to have gained access to Plaintiff's unpublished book, from which they are stealing trade secrets. (*Id.* ¶ 90).

Plaintiff alleges that Defendants are hacking his equipment to spy on him and stalk him, to sexually harass him, and to engage in sex trafficking, (Compl. ¶¶ 56, 58). He also alleges he is being physically "stalked . . . all around tinsel town" by females who wear clothes with threatening messages, cars with Florida license plates, and Australians. (*Id.* ¶¶ 114–17). Plaintiff also alleges that a series of car accidents are a part of the conspiracy orchestrated by Defendants. (Compl. ¶¶ 123–26).

The conspiracy is also alleged to involve health care fraud extending back to Plaintiff's birth in 1982. (Compl. ¶ 109). Defendants are accused of "using dermatology and other health care related fraud to control the Plaintiff; to trap the Plaintiff in his own skin." (*Id.*). Doctors are accused of "aging" Plaintiff, making him wait in examination rooms, and prescribing medication with dangerous side effects. (*Id.* ¶ 110–12).

Plaintiff lists "additional problems," including "Google Maps/iPhone Hack", "Car Computer Hack False System Malfunction Errors", "Pharmacy and Doctor Office Harassment", "License Plate Stalking Hacks", and "Food, Gas Station, and Entertainment Hacks". (*Id.* ¶ 61). Plaintiff also makes allegations against parties not named as Defendants in the action, such as PayPal, Spotify, Comm100, Mail Chimp, Uber, Model Mayhem, and AirBnb, as well as door men at night clubs, law enforcement officers, the court system, the EEOC, Plaintiff's family members, and Plaintiff's landlords and roommates. (*Id.* ¶¶ 60, 78, 80–83, 103–5, 113–15, 123–26, 129–41). Plaintiff also suggest that Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg, Apple CEO Tim Cook, and Twitter CEO Jack Dorsey are involved directly in the conspiracy. (*Id.* ¶¶ 152, 154, 157). Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants are publishing fake news online and on television to control Plaintiff. (Compl. ¶ 108).

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. CV17-04921-MWF (PLAx)

Date: December 20, 2017

Title: Russell Rope -v- Facebook, Inc., et al.

The JPMorgan Motion seeks dismissal of the Complaint pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) and the doctrine of res judicata. The Apple Motion also seeks dismissal pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) and res judicata, as well as Rule 8.

II. FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM

A. Legal Standard

“Dismissal under Rule 12(b)(6) is proper when the complaint either (1) lacks a cognizable legal theory or (2) fails to allege sufficient facts to support a cognizable legal theory.” *Somers v. Apple, Inc.*, 729 F.3d 953, 959 (9th Cir. 2013). “Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) requires only ‘a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief,’ in order to ‘give the defendant fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which it rests’” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (quoting *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 47 (1957)).

In ruling on the Motion under Rule 12(b)(6), the Court follows *Bell Atlantic* and *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662 (2009). “To survive a motion to dismiss, a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter . . . to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 570). The Court must disregard allegations that are legal conclusions, even when disguised as facts. *See id.* at 681 (“It is the conclusory nature of respondent’s allegations, rather than their extravagantly fanciful nature, that disentitles them to the presumption of truth.”); *Eclectic Properties E., LLC v. Marcus & Millichap Co.*, 751 F.3d 990, 996 (9th Cir. 2014). “Although ‘a well-pleaded complaint may proceed even if it strikes a savvy judge that actual proof is improbable,’ plaintiffs must include sufficient ‘factual enhancement’ to cross ‘the line between possibility and plausibility.’” *Eclectic Properties*, 751 F.3d at 995 (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 556–57) (internal citations omitted).

The Court must then determine whether, based on the allegations that remain and all reasonable inferences that may be drawn therefrom, the complaint alleges a

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. CV17-04921-MWF (PLAx)

Date: December 20, 2017

Title: Russell Rope -v- Facebook, Inc., et al.

plausible claim for relief. *See Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 679; *Cafasso, U.S. ex rel. v. Gen. Dynamics C4 Sys., Inc.*, 637 F.3d 1047, 1054 (9th Cir. 2011). “Determining whether a complaint states a plausible claim for relief is ‘a context-specific task that requires the reviewing court to draw on its judicial experience and common sense.’” *Ebner v. Fresh, Inc.*, 838 F.3d 958, 963 (9th Cir. 2016) (quoting *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 679). Where the facts as pleaded in the complaint indicate that there are two alternative explanations, only one of which would result in liability, “plaintiffs cannot offer allegations that are merely consistent with their favored explanation but are also consistent with the alternative explanation. Something more is needed, such as facts tending to exclude the possibility that the alternative explanation is true, in order to render plaintiffs’ allegations plausible.” *Eclectic Properties*, 751 F.3d at 996–97; *see also Somers*, 729 F.3d at 960.

B. Discussion

Apple Defendants argue that the Complaint fails to satisfy Rule 8’s basic notice requirements. (Apple Mot. at 6). Rule 8 requires pleadings to contain “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2).

A court may dismiss a complaint “for failure to satisfy Rule 8 if it is so confusing that ‘its true substance, if any, is well disguised.’” *Bailey v. BAC Home Loan Serv., LP*, No. CV 11-648-LEK (BMKx), 2012 WL 589414, at *1 (D. Haw. Feb. 12, 2012) (quoting *Hearns v. San Bernardino Police Dep’t*, 530 F.3d 1124, 1131 (9th Cir. 2008)). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has affirmed dismissal of excessively long, redundant, and confusing complaints for failure to comply with Rule 8. *See, e.g., McHenry v. Renne*, 84 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 1996) (affirming dismissal of complaint that was “argumentative, prolix, replete with redundancy, and largely irrelevant”); *Carrigan v. Cal. State Legislature*, 263 F.2d 560, 566 (9th Cir. 1959) (affirming dismissal of a 150-page complaint describing plaintiff’s thoughts, worries, hearsay conversations, frustrations and difficulties with doctors and insurance companies, and medical reports); *Nevijel v. North Coast Life Ins. Co.*, 651 F.2d 671, 675 (9th Cir. 1981) (affirming dismissal of complaint that was “verbose, confusing

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. CV17-04921-MWF (PLAx)

Date: December 20, 2017

Title: Russell Rope -v- Facebook, Inc., et al.

and almost entirely conclusory”); *Hatch v. Reliance Ins. Co.*, 758 F.2d 409, 415 (9th Cir. 1985) (affirming district court’s dismissal of complaints that “exceeded 70 pages in length, were confusing and conclusory, and not in compliance with Rule 8”);

District Courts regularly dismiss complaints containing indecipherable claims for relief. *See, e.g., United States ex rel. Mateski v. Raytheon Co.*, No. CV 06-3614-ODW (KSx), 2017 WL 1954942 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 10, 2017) (dismissing with leave to amend 134-page, undecipherable complaint); *Adams v. California*, No. CV 02-5419-CRB, 2003 WL 202638, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Jan 24, 2003) (dismissing claims with prejudice where “Plaintiff has not stated a coherent claim against any of the defendants”); *George v. Dutcher*, No. CV 16-679-RCJ (VPCx), 2017 WL 1393064, at *2 (D. Nev. Feb. 28, 2017) (“[P]laintiff’s largely incomprehensible narrative makes it nearly impossible for the court to identify the factual or legal basis for her claims or the nature of her requested relief.”).

Here, Plaintiff’s Complaint is 166 pages long, and filled with rambling, unrelated allegations against the named Defendants as well as his doctors, strangers on the street, law enforcement officers, doormen at night clubs, his brothers, his landlords, and myriad other companies and individuals. Plaintiff includes every slight and setback he has encountered in the last several years in the Complaint, claiming that they are all part of one conspiracy. He attaches 66 exhibits which only add to the confusion. For example, Exhibits 1 and 2 to the Complaint are lists of other suspected conspirators, ranging from Plaintiff’s high school and college classmates and his siblings to attorneys he has contacted and companies like AT&T and MySpace. (Docket Nos. 17-13, 17-4). Exhibit 4 appears to be a collage of appearances of the number “187” in Plaintiff’s social media pages. (Docket No. 17-6).

It is neither Defendants’ nor the Court’s responsibility to “expend time and effort searching through large masses of conclusory, argumentative, evidentiary and other extraneous allegations in order to discover whether the essentials of claims asserted can be found in such a mélange.” *Jacobson v. Schwartzenegger*, 226 F.R.D. 395, 397 (C.D. Cal. 2005) (citation omitted) (dismissing 200-page complaint with leave to amend for failure to comply with Rule 8). Plaintiff’s conclusory assertion

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. CV17-04921-MWF (PLAx)

Date: December 20, 2017

Title: Russell Rope -v- Facebook, Inc., et al.

that “Rule 8 does not apply” because Plaintiff did provide short and plain statements (Docket No. 108) does not make it so.

The Motions are therefore **GRANTED**. The Court will permit Plaintiff one opportunity to amend his Complaint to remove excessive redundancy, allegations irrelevant to the claims for relief, and conclusory or excessively argumentative allegations. Because the Court concludes that the Complaint fails to meet the requirements of Rule 8, it does not reach Defendants’ arguments regarding why the Complaint fails to state each of the 20 claims for relief, which in any case appear to largely point to the conclusory, vague, and confusing nature of the allegations. Defendants may raise these arguments again in response to Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint, if there is one.

III. RES JUDICATA

Both Motions argue that some of Plaintiffs’ claims are barred by res judicata. (JPMorgan Mot. at 5–7; Apple Mot. at 7 n.3). Under the doctrine of res judicata, “a final judgment on the merits bars further claims by parties or their privies based on the same cause of action.” *In re Schimmels*, 127 F.3d 875, 881 (9th Cir. 1997). The doctrine precludes a party from re-litigating (1) the same claim, (2) against the same party, (3) when that claim proceeded to a final judgment on the merits in a prior action.” *MHC Fin. Ltd. P’ship v. City of San Rafael*, 714 F.3d 1118, 1125 (9th Cir. 2013). Federal courts are required to give state court judgments the same preclusive effect they would be given by other courts in that state. *Brodheim v. Cry*, 584 F.3d 1262, 1268 (9th Cir. 2009).

JPMorgan argues that, although Plaintiff’s Complaint in this action contains 20 vague claims for relief, the factual allegations against JPMorgan are the same as the allegations in Plaintiff’s state court action, filed in 2016: *Russell Rope v. JP Morgan Chase & Co.*, Case No. BC608501. Essentially, both actions alleged that JPMorgan closed Plaintiff’s account, withheld his money, tried to force him to sign an indemnity agreement, and engaged in employment discrimination. (JPMorgan Mot. at 6, Ex. A). The superior court sustained JPMorgan’s demurrer in that action, which was based on

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. CV17-04921-MWF (PLAx)

Date: December 20, 2017

Title: Russell Rope -v- Facebook, Inc., et al.

Plaintiff's failure to state a claim upon which relief could be granted. The case was subsequently dismissed with prejudice. (*See id.*, Exs. B, D, and E).

Likewise, the Apple Defendants argue that to the extent Plaintiff's allegations in this Complaint are based on the same facts and evidence alleged in his prior state court action against Apple and its CEO, Facebook and its CEO, Alphabet, and Twitter, which was dismissed in its entirety without leave to amend, the current claims are barred by res judicata. (Apple Mot. at 6–7, n.3). The similar state court action, *Russell Rope v. Apple, Inc., et al.*, Case No. BC607769, was filed in 2016. (*See id.*, Ex. B). In 2014, Plaintiff also attempted to file a similar case in federal court against the same defendants as the current action (excepting JPMorgan). That case, *Russell Rope v. Facebook, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 2:14-cv-04900 (C.D. Cal), was dismissed in its entirety by the Magistrate Judge for failure to state a claim upon which relief could be granted. (*Id.*, Ex. A at 10 (“Plaintiff’s Complaint contains conclusory allegations but not specific facts to support a claim of conspiracy.”)).

Plaintiff himself refers to and incorporates by reference all of the prior actions described above. He acknowledges that “[t]his case was originally filed incorrectly as three individual cases. It now makes most sense to refile as a single new case.” He appears to think that by filing this case and paying the filing fee, he “bypass[ed] the previously false frivolous case block, which is allegedly a trick used against poor pro se litigants legitimately filing in forma pauperis.” (Compl. ¶ 41). He says this action is “most similar” to the 2014 federal action against Facebook, et al. (*Id.* ¶ 45). He attaches that federal court complaint as Exhibit 41 to the Complaint. (Docket No. 17-43). He also references the state court action against JPMorgan throughout the Complaint, even incorporating it by reference as Exhibit 45 to the Complaint. (*See* Compl. ¶¶ 41, 85, 264).

Plaintiff argues in Opposition to the JPMorgan Motion that res judicata cannot apply because Defendants “basically kidnapped Plaintiff thereby making him unable to attend court.” (Opp. at 2). This allegations is irrelevant to the three elements of res judicata, listed above. He further asserts that res judicata does not apply because the Complaint in this action is “brought under a different title and with a lot of new

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. CV17-04921-MWF (PLAx)

Date: December 20, 2017

Title: Russell Rope -v- Facebook, Inc., et al.

subject matter.” (*Id.*). This, too, may not be relevant to the application of res judicata. The “true inquiry” for res judicata purposes is whether the “claims arose from the same transactional nucleus of facts.” *United States v. Liquidators of European Fed. Credit Bank*, 630 F.3d 1139, 1151 (9th Cir. 2011); *Turtle Island Restoration Network v. U.S. Dep’t of State*, 673 F.3d 914, 918 (9th Cir. 2012) (holding that where claims arise out of “same transactional nucleus of facts” res judicata may apply even if actions present different legal claims).

He further suggests that res judicata should not apply because he was “fraudulently denied his rights” and because the prior courts made “bad decisions.” (Opp. at 2, 3). The remedy for Plaintiff’s dissatisfaction with any prior rulings would have been to file motions to vacate the judgment or for reconsideration, or to appeal the decisions, not to re-plead the same allegations in a new Complaint.

Although the confusing nature of the allegations of the Complaint make it impossible to determine conclusively that this action is barred by res judicata, it appears highly likely that at least some of the claims are so barred. To the extent Plaintiff chooses to amend his Complaint to comply with Rule 8, as described above, he must also ensure that his Complaint raises only claims that have not already been dismissed on the merits. That Plaintiff may not agree with the decisions of the courts in the prior actions is irrelevant to their preclusive effect in this action, and he may not raise the same allegations again here.

IV. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, the Motions are **GRANTED *with leave to amend***. Although the Court doubts Plaintiff can state a non-frivolous claim that is not barred by res judicata, Plaintiff may file a First Amended Complaint, if any, consistent with the Court’s instructions above on or before **January 16, 2018**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. CV17-04921-MWF (PLAx)

Date: December 20, 2017

Title: Russell Rope -v- Facebook, Inc., et al.

The Court notes that a party to this lawsuit does not have a lawyer. Parties in court without a lawyer are called "pro se litigants." These parties often face special challenges in federal court. Public Counsel runs a free Federal Pro Se Clinic at the Los Angeles federal courthouse where pro se litigants can get information and guidance. The clinic is located in Room G-19, Main Street Floor, of the United States Courthouse, 312 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, California 90012. For more information, litigants may call (213) 385-2977 (x 270) or they may visit the Pro Se Home Page found at <http://prose.cacd.uscourts.gov/federal-pro-se-clinics> . Clinic information is found there by clicking "Pro Se Clinic - Los Angeles".

#19-5616

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Russell Rope,

Petitioner,

vs.

Facebook, Inc., Apple, Inc., Alphabet, Inc., Twitter, Inc.,
JPMorgan Chase & Co., & John Does 1 to 10,

Respondents,

Attachment to [Emergency] Petition for Extraordinary Writ(s)
Over The United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit &
The United States District Court for the Central District of California
#18-55782 & #2:17-cv-04921

APPENDIX H

Cover Sheet & Copy of Most Recent (Supplemental) Reports/Cease & Desist & Demand
Letters Currently Justice Obstructed @ LAPD & BHPD

/s/ **RUSSELL ROPE** 4/10/2020
Petitioner & Plaintiff In Pro Per

Incident #: 10-53086

Beverly Hills Police Department

Russell Rope,

Victim,

vs.

John & Jane Does 1 to 100,

Perpetrators,

Supplemental Report
Public Records Request
Cease & Desist & Demand

ATTN Chief Sandra Spagnoli

Regarding Incident Number **10-53086 @ 10/4/2019**

- **Stalking / Harassment:** Mostly Around Beverly Hills Public Library
- **+ Conspiracy:** With Racketeer Influenced Corrupt Organization ("RICO")
- **+ Fraud:** Dishonest Means for Deprivation of Money, Property & Legal Rights

I. Summary

Russell Rope is a native local original genius with priceless intellectual property and an active federal lawsuit currently on the docket in the Supreme Court of The United States. It recently became necessary to report stalkers within the City of Beverly Hills; mostly around the library, of which the victim is a card holding member with good reason and every right to be on the premises. Stalkers have been harrassing, spying, and attempting to entrap; all in relation to and following previous criminally obstructed complaints in other jurisdictions. Stalkers are suspected to be puppets with more serious criminals pulling strings and probably from locally. The tort for conspiracy holds violators accountable for all causes of action where perpetrators have not only threatened life, but actually tried to take it; therefore and independent of any third party framework, misdirection, or fabrications, this report should be taken as a serious death threat on a very important and peaceful citizen minding their own business in your jurisdiction.

II. Background

Russell has been spending a lot of time in Beverly Hills, for which he has a birthright claim not simply limited to based on grandparents who lived within walking distance of the library, but also and more importantly because he worked for the freedom to choose, and plans to purchase real estate and conduct official business from here upon legal victory or whatever first brings financial success. Russell was hoping to resolve the issues being reported in federal court by now, had prepared a bulletproof side civil case for Beverly Hills Courthouse against the same John Does from this report, for the purpose of pro se investigation, but federal courts have been stalling, the completed version of the perfect side complaint was not backed up and stored only on the computer that was stolen as mentioned below (night before both the side complaint for BH and Petition to SCOTUS were to be filed), so the time has come to involve local authorities.

FYI and with the utmost respect for first responders and good police officers, Russell is pursuing very serious criminal claims against several corporations inclusive to, and if not settled now, then later against, bad justice obstructors not limited to at LAPD and LASD. BHPD “is,” over “was,” the last untainted local law enforcement in the area, which had been part of a deciding factor in setting a permanent residency goal and why Russell did not want to communicate with BHPD at all until after legal matters were settled and real estate acquired. On that note, Russell also has a relevant claim to “The Mountain” located @ 1652 Tower Grove Dr, Beverly Hills, CA 90210; based on fraud in conspiracy with those recently in control of the property and affiliates as possible John Doe third parties to the lawsuit in SCOTUS. Stalker puppet string pulling John Does also surely tried to use BHPD and other local workers against Russell while he has been working out of the library and waiting on the slow DOJ, but that seems to have calmed down and immediately following this report being started in person last month. Simple internal BHPD investigation, if you do not already know, should turn up serious criminals not directly affiliated with BHPD. Assume Russell already knows, and that his intent is best where he mostly just want your honorable service, validation, support and protection.

III. Research

Please read this entire document then begin researching the case history as documented on the victim’s blog. Like terrorists minus a demands list, perpetrators have been following the victim from home to home and city to city, entrapping, fabricating, obstructing, pushing victim out of life, copying, assaulting, and stealing in a cruel criminal pattern of racketeering activity. The most recent addition to the claims now legitimately falls under not limited to jurisdiction of Beverly Hills Police Department. Victim is a card holding member of the Library, which he has been using regularly all year, has other family, friends, and acquaintances either working or residing within the city, none of whom have any legitimate reason to be in the library, and some of whom are highly suspect and should be no less than investigated.

A. First Amended COMPLAINT (“FAC”) @ <https://russellrope.com/blog/?tag=civil>

1. Evidence (.pdf -- Minus Lodged & Sealed On Blog)

- * Criminally Obstructed @ Central District Court of California
- * Criminally Obstructed @ Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals
- * Relevant to Everything Including BHPD Local Investigation

B. Petition for Writ of Certiorari @ <https://russellrope.com/blog/?tag=civil>

- * Petitioning for Rehearing @ Supreme Court of The United States
- * SCOTUS = FYI & Not for BPHD to Investigate

C. Timeline of Obstruction of Justice:

Russell is a brave reactor peacefully protecting a life of hard work in opposition to criminal instigators with greedy motives and evil tactics evolving from abuse of power hacks to entrapments with false imprisonment based on fabrications, to gang stalking, battery, a broken foot, grand theft, repetition, etc. LAPD is supposed to be reopening a new investigation into the following LAPD reports. It is of preference for departments to do completely independent investigations with only RR support and relaying of relevant discovery. This part is mostly FYI:

1. Threats > Fraud/Conspiracy Reported @ LHSD (2013-2014)

- o Lost Hills Sheriff Department Neglected Multiple Reports
- o So I Filed Lawsuit & Applied For CCW
 - LHSD False Arrest/5150 To Deny Already Delayed CCW & Steal Gun
 - Resulted in Getting Kicked Out of Parents House
 - Would have been blessing minus criminal roommates since.

2. Reported RICO etc @ DA (2013-2014)

- o Started Contacting All Law Enforcement Neglecting
 - DA Office Removed File Upload From Contact Form
 - After Uploaded PDF Case/Report File
 - USSS, FBI/ic3.gov, DOJ, DA High Tech Crimes, etc.

3. Fraud Reported @ Hwood LAPD (Followed from Agoura Hills) (2015-2016)

- o Multiple Attempted / Obstructed Reports (RICO; Bank/Loan Fraud, Housing/Entrapment)
- o Supplemental Report To Detectives Cantrell & Rodriguez Disappeared
 - Rough Draft of Original Complaint Before FAC

4. Threats Reported @ HLAPD + Supplemental Report (2017?)

- o Neglected Report Led to Vandalism etc.
 - Named Perpetrator in Direct Conspiracy w/ RICO Spy John Doe(s)
 - Was quoting contents of private email to Sean Parker & Peter Thiel

- 5. Vandalism Reported @ HLAPD + Supplemental Report (2017-2018)**
 - o Multiple Neglected Reports Resulted in Grand Theft Auto
 - Slashed Tires Report
 - Engine Termination Report
 - No Victim Comp Resulted in No Smog/Reg & LAPD Tow/Theft
- 6. Battery Reported @ WHSD (2018)**
 - o Detectives Did Not Follow Up or Return Multiple Calls
 - Jumped by Camera Stalker(s) Outside Roxy After Leaving 10AK
 - Perpetrators On Security Video & Linked to John Doe
- 7. Grand Theft Reported @ LAPD 6th St. Officers @ Subway Station (2019)**
 - o Detective Did Not Follow Up or Return Call
 - o Perpetrators Suspected to be Stalkers Possibly Fake Security
 - Should Have Been On Surveillance & Possibly Linked to Tap Card
- 8. Stalking Reported @ HLAPD (9/2019)**
 - o Most Recent Report
 - Case Can be Solved by Solving the Others & Root of Obstruction
- 9. Entrapment @ UCLA (7/2019) To Be Reported To Internal Investigation**
 - o Ridiculous On Campus Stalking While Using Library Turned False Arrest
 - o Reported to FBI & Case Rejected by City Attorney's Office
 - o Led by Officer Chavez = Suspected Real Name of Trap LADOT Officer
 - Complete Setup, Computer/Library Disruption, Number 3 & 1 Hacks
 - Similar Pattern to Prior Entrapment (Attempted Racial War)
- 10. Stalking @ Beverly Hills Public Library (10/2019)**

IV. Investigation

- A. Internal:** The best and easiest place to start investigating would be at BHPD who is suspected to have been coerced into not only stalking around the Beverly Hills Public Library area, but who has also been obstructing since the initial report for the same reason. Defendants have been framing the victim's character and abusing power over both technology and authority; locally, trying to get people to snoop as if they hope to entrap when victim is honestly minding his own business and going out of his way to avoid people.
- B. License Plates:** Next, Russell has been taking photos of license plates on cars belonging to suspected stalkers. They are usually plates contain harassing messages formed from their letters and numbers, or belong to a camera stalker, but there are other things like the car full of women who blocked the victim's path en route to the library who then made gun signals with their hands followed by

another man trying to fight and later on a woman who literally tried to run the victim over on the other side of town this weekend. These must be investigated to see if which are real or vanity plates, when the numbers were assigned, who the registered owners are and what are the common links between them and John Does. Everything can be proven through proper cooperative investigation and Russell would really like to continue to do as much of this work himself as possible if not actively participating, for the purpose of acquiring real information.

What investigation tools does BHPD have?

- Does BHPD use Palantir technology?
- What information is readily available?
 - NCIC Access?
 - Phone number & DMV/registration lookup?
 - Background check?
- Can you legally show me and let me use your technology?
- If not, please deputize me or take me to someone who can? Seriously.

C. Library Cameras

- Who has access? Does BHPD have access without subpoena?
 - Can you show me the security room?
- How long is video stored?
- Answers first, then more information about what we are looking for....

D. Library Computer Network Software

- Screen Watching/Sharing Capabilities
- Who has access? Does BHPD have access without subpoena?

E. Library Member Records & Patrons

- Check to see if specific people have library cards and when issued.
 - Do records show dates of card usage?
- Does BHPD have access without subpoena?
- Head librarian's discretion to share information?
- Can we start getting identification from a few suspect library stalkers?
- Answers first, then more information about what we are looking for....

V. Requests

In addition to thorough investigation and sharing of information:

A. Meeting Requests:

- Chief & Who Ranks Higher? - This is now their legal responsibility.
- Mayor - For any support possible; to follow up on email sent by victim.
- District/City Attorney - Most importantly for victim compensation, but also in preparation to press charges/arrest warrants if necessary.

- Feds - For more help with federal investigation of RICO
- Head Librarian & Head Library IT Admin - For access without BHPD

B. Additional Request

- Legal Support - District/City Attorney(s) connection should be enough....
- Victim Compensation - Advocate within BHPD? ASAP. I qualify for the maximum by law, which could resolve a lot of issues.
- Witness Relocation/Protection - Beverly Hills > Hollywood Hills
- Freelance/Part-Time Work (on RR own case then possibly as needed)

C. Public Records Request

- This is document is to be treated like no less than a public records request.
- Active Involvement Joint Investigation For QA
 - > (Greater Than) Information Acquired By BHPD Shared With RR

D. Cease & Desist

- Stop Creeping On Victim Like Stalkers
- Stop Obstructing Justice
- Stop Neglecting

E. Demands

- Justice As Requested

VI. Conclusion :: Response Requested ASAP!

In conclusion, greedy and envious criminals have taken almost everything that matters most to the victim. There is no justification for their illegal actions. They have killed relationships, pushed the victim out of his family, falsely imprisoned, stolen money, physical property, and intellectual property, homes, his car, business, health, time, and they must be brought to justice. The possible federal legal victory still provides the best possible conflict resolution for all parties, but is not providing security or investigation quick enough. You are not even being asked to make an arrest at this point, but rather to protect and serve through the sharing of information, access, and connections that cost nothing to you, BHPD, or the public; other than taxes that pay your salary to do this job. Please help this near future permanent resident of the city out and join team honesty on the rise to success.

Yours Truly,

/s/ **RUSSELL ROPE** 11/19/2019 © Copyright * Infinity
 @ Russell Rope
 @ justice@russellrope.com
 @ <https://russellrope.com>
 @ 310-663-7655

Report #: 911-TBD

Los Angeles Police Department

Russell Rope,

“Plaintiff” > “Victim”

vs.

John & Jane Does 1 to 100,

Perpetrators / Defendants

Supplemental Report
Public Records Request
Cease & Desist & Demand

ATTN Chief Moore & Detective Klohr

Regarding Recent Reports With Front Desk Officers & Detective Klohr (Sep-Nov 2019)

- **Stalking / Harassment:** Specifically Around Hollywood
- **+ Conspiracy:** With Racketeer Influenced Corrupt Organization (“RICO”)
- **+ Fraud:** Dishonest Means for Deprivation of Money, Property & Legal Rights

I. Summary

Russell Rope is a native local original genius with priceless intellectual property and an active federal lawsuit currently on the docket in the Supreme Court of The United States. It recently became necessary to start yet another report at Hollywood LAPD triggered by an increasingly concerning daily dose of stalkers within Los Angeles County; in this instance specific to the Hollywood area. Stalkers have been harrassing, spying, stealing, assaulting, attempting to cause: more-than-enough-already serious loss and injury, entrapment, peonage, and or death; all in relation to and following the contents of previous obstructed complaints. Stalkers are believed to be puppets with more serious criminals pulling strings as there is no other explanation for insanely repetitive patterns of customized and coordinated attacks coming from unknown people. The tort for conspiracy holds violators accountable for all causes of action where perpetrators have not only threatened life, but actually tried to take it; therefore, and independent of any third party framework, misdirection, or fabrications, this report should be taken as a serious death threat on a very important and peaceful citizen minding his own business

in your jurisdiction. Moreover, the victim is probably the only one on this level, but not the first to have been terrorized by this type of evil, and if obstruction continues, surely not the last, which is another reason the people demand justice; for all.

II. Background

Everything the victim has reported to any law enforcement is very obviously connected to the same criminal racket reported in his federal lawsuit, and each neglected report or obstruction basically excuses the violation and promotes the next, evolution of, and copycat crime(s). Whether LAPD is protecting themselves or other government, the victim's worse than abusive family, other Defendants, or all the above, justice needs truth and answers will arise from us collaborating or inevitably and forcibly through the Department of Justice where it is possible that no mercy will be granted to any conspirator/obstructor.

FYI and with the utmost respect for first responders and good police officers, Russell is pursuing very serious criminal claims against several corporations inclusive to, and if not settled now, then later against, bad justice obstructors being any who might have done so little as misdirected or concealed information. Russell knows the law(s); specifically corresponding to everything reported, would not waste time reporting if unable to allege and prove all the elements of each violation, etc., so please do not bother with anymore lies that inevitably until corrected make LAPD look bad. Simple internal LAPD investigation, if you do not already know, should turn up serious criminals not directly affiliated with LAPD who has never had a legitimate reason to hate on the true victim. Assume Russell already knows and could probably bust anyone discoverable for a multitude of crimes, but it is important for you to identify the sources on your own merits, not only for redemption, but also to make the case stronger with enough leverage for the best version of justice, and please trust Russell has the best intent where he mostly just wants your honorable service, validation, support and protection; and to win as planned in SCOTUS.

III. Research

Please read this entire document then begin researching the case history as documented on the victim's blog and referenced below. Like terrorists minus a demands list, perpetrators have been following the victim from home to home and city to city, entrapping, fabricating, obstructing, pushing victim out of life, copying, assaulting, and stealing in a cruel criminal pattern of racketeering activity.

A. First Amended COMPLAINT ("FAC") @ <https://russellrope.com/blog/?tag=civil>

1. Evidence (Attachment / .pdf -- Minus Lodged & Sealed On Blog)

- * Criminally Obstructed @ Central District Court of California
- * Criminally Obstructed @ Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals
- * Relevant to Everything Including LAPD Local Investigation

B. Petition for Writ of Certiorari @ <https://russellrope.com/blog/?tag=civil>

* Petitioning for Rehearing @ Supreme Court of The United States

* SCOTUS = FYI & Not for LAPD to Investigate

C. Timeline of Obstructed of Justice/Police Reports:

Russell is a brave but civil reactor peacefully protecting a life of hard work in opposition to criminal instigators with greedy motives and evil tactics evolving from abuse of power hacks to entrapments with false imprisonment based on fabrications, to gang stalking, battery, a broken foot, grand theft, repetition, etc. LAPD is supposed to be reopening a new investigation into the following LAPD reports. It is of preference for departments to do completely independent and transparent (not publicized) investigations with only Russell's relaying of relevant discovery unless otherwise discussed or agreed upon.

1. Threats > Fraud/Conspiracy Reported @ LHSD (2013-2014)

- o Lost Hills Sheriff Department Neglected Multiple Reports / Threats
 - Filed Lawsuit & Applied for CCW
 - False Arrest / 5150 to Deny Already Delayed CCW & Steal Gun
 - Resulted in Getting Kicked Out of Parents' House
 - Blessing Minus Stalking & Criminal Roommates

2. Reported RICO etc. @ DA etc. (2013-2014)

- o Started Contacting All Law Enforcement Neglecting
 - DA Office Removed File Upload From Contact Form After Uploaded PDF Case/Report File
 - USSS, FBI/ic3.gov, DOJ, DA High Tech Crimes, etc.

3. Fraud Reported @ Hollywood LAPD (Followed From Agoura) (2015-2016)

- o Multiple Reports (RICO; Bank/Loan Fraud, Housing/Entrapment)
- o Supplemental Report to Detectives Cantrell & Rodriguez
 - Allegedly Disappeared; Rough Draft of Complaint Before FAC

4. Threats Reported @ HLAPD + Supplemental Report (2017?)

- o Neglected Report Led to Vandalism etc.
 - Named Perpetrator in Direct Conspiracy w/ RICO Spy John Doe(s)
 - Quoted private email that day to Sean Parker & Peter Thiel

5. Vandalism Reported @ HLAPD + Supplemental Report (2017-2018)

- o Multiple Neglected Reports Resulted In Grand Theft Auto
 - Slashed Tires Report
 - Engine Termination Report
 - No Victim Comp Resulted in No Smog / Reg & LAPD Tow
 - Who Bought Russell's Jeep? How much? Relevant Info Plz

6. Battery Reported @ WHSD (2018)

- o Detectives Did Not Follow Up or Return Multiple Calls
 - Jumped By Camera Stalker(s) Outside Roxy After Leaving 10AK
 - Perps Would Have Been On Security Video & Linked to John Doe(s)

7. Grand Theft Reported @ LAPD6TH (2019)

- o Detective(s) Did Not Follow Up or Return Call
- o Perpetrators Suspected To Be Stalkers Possibly Fake Security
 - Should Have Been On Metro Surveillance & Possibly Linked to Tap
 - Also Similarly Stole iPhone Months Earlier (2018); Not Reported

8. Stalking Reported @ HLAPD (9/2019)

- o Most Recent Report
 - Case Can be Solved by Solving the Others & Root(s) of Obstruction
 - Wheels Stalkers, Gym Stalkers, AGS Stalkers, Bus Stalkers, etc.
 - Gym Stalking Just Got Worse Reported @ Officer Menke (11/21/2019)

9. Entrapment @ UCLA (7/2019)

- o Ridiculous On Campus Stalking While Using Library Turned False Arrest
- o Reported to FBI & Case Rejected by City Attorney's Office
- o Led by Officer Chavez = Suspect Real Name of Entrapment LADOT Officer
 - Complete Setup, Computer/Library Disruption, Number 3 & 1 Hacks
 - Similar Entrapment Before Case Progression
 - Attempted Racial War, Patterns of Misdirecting Tactics

The incomplete recent addition to reports now involves another wrongful arrest / false imprisonment, illegal search and seizure, harassment, stalking, attempted assault, entrapment, etc. while on campus using the public library @ UCLA. Victim is a card holding member of the library with many levels of affiliation to the university, which he had been using daily for months without causing any problems prior to these failed violations resulting in both a ban and no file rejection of UCLA PD by the city attorney's office. This is relevant to the false arrest in the Hollywood Hills because UCLA PD similarly tried to frame the victim with a ridiculous motive of racism, was playing into other distinguishing patterns of the same racketeering activity, and the name of the main bad cop was the same as the suspected real name of the entrapping LADOT officer whose identity appears to be worse than illegally concealed on the LAPD report. This must be no less than investigated. There was no moving truck on the day in question. Who called/sent LADOT officer up to the off grid cul de sac?

III. Investigation

A. Start With All Previous Hollywood LAPD Reports

The best and easiest place to start investigating would be at LAPD who is suspected to have been coerced by Defendants who have been framing the victim's character and abusing power over both technology and authority. What happened with each of the aforementioned LAPD reports, why, who made decisions to neglect and/or ordered obstructions? What third parties have been in communication with LAPD regarding the victim, his case, and for what reason(s)?

Next, Russell has been taking photos of license plates on cars belonging to suspected stalkers. The plates usually contain harassing messages formed from their letters and numbers, or belong to a camera stalker, but there are other things like the car full of women who blocked the victim's path en route to the library who then made gun signals with their hands followed by another man trying to fight and later on a woman who literally tried to run the victim over on the other side of town this weekend. These things must be investigated to see what are the common links between them and damage causing John Does. Everything can be proven through proper cooperative investigation and Russell would really like to continue to do as much of this work himself as possible with your guidance if not actively participating; for the purpose of acquiring real information.

A. Questions:

What investigation tools / resources does LAPD have?

- Does LAPD use Palantir technology? (Owned by Suspect Peter Thiel)
 - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aJ-u7yDwC6g>
- What information is readily available?
 - NCIC Access? Background check?
 - Phone number & DMV/registration lookup?
- Can you legally show me and let me use your technology?
- If not, please deputize me or take me to someone who can? Seriously.

What access does LAPD have to Los Angeles Public Libraries ("LAPL")?

Re: Library Cameras, Computer Network, Member Records & Patrons

- Who has access? Does LAPD have access without subpoena?
 - Can you show me the security room?
- How long is video stored?
- Screen Watching/Sharing Capabilities?
- Can we start getting identification from a few suspect library stalkers?
- Answers first, then more information about what we are looking for....

Who is the highest ranking justice obstructor and why are they obstructing?

- Thought it was captains at Hollywood LAPD, but suspect it goes higher up @ not limited to LAPD. Palka, and probably Zarcone before him, are responsible on some level but it looks like Palka currently reports to a suspect Jewish Deputy Chief Eisenberg @ <http://assets.lapdonline.org/assets/pdf/Org%20Chart%209-1-19.pdf>

What Do You Know About The Jew Lie Theory?

Investigate Ranking Jews @ Hollywood LAPD and/or LAPD

- Not a hater; just wearing the hat of detective trying to figure out how and why justice was obstructed and believe initial character frame started out as fraud faith based false entitlement over free will. There was an officer Grossman who interrupted the report with detective Cantrell. He alleged to having been on victim's evil older brother's payroll for event security, yet regardless of suspected ulterior motives, gave credibility to victim's claims as he was questioned in front of Detective. Grossman and Eisenberg are Jewish names, and Jews who have delusional aspirations of making a name off exploitation have been hating on victim the more he distances himself and minds his own business.

Can We Start Investigating A Long List Of License Plates? Interstate?

- Vanity Plates or Random, Assignment Dates, Other Mutual Connections

Are You Prepared To Arrest The Highest Level Obstructers & Perpetrators?

- Would you arrest your own boss? How about their boss, etc.?
- If not, how about employing me to put my name on everything?

Does law enforcement have easy access to personal records for public services such as DPSS, MediCal, and CalFresh, or know how Defendants might be accessing all of that info other than hacking my phone?

- Someone with access to all the above is using that info to stalk and harass.

IV. Requests

A. Please (Re)Investigate All Hollywood LAPD Reports

- & Respond to Everything Possible Line by Line
 - Edit Attached Word Document & Respond in Another Font Color
 - Like This For Thoroughness....
 - Also Providing .pdf Via Email & Printed Delivered @ Station
- Detective Klohr Should Already Be Digging....
 - Liability is on Detective, Captains, & Chief(s) Past & Present Until Otherwise Proven by Detective/LAPD
 - Only Excuse for Inaction is Transferring Case to Higher Law Enforcing Authority Willing & Able (in Collaboration with Russell)
- Referenced Below in Relevant Timeline
 - No Excuse for Unresolved Complaints = Illegal Obstruction
 - Tolerance of Criminal Actions to Does Not Stop/Deter Crime
 - Detain, Interrogate, &/or Arrest; ANYONE Other Than The Victim
 - Complete Quashed LAPD Subpoena (Attached)

- Can Detectives/DA etc. Get Information Faster & By Element of Surprise With or Without Warrants etc. Please?
- o Any Reports Against Victim/Character Witness/False Accusations?
 - Communications With Family, Friends, Gov Regarding Victim? etc.?
 - Any Concealed Information Victim Might Have Reliance Upon?
 - Relevant to Federal Lawsuit; Share Willfully for Forgiveness

B. Meeting Requests:

- Chief & Higher? - Now Additionally Their Legal Responsibility
- Mayor - Eric Garcetti; For Any Support Possible
 - o Following Up On Previous Neglected Requests Made @ City Hall
- District/City Attorney - Jackie Lacey & Mike Feuer
 - o Most Importantly for Victim Compensation
 - o Preparation to Press Charges/Arrest Warrants if Necessary
 - o Terminate Looming Unfiled Report from UCLA PD
- Feds - For More Help With Federal Investigation of RICO
 - o Connection To Director / Highest Ranking in LA
 - o Need Unobstructed Information From: Secret Service, FBI, & CIA
- Head(s) of LAPL & Subpoenaed Organizations

C. Additional Request

- Legal Support - District/City Attorney(s) Connection Should Be Enough....
- Victim Compensation - Real Advocate Within LAPD/DA? ASAP
 - o This Should Have Happened Like Overnight & Years Ago
- Witness Protection - Beverly Hills > Hollywood Hills (Hotel Connections?)
- Freelance/Part-Time Work (On RR Own Case Then Possibly As Needed)

D. Public Records Request

- This Document To Be Treated Like No Less Than Public Records Request
 - o More Like Court Ordered Via Inevitable Subpoena
- Active Involvement Joint Investigation For QA
 - o > (Greater Than) Information Acquired By LAPD Shared With RR

E. Completion of Illegally Quashed Subpoenas

- o Please Fulfill LAPD Subpoena
- o & All Additional Attached Subpoenas Coordinated Directly With Russell
 - Search Warrants Without Notice > Subpoenas
 - Literally Seen Cops Search Personal Computer & Not Find Stuff
 - When Serving Warrant On Dumb Brother

F. Show Russell Everything

- o Wants to see your computer, software, what information your screen(s) can pull up on both victim himself and suspects, from the perspective of detective opposed to a print out or word of mouth.

G. Cease & Desist

- Stop Creeping On Victim Like Stalkers, Stop Obstructing, Stop Neglecting

H. Demands

- Justice As Requested

VI. Conclusion :: Response Requested ASAP!

Reiterating the fact that Russell Rope has absolutely **NO MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES, only haters of brilliance and integrity with no honest defense but to impossibly attack credibility.** The real victim, Russell, has never had any legitimate mental health problems and never had any issues with law enforcement, both not alleged until being retaliated against by instigating Defendants for reporting crimes and filing lawsuits after cease and desist legal warnings were neglected. That is not how justice is supposed to work. Prior to alleged RICO conspiracy, victim's record was flawless, is currently clean, was expunged since entrapment, and this member of the community, acknowledged by the previous, has the same rights as you. The victim is highly educated and has priceless intellectual property claims; lives, runs his business, has several gig jobs, and does regular volunteer work in and around Hollywood.

Some of the known John Does are not even US citizens causing problems that also affect others here in Los Angeles. Different Does are not from this state, county, city, or region, but a lot of crimes were committed here, or the victim was here if the crimes were committed online. There is every honest reason to support the victim and terminate crime. Get your priorities straight. Law breaking invaders must die, metaphorically and/or in self-defense; by LAW. Moreover, there have been zero denials of the victim's accusations and all of Russell's predictions have been correct.

In conclusion, greedy and envious criminals have taken almost everything that matters most to the victim. Damages are irreparable, but justice is attainable. There is no justification for Defendants' illegal and immoral actions. They have killed relationships, pushed the victim out of his family, falsely imprisoned, stolen money, physical property, and intellectual property, homes, his car, business, health, time, and they must be brought to justice. The possible federal legal victory still provides the best possible conflict resolution for all parties, is certainly more all encompassing than this report, but is not providing security or investigation quick enough. LAPD is welcome to, but not even being asked to make an arrest at this point; rather to protect and serve through joint investigation with the Plaintiff, sharing of information, access, and connections that cost nothing other than time our taxes are intended to pay for. Please do the right thing, being your job with integrity, and help this native local citizen on a quest for justice; join team honesty on the rise to success.

/s/ **RUSSELL ROPE** (11/21/2019) © Copyright * Infinity
@ justice@russellrope.com
@ <https://russellrope.com>
@ 310-663-76544

#19-5616

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Russell Rope,

Petitioner,

vs.

Facebook, Inc., Apple, Inc., Alphabet, Inc., Twitter, Inc.,
JPMorgan Chase & Co., & John Does 1 to 10,

Respondents,

On Petition for Extraordinary Writ
Specifically for Writs of Mandamus & Prohibition
The United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit &
The United States District Court for the Central District of California
#18-55782 & #2:17-cv-04921

AFFIDAVIT & CERTIFICATION OF A PARTY UNREPRESENTED BY COUNSEL

Petitioner, Russell Rope, seeks [Emergency] Extraordinary Writ(s) for the above entitled case number 19-5616. **Briefly and distinctly stated, this Petition is necessary, not limited to based on grounds not previously presented, which can be elaborated upon as necessary, but also because constitutional due process rights are being violated, life is in danger, and humanitarian rights of citizens are at stake.** Denying the previous Petition(s) were grave errors that must be corrected ASAP; like immediately upon receipt of **this Petition is presented in great faith and not for delay.** Please grant this vital justice.

/s/ **RUSSELL ROPE** 6/10/20
Petitioner & Plaintiff In Pro Per
(310) 663-7655

#19-5616

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Russell Rope,

Petitioner,

vs.

Facebook, Inc., Apple, Inc., Alphabet, Inc., Twitter, Inc.,
JPMorgan Chase & Co., & John Does 1 to 10,

Respondents,

Proof of Service
On Petition for Extraordinary Writ
Specifically for Writs of both Mandamus & Prohibition
The United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit &
The United States District Court for the Central District of California
#18-55782 & #2:17-cv-04921

PROOF OF SERVICE OF [EMERGENCY] PETITION FOR EXTRAORDINARY WRIT

I, Russell Rope, declare that on the date of June 10, 2020, as normally required by Supreme Court, that I have served the enclosed EMERGENCY: MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS*, PETITION FOR *EXTRAORDINARY WRIT(S)*, and AFFIDAVIT & CERTIFICATION OF A PARTY UNREPRESENTED BY COUNSEL on each party to the above proceeding (including judges), specifically on their counsel by both electronically filing said documents in the Ninth Circuit and emailing where they have previously agreed to electronic service. Furthermore, Petitioner is exempt from traditional methods of serving Respondents for the following reason:

SCOTUS Rule 29.3:

“...unless the party filing the document is proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*...”

Plaintiff is both *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*. The rule is not clear as what exactly to do in this extraordinary situation, but other SCOTUS instructions and rules give reason for Petitioner to believe The Court can and will provide service if unbelievably necessary.

Names & Addresses of Served Attorneys & Judges as Follows:

- Alphabet Inc. & Twitter, Inc. Attorneys:
 - Bali, Sunita @ sbali@perkinscoie.com
 - Snell, James G. @ jsnell@perkinscoie.com
- Apple, Inc. Attorneys:
 - Erickson, Ryan Bodine @ rerickson@lewisllewellyn.com
 - Furman, Rebecca @ bfurman@lewisllewellyn.com
- Facebook, Inc. Attorneys:
 - Malhotra, Paven @ pmalhotra@keker.com
 - Mehta, Neha @ ymehta@lewisllewellyn.com
- JPMorgan Chase & Co. Attorneys:
 - Watson, Brett D. @ bwatson@ldattorneys.com & bwatson@cozen.com
- Trial-Court Judge(s):
 - Michael W. Fitzgerald @ MWF_Chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov
 - Paul. L. Abrams @ pla_chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov
 - Circuit Court Judges Via CM/ECF @ ca9.uscourts.gov/cmecf

I declare under penalty of perjury, that to the best of my knowledge, all of the aforementioned is true and correct.

/s/ **RUSSELL ROPE** 6/10/2020
Petitioner & Plaintiff In Pro Per
(310) 663-7655

#19-5616

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Russell Rope,

Petitioner,

vs.

Facebook, Inc., Apple, Inc., Alphabet, Inc., Twitter, Inc.,
JPMorgan Chase & Co., & John Does 1 to 10,

Respondents,

Emergency Application

The United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit &
The United States District Court for the Central District of California
#18-55782 & #2:17-cv-04921

IN RE RUSSELL ROPE. [EMERGENCY] APPLICATION (FOR PROMPT ACTION)

Attention Justice Kagan

@

Russell Rope

#1607 POB 1198
Sacramento, CA 95812
(310) 663-7655

Petitioner In Pro Per

This application for emergency action is addressed to you because you are assigned to the Ninth Circuit from which this case arises. With all due respect, you surely must agree that my or any human and legal rights as a citizen and second born of three sons are certainly no less than those of a Jewish woman deserving a life of liberty let alone a bat-mitzvah equal to that of a Jewish man. This case is not about religion over law, possibly vice versa is not the point, nor should it be about evil family that turned against me with corporate frauds ensuring undeserved wealth as motive for continued betrayal, or the system obstructing for those reasons, or similar such as sibling babies rushed to birth as a copout for contribution to a character framework attempting to discredit Petitioner's perfect mental health in attempt at rendering Petitioner defenseless. None of that, or false relief from it or them, is or would be justice to the true causes of action.

Serious criminal and civil rights violations are reality forming the basis for this case. Alleged and intolerable misbehavior also happens to be in conflict with deadly sins by all faiths, with worse attempted, suspected, or awaiting discovery, and the treatment of Petitioner's claims thus far is tainting the sacred laws that are the foundation for our great United States of America. This case has the ability to serve the causes of The People as much as Plaintiff, and its intent ensures awarded relief reflects more than that statement. In addition to but separately from the Petition for Extraordinary Writ, you are being asked to: please personally read and reconsider not only both the Petition for Writ

of Certiorari and the Petition for Rehearing, but also the FAC and evidence including under seal, make sure that what you read is the same as what appears on Petitioner's blog where not limited to the Petition for Rehearing is still missing from the docket and the Petition for Extraordinary Writ is very possibly being obstructed, make sure the once again unnecessarily corrected Petition for Extraordinary Writ being rerereresubmitted on this date gets filed, that everything filed gets docketed, then finally recognize that nonviolent change yielding mandatory results requires court support.

I, Russell Rope, aka "Petitioner" and "Plaintiff" in pro per, as personally as anything I have written in something like a couple thousand pages of totally honest filings and reports, implore you to demand that the other Justices join US by taking swift action in utilizing the full discretionary power of SCOTUS to support my most proper pro per version of justice, which happens to be the only solution on the transparent table, or at least to be specific in your notation, required by the same Rule Twenty Two being the authority for this application, as to the specific reasons for any denials, so that I may have another opportunity for correction if absolutely necessary, which should not be the response because the unnecessary alternative would be another stall tactic attached to your name being a stain on a dirty cloth covering the remarkable craftsmanship of said table that is our impartially round Constitution. Petitioner is truly seeking no more than what is fair, which begins with prompt movement favorable to the Petitioner in pro per

accompanied by as much of the requested relief as can at this time be legally commanded by SCOTUS.

In conclusion, and in honor of your respecting the peaceful exercising of our rights, with your full support of this can not be legally dismissed under the rug, Petitioner will continue doing best to spare the masses of dumb Does, connected through conspiracy tort, from any or at least unnecessary retaliation. Please terminate obstruction with immediate consideration, not only due to the more relevant than ever labeled “emergency” situation caused by alleged criminal actions including but not limited to another recent and unprovoked physical assault and attempted theft by conspiring stalkers reported to obstructing police, but also to the corresponding Petitions by endorsing and granting the desired legal progress on the rise to success.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ **RUSSELL ROPE** 6/10/2020
Petitioner & Petitioner In Pro Per
<https://russellrope.com/blog/?tag=civil>

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Russell Rope,

Petitioner,

vs.

Facebook, Inc., Apple, Inc., Alphabet, Inc., Twitter, Inc.,
JPMorgan Chase & Co., & John Does 1 to 10,

Respondents,

Proof of Service

Emergency Application

The United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit &
The United States District Court for the Central District of California
#18-55782 & #2:17-cv-04921

PROOF OF SERVICE OF [EMERGENCY] APPLICATION (FOR PROMPT ACTION)

I, Russell Rope, declare that on the date of June 10, 2020, as normally required by Supreme Court, that I have served the enclosed EMERGENCY APPLICATION on each party to the above proceeding (including judges), specifically on their counsel by both electronically filing said documents in the Ninth Circuit and emailing where they have previously agreed to electronic service. Furthermore, Petitioner is exempt from traditional methods of serving Respondents for the following reason:

SCOTUS Rule 29.3:

“...unless the party filing the document is proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*...”

Plaintiff is both *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*. The rule is not clear as what exactly to do

in this extraordinary situation, but other SCOTUS instructions and rules give reason for Petitioner to believe The Court can and will provide service if unbelievably necessary.

Names & Addresses of Served Attorneys & Judges as Follows:

- Alphabet Inc. & Twitter, Inc. Attorneys:
 - Bali, Sunita @ sbali@perkinscoie.com
 - Snell, James G. @ jsnell@perkinscoie.com
- Apple, Inc. Attorneys:
 - Erickson, Ryan Bodine @ rerickson@lewisllewellyn.com
 - Furman, Rebecca @ bfurman@lewisllewellyn.com
- Facebook, Inc. Attorneys:
 - Malhotra, Paven @ pmalhotra@keker.com
 - Mehta, Neha @ ymehta@lewisllewellyn.com
- JPMorgan Chase & Co. Attorneys:
 - Watson, Brett D. @ bwatson@ldattorneys.com & bwatson@cozen.com
- Trial-Court Judge(s):
 - Michael W. Fitzgerald @ MWF_Chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov
 - Paul. L. Abrams @ pla_chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov
 - Circuit Court Judges Via CM/ECF @ ca9.uscourts.gov/cmecf

I declare under penalty of perjury, that to the best of my knowledge, all of the aforementioned is true and correct.

/s/ **RUSSELL ROPE** 6/10/2020
Petitioner & Plaintiff In Pro Per
(310) 663-7655

No. 19-5616

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Russell Rope — PETITIONER

VS.

Facebook, Apple, Alphabet,
Twitter, Chase, & John Does — RESPONDENT(S)

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS*

The petitioner asks leave to file the attached petition for a writ of certiorari without prepayment of costs and to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

Please check the appropriate boxes:

☒ Petitioner has previously been granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in the following court(s):

Stanley Mosk Courthouse @ 111 N Hill St, Los Angeles, CA 90012

☐ Petitioner has **not** previously been granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in any other court.

☒ Petitioner's affidavit or declaration in support of this motion is attached hereto.

☐ Petitioner's affidavit or declaration is **not** attached because the court below appointed counsel in the current proceeding, and:

☐ The appointment was made under the following provision of law: _____
_____, or

☐ a copy of the order of appointment is appended.

/s/ Russell Rope (4/10/2020)

(Signature)

**AFFIDAVIT OR DECLARATION
IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS***

I, Russell Rope, am the petitioner in the above-entitled case. In support of my motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*, I state that because of my poverty I am unable to pay the costs of this case or to give security therefor; and I believe I am entitled to redress.

1. For both you and your spouse estimate the average amount of money received from each of the following sources during the past 12 months. Adjust any amount that was received weekly, biweekly, quarterly, semiannually, or annually to show the monthly rate. Use gross amounts, that is, amounts before any deductions for taxes or otherwise.

Income source	Average monthly amount during the past 12 months		Amount expected next month	
	You	Spouse	You	Spouse
Employment	\$ 2,100	\$ NA	\$ 0	\$ NA
Self-employment	\$ 1,890	\$ NA	\$ 210	\$ NA
Income from real property (such as rental income)	\$ 0	\$ NA	\$ 0	\$ NA
Interest and dividends	\$ 0	\$ NA	\$ 0	\$ NA
Gifts	\$ 0	\$ NA	\$ 0	\$ NA
Alimony	\$ 0	\$ NA	\$ 0	\$ NA
Child Support	\$ 0	\$ NA	\$ 0	\$ NA
Retirement (such as social security, pensions, annuities, insurance)	\$ 0	\$ NA	\$ 0	\$ NA
Disability (such as social security, insurance payments)	\$ 0	\$ NA	\$ 0	\$ NA
Unemployment payments	\$ 0	\$ NA	\$ 0	\$ NA
Public-assistance (such as welfare)	\$ 1,989	\$ NA	\$ 221	\$ NA
Other (specify):	\$ 0	\$ NA	\$ 0	\$ NA
Total monthly income:	\$ 341	\$ NA	\$ 221	\$ NA

2. List your employment history for the past two years, most recent first. (Gross monthly pay is before taxes or other deductions.)

Employer	Address	Dates of Employment	Gross monthly pay
W.Connection, LLC	#1607 POB 1198 Sacramento, CA	01/03/2007-Present	\$ 210
Wheels Labs, Inc.	Sunset Blvd, WeHo	Summer 2019	\$ 1,000 to 0

3. List your spouse's employment history for the past two years, most recent employer first. (Gross monthly pay is before taxes or other deductions.)

Employer	Address	Dates of Employment	Gross monthly pay
NA	NA	NA	\$ NA

4. How much cash do you and your spouse have? \$ 21
Below, state any money you or your spouse have in bank accounts or in any other financial institution.

Type of account (e.g., checking or savings)	Amount you have	Amount your spouse has
All Checking Accounts Overdrawn	\$ NA	\$ NA

5. List the assets, and their values, which you own or your spouse owns. Do not list clothing and ordinary household furnishings.

<input type="checkbox"/> Home Value NA	<input type="checkbox"/> Other real estate Value NA
---	--

<input type="checkbox"/> Motor Vehicle #1 Year, make & model NA	<input type="checkbox"/> Motor Vehicle #2 Year, make & model NA
--	--

☒ Other assets
Description Priceless Intellectual Property & Legal Claims

6. State every person, business, or organization owing you or your spouse money, and the amount owed.

Person owing you or your spouse money	Amount owed to you	Amount owed to your spouse
Respondents	\$ 100,000,000,000	\$ NA

7. State the persons who rely on you or your spouse for support. For minor children, list initials instead of names (e.g. "J.S." instead of "John Smith").

Name	Relationship	Age
NA	NA	NA

8. Estimate the average monthly expenses of you and your family. Show separately the amounts paid by your spouse. Adjust any payments that are made weekly, biweekly, quarterly, or annually to show the monthly rate.

	You	Your spouse
Rent or home-mortgage payment (include lot rented for mobile home)	\$ 169	\$ NA
Are real estate taxes included?	NA	
Is property insurance included?	NA	
Utilities (electricity, heating fuel, water, sewer, and telephone)	\$ 0	\$ NA
Home maintenance (repairs and upkeep)	\$ 0	\$ NA
Food	\$ 0	\$ NA
Clothing	\$ 0	\$ NA
Laundry and dry-cleaning	\$ 0	\$ NA
Medical and dental expenses	\$ > 50	\$ NA

	You	Your spouse
Transportation (not including motor vehicle payments)	\$ 0	\$ NA
Recreation, entertainment, newspapers, magazines, etc.	\$ 0	\$ NA
Insurance (not deducted from wages or included in mortgage payments)		
Homeowner's or renter's	\$ 0	\$ NA
Life	\$ 0	\$ NA
Health	\$ 0	\$ NA
Motor Vehicle	\$ 0	\$ NA
Other:	\$ 0	\$ NA
Taxes (not deducted from wages or included in mortgage payments)		
(specify):	\$ 0	\$ NA
Installment payments		
Motor Vehicle	\$ 0	\$ NA
Credit card(s)	\$ 0	\$ NA
Department store(s)	\$ 0	\$ NA
Other:	\$ 0	\$ NA
Alimony, maintenance, and support paid to others	\$ 0	\$ NA
Regular expenses for operation of business, profession, or farm (attach detailed statement)	\$ 0	\$ NA
Other (specify): <u>Web Hosting & Registration</u>	\$ 10	\$ NA
Total monthly expenses:	\$ > 221	\$ NA

9. Do you expect any major changes to your monthly income or expenses or in your assets or liabilities during the next 12 months?

☒ Yes ☐ No Hope to Gain Clients, Employment, Income, & Legal Victory

10. Have you paid – or will you be paying – an attorney any money for services in connection with this case, including the completion of this form? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, how much? _____ NA

If yes, state the attorney's name, address, and telephone number:

11. Have you paid—or will you be paying—anyone other than an attorney (such as a paralegal or a typist) any money for services in connection with this case, including the completion of this form?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, how much? _____ NA

If yes, state the person's name, address, and telephone number:

12. Provide any other information that will help explain why you cannot pay the costs of this case.

Respondents are the Reason Plaintiff is Broke & Homeless;
Respondents have been Trying to Take Plaintiff's Freedom &/or Life

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on: _____ April 10th _____, 2020

/s/ Russell Rope

(Signature)