

**#20-5236**

---

**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 + SCOTUS #19-5616

---

**IN RE RUSSELL ROPE. EMERGENCY APPLICATION**

---

**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 Justice Kagan because she is assigned to the Circuit from which this case arises.

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 both past and present, so that I may have another opportunity for correction if absolutely necessary, which would not be the response of the prompt action I am most respectfully seeking. Petitioner truly desires no more than what is fair, which begins with expedited movement favorable to the Petitioner in pro per accompanied by as much of the requested relief from the FAC as can at this time be legally commanded by SCOTUS.

## REQUESTS:

- Start with what was also filed as five new motions and PLEASE:
  - Accept all pro se Petitioner filings as is / with any deficiency
  - Expedite everything based on life threatening situation
  - Consolidate the two cases @ SCOTUS
  - Transfer exhibits from the first to the current case @ SCOTUS
  - Grant Petitioner access to electronic filing in pro per
  - Make sure everything filed is the right order and docketed (see Petitions)
- Personally review everything filed in all three courts.
- Follow up with Chief Justice Roberts in regards to Application for Bar Admission

In conclusion, 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 more recent and unprovoked stalking, another physical assault, and attempted theft by conspirators as reported to obstructing police, but also to the pending extraordinarily perfected Petition for Extraordinary Writ by endorsing and granting in full the rise to success.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ RUSSELL ROPE 9/4/2020  
[russellrope.com/blog/?tag=civil](http://russellrope.com/blog/?tag=civil)

*\* Originally Filed 06/10/2020  
Petitioner In Pro Per*

**#20-5236**

---

**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 + SCOTUS #19-5616

---

**PROOF OF SERVICE OF EMERGENCY APPLICATION TO JUSTICE KAGAN**

---

I, Russell Rope, declare that on the date of September 4, 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](mailto:sbali@perkinscoie.com)
  - Snell, James G. @ [jsnell@perkinscoie.com](mailto:jsnell@perkinscoie.com)
- Apple, Inc. Attorneys:
  - Erickson, Ryan Bodine @ [rerickson@lewislewellyn.com](mailto:rerickson@lewislewellyn.com)
  - Furman, Rebecca @ [bfurman@lewislewellyn.com](mailto:bfurman@lewislewellyn.com)
- Facebook, Inc. Attorneys:
  - Malhotra, Paven @ [pmalhotra@keker.com](mailto:pmalhotra@keker.com)
  - Mehta, Neha @ [ymehta@lewislewellyn.com](mailto:ymehta@lewislewellyn.com)
- JPMorgan Chase & Co. Attorneys:
  - Watson, Brett D. @ [bwatson@ldattorneys.com](mailto:bwatson@ldattorneys.com) & [bwatson@cozen.com](mailto:bwatson@cozen.com)
- District Court Judges:
  - Michael W. Fitzgerald @ [MWF\\_Chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov](mailto:MWF_Chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov)
  - Paul. L. Abrams @ [pla\\_chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov](mailto:pla_chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov)
- Circuit Court Judges
  - Edward Leavy, Jay Bybee, Andrew Hurwitz
  - Via CM/ECF @ [ca9.uscourts.gov/cmecf](http://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 9/4/2020  
*Petitioner In Pro Per*  
(310) 663-7655

*\* Originally Filed & Served 06/10/2020*

**#20-5236**

---

**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,*

Motion for Case Consolidation  
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 + SCOTUS #19-5616

---

**IN RE RUSSELL ROPE. MOTION FOR CASE CONSOLIDATION**

---

Please join case #19-5616 and case #20-3652 because not only are they the same case, but they are also relevant to each other, and evidence lodged under the first must be considered for the pending Petition for Extraordinary Writ.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ RUSSELL ROPE 9/4/2020  
*Petitioner In Pro Per*

**#20-5236**

---

**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

Motion for Case Consolidation

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 + SCOTUS #19-5616

---

**PROOF OF SERVICE OF MOTION FOR CASE CONSOLIDATION**

---

I, Russell Rope, declare that on the date of September 4, 2020, as normally required by Supreme Court, that I have served the enclosed MOTION FOR CASE CONSOLIDATION 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](mailto:sbali@perkinscoie.com)
  - Snell, James G. @ [jsnell@perkinscoie.com](mailto:jsnell@perkinscoie.com)
- Apple, Inc. Attorneys:
  - Erickson, Ryan Bodine @ [rerickson@lewislewellyn.com](mailto:rerickson@lewislewellyn.com)
  - Furman, Rebecca @ [bfurman@lewislewellyn.com](mailto:bfurman@lewislewellyn.com)
- Facebook, Inc. Attorneys:
  - Malhotra, Paven @ [pmalhotra@keker.com](mailto:pmalhotra@keker.com)
  - Mehta, Neha @ [ymehta@lewislewellyn.com](mailto:ymehta@lewislewellyn.com)
- JPMorgan Chase & Co. Attorneys:
  - Watson, Brett D. @ [bwatson@ldattorneys.com](mailto:bwatson@ldattorneys.com) & [bwatson@cozen.com](mailto:bwatson@cozen.com)
- District Court Judges:
  - Michael W. Fitzgerald @ [MWF\\_Chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov](mailto:MWF_Chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov)
  - Paul. L. Abrams @ [pla\\_chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov](mailto:pla_chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov)
- Circuit Court Judges
  - Edward Leavy, Jay Bybee, Andrew Hurwitz
  - Via CM/ECF @ [ca9.uscourts.gov/cmecf](http://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** 9/4/2020  
*Petitioner In Pro Per*



**#20-5236**

---

**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,*

Motion to File with Deficiency  
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 + SCOTUS #19-5616

---

**IN RE RUSSELL ROPE. MOTION TO FILE WITH DEFICIENCY**

---

Petitioner *In Pro Per* and *In Forma Pauperis*, simultaneously a “prisoner” of war and a free man, has been threatened for life and time is of essence. There is no excuse for sending anything back for irrelevant correction. Filing by mail is obsolete and causing problems. Please file and docket everything, regardless of any possible deficiency or what anyone other than Justices rule, and put the docketed Petition for Extraordinary Writ back in numerical page order as it was sent to The Court.

/s/ RUSSELL ROPE 9/4/2020  
*Petitioner In Pro Per*

**#20-5236**

---

**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

Motion to File with Deficiency

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 + SCOTUS #19-5616

---

**PROOF OF SERVICE OF MOTION TO FILE WITH DEFICIENCY**

---

I, Russell Rope, declare that on the date of September 4, 2020, as normally required by Supreme Court, that I have served the enclosed MOTION TO FILE WITH DEFICIENCY 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](mailto:sbali@perkinscoie.com)
  - Snell, James G. @ [jsnell@perkinscoie.com](mailto:jsnell@perkinscoie.com)
- Apple, Inc. Attorneys:
  - Erickson, Ryan Bodine @ [rerickson@lewislewellyn.com](mailto:rerickson@lewislewellyn.com)
  - Furman, Rebecca @ [bfurman@lewislewellyn.com](mailto:bfurman@lewislewellyn.com)
- Facebook, Inc. Attorneys:
  - Malhotra, Paven @ [pmalhotra@keker.com](mailto:pmalhotra@keker.com)
  - Mehta, Neha @ [ymehta@lewislewellyn.com](mailto:ymehta@lewislewellyn.com)
- JPMorgan Chase & Co. Attorneys:
  - Watson, Brett D. @ [bwatson@ldattorneys.com](mailto:bwatson@ldattorneys.com) & [bwatson@cozen.com](mailto:bwatson@cozen.com)
- District Court Judges:
  - Michael W. Fitzgerald @ [MWF\\_Chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov](mailto:MWF_Chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov)
  - Paul. L. Abrams @ [pla\\_chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov](mailto:pla_chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov)
- Circuit Court Judges
  - Edward Leavy, Jay Bybee, Andrew Hurwitz
  - Via CM/ECF @ [ca9.uscourts.gov/cmecf](http://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 9/4/2020**  
*Petitioner In Pro Per*

**#20-5236**

---

**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,*

Motion for Electronic Filing

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 + SCOTUS #19-5616

---

**IN RE RUSSELL ROPE. MOTION FOR ELECTRONIC FILING**

---

Please grant Petitioner In Pro Per access to e-filing because there have been too many problems caused delays, interferences, obstructions; errors, or whatever you want to call the results of an obsolete and insecure system. Nevertheless, necessity is based on time is of the essence because this is a life threatening situation.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ RUSSELL ROPE 9/4/2020  
*Petitioner In Pro Per*

**#20-5236**

---

**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

Motion for Electronic Filing

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 + SCOTUS #19-5616

---

**PROOF OF SERVICE OF MOTION FOR ELECTRONIC FILING**

---

I, Russell Rope, declare that on the date of September 4, 2020, as normally required by Supreme Court, that I have served the enclosed MOTION FOR ELECTRONIC FILING 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](mailto:sbali@perkinscoie.com)
  - Snell, James G. @ [jsnell@perkinscoie.com](mailto:jsnell@perkinscoie.com)
- Apple, Inc. Attorneys:
  - Erickson, Ryan Bodine @ [rerickson@lewislewellyn.com](mailto:rerickson@lewislewellyn.com)
  - Furman, Rebecca @ [bfurman@lewislewellyn.com](mailto:bfurman@lewislewellyn.com)
- Facebook, Inc. Attorneys:
  - Malhotra, Paven @ [pmalhotra@keker.com](mailto:pmalhotra@keker.com)
  - Mehta, Neha @ [ymehta@lewislewellyn.com](mailto:ymehta@lewislewellyn.com)
- JPMorgan Chase & Co. Attorneys:
  - Watson, Brett D. @ [bwatson@ldattorneys.com](mailto:bwatson@ldattorneys.com) & [bwatson@cozen.com](mailto:bwatson@cozen.com)
- District Court Judges:
  - Michael W. Fitzgerald @ [MWF\\_Chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov](mailto:MWF_Chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov)
  - Paul. L. Abrams @ [pla\\_chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov](mailto:pla_chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov)
- Circuit Court Judges
  - Edward Leavy, Jay Bybee, Andrew Hurwitz
  - Via CM/ECF @ [ca9.uscourts.gov/cmecf](http://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** 9/4/2020  
*Petitioner In Pro Per*

**#20-5236**

---

**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,*

Motion for Expedited Consideration  
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 + SCOTUS #19-5616

---

**IN RE RUSSELL ROPE. MOTION FOR EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION**

---

Please grant Expedited Consideration of the Petition for Extraordinary Writ based on stalkers, assaults, and death threats. Time is of the essence. Terminate obstruction, quit stalling, and hurry the funk up in joining Petitioner on the rise dot com to success.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ RUSSELL ROPE 9/4/2020  
*Petitioner In Pro Per*

**#20-5236**

---

**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

Motion for Expedited Consideration

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 + SCOTUS #19-5616

---

**PROOF OF SERVICE OF MOTION FOR EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION**

---

I, Russell Rope, declare that on the date of September 4, 2020, as normally required by Supreme Court, that I have served the enclosed MOTION FOR EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION 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](mailto:sbali@perkinscoie.com)
  - Snell, James G. @ [jsnell@perkinscoie.com](mailto:jsnell@perkinscoie.com)
- Apple, Inc. Attorneys:
  - Erickson, Ryan Bodine @ [rerickson@lewislewellyn.com](mailto:rerickson@lewislewellyn.com)
  - Furman, Rebecca @ [bfurman@lewislewellyn.com](mailto:bfurman@lewislewellyn.com)
- Facebook, Inc. Attorneys:
  - Malhotra, Paven @ [pmalhotra@keker.com](mailto:pmalhotra@keker.com)
  - Mehta, Neha @ [ymehta@lewislewellyn.com](mailto:ymehta@lewislewellyn.com)
- JPMorgan Chase & Co. Attorneys:
  - Watson, Brett D. @ [bwatson@ldattorneys.com](mailto:bwatson@ldattorneys.com) & [bwatson@cozen.com](mailto:bwatson@cozen.com)
- District Court Judges:
  - Michael W. Fitzgerald @ [MWF\\_Chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov](mailto:MWF_Chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov)
  - Paul. L. Abrams @ [pla\\_chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov](mailto:pla_chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov)
- Circuit Court Judges
  - Edward Leavy, Jay Bybee, Andrew Hurwitz
  - Via CM/ECF @ [ca9.uscourts.gov/cmecf](http://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 9/4/2020**  
*Petitioner In Pro Per*

**#20-5236**

---

**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,*

Motion for Transfer of Exhibits

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 + SCOTUS #19-5616

---

**IN RE RUSSELL ROPE. MOTION FOR TRANSFER OF EXHIBITS**

---

Please transfer the exhibits/evidence filed and lodged under seal from case #19-5616 to case #20-3652 because evidence lodged under the first case must be considered for not limited to the pending Petition for Extraordinary Writ.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ RUSSELL ROPE 9/4/2020  
*Petitioner In Pro Per*

**#20-5236**

---

**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

Motion for Transfer of Exhibits

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 + SCOTUS #19-5616

---

**PROOF OF SERVICE OF MOTION FOR TRANSFER OF EXHIBITS**

---

I, Russell Rope, declare that on the date of September 4, 2020, as normally required by Supreme Court, that I have served the enclosed MOTION FOR TRANSFER OF EXHIBITS 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](mailto:sbali@perkinscoie.com)
  - Snell, James G. @ [jsnell@perkinscoie.com](mailto:jsnell@perkinscoie.com)
- Apple, Inc. Attorneys:
  - Erickson, Ryan Bodine @ [rerickson@lewislewellyn.com](mailto:rerickson@lewislewellyn.com)
  - Furman, Rebecca @ [bfurman@lewislewellyn.com](mailto:bfurman@lewislewellyn.com)
- Facebook, Inc. Attorneys:
  - Malhotra, Paven @ [pmalhotra@keker.com](mailto:pmalhotra@keker.com)
  - Mehta, Neha @ [ymehta@lewislewellyn.com](mailto:ymehta@lewislewellyn.com)
- JPMorgan Chase & Co. Attorneys:
  - Watson, Brett D. @ [bwatson@ldattorneys.com](mailto:bwatson@ldattorneys.com) & [bwatson@cozen.com](mailto:bwatson@cozen.com)
- District Court Judges:
  - Michael W. Fitzgerald @ [MWF\\_Chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov](mailto:MWF_Chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov)
  - Paul. L. Abrams @ [pla\\_chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov](mailto:pla_chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov)
- Circuit Court Judges
  - Edward Leavy, Jay Bybee, Andrew Hurwitz
  - Via CM/ECF @ [ca9.uscourts.gov/cmecf](http://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** 9/4/2020  
*Petitioner In Pro Per*

**#20-5236**

---

**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,*

Application for Bar Admission  
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 + SCOTUS #19-5616

---

**IN RE RUSSELL ROPE. APPLICATION FOR BAR ADMISSION**

---

**Attention Chief Justice Roberts**

**@**

**Russell Rope**

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

*Petitioner In Pro Per*

This is an Application to Chief Justice Roberts for not less than sponsorship of the attached Bar Application, but preferably for use of total discretionary authority to award Bar Admission.

With your approval, the only seemingly questionable rule that could be used to deny the application would be SCOTUS Rule 5(1), but that could be argued with a generous interpretation that admitting this pro se case to be filed and assigned in District Court, gave admission to practice law in the highest court(s) of the state considering the inherited admission into Circuit (being the highest in the state; superseding state courts) and then to Supreme Court; therefore, Petitioner In Pro Per was admitted to practice law in the highest court(s) since this case was filed just barely more than the required three years ago; aside from the original filing six years that did not inherit admission to higher courts. Think about it like the Conspiracy Tort where the evil Sith puppet conspirator inherits all the crimes, in this scenario the Jedi Master Petitioner similarly inherits the good admission to practice law in said courts. You can know someone better by reading them than face-to-face greeting them, and the rest of the requirements can be easily satisfied if you or the bar make a redepmtioniously favorable and mostly symbolic exception based on this logic. If that is not enough, then being Chief Justice should stand for something not limited to the ability to deem someone worthy of passing your

bar, which would not be much different than a POTUS appointing a Justice who had never worked as a judge.

Petitioner is an attorney; someone who practices the law, and that practice has consumed professional work for nearly a decade. Virtuous and of supreme moral character, Petitioner should be officially recognized as such. Moreover, his father is an attorney and so was his father's father, so there is a legacy aspect to anything they can do, Petitioner can do better. Petitioner could have traditionally satisfied any requirements during the time spent fighting obstruction from The Courts being the best law school there is; thanks for the education and think about this is technically afforded by remedies for fraud. Petitioner has no intention of practicing law for other parties, but this honor would make up for some injustice.

The actual application is attached. Please share this information and request, if necessary and on Petitioner's behalf, the other sponsor signature from Justice Kagan. Respect this mind and indomitable spirit. Please additionally look into the other case files to make sure they receive fair and expedited attention, start granting everything as is the just thing to do, and join Petitioner on the rise dot com to success.

/s/ RUSSELL ROPE 9/4/2020  
*Petitioner In Pro Per*

# Supreme Court of the United States

## APPLICATION FOR ADMISSION TO PRACTICE

(Please do not submit attachments unless instructed to do so)

Fill out form online and print

Name as you want shown on your Certificate: Russell Rope

First Name: Russell Last Name: Rope

Middle Name: Suffix:

Firm Name: RR Productions

Address: #1607 POB 1198

City: Sacramento State: CA Zip Code: 95812

Office Phone: +1 (310) 663-7655 Alternate Phone:

Email Address: justice@russellrope.com

Check this box if you want the alternate Certificate described in the instructions.

1. City and state you want shown on your Certificate. City: Los Angeles State: CA

2. Date of birth: 11/25/1982 3. Birth City: Los Angeles 4. Birth State/Country: Los Angeles

5. Residence Address: #1607 POB 1198

City: Sacramento State: CA Zip Code: 95812

6. Name of parents: (a) Mother's full maiden name Confidential

(b) Father's name Confidential

7. State court(s) of last resort to which you are admitted to practice, and date(s) of admission.

State Court	Date of Admission
	NA

State Court	Date of Admission
	NA

8. Are you engaged in the practice of the law?  Yes  No State the nature of your practice, whether by self, in partnership, or associated with or employed by others, giving the name of the firm or employer.

In Pro Per Private Practice

9. List firms or other entities with which you have been formerly associated, or by which you have been employed, as a lawyer.

NA

10. Undergraduate and legal education and when and where degrees received.

School	Degree	Location	Date Received
University of Colorado	Technology/Art/Media	Boulder	2006
University of California	NA	Los Angeles	NA
Art Center	NA	Pasadena	NA

11. Have you ever changed your name or been known by any name or surname other than those appearing on this application?  Yes  No

If so, state and give details. Confidential

12. (a) Have you ever been disciplined, disbarred, sanctioned, or suspended from practice before any court, department, bureau, or commission of the United States, or of any State, Commonwealth, Territory, Possession, or the District of Columbia, or have you received any public or private  Yes  No reprimands from any such entity pertaining to your conduct as a member of the bar?

(b) Are there any disciplinary proceedings presently pending against you?  Yes  No

(c) Have you been denied admission to the bar of this Court or the bar of any entity described in (a) above?  Yes  No

(d) Have you been convicted of a crime? (other than a minor traffic violation)  Yes  No

(e) If you answered "yes" to any of the questions in this paragraph you must provide a detailed explanation on a separate sheet and attach any relevant documentation concerning your answer.



COMPLETE CERTIFICATION ON FOLLOWING PAGE





**#20-5236**

---

**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

Application for Bar Admission

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 + SCOTUS #19-5616

---

**PROOF OF SERVICE OF APPLICATION FOR BAR ADMISSION**

---

I, Russell Rope, declare that on the date of September 4, 2020, as normally required by Supreme Court, that I have served the enclosed APPLICATION FOR BAR ADMISSION 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](mailto:sbali@perkinscoie.com)
  - Snell, James G. @ [jsnell@perkinscoie.com](mailto:jsnell@perkinscoie.com)
- Apple, Inc. Attorneys:
  - Erickson, Ryan Bodine @ [rerickson@lewislewellyn.com](mailto:rerickson@lewislewellyn.com)
  - Furman, Rebecca @ [bfurman@lewislewellyn.com](mailto:bfurman@lewislewellyn.com)
- Facebook, Inc. Attorneys:
  - Malhotra, Paven @ [pmalhotra@keker.com](mailto:pmalhotra@keker.com)
  - Mehta, Neha @ [ymehta@lewislewellyn.com](mailto:ymehta@lewislewellyn.com)
- JPMorgan Chase & Co. Attorneys:
  - Watson, Brett D. @ [bwatson@ldattorneys.com](mailto:bwatson@ldattorneys.com) & [bwatson@cozen.com](mailto:bwatson@cozen.com)
- District Court Judges:
  - Michael W. Fitzgerald @ [MWF\\_Chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov](mailto:MWF_Chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov)
  - Paul. L. Abrams @ [pla\\_chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov](mailto:pla_chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov)
- Circuit Court Judges
  - Edward Leavy, Jay Bybee, Andrew Hurwitz
  - Via CM/ECF @ [ca9.uscourts.gov/cmecf](http://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 9/4/2020**  
*Petitioner In Pro Per*