

STRITZINGER v SOUTH CAROLINA, ET ALL

IN THE SOUTH CAROLINA
SUPREME COURT
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA

2019-001852

2ND MOTION FOR MISCELLANEOUS FINAL RELIEF BEFORE APPEAL TO SUPREME COURT OF UNITED STATES

RECEIVED

MOTION SUMMARY – PRESENTED IN PART B

JUL 14 2020

S.C. SUPREME COURT

(1) MOTION FOR STAY OF MANDATE

(2) MOTION TO ADD PARTIES UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, VERIZON, APPLE AND GOOGLE RELATED TO PREVIOUS DEPARTMENTALLY CLASSIFIED PATENTS AWARDED TO VERIZON ON BEHALF OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

(3) REQUEST FOR PERMANENT INJUNCTION TO APPLE COMPUTER, AND GOOGLE FOR BUILDING AND PROXIMITY PROCESSING INFRASTRUCTURE DOMESTICALLY OR ABROAD INTERFERING WITH VERIZON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND CLASSIFIED PATENTS PROPERTY

(4) MOTION TO TRANSFER TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES ON ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

(5) MOTION FOR CRIMINAL CITATION TO GOVERNOR MCMASTER FOR USING LOCATION TO PROCESS ENHANCED METADATA IN VIOLATION OF US SUPREME COURT PRECEDENT (US V CARPENTER), VERIZON PATENT INFRINGEMENT, AND FELONY POISONING OF A US GOVERNMENT OFFICER,

(6) NOTICE OF FELONY UNMASKING OF A US GOVERNMENT OFFICER AS PREVIOUSLY NOTIFIED TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF SOUTH CAROLINA, AND VARIOUS FELONY ACTIONS BY PALMETTO HEALTH CARE STAFF (RAYNOR, ET ALL)

A. BACKGROUND

1) PRESIDENT OBAMA AWARDED A CLASSIFIED PATENT TO VERIZON ON PROXIMITY SERVICES WHICH GOOGLE AND APPLE HAVE BREACHED UNKNOWINGLY WITHOUT APPROVAL FROM VERIZON OR THE US GOVT.

2) APPELLANT JOHN S. STRITZINGER ISNT EVEN ALLOWED TO DISCUSS WITH THIS COURT THE SAME, A DEPARTMENTALLY CLASSIFIED PATENT AWARDED TO VERIZON FOR GENERIC PROXIMITY PROCESSING OF ALL ELECTRONIC TAGS FROM ANY SOURCE USING ALL WIRELINE AND WIRELESS ASSETS IN THE UNITED STATES AS OF JUNE OF 2013.

2) FURTHERMORE APPLE COMPUTER, AND GOOGLE ARE NOT CLEARED FOR THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY WHICH WAS MARKED DEPARTMENTALLY CLASSIFIED BY PRESIDENT BARRACK OBAMA, AND WHICH NEEDS PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY TO DISCLOSE.

3) FURTHERMORE, THE GOOGLE CEO IS NOT A 2ND GENERATION NATURAL BORN US CITIZEN AND CANNOT EVER RECEIVE A CLEARANCE FOR THIS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY WITHOUT PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY, OR A SPECIFIC ORDER BY THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES COMMANDING THE PRESIDENT TO DO SO SIGNED BY THE FULL COURT AND THE SENATE WITH ITS PRESENT STATUS.

4) VERIZON AND THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, THE US MILITARY AND THE US SECRET SERVICE HAVE TAKEN SPECIFIC ACTIONS TO SECURE THE UNITED STATES ELECTRONIC INFRASTRUCTURE INCLUDING THE SOLE RIGHT TO PROCESS PROXIMITY TAGS IN INTER-EXCHANGE, LOCAL, AND REGIONAL MARKETS IN-LINE WITH ALL FEDERAL AND LOCAL LAWS.

5) TO THE EXTENT VERIZON BELIEVES IT NEEDS TO EXPOSE SOME OF THIS INFORMATION TO LOCAL STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS FOR A FEE, THEY WILL, BUT IT IS NOT A TARRIFFED SERVICE, AND MUST BE NEGOTIATED BY AND BETWEEN EACH GOVERNOR SEPERATELY AND UNDER APPROPRIATE LEGAL SAFEGUARDS. IN OTHER WORDS GOVERNOR MCMASTER PERSONALLY NEEDS TO APPLY TO MR. WRAY, MR. OBAMA, AND THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OF VERIZON FOR ACCESS TO ELECTRONIC ACCESS ON SOUTH CAROLINA SOIL, AS TO GOVERNORS OF OTHER STATES IN THE UNION WHO LIKELY AFTER SEEING THIS PLEADING WILL SEEK TO JOIN THIS CASE IN THE HIGH COURT. INSTEAD VERIZON HAS OFFERED TO DELIVER THIS INFORMATION TO STATE CONSUMERS BY CONNECTING BY PROPRIETARY PEERING TO STATE SUPREME COURTS, WITH EACH STATE BY SUPREME COURT ORDER OR STATUTE DEFINING APPROPRIATE SAFEGUARDS FOR ENHANCED METADATA. (SEE ACLU v CLAPPER 2nd US 14-42)

6) THE SYSTEM DEVELOPED BY THE WHITEHOUSE UNDER PRESIDENT OBAMA BY HIS SOLE DIRECTION ALSO HAS IMPORTANT RAMIFICATIONS FOR G8 COUNTRIES INCLUDING BOTH PARTNERS, AND MILITARY OPPONENTS ALIKE, AND THUS SIMILAR CARE/TREATIES NEED TO BE NEGOTIATED BY VERIZON WITH OTHER FOREIGN POWERS SUBJECT TO CONGRESSIONAL EXPORT ACTIONS AS MR. OBAMA EXTENDED DOMESTIC POWERS INTO MILITARY DOMAINS BY HIS OWN EXPLICIT ORDER FOR THAT VERY ORDER.

THAT FACT WILL BE APPARENT TO ANY JUDGE WHO WOULD LIKE TO HAVE A 30 MIN BRIEFING IN CHAMBERS TO LAWYERS FROM THE PARTIES WHO ARE CLEARED BY THE US SUPREME COURT BAR (IE MEMBERS OF THE BAR OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, OR CARRY FISA SECURITY CREDENTIALS).

7) THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES APPROVED THE CONSTRUCTION OF THIS SYSTEM UNDER THE PATRIOT ACT, (MODIFIED BY THE USA FREEDOM ACT) WHICH HAS BEEN REAUTHORIZED ON AT LEAST TWO OCCASIONS AT VOTES AS HIGH AS 98-2, OR SUFFICIENT FOR CONSTIUTIONAL MODIFICATION WHICH MAY BECOME NECESSARY OVER TIME. THE PATRIOT ACT ALSO AUTHORIZES LETHAL FORCE TO THE US ARMY, AND FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT FOR ANY PARTIES WHICH ARE VIOLATING NATIONAL SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES WHICH THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, GOOGLE, AND APPLE NOW ARE. FURTHERMORE, MANY OTHER STATES ARE ALSO VIOLATING THE

SAME LAWS IN A HOPE TO IDENTIFY COVID-19 SPREAD BETWEEN STATES (WHICH IS A PROXIMITY PROCESS).

8) VERIZON HAS THE POWER, IN CONJUNCTION WITH OTHER REGULATED PEERS INCLUDING ATT, SPRINT, AND CENTURYLINK AMONG OTHERS TO PROCESS PROXIMITY DOMAINS OF ARBITRARY SIZE, OUTSIDE OF TRADITIONAL CELLULAR DOMAINS. FOR EXAMPLE A METRO BUS CAN BE A PROXIMITY DOMAIN, A BUSINESS CAN BE A PROXIMITY DOMAIN, OR A CITY (SUCH AS THE CITY OF FLORENCE) COULD BE A PROXIMITY DOMAIN. FURTHERMORE, TAGS CAN BELONG TO MULTIPLE DOMAINS AT THE SAME TIME (VPN TAGGING). FOR EXAMPLE AN ELECTRONIC TAG COULD BELONG TO A SOUTH CAROLINA DOMAIN, A 4TH CIRCUIT FEDERAL DOMAIN, A RICHLAND COUNTY DOMAIN, AND AN FBI-WATCHLIST DOMAIN ALL AT THE SAME TIME. (SEE STRITZINGER, STILLEY, ET ALL – AMAZON)

9) THE SYSTEM DETAILS WERE ALL MARKED ABOVE THE GENERAL TOP SECRET CLEARANCES HELD BY FBI FIELD AGENTS, AND WAS USED BY SPECIAL COUNSEL MUELLER IN THE RUSSIAN ELECTION INTERFERENCE PROGRAM. THAT SHOULD BE SUFFICIENT FOR THE COURT TO ALLOW A BRIEF INTRODUCTION, WHICH WAS SUCH A RADICAL CONCEPT FOR AT LEAST 100 MEDICAL PROFESSIONALS THAT THEY COULD NOT RATIONALIZE IT. FURTHERMORE, THE SYSTEM CAN BE EXTENDED TO PAIRINGS OF INFORMATION FROM OTHER SOURCES (AI BASE). FOR EXAMPLE, BIO-METRIC DATA FROM A SMART-HELMET SYSTEM FOR A US SOLDIER. VERIZON HAS IDENTIFIED OVER 400 APPLICATIONS WHICH IT BELIEVES ARE ALL UNIQUE USING THIS BASE PROXIMITY PROCESSOR ALL OF WHICH ARE ALSO ITS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, AND WHICH WE HAVE VALUED BETWEEN 50B AND 2T DOLLARS.

10) PRESIDENT OBAMA DID NOT PAY FOR THE SYSTEM OF RECORD AS HE HAD ORDERED MAKING THIS A VERY COMPLEX CASE. FURTHERMORE HE PROVIDED NO DOCUMENTATION OF HIS ORDER SO THAT WE COULD DISCUSS THE PATENT EITHER WITH THE US FEDERAL COURT OF APPEALS, OR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, AS MR. OBAMA DID NOT EVEN WANT MR. PANETTA TO KNOW OF ITS EXISTENCE.

IT IS EQUIVALENT TO THE FORENSICS TOOLS INSTALLED IN THE WHITEHOUSE BY PRESIDENTS NIXON & KENNEDY, BUT UNLIKE THAT SYSTEM IT CROSSES THE ENTIRE PSTN IN THE UNITED STATES. FURTHERMORE, PRESIDENT OBAMA DID NOT CLEAR THE VICE PRESIDENT(BIDEN) FOR ACCESS TO THE SAME SYSTEM AND TOLD APPELLANT PERSONALLY THAT HE HAD ENFORCEMENT POWER UP TO DEATH AS ALREADY APPROVED BY CONGRESS.

11) PRESIDENT OBAMAS COUNSEL (MS. RUEMELLER) ADVISED PETITIONER THAT THE GOVERNMENTS INTENTION WAS TO ENFORCE THE PATRIOT ACT AND SHE NEEDED NO ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION.

FURTHERMORE, GENERAL ALEXANDER WHO WAS IN CHARGE OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY TEAM ADVISED ME THAT ARMY DELTA WAS ASSIGNED TO PROTECT IT, AND THAT FT. BRAGG WAS THE SECURITY DOMAIN FOR ALL ISSUES INVOLVING IT. FURTHERMORE VERIZON ADVISED ME THAT I HAD TO STAY WITHIN 25 MILES OF A US MILITARY BASE FOR THE REST OF MY LIFE, OR UNTIL PRESIDENT OBAMA CHANGED ITS DESIGNATION, YET THE US GOVERNMENT HAS NEITHER ISSUED ME SECURITY CREDENTIALS, PAID ME FOR MY TIME, OR VERIZON TO MY KNOWLEDGE IN A LIKE FOR LIKE FORM, WHICH IS WHY I NEEDED TO LITIGATE WITH VERIZON.

12) DHS SECRETARIES KNOWING THEY HAD A PROBLEM OF A SIZE SO LARGE THEY COULDN'T RESOLVE, DECIDED TO SIMPLY EXPAND THE US ARMY NOC ON THE VERIZON CAMPUS TO INCLUDE A JOINT OPS CENTER WITH THEIR RESOURCES, AND THEY ACTUALLY RELOCATED THE VERIZON FEDERAL ENGINEERING TEAM TO A NEW FACILITY AT THE AOL COMPLEX.

FURTHERMORE, THE US ARMY HAD ALREADY DESIGNATED VERIZON FEDERAL AS A US ARMY BASE AT ASHBURN, AS IS THE RELATED DULLES AIRPORT COMPLEX. THE US MILITARY IS VERY HAPPY TO EXTEND THIS TO INCLUDE LEESBURG, AND VARIOUS CIVIL WAR SITES WHICH THEY CLAIM ANYWAY AS THEIR OWN FOR OBVIOUS REASONS, NEVERTHELESS ALL VERIZON ENGINEERING EMPLOYEES IN THE FEDERAL BUSINESS WERE DEFACTO US ARMY EMPLOYEES WHILE WORKING IN ASHBURN.

13) I EXPLAINED TO MY US SENATOR(MARC WARNER FROM VIRGINIA) WHO IS A DEMOCRAT, AND FRIEND OF MR. OBAMA THAT THE SITUATION WAS SO NEARLY INCREDIBLE, THAT HE NEEDED TO SIGN A LETTER OF INTRODUCTION TO THE FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT WHICH REFUSES TO SERVE THE CASE BELOW THE CIRCUIT LEVEL BY JUDGE WOOTEN (HE BELIEVES THAT LOCAL RULE 15 OF THE FEDERAL APPELATE RULES APPLIES) WHICH MEANS THE US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE 4TH CIRCUIT SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO REVIEW ON ORIGINAL JURISDICTION THE ORDER OF PRESIDENT OBAMA ON AN EXECUTIVE ORDER. BUT THE ORDER ITSELF IS ALSO SEALED, AND WITHOUT A FEDERAL SUBPOENA I CANT EVEN ACCESS IT. (EXHIBIT A)

14) MR. OBAMAS POSITION AS HE HAD A CONTRACT WITH VERIZON. VERIZON RATES ARE PRE-NEGOTIATED, AND HE MADE A HARD OFFER FOR "BLUEPRINTS" WHICH INCLUDE ABOUT 40 ANCILLARY PATENTS FOR THINGS LIKE PASSING LOCATION TO A WEAPON SYSTEM FROM A CELLULAR DOMAIN FOR 200M DOLLARS. VERIZON CEO LOWELL MCADAM WHO IS NO LONGER WITH THE COMPANY, MADE AN OFFER TO BUY THESE BLUEPRINTS, AND PRELIMINARY PATENTS FOR 409M DOLLARS FROM GREENVILLE ASSOCIATES, AND THEN HE DIDNT PAY EITHER.

MR. HOLLIDAY FROM BANK OF AMERICA, SUBJECT TO MEDIATION WITH AN INTERNAL LEGAL TEAM AT BANK OF AMERICA(AND NOT OUTSIDE COUNSEL), SIMPLY OFFERED ME A JOB TO RETURN TO THE COMPANY AS A PRESIDENT OF A BUSINESS UNIT AT 2M DOLLARS PER YEAR, AND THEN IN THAT ROLE I COULD NEGOTIATE WITH ALL REGULATED US CARRIERS WHO HAD INTERESTS IN THIS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY WHICH WOULD HAVE BEEN A FULL TIME JOB ANYWAY. HOWEVER MR. OBAMA, AND CONGRESS WOULD HAVE TO APPROVE THAT TRANSFER TO BANK OF AMERICA (FEDERAL) WHICH IT ALREADY HAS CONTRACTS AS WELL.

13) IN OTHER WORDS IF PETITIONER CAN SIMPLY RETURN TO WORK AT VERIZON WHERE HE WAS A SENIOR ENGINEER ASSIGNED EFFECTIVELY TO A US ARMY BASE, OR TO THE NEW JOB OFFERED BY THE CHAIRMAN OF BANK OF AMERICA, WE CAN MEDIATE THE BALANCES DUE OUT OF COURT WITH VERIZON AND BANK OF AMERICA. THE ISSUE IS APPLE COMPUTER MADE A BID FOR THE SAME MATERIALS AT 2.5B WHILE PETITIONER/APPELLANT WAS LIVING IN FLORIDA, AND GOOGLE HAS MADE A BID FOR CERTAIN COMPUTING SYSTEMS AT BANK OF AMERICA WHICH ARE REQUIRED ANYWAY TO EXTEND THE SYSTEM INTO COMMERCIAL MARKETS OVER TIME.

14) BANK OF AMERICA CAN RESOLVE THE ENTIRE DISPUTE I AM QUITE CONFIDENT WITH ME IN CHARGE OF A JOB WHICH I ALREADY HELD IN CHARLOTTE(FROM 2008-2011) BEFORE ARRIVING AT VERIZON, WHICH THE US ARMY HAS ALSO DESIGNATED AS SUFFICIENT FOR VARIOUS REASONS

INCLUDING THE LOCATION OF THE US FEDERAL RESERVE WHICH IT HAS SWORN TO DEFEND IN THE CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT. BANK OF AMERICA FEDERAL HAS OPERATIONS IN SAN ANTONIO, RICHMOND AND NORFOLK ALL OF WHICH ARE SUFFICIENT AS WELL AS IS SAN DIEGO, LAS VEGAS AND SAN FRANCISCO. WHICH IS SUBJECT TO THE RELATED EMPLOYMENT ACTION.

15) FURTHERMORE THERE ARE ROUGHLY 7 DOMAIN MANAGERS AT US INSTITUTIONS ALL OF WHICH ARE NSTAC PARTICIPANTS LIKE MYSELF AND NEED TO BE ENGAGED IN SOME FORM, AND AS MANY AS 15 INTERNATIONAL CARRIERS MOST OF WHICH I HAVE BEEN EXPOSED TO AT THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE LEVEL WHILE AT BANK OF AMERICA, AND ALL OF WHICH HAVE CONTRACTS WITH BANK OF AMERICA FOR SPECIAL ENGINEERING. FURTHERMORE, VERIZON PARENT BEING A WHOLESALER IN THE US HAS AGREEMENTS WITH ALL THE PARTIES AS WELL.

16) IN SUMMARY, AS A BANK OF AMERICA OFFICER, MR. MOYNIHAN AND THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OWE ME OVER 12M DOLLARS IN SALARY AT THIS POINT IN TIME PLUS EITHER 2.1B IN ROYALTY PAYMENTS TO GREENVILLE ASSOCIATES CONSULTING(MEDIA PA), OR AN AGREEMENT TO ORDER A SETTLEMENT DISCUSSION. FOR VERIZON THE SITUATION APPEARS TO BE EASY, AS THEY ONLY OWE 7 YEARS OF PAY AT A MUCH LOWER RATE, HOWEVER THEY MADE AN APPROXIMATELY 200B SALE TO THE US GOVERNMENT WITH APPELLANT AS THE ONLY SALES PERSON AND ALREADY UNDER CONTRACT. THIS WAS APPROXIMATELY 2.1B DOLLARS AS WELL BUT IT WAS SUBJECT TO LONG TERM "BANKS".

IN OTHER WORDS VERIZON CREATES ANNUITIES FOR SALES PERSONS WHO EXCEED THEIR SALES MAXIMUM COMPENSATION, AND THESE ISSUES ARE SUBJECT TO BOARD APPROVAL. JOSEPH R. PALMIERI, ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL OF VERIZON HAS REFUSED TO FILE AN APPEARANCE IN ANY COURT EXCEPT VIRGINIA WHICH TECHNICALLY DID NOT HAVE JURISDICTION OVER THE AWARD (SEE ARTICLE III OF THE CONSTITUTION – DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN MULTIPLE STATES) IS THE SOLE JURISDICTION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

17) APPELLANT NOTIFIES THIS COURT THAT THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES HAS ALREADY RULED ON ALL RELATED ISSUES EXPLICITLY (SEE RILEY V CALIFORNIA, US V KNOTTS, US V CARPENTER, SMITH V MARYLAND, US V KARO) AND THE ODDS THEY WILL TAKE THIS CASE IS VERY HIGH.

FURTHERMORE, MR. ROBERTS, MR. ALITO, AND AT LEAST THREE OTHER JUSTICES HAVE CONTACTED APPELLANT BECAUSE THEY BELIEVE THE SITUATION BORDERS ON COMEDY. THEY HOWEVER WANT THE US DISTRICT COURTS TO KNOW VERY SPECIFICALLY THAT THEY DONT HAVE THE POWER TO OBSTRUCT CIVIL PROCESSES BY POCKET VETO WHICH THEY DO ALMOST EVERY DAY WHICH IS OUTSIDE THE RULES SET BY CONGRESS. SPECIFICALLY IF A US COURT SIMPLY DOESNT ISSUE A SUMMONS FOR ANY REASON, THE CASE TECHNICALLY NEVER GOT TRIED. AND EVEN IF A SUMMONS IS CREATED, IF THERE IS NO TRANSCRIPT, THEN US COURTS OF APPEALS SIMPLY DISMISS FURTHER APPEALS. AND WITHOUT A PUBLISHED JUDGEMENT (VERSUS UNPUBLISHED JUDGEMENT) THE US SUPREME COURT WILL NOT REVIEW THE CASE, IN FACT THEY WONT EVEN DOCKET THE CASE, AND PROVIDE A CAUSE NUMBER UNLIKE LOWER COURTS. IN SUCH THEY ARE LYING TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ABOUT THE MASSIVE AMOUNT OF CORRESPONDENCE THEY RECEIVE AS MUST LAYPEOPLE BELIEVE THEY ARE THE COURT OF LAST RESORT FOR ALL CRIMINAL ACTIONS, AND ALL CIVIL ACTIONS

WHICH IS NOT TRUE. HOWEVER DUE TO US V SHIPP (1905) THERE IS SOME PRECEDENT TO SUPPORT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

IF THE SUPREME COURT OF UNITED STATES ISSUED STATISTICS EXTERNALLY TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE AS THEY SHOULD, YOU WOULD UNDERSTAND WHAT I AM ADVISING. I HAVE LITTERALLY FILED 7 APPEALS FOLLOWING FINAL ORDERS FROM 7 STATE SUPREME COURTS, AND 4 US COURTS OF APPEALS, AND A SINGLE CLERK IN THE SUPREME COURT WHO IS ASSIGNED THE LETTER "S", REFUSES TO PUT MY CASE ON THE DOCKET UNTIL I GET A PUBLISHED OPINION FROM A SUPREME COURT OR A US COURT OF APPEALS, WHICH THEY WILL NOT DO WITHOUT TRANSCRIPTS. AND TRANSCRIPTS ARE IMPOSSIBLE OR NEAR IMPOSSIBLE IN A NATIONAL SECURITY CASE.

18) APPELLANT IS NOT A US ARMY SOLDIER, BUT BELIEVED THE US ARMY DISTRICT COURT, OR FISA ARE HIS OWNLY OPTIONS TO GET A TRANSCRIPT, BUT HE IS QUITE SURE THAT WITHIN 15MINS OF A SHOW CAUSE, EVEN THE COLONEL ASSIGNED AS THE MAGISTRATE, WOULD FIND THAT A US ARMY COURT OF APPEALS MAY HAVE TO RULE ON ORIGINAL JURISDICTION, AND EVEN THEY COULD NOT OVERRIDE AN ORDER FROM CONGRESS, AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES ENFORCING IT.

19) APPELLANT IS THEREFORE ASKING TO OFFER A 15 MIN PRESENTATION TO THE COURT (AS I HAVE ALREADY DONE FOR A DELAWARE SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE), AND AFTER THIS PRESENTATION JUST AS DELAWARE HAD DONE, THEY WOULD SIMPLY SAY GOD BLESS YOU, AND TAKE CARE.

UNFORTUNATELY TWO NARCISSISTS (DR. JEFFREY RAYNOR, AND JAMES R. STRITZINGER JR) CANNOT BELIEVE THAT THEY DONT HAVE SECURITY CLEARANCES FOR NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS, AND ONE OF THEM ISSUED A 160K BILL FOR HIS INCOMPETENCE IN THIS CASE, WHILE THE OTHER SIMPLY TIED HIM UP IN COURT UNTIL THE STATE OF TEXAS STOLE HIS HOUSE IN AUSTIN CREATING MASSIVE AMOUNTS OF DAMAGE IN THIS CASE.

20) THE FISA COURT SYSTEM IN MY OPIONION IS NOT AUTHORIZED BY AN APPROPRIATE ACT WHICH EXCEEDS PATRIOT ACT CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORITY, AND EFFECTIVELY IS AN ASSOCIATE COURT FOR JUDGE ROBERTS HIMSELF WHO IS THE CIRCUIT JUSTICE FOR THE 4TH CIRCUIT, THE FEDERAL DISTRICT, AND FISA. I HAVE WRITTEN TO JUSTICE ROBERTS, AND I KNOW HE HEARS ME, BUT HE IS SIMPLY ENFORCING THE CONSTITUTION. IT REQUIRES A BRIEF ON EXTRODINARY CIRCUMSTANCES (WHICH THIS IS), AND/OR A BINDING PUBLISHED OPINION FROM A COURT SUCH AS THIS ONE.

21) I ASK NOTHING MORE OF THIS COURT THAN TO SIMPLY BIND THE PARTIES I AM REQUESTING TO THIS JUDGEMENT, AND PUBLISHING AN OPINION WHICH EITHER EXPLICITLY TRANSFERS IT TO THE US SUPREME COURT OR DISMISSES IT. EITHER WAY THE RESULT IS THE SAME, I WILL EITHER FILE A NEW CASE IN THE SUPREME COURT PERMITTED BY YOUR LETTER OF INTRODUCTION, OR I WILL FILE AN APPEAL OF THE INCOMPETENCE OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT SYSTEM WHICH HAS NOT ALLOWED ME TO CALL A SINGLE WITNESS OR MARK ANY DOCUMENT IN THE HIGHEST TRIAL COURT IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA EVEN IN MY OWN DEFENSE. AS SUCH I BELIEVE THAT JUDGE KELLY, MANNING, AND HOOD FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA ARE IN CONTEMPT OF ITS OWN CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORIZATION BY THE LEGISLATURE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

22) WE WOULD LIKE THIS COURT TO SIMPLY RULE ON THE REQUIREMENTS OF A CIRCUIT COURT TO DISMISS ANY ACTION WITHOUT A SHOW CAUSE, WHERE THE PLEADING PARTY GETS AT LEAST 15

MINUTES TO PROFFER WHAT EVIDENCE HE OR SHE WOULD PRESENT IF GIVEN A TRIAL. FOR EXAMPLE JUDGE KELLY COULD HAVE DENIED ME A TRIAL AFTER ASKING ME PLEASE PROVIDE A LIST OF ALL WITNESSES I MAY CALL, ALL DOCUMENTS I INTEND TO INSERT INTO THE RECORD, AND LEGAL ARGUMENTS I INTEND TO MAKE. THE STATE OF TEXAS CALS THIS RULE 194 DISCOVERY, AND I AM QUITE SURE THE STATE OF TEXAS IS RIGHT, AND FOR THAT REASON THIS COURT SHOULD CONSIDER MODIFYING THE RULES IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA. IF SOUTH CAROLINA ADOPTS TEXAS RULE 194, THEN A SHOW CAUSE COULD ACTUALLY BE COMPLETED IN 2 MINS OF COURT TIME, AND A BINDING JUDGEMENT RENDERED. FOR EXAMPLE – JUDGE KELLY COULD HAVE SAID JOHN PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR RULE194 DISCOVERY PACKET WITHIN 7 DAYS. I WILL READ IT AND ENTER AN ORDER ON ITS SUFFICIENCY, AND ANY DEFECTS WHICH CAN BE CURED WITHIN 30 DAYS. THATS NOT AN UNDUE BURDEN ON THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, AND IN FACT LIKELY WOULD ELIMINATE MOST OF THE VOLUME ON THE DOCKET TODAY. IT HAS BEEN USED BY TEXAS FOR MORE THAN 50 YEARS, AND IM QUITE SURE THAT TRAVIS COUNTY (WHERE APPELLANT HAS PRACTICED) AND WHICH IS ALMOST IDENTICAL IN STRUCTURE TO RICHLAND COUNTY IN ALMOST EVERY WAY WOULD BE AN APPROPRIATE STANDARD. APPELLANT IS INCLUDING AN EXAMPLE RULE 194 DISCOVERY PACKET OF HIS CASE WITH MS. WRIGHT WHICH IS ALREADY MARKED, AND IS AN EXHIBIT WHICH COULD BE CONSIDERED ANYWAY.

B. MOTIONS DETAIL – SEE FOLLOWING PAGE

2019-001852

CONSIDERING THE PREVIOUSLY FACTS, APPELLANT SWARES AS A US GOVERNMENT OFFICER ARE TRUE, APPELLANT SEEKS THE FOLLOWING RELIEF OF THIS COURT.

1) MOTION FOR STAY

- 1) Appellant requests this court enter a stay, because the other Citations supported by this court from the Probate Court have yet to be tried in a formal manner in the Circuit Court of South Carolina and all actions in that case are still pending.
- 2) Appellant notes that the orders of the Probate Court were irrational considering Dr Buckley from Palmetto Health had overruled his peer Dr. Raynor, and removed Appellant from care, medication, and all restrictions once he was sure that Appellant had an unbroken work history of nearly 30 years. Appellant was appointed incompetent counsel who refused to even do previous employment checks or call witnesses on his behalf, and didn't brief the court on any relevant fact, which is why he believes he is likely to prevail at the circuit level.
- 3) Appellant notes that the Probate Court Actions were effectively cross-claims to his employment matters which they do not have appropriate security clearances to even review.
- 4) Appellant notes none of the doctors called in the probate action were deposed or provided their thoughts more than 30 days before trial which is required by Circuit court rules, this is in fact a due Process claim under the 5th Amednment to the US constitution.

ALL Things considered, Appellant Prays for a Stay of this courts Mandate pending a completion of the circuit Action.

2) MOTION TO ADD PARTIES – GOOGLE, APPLE AND US GOVERNMENT

Appellant notes that Google and Apple have announced a joint partnership to build a Covid Proximity Processor Cross Domain which he believes is violation of the classified patent already issued to Verizon for the same services to the Federal Government as a whole. Furthermore State Disclosure of Covid information to 3rd party non-doctors cannot be done without patient permission(which is unlikely), or a Federal Court which they do not have. As such the parties as previously cited are material as follows:

PARTY – THE US GOVERNMENT – VIA PRESIDENT BARRACK OBAMA ACTING AS COMMANDER AND CHIEF OF THE US ARMED FORCES AND AS COMMANDING EXECUTIVE OF THE US SECRET SERVICE, AND AS THE EXECUTIVE IN CHARGE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, AND AS THE EXECUTIVE IN CHARGE OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION ALL CUSTOMERS OF VERIZON FEDERAL INC, 22001 LOUDOUN COUNTY PARKWAY, ASHBURN, VA.

James Gilligan
US Department of Justice
James.gilligan@doj.gov

PARTY – TIM COOK – CEO OF APPLE COMPUTER
VIA COUNSEL OF RECORD IN THE FEDERAL DISTRICT

Dominic E. Massa
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
dominic.massa@wilmerhale.com

PARTY – GOOGLE CEO – SUNDAR PINCHAI
Represented by
Kevin McGann
White & Case LLP
kmcgann@whitecase.com

3) REQUEST FOR PERMANENT INJUNCTION

Appellant is requesting that Google and Apple be restrained by this court from running an enhanced metadata processor on US Soil which is not approved by the US Department of Defense, the President, and Congress, as Verizon was already advised in 2013. Appellant notes that President Obama's Executive Orders and warnings to Verizon have been ignored by Google and Apple who were also NSTAC participants and know better. Appellant believes they are simply trying to skirt the laws and actions of President Obama by attempting to get President Trump to ignore them. Unfortunately in this case, the Verizon Patents are supported by Statute under the Patriot Act, and cannot be overturned without Congressional Action, furthermore the US Supreme Court cannot mandate or strike the same provisions which they and other courts have already reviewed previously.

4) MOTION TO TRANSFER TO THE US SUPREME COURT UNDER ARTICLE III OF THE US CONSTITUTION AND 28 USC 1441.

Appellant notes that President Obama on a National Security Issue is only governed by the US Supreme Court under Article III of the Constitution, especially after 5 US District Courts, and two US courts of Appeals have denied a review of the Presidents Orders supporting a Congressional Act. As such the Supreme Court, or this court are the only two remaining courts which could review an Executive order of the President (Original 13 which ratified the Constitution inline with its formation).

5) MOTION FOR A CRIMINAL CITATION OR CENSURE TO GOVERNOR MCMASTER FOR OPERATING AN ENHANCED METADATA SYSTEM ON SOUTH CAROLINA SOIL VIA ITS OUTSOURCED AGENT PALMETTO HEALTH WHICH HAS FOLLOWED APPELLANT ILLEGALLY INTO EVERY RESTAURANT, BUSINESS, AND LOCATION HE HAS ENTERED FOR ALMOST THREE YEARS AND IN CONFLICT WITH THEIR OWN DOCTORS ORDERS. THE APPROPRIATE LEGAL STANDARD IS TORTURE UNDER THE 8TH AMENDMENT TO THE US CONSTITUTION, AND VIOLATIONS OF THE US CONSTITUTION UNDER THE COLOR OF LAW. 18 USC 242 - 18 U.S. Code § 242. Deprivation of rights under color of law which is how constitutional provisions are provisioned.

Appellant testifies that the State of South Carolina likely in conjunction with Mr. Richardson from Queen Ann's County MD, on a case terminated by the Maryland Court of Appeals its highest court attached him with a location based FMRI system for the better part of six years due to the classified materials in this program. Appellant notifies the court that SC. State police and medical doctors were providing him inputs from this system in real time everywhere he walked, attended church, went out in public etc.


6)REQUEST FOR FELONY CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION OF RAYNOR, STRITZINGER JR, AND SMILEY.

APPELLANT NOTES THAT UNMASKING A FEDERAL OFFICER IS A FELONY UNDER THIS CODE, AND HIS BROTHER JAMES R. STRITZINGER JR, DR. RAYNOR, AND TWO PROBATE JUDGES FROM THIS STATE HAVE IGNORED HIS WARNINGS ON THE SAME. (SEE PFLAME v US. – DC DISTRICT COURT) ENDANGERING THE LIVES OF HIS ENTIRE FAMILY INCLUDING THEMSELVES WITHOUT REASON, AND AFTER THREE IDENTICAL TRIALS HAD ALREADY OCCURRED IN THE HIGHEST COURTS IN MARYLAND, DELAWARE, VIRGINIA, PENNSYLVANI AND FLORIDA.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENT WAS SERVED TO SOUTH CAROLINA, VERIZON, GOOGLE, APPLE, AND THE US GOVERNMENT BY EMAIL AND FACSIMILE ON OR BEFORE THE 9th DAY OF JULY 2020 TO THE COUNSELS OF RECORD ABOVE, AND JOSEPH R. PALMIERI FROM VERIZON WHO IS A CORPORATE OFFICER.

Signed this 8th day of July 2020

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of several large, overlapping loops and a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

RECEIVED
JUL 14 2020
S.C. SUPREME COURT

UPDATE
April 10, 2020

Apple and Google partner on COVID-19 contact tracing technology



Across the world, governments and health authorities are working together to find solutions to the COVID-19 pandemic, to protect people and get society back up and running. Software developers are contributing by crafting technical tools to help combat the virus and save lives. In this spirit of collaboration, Google and Apple are announcing a joint effort to enable the use of Bluetooth technology to help governments and health agencies reduce the spread of the virus, with user privacy and security central to the design.

Since COVID-19 can be transmitted through close proximity to affected individuals, public health officials have identified contact tracing as a valuable tool to help contain its spread. A number of leading public health authorities, universities, and NGOs around the world have been doing important work to develop opt-in contact tracing technology. To further this cause, Apple and Google will be launching a comprehensive solution that includes application programming interfaces (APIs) and operating system-level technology to assist in enabling contact tracing. Given the

urgent need, the plan is to implement this solution in two steps while maintaining strong protections around user privacy.

First, in May, both companies will release APIs that enable interoperability between Android and iOS devices using apps from public health authorities. These official apps will be available for users to download via their respective app stores.

Second, in the coming months, Apple and Google will work to enable a broader Bluetooth-based contact tracing platform by building this functionality into the underlying platforms. This is a more robust solution than an API and would allow more individuals to participate, if they choose to opt in, as well as enable interaction with a broader ecosystem of apps and government health authorities. Privacy, transparency, and consent are of utmost importance in this effort, and we look forward to building this functionality in consultation with interested stakeholders. We will openly publish information about our work for others to analyze.

All of us at Apple and Google believe there has never been a more important moment to work together to solve one of the world's most pressing problems. Through close cooperation and collaboration with developers, governments and public health providers, we hope to harness the power of technology to help countries around the world slow the spread of COVID-19 and accelerate the return of everyday life.

As part of this partnership, Google and Apple are releasing draft technical documentation including Bluetooth and cryptography specifications and framework documentation.

Press Contact

Fred Sainz
Apple
sainz@apple.com

Latest Articles

UPDATE

Apple expands iPhone repair services to hundreds of new locations across the US

July 8, 2020

The latest news and updates, direct from Apple.

[Read more >](#)

Newsroom [Apple and Google partner on COVID-19 contact tracing technology](#)

Shop and Learn

- [Mac](#)
- [iPad](#)
- [iPhone](#)
- [Watch](#)
- [TV](#)
- [Music](#)
- [AirPods](#)
- [HomePod](#)
- [iPod touch](#)
- [Accessories](#)
- [Gift Cards](#)

Services

- [Apple Music](#)
- [Apple News+](#)
- [Apple TV+](#)
- [Apple Arcade](#)
- [Apple Card](#)
- [iCloud](#)
- Account**
- [Manage Your Apple ID](#)
- [Apple Store Account](#)
- [iCloud.com](#)

Apple Store

- [Find a Store](#)
- [Genius Bar](#)
- [Today at Apple](#)
- [Apple Camp](#)
- [Field Trip](#)
- [Apple Store App](#)
- [Refurbished and Clearance](#)
- [Financing](#)
- [Apple Trade In](#)
- [Order Status](#)
- [Shopping Help](#)

For Business

- [Apple and Business](#)
- [Shop for Business](#)
- For Education**
- [Apple and Education](#)
- [Shop for College](#)
- For Healthcare**
- [Apple In Healthcare](#)
- [Health on Apple Watch](#)
- [Health Records on iPhone](#)
- For Government**
- [Shop for Government](#)
- [Shop for Veterans and Military](#)

Apple Values

- [Accessibility](#)
- [Education](#)
- [Environment](#)
- [Inclusion and Diversity](#)
- [Privacy](#)
- [Supplier Responsibility](#)

About Apple

- [Newsroom](#)
- [Apple Leadership](#)
- [Job Opportunities](#)
- [Investors](#)
- [Events](#)
- [Contact Apple](#)

More ways to shop: Find an Apple Store or other retailer near you. Or call 1-800-MY-APPLE.

To reuse, cover or mark through any previous shipping information.

Align top of FedEx Express® shipping label here.

FedEx Package
Express **US Airbill** # **8157 2030 1088**

1 From **174/20**
 Date **1/4/20**
 Sender Name **John Stewart Stritzinger III**
 Address **2156 Cresthill Dr**
 City **Columbia** State **SC** ZIP **29223**
 Country **United States US**

2 Your Internal Billing Reference

3 To Recipient **Supreme Court**
 Name **SC**

RT TUE
FZ
16:30
1088
07.14

ORIGIN ID:USCA (943) 252-3453
 JOHN STEWART STRITZINGER III
 2156 CRESTHILL DR
 COLUMBIA, SC 29223
 UNITED STATES US

SHIP DATE: 09JUL20
 ACTWGT: 0.30 LB
 CNO: 692201/85F02110
 BILL CREDIT CARD

104
B20
6
16:30
E
1088
07.14

TO **SUPREME COURT OF SC**
 1231 GERVAIS ST
 COLUMBIA SC 29201

sa **FedEx Express** **pe**



FedEx Express
E
 REL# 3788346


RECEIVED
 JUL 14 2020
 S.C. SUPREME COURT

TUE - 14 JUL 4:30P
EXPRESS SAVER

TRK# 8157 2030 1088
 (0200)

28 USCA

29201
 SC-US CAE



RT TUE
FZ
16:30
1088
07.13

Align bottom of peel-and-stick airbill or pouch here.

4 Express Package Service **0200**

5 Packaging Standard Special Handling and Delivery Signature Option

6 Special Handling and Delivery Signature Option

7 Signature Required Direct Return Return Signature