

No. 22-380

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
OCT 20 2022
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

—◆—
RALAND J BRUNSON,

Petitioner,

v.

ALMA S. ADAMS, et, al.,

Respondents.

—◆—
**On Petition for Writ of Certiorari
To The United States Court Of Appeals
For The Tenth Circuit**

—◆—
PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

—◆—
Raland J Brunson
4287 South Harrison Blvd., Apt 132
Ogden, Utah 84403
Phone: 385-492-4898
Petitioner in pro se

RECEIVED
OCT 24 2022
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

A serious conflict exists between decisions rendered from this Court and lower appeal courts, along with constitutional provisions and statutes, in deciding whether or not the trial court has jurisdiction to try the merits of this case.

This case uncovers a serious national security breach that is unique and is of first impression, and due to the serious nature of this case it involves the possible removal of a sitting President and Vice President of the United States along with members of the United States Congress, while deeming them unfit from ever holding office under Federal, State, County or local Governments found within the United States of America, and at the same time the trial court also has the authority, to be validated by this Court, to authorize the swearing in of the legal and rightful heirs for President and Vice President of the United States.

In addition there are two doctrines that conflict with each other found in this case affecting every court in this country. These doctrines are known as the doctrine of equitable maxim and the doctrine of the object principle of justice. Equitable maxim created by this court, which the lower court used to dismiss this case, sets in direct violation of the object principle of justice also partially created by this Court and supported by other appeal courts and constitutional provisions.

These conflicts call for the supervisory power of this Court to resolve these conflicts, which has not, but should be, settled by this Court without delay.

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

Petitioner Raland J Brunson is an individual representing himself and is a Plaintiff in the trial court.

The following 388 Respondents are a party to this action as defendants in the trial court:

Named persons in their capacities as United States House Representatives: ALMA S. ADAMS; PETE AGUILAR; COLIN Z. ALLRED; MARK E. AMODEI; KELLY ARMSTRONG; JAKE AUCHINCLOSS; CYNTHIA AXNE; DON BACON; TROY BALDERSON; ANDY BARR; NANETTE DIAZ BARRAGÁN; KAREN BASS; JOYCE BEATTY; AMI BERA; DONALD S. BEYER JR.; GUS M. ILIRAKIS; SANFORD D. BISHOP JR.; EARL BLUMENAUER; LISA BLUNT ROCHESTER; SUZANNE BONAMICI; CAROLYN BOURDEAUX; JAMAAL BOWMAN; BRENDAN F. BOYLE; KEVIN BRADY; ANTHONY G. BROWN; JULIA BROWNLEY; VERN BUCHANAN; KEN BUCK; LARRY BUCSHON; CORI BUSH; CHERI BUSTOS; G. K. BUTTERFIELD; SALUD O. CARBAJAL; TONY CÁRDENAS; ANDRÉ CARSON; MATT CARTWRIGHT; ED CASE; SEAN CASTEN; KATHY CASTOR; JOAQUIN CASTRO; LIZ CHENEY; JUDY CHU; DAVID N. CICILLINE; KATHERINE M. CLARK; YVETTE D. CLARKE; EMANUEL CLEAVER; JAMES E. CLYBURN; STEVE COHEN; JAMES COMER; GERALD E. CONNOLLY; JIM COOPER; J. LUIS CORREA; JIM COSTA; JOE COURTNEY; ANGIE CRAIG; DAN CRENSHAW; CHARLIE CRIST; JASON CROW; HENRY CUELLAR; JOHN R. CURTIS; SHARICE DAVIDS; DANNY K. DAVIS; RODNEY DAVIS; MADELEINE DEAN; PETER A. DEFAZIO; DIANA DEGETTE; ROSAL DELAURO; SUZAN K. DELBENE;

ANTONIO DELGADO; VAL BUTLER DEMINGS; MARK
DESAULNIER; THEODORE E. DEUTCH; DEBBIE
DINGELL; LLOYD DOGGETT; MICHAEL F. DOYLE;
TOM EMMER; VERONICA ESCOBAR; ANNA G. ESHOO;
ADRIANO ESPAILLAT; DWIGHT EVANS; RANDY
FEENSTRA; A. DREW FERGUSON IV; BRIAN K.
FITZPATRICK; LIZZIE LETCHER; JEFF
FORTENBERRY; BILL FOSTER; LOIS FRANKEL;
MARCIA L. FUDGE; MIKE GALLAGHER; RUBEN
GALLEGO; JOHN GARAMENDI; ANDREW R.
GARBARINO; SYLVIA R. GARCIA; JESÚS G. GARCÍA;
JARED F. GOLDEN; JIMMY GOMEZ; TONY GONZALES;
ANTHONY GONZALEZ; VICENTE GONZALEZ; JOSH
GOTTHEIMER; KAY GRANGER; AL GREEN; RAÚL M.
GRIJALVA; GLENN GROTHMAN; BRETT GUTHRIE;
DEBRA A. HAALAND; JOSH HARDER; ALCEE L.
HASTINGS; JAHANA HAYES; JAIME HERRERA
BEUTLER; BRIAN HIGGINS; J. FRENCH HILL; JAMES
A. HIMES; ASHLEY HINSON; TREY HOLLINGSWORTH;
STEVEN HORSFORD; CHRISSY HOULAHAN; STENY H.
HOYER; JARED HUFFMAN; BILL HUIZENGA; SHEILA
JACKSON LEE; SARA JACOBS; PRAMILA JAYAPAL;
HAKEEM S. JEFFRIES; DUSTY JOHNSON; EDDIE
BERNICE JOHNSON; HENRY C. JOHNSON JR.;
MONDAIRE JONES; DAVID P. JOYCE; KAIALI'I
KAHELE; MARCY KAPTUR; JOHN KATKO; WILLIAM R.
KEATING; RO KHANNA; DANIEL T. KILDEE; DEREK
KILMER; ANDY KIM; YOUNG KIM; RON KIND; ADAM
KINZINGER; ANN KIRKPATRICK; RAJA
KRISHNAMOORTHY; ANN M. KUSTER; DARIN
LAHOOD; CONOR LAMB; JAMES R. LANGEVIN; RICK
LARSEN; JOHN B. LARSON; ROBERT E. LATTA; JAKE
LATURNER; BRENDA L. LAWRENCE; AL LAWSON JR.;
BARBARA LEE; SUSIE LEE; TERESA LEGER
FERNANDEZ; ANDY LEVIN; MIKE LEVIN; TED LIEU;

ZOE LOFGREN; ALAN S. LOWENTHAL; ELAINE G. LURIA; STEPHEN F. LYNCH; NANCY MACE; TOM MALINOWSKI; CAROLYN B. MALONEY; SEAN PATRICK MALONEY; KATHY E. MANNING; THOMAS MASSIE; DORIS O. MATSUI; LUCY MCBATH; MICHAEL T. MCCAUL; TOM MCCLINTOCK; BETTY MCCOLLUM; A. ADONALD MCEACHIN; JAMES P. MCGOVERN; PATRICK T. MCHENRY; DAVID B. MCKINLEY; JERRY MCNERNEY; GREGORY W. MEEKS; PETER MEIJER; GRACE MENG; KWEISI MFUME; MARIANNETTE MILLER-MEEKS; JOHN R. MOOLENAAR; BLAKE D. MOORE; GWEN MOORE; JOSEPH D. MORELLE; SETH MOULTON; FRANK J. MRVAN; STEPHANIE N. MURPHY; JERROLD NADLER; GRACE F. NAPOLITANO; RICHARD E. NEAL; JOE NEGUSE; DAN NEWHOUSE; MARIE NEWMAN; DONALD NORCROSS; ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ; TOM O'HALLERAN; ILHAN OMAR; FRANK PALLONE JR.; JIMMY PANETTA; CHRIS PAPPAS; BILL PASCRELL JR.; DONALD M. PAYNE JR.; NANCY PELOSI; ED PERLMUTTER; SCOTT H. PETERS; DEAN PHILLIPS; CHELLIE PINGREE; MARK POCAN; KATIE PORTER; AYANNA PRESSLEY; DAVID E. PRICE; MIKE QUIGLEY; JAMIE RASKIN; TOM REED; KATHLEEN M. RICE; CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS; DEBORAH K. ROSS; CHIP ROY; LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD; RAUL RUIZ; C. A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER; BOBBY L. RUSH; TIM RYAN; LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ; JOHN P. SARBANES; MARY GAY SCANLON; JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY; ADAM B. SCHIFF; BRADLEY SCOTT SCHNEIDER; KURT SCHRADER; KIM SCHRIER; AUSTIN SCOTT; DAVID SCOTT; ROBERT C. SCOTT; TERRI A. SEWELL; BRAD SHERMAN; MIKIE SHERRILL; MICHAEL K. SIMPSON; ALBIO SIRES; ELISSA SLOTKIN; ADAM SMITH; CHRISTOPHER H.

SMITH; DARREN SOTO; ABIGAIL DAVIS
SPANBERGER; VICTORIA SPARTZ; JACKIE SPEIER;
GREG STANTON; PETE STAUBER; MICHELLE STEEL;
BRYAN STEIL; HALEY M. STEVENS; STEVE STIVERS;
MARILYN STRICKLAND; THOMAS R. SUOZZI; ERIC
SWALWELL; MARK TAKANO; VAN TAYLOR; BENNIE
G. THOMPSON; MIKE THOMPSON; DINA TITUS;
RASHIDA TLAIB; PAUL TONKO; NORMA J. TORRES;
RITCHIE TORRES; LORI TRAHAN; DAVID J. TRONE;
MICHAEL R. TURNER; LAUREN UNDERWOOD; FRED
UPTON; JUAN VARGAS; MARC A. VEASEY; FILEMON
VELA; NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ; ANN WAGNER;
MICHAEL WALTZ; DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ;
MAXINE WATERS; BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN;
PETER WELCH; BRAD R. WENSTRUP; BRUCE
WESTERMAN; JENNIFER WEXTON; SUSAN WILD;
NIKEMA WILLIAMS; FREDERICA S. WILSON; STEVE
WOMACK; JOHN A. YARMUTH; DON YOUNG; the
following persons named are for their capacities as U.S.
Senators; TAMMY BALDWIN; JOHN BARRASSO;
MICHAEL F. BENNET; MARSHA BLACKBURN;
RICHARD BLUMENTHAL; ROY BLUNT; CORY A.
BOOKER; JOHN BOOZMAN; MIKE BRAUN; SHERROD
BROWN; RICHARD BURR; MARIA CANTWELL;
SHELLEY CAPITO; BENJAMIN L. CARDIN; THOMAS R.
CARPER; ROBERT P. CASEY JR.; BILL CASSIDY;
SUSAN M. COLLINS; CHRISTOPHER A. COONS; JOHN
CORNYN; CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO; TOM
COTTON; KEVIN CRAMER; MIKE CRAPO; STEVE
DAINES; TAMMY DUCKWORTH; RICHARD J. DURBIN;
JONI ERNST; DIANNE FEINSTEIN; DEB FISCHER;
KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND; LINDSEY GRAHAM; CHUCK
GRASSLEY; BILL HAGERTY; MAGGIE HASSAN;
MARTIN HEINRICH; JOHN HICKENLOOPER; MAZIE
HIRONO; JOHN HOEVEN; JAMES INHOFE; RON

JOHNSON; TIM KAINE; MARK KELLY; ANGUS S. KING, JR.; AMY KLOBUCHAR; JAMES LANKFORD; PATRICK LEAHY; MIKE LEE; BEN LUJAN; CYNTHIA M. LUMMIS; JOE MANCHIN III; EDWARD J. MARKEY; MITCH MCCONNELL; ROBERT MENENDEZ; JEFF MERKLEY; JERRY MORAN; LISA MURKOWSKI; CHRISTOPHER MURPHY; PATTY MURRAY; JON OSSOFF; ALEX PADILLA; RAND PAUL; GARY C. PETERS; ROB PORTMAN; JACK REED; JAMES E. RISCH; MITT ROMNEY; JACKY ROSEN; MIKE ROUNDS; MARCO RUBIO; BERNARD SANDERS; BEN SASSE; BRIAN SCHATZ; CHARLES E. SCHUMER; RICK SCOTT; TIM SCOTT; JEANNE SHAHEEN; RICHARD C. SHELBY; KYRSTEN SINEMA; TINA SMITH; DEBBIE STABENOW; DAN SULLIVAN; JON TESTER; JOHN THUNE; THOM TILLIS; PATRICK J. TOOMEY; HOLLEN VAN; MARK R. WARNER; RAPHAEL G. WARNOCK; ELIZABETH WARREN; SHELDON WHITEHOUSE; ROGER F. WICKER; RON WYDEN; TODD YOUNG; JOSEPH ROBINETTE BIDEN JR in his capacity of President of the United States; MICHAEL RICHARD PENCE in his capacity as former Vice President of the United States, and KAMALA HARRIS in her capacity as Vice President of the United States and JOHN and JANE DOES 1-100.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|----------------|
| QUESTIONS PRESENTED..... | i |
| PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING | ii |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | vii |
| TABLE OF AUTHORITIES..... | viii |
| LIST OF PROCEEDINGS..... | 1 |
| JURISDICTION | 1 |
| SUPREME COURT RULE 14(F) PROVISIONS | 1 |
| STATEMENT OF THE CASE..... | 3 |
| REASONS FOR GRANTING THIS PETITION | 8 |
| CONCLUSION | 9 |
| APPENDIX | |
| 10th CIRCUIT ORDER AND JUDGMENT | App. 1 |
| APPELLANT’S OPENING BRIEF..... | App. 11 |
| TRIAL COURT JUDGMENT | App. 29 |
| TRIAL COURT ADOPTING REPORT | App. 30 |
| TRIAL COURT REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION | App. 35 |
| OPPOSITION TO DISMISS | App. 55 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

U.S. CONSTITUTION

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| Amendment I | 1, 5, App. 17 |
| Amendment IX..... | 2, App. 15 |
| Amendment V | 2 |
| Amendment XII | 3, App. 25 |
| Amendment XIV | 2, App. 25 |
| Article 1 Section 11..... | 2 |
| Article III | App. 14, 17, 21 |
| Declaration of Independence - Clause 1 & II..... | 14 |

UTAH CONSTITUTION

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Article I Section 3 | 3 |
|---------------------------|---|

STATUTES

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|
| 18 U.S. Code § 2381 | 6, App. 9 |
| 28 U. S. C. § 2101(e) | 4 |
| 28 U.S.C.A. §1257(a)..... | 1 |

CASES

| | |
|--|------------|
| <i>American Bush v. City Of South S</i> , 2006 UT 40.... | 5, App. 16 |
| <i>Carey v. Piphus</i> , 435 U.S. 247..... | App. 21 |
| <i>Determination Of Rights To Use Of Water</i> , 2008 UT 25 182 P.3d 362..... | App. 13 |
| <i>Morris v. House</i> , 32 Tex. 492 (1870)..... | 5, App. 9 |
| <i>Radioshack Corp. v. ComSmart, Inc.</i> , 222 SW 3d .. | 5, App. 19 |
| <i>Rector v. City and County of Denver</i> , 348 F. 3d 935 .. | App. 22 |
| <i>State v. Ruiz</i> , 2012 UT 29, 282 P.3d 998..... | App. 13 |

RULES

| | |
|-------------------------------|--------|
| Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1)..... | App. 2 |
| Rule 11 Supreme Court..... | 1, 4 |

LIST OF PROCEEDINGS

- *Raland J Brunson v. Alma S. Adams*, et al., No. 1:21-cv-00111-CMR, U.S. District Court for the District of Utah. Judgment entered February 2, 2022.
- *Raland J Brunson v. Alma S. Adams*, No. 22-4007, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit. Judgment entered October 6, 2022.



JURISDICTION

Jurisdiction is found under *28 U.S.C.A. §1257(a)*

“Final judgments...rendered by the highest court of a State...may be reviewed by the Supreme Court by writ of certiorari...where any...right [or] privilege...is specially set up or claimed under the...statutes of...the United States.”



SUPREME COURT RULE 14(F) PROVISIONS

Amendment I of the Constitution of the United States: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting . . . the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Article VI of the Constitution. “This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made Pursuance thereof; . . .shall be the supreme Law of the land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby.”

Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States; “. . . 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.” **Section 3:** “No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any state, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any state legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any state, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.”

Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution: “No person shall...be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law . . .”

Ninth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States; “The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.”

Article I Section 7 of the Constitution of Utah; “No person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law.”

Article 1 Section 2 of the Constitution of Utah; “All courts shall be open . . .which shall be administered without denial or unnecessary delay; and no person shall be barred from prosecuting or defending before any tribunal in this State, by himself or counsel, any civil cause to which he is a party.”



STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This action is against 388 federal officers in their official capacities which include President Joseph Robinette Biden Jr, Vice President Kamala Harris, Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi and former Vice President Michael Richard Pence (“Respondents”). All the Respondents have taken the required Oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States of America against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and as such they are liable for consequences when they violate the Oath of Office.

Respondents were properly warned and were requested to make an investigation into a highly covert swift and powerful enemy, as stated below, seeking to destroy the Constitution and the United States. Respondents purposely thwarted all efforts to investigate this, whereupon this enemy was not checked or investigated, therefore the Respondents adhered to this enemy. Because of Respondents intentional refusal to investigate this enemy, Petitioner Raland J Brunson (“Brunson”) brought this action against Respondents because he was seriously personally damaged and violated by this action of Respondents, and consequently this action unilaterally violated the rights of every citizen of the U.S.A. and perhaps the rights of every person living, and all courts of law.

On January 6, 2021, the 117th Congress held a proceeding and debate in Washington DC (“Proceeding”). This Proceeding was for the purpose of counting votes under the 2020 Presidential election for the President and Vice President of the United States under Amendment XII. During this Proceeding over 100 members of U.S. Congress claimed factual evidence that the said election was rigged. The refusal of the Respondents to investigate this congressional claim (the enemy) is an act of treason and

fraud by Respondents. A successfully rigged election has the same end result as an act of war; to place into power whom the victor wants, which in this case is Biden, who, if not stopped immediately, will continue to destroy the fundamental freedoms of Brunson and all U.S. Citizens and courts of law.

Due to the fact that this case represents a national security breach on a unprecedented level like never before seen seriously damaging and violating Brunson and coincidentally effects every citizen of the U.S.A. and courts of law. Therefore, Brunson moves this court to grant this petition, or in the alternative without continuing further, order the trial court to grant Brunson's complaint in its fullest. Brunson's complaint is the mechanism that can immediately remove the Respondents from office without leaving this country vulnerable without a President and Vice President.

Despite the grave importance of this case, the trial court granted Respondents motion to dismiss ("Motion") by stating "IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that plaintiff Raland Brunson's action is dismissed without prejudice". ("Order") This Order followed the trial court's order to adopt its report and recommendation that Brunson did not get until close to the beginning of Oct. 2022 thus prejudicing Brunson from timely filing any objections, and the Order did not properly address Brunson's opposition to the Motion. Brunson's opposition clearly shows that Brunson has standing.

Per Brunson's opening brief and as outlined in Brunson's said opposition (both not properly addressed by the lower courts) Brunson's has standing and the trial court has full proper jurisdiction to rule on the merits of this case based upon the following factors:

a) The case of *American Bush v. City Of South Salt Lake*, 2006 UT 40 140 P.3d.1235 clearly states that the Constitution of the United States along with State Constitutions do not grant rights to the people. These instruments measure the power of the rulers but they do not measure the rights of the governed, and they are not the fountain of law nor the origin of the people's rights, but they have been put in place to protect their rights. Therefore the statutes and case law cited by Respondents claiming immunity from Brunson's claims in this instance are unconstitutional and this Court needs to rule in that manner.

b) "The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people." Therefore, the purpose of the Constitution was written to protect our self evident rights. The Constitution cannot be construed by any means, by any legislative, judicial and executive bodies, by any court of law to deny or disparage our rights. This is the supreme law of the land. "This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made Pursuance thereof; . . shall be the supreme Law of the land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby." Article VI of the Constitution.

c) The First Amendment of the Constitution states that Congress shall make no law prohibiting the right of the people to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

d) "Our courts have consistently held that fraud vitiates whatever it touches, *Morris v. House*, 32 Tex. 492 (1870)". *Estate of Stonecipher v. Estate of Butts*, 591 SW 2d 806. And "It is a stern but just maxim of law that fraud vitiates everything into which it enters." *Veterans Service Club v. Sweeney*, 252 S.W.2d 25, 27 (Ky.1952)." *Radioshack Corp. v. ComSmart, Inc.*, 222 SW 3d 256.

Vitiate; "To impair or make void; to destroy or annul, either completely or partially, the force and effect of an act or instrument." West's Encyclopedia of American Law, edition 2.

e) Due to the uniqueness of this case, the trial court does have proper authority to remove the Respondents from their offices under 18 U.S. Code § 2381 which states "Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States, levies war against them or adheres to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort within the United States or elsewhere, is guilty of treason and shall suffer death, or shall be imprisoned not less than five years and fined under this title but not less than \$10,000; and shall be incapable of holding any office under the United States." A court adjudicating that the Respondents, who have taken the Oath of Office, to be incapable of holding their offices or who have adhered to a domestic enemy, means nothing without such removal of office.

Under the stated factors Brunson has an unfettered right to sue the Respondents under the serious nature of his claim, no legislation can measure Brunson's right to sue the Respondents. Furthermore, Brunson's allegations against Respondents' adhering to a domestic enemy, and committing acts of fraud are not protected by any kind of legislation of jurisdictional immunity. Essentially, acts of Congress cannot protect fraud, nor protect the violation of the Oath or that give aid and comfort to enemies of the United States Constitution or America as alleged in Brunson's complaint against the Respondents. These are facts that cannot be overcome, therefore, Brunson found no need to include in this petition a copy of Respondents' opposition to Brunson's opening brief or any of their arguments. Nevertheless, Brunson's opening brief does touch upon Respondents' immunity arguments and shows

how Respondents do not, nor can they, overcome Brunson's arguments as stated herein.

It is an uncontestable fact that the Respondents committed fraud and treason breaching our national security (as factually alleged in Brunson's complaint), thus adhering to an domestic enemy that continues to breach our national security at an alarming rate on a daily basis. This national security breach is having the same end result as an act of war; to place into power whom the Respondents want, which is Biden. Brunson moves this Court, with its powers, to order the trial court of this case to immediately grant to Brunson the damages he seeks in his complaint. This is necessary to immediately secure our national security without any further delay.

Turning now to the doctrine of equitable maxim created by this Court, this doctrine stands in direct conflict of the doctrine of the object principle of justice.

The doctrine of the object principle of justice is couched by the supreme law of the land, and sets in motion to provide our court system to be the most just, limited, highly effective and easy to understand, and infuses our court system to be the most highly respected and dearly admired court system greater than the world has ever seen. The doctrine of equitable maxim kills this and had the trial court been guided by the object principle of justice this appeal would not be necessary.

In addition, the doctrine of the object principle of justice stops the precarious nature of our courts, their jobs would be much easier with less stress, and parties in court would have a strong sense on how the court is going to rule thus promoting settlements to high degree and as such, lawsuits and appeals would be greatly reduced. This is an absolute fact.

Jurisprudence requires this Court to revoke the doctrine of equitable maxim that it created and to instill the doctrine of the object principle of justice more thoroughly throughout the entire court system in America.

The doctrines of equitable maxim and the object principle of justice are fully explained in a petition before this court under docket No. 18-1147. To avoid being repetitious, Brunson herein incorporates the argument found therein as though fully stated herein and moves this court to address the question either under this petition or docket No. 18-1147.

◆

REASONS FOR GRANTING THIS PETITION

Brunson's complaint alleges fraud, violations of the Oath of Office and touches on acts of treason committed by the Respondents. These serious offenses need to be addressed immediately with the least amount of technical nuances of the law and legal procedures because these offenses are flowing continually against Brunson's liberties and life and consequently is a continual national security breach.

Voting is the greatest power an individual can exercise in a Republic; it is Brunson's personal voice and the way he can protect his personal constitutional protected rights and the U.S. Constitution. See ¶ 71 of the Complaint. When the allegations of a rigged election came forward the Respondents had a duty under law to investigate it or be removed from office.

An honest and fair election can only be supported by legal votes, this is sacred. It is the basis of our U.S. Republican Form of Government protected by the U.S. Constitution. The efforts made, as stated in the complaint, that avoided an investigation of how Biden won the election, is an act of

treason and an act of levying war against the U. S. Constitution which violated Brunson's unfettered right to vote in an honest and fair election and as such it wrongfully invalidated his vote.

As a national security interest, Brunson moves this court to be swift by going beyond granting this petition, it should order the lower court to grant Brunson's complaint to avoid any further delay.

◆

CONCLUSION

This petition is set forth in the interest of justice in protecting Brunson's right to petition for a redress of grievances against the Respondents, and ensuring his right of due process against the encroachment of the doctrine of equitable maxim, and charging the Respondents who failed to investigate the allegations of a rigged election by having them removed from office without further delay.

Dated: October 13, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Raland J Brunson
Raland J Brunson
4287 South Harrison Blvd., Apt 132
Ogden, Utah 84403
Phone: 385-492-4898
Petitioner in pro se