

NOV 07 2022

No.22-\_\_\_\_\_

---

**In The  
Supreme Court Of The United States**

---

BRIAN DAVID HILL,  
Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Respondent,

---

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

---

**PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

---

Brian David Hill  
*Pro Se*

Ally of QANON, and Atty. Lin Wood  
*Former USWGO Alternative News Reporter*

310 FOREST STREET, APARTMENT 2  
MARTINSVILLE, VIRGINIA 24112

Tel.: (276) 790-3505

E-Mail: c/o Roberta Hill at rbhill67@comcast.net

---

Dated: November 7, 2022



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

JusticeForUSWGO.wordpress.com

JusticeForUSWGO.NL //

USWGO.COM

**ORIGINAL**

## **I. Questions Presented**

Where the U.S. Court of Appeals did not properly and appropriately proceed with two consolidated interlocutory appeals on the District Court's order denying Motion for Special Master and Motion to Reconsider the District Court's order denying a Motion for a Special Master to investigate alleged blackmail videos of child rape and murder concerning "judges" and "officials"?

Where the U.S. District Court improperly and unlawfully denied the undisputed, uncontested Motions for Special Master and Appointment of Counsel to conduct discovery and review of credible Georgia Attorney L. Lin Wood's claim of allegedly "judges" and "officials" being blackmailed with child rape and murder in such a horrendous scheme by the Intelligence agencies?

Where the U.S. Court of Appeals wrongfully dismissed the appeals by claiming that they have a lack of jurisdiction when such interlocutory appeals were necessary over the issues of needing a Special

Master to subpoena Attorney Lin Wood for the alleged video recordings and review over alleged video recordings of “judges” being potentially blackmailed with child rape and murder which may affect their impartiality and independence, in sheer violation of Due Process of Law requiring IMPARTIALITY OF JUDGES and in violation of 28 U.S.C. § 455?

Where the U.S. District Court had erred or abused discretion on denying Motion for Special Master and Motion to Reconsider the District Court’s order denying a Motion for a Special Master, because the judges who are involved in the case may or may not be blackmailed with child rape and murder which may be considered a CONFLICT OF INTEREST, and should have stepped aside after Petitioner made such allegations with a credible witness alleging the existence of GOD-KNOWS-HOW-MANY blackmail videos of “judges” and “officials”, to allow a Special Master to order the alleged blackmail scheme video recordings or tapes alleged by Attorney L. Lin Wood?

Where case law precedent in this very Court and the lower Courts all held that a Special Master is

warranted in special circumstances and that refusal to appoint a Special Master (with no potential conflict of interest issues) over matters such as judges possibly being blackmailed with a sexual crime may throw the entire judicial system in jeopardy causing lack of confidence and a lack of integrity?

Where the “due process of law” clause of the U.S. Constitution, Amendment V, is being deprived and ignored by the U.S. District Court in the Middle District of North Carolina and the supervisory Court known as the U.S. Court of Appeals by allowing their judges to possibly be blackmailed with anything including child rape and murder without ever so much as an investigation or questioning the witness Attorney L. Lin Wood who is protecting his source or sources requiring the necessary need for a subpoena or court order to review over the alleged blackmail videos alleged by this Attorney on Twitter last year?

Table of Contents

**I. Questions Presented..... iv**  
**II. Table of Contents ..... v-vi**  
**III. Table of Authorities ..... vii**  
**IV. Petition for Writ Of Certiorari..... 1**  
**V. Opinions Below..... 10**  
**VI. Jurisdiction ..... 11**  
**VII. Constitutional Provisions Involved ..... 11**  
**VIII. Statement of the Case..... 11**  
**1. The Uncontested, Undisputed Motions by  
Mr. Hill ..... 13**  
**2. The Order of the U.S. District Court for  
the Middle District of North Carolina  
denying two motions which would have  
resolved the issues and fear of the  
probability that there may be videotapes or  
video recordings show that federal judges  
may or may not be blackmailed with child  
rape and murder ..... 16**  
**IX. REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .. 24**  
**A. To protect the integrity, independence,  
ethics, and constitutionality of the decisions  
of judges within the District Court and  
Appeals Court, as well as protecting the  
Judicial Machinery from the possibility of  
blackmail of any kind whether or not it is  
only of the alleged child rape and murder as  
alleged by Attorney Lin Wood, or of any  
other kinds of blackmail being used to  
compromise Federal Judges. The decision by  
both the District Court and Court of Appeals  
is in conflict of law, conflict of well-  
established precedent in federal courts  
nationwide ..... 24**

**B. To keep in uniformity with the Circuits, to conform with federal law, and to prevent a new conflict of law which would disturb the uniformity of other circuits which all make rulings on requirement of impartiality of federal judges in a case ..... 28**

**X. CONCLUSION ..... 35**

## II. Table of Authorities

### Cases

<u>Liteky v. United States, 510 U.S. 540 (1994)</u> .....	31
<u>Hurles v. Ryan, 752 F.3d 768 (9th Cir. 2011)</u> .....	31
<u>United States v. Paul, 561 F.3d 970 (9th Cir. 2009)</u> .....	32
<u>In re Nettles, 394 F.3d 1001 (7th Cir. 2005)</u> .....	32
<u>United States v. Andrews, 390 F.3d 840 (5th Cir. 2004)</u> .....	32
<u>U.S. at _____, n. 12, 108 S.Ct. at 2205, n. 12, 100 L.Ed.2d at 875</u> <u>. 12</u> .....	30
<u>Tumey, supra, 273 U.S. at 532, 47 S.Ct. at</u> <u>444</u> .....	30
<u>Ward v. Village of Monroeville, 409 U.S. 57, 60, 93 S.Ct. 80, 83,</u> <u>34 L.Ed.2d 267</u> <u>(1972)</u> .....	30
<u>Aetna Life Ins. Co. v. Lavoie, supra, 475 U.S. 813, 106 S.Ct. 1580, 89</u> <u>L.Ed.2d 823</u> .....	30
<u>Scott v. U.S., 559 A.2d 745, 753 n.16 (D.C.</u> <u>1989)</u> .....	30

<u>Tumey v. Ohio, 273 U.S. 510, 532, 47 S.Ct. 437, 444, 71 L.Ed. 749</u> <u>(1927)</u> .....	29
<u>Offutt v. United States, 348 U.S. 11, 14, 75 S.Ct. 11, 13, 99 L.E.</u> <u>11 (1954)</u> .....	29
<u>In re Murchison, 349 U.S. 133, 136, 75 S.Ct. 623, 625, 99 L.Ed.</u> <u>942 (1955)</u> .....	29
<u>Aetna Life Ins. Co. v. Lavoie, 475 U.S. 813, 823, 106 S.Ct. 1580,</u> <u>1586, 89 L.Ed.2d 823 (1986)</u> .....	29
<u>U.S. , 108 S.Ct. at 2203, 100 L.Ed.2d at 874-75; see</u> <u>Vuitton, supra, 107 S.Ct. at 2138-</u> <u>40</u> .....	29
<u>Scott v. U.S., 559 A.2d 745, 752-53 (D.C. 1989) (“Id. U.S. ,</u> <u>108 S.Ct. at 2203, 100 L.Ed.2d at 873-</u> <u>74</u> .....	29
<u>Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541, 545-46</u> <u>(1949)</u> .....	10

## Rules

Rule 7.1 of the Georgia Rules of Professional Conduct.....	4, 12, 13, 32
Georgia Professional Conduct Bar Rule 7.1.....	7
Local Rule 7.3. Under the Local Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for the Middle District of North Carolina.....	19
Local Rule 7.3(k) MOTION PRACTICE.....	19



LR 7.3 MOTION PRACTICE (f).....	19
Local Rule 7.3, paragraphs (f) and (k).....	28
Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b).....	10

**Statutes**

28 U.S. Code § 455.....	3, 33, 34
28 U.S. Code § 455(a).....	31
28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).....	11
28 U.S.C. § 1291.....	10
28 U.S.C. § 1292.....	10
28 U.S.C. § 2101.....	11
28 U.S.C. § 2255(A).....	20
28 U.S.C. § 2255.....	10
28 U.S.C. <del>§</del> 2255.....	14-15, 17

**Constitutional Provisions**

United States Constitution, Amendment V.....	10
U.S. Constitution, Amendment V, Due Process Clause...7	

**Petition seeking review of Judgment**

U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit;  
consolidated appeals case nos. 22-6325 and 22-6501,  
Petition for Rehearing denied: October 24, 2022,  
Consolidated Appeals dismissed on August 23, 2022.

#### IV. Petition for Writ Of Certiorari

Brian David Hill (“Petitioner”), a criminal defendant and civil case 2255 Petitioner who is currently serving a sentence of supervised release by and through the United States Probation Office for the Western District of Virginia by the original order of the Middle District of North Carolina. Brian David Hill (“Petitioner”) respectfully petitions this court for a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the U.S. Court of Appeals (“Appeals Court”) (JA 1-4). The judgment (JA 1-4) wrongfully dismissing two consolidated interlocutory appeals (JA 22) over two orders in the United States District Court (“District Court”) denying the uncontested 2255 civil case Motion (JA 6) asking for a Special Master (Doc #294) and for denying (JA 21) a Motion asking to Reconsider (Doc #301, 18 Exhibits) the order denying the Motion asking for a Special Master. Those uncontested Motions were regarding a need for a Special Master to review over alleged sexual blackmail tapes aka video recordings who was alleged by a credible attorney from Georgia named L. Lin Wood, and both of those denied motions were uncontested/undisputed by the Respondent: United States of America. It was asking for a necessary remedy of relief to prevent a possibly compromised and possibly partial judge who may or may not be a puppet of sexual blackmail evidence if the judges are ever in any of

those alleged videotapes. There should have been a federal criminal investigation over the John Does and Jane Does in those child rape and murder sexual blackmail tapes A LONG TIME AGO. The purpose of those motions was to have a Special Master appointed in the 2255 civil/criminal Habeas Corpus case for the purposes of (1) contacting Attorney L. Lin Wood, (2) requesting for or entering a court order for him to compel him to have his source, or sources, or client, or clients furnish a copy of the alleged proclaimed encrypted blackmail video recordings or tapes as well as providing the password for the encrypted alleged blackmail videos (Doc. #301-7), (3) and that the Special Master reviews over them or even ask for any additional staff including investigators to review over the alleged blackmail videos to determine if any specific Federal Judges involved in Brian David Hill's criminal case and 2255 civil case were possibly ever in any of the alleged blackmail video files which Attorney Lin Wood have spoken of (Document #290-1, pages 4 and 6). The Federal Judges Brian suspects may be blackmailed is the former Chief Judge William Lindsey Osteen Junior of the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, as well as current Chief Judge Thomas David Schroeder. Brian suspects or fears both may be blackmailed and that was why he requested a Special Master to review over the alleged blackmail video files, by contacting Attorney L. Lin Wood like Brian had done a year

prior asking for information on who had been blacked (JA 9-20), and compelling Attorney Lin Wood to turn over a copy of the blackmail tapes to a Special Master for such reviewing over those blackmail videos to determine if those judges are in there. If they are ever proven blackmailed with the tapes, then Brian D. Hill will never face fair and impartial justice in that Court or in the U.S. Court of Appeals, it will be impossible to receive any justice at all with such blackmail and compromise if the blackmail videos prove this. This is dangerous, scary.

This is VERY SERIOUS as any form of sexual blackmail of Federal Judges dismantles the integrity, dismantles the credibility, dismantles the independence, dismantles the ethics, and dismantles the legality of the Federal Courts, and throws possibly many criminal and civil cases into disarray. However, Federal Law (28 U.S.C. § 455) and the U.S. Constitution requires that the TRIER OF FACT be neutral, be impartial, and only make legal rulings and legal decisions based on facts which is based on sound evidence and law. It is unlawful and even criminal for anybody to blackmail a Federal Judge and anybody includes any employee of the Federal Government. The Federal Government has no right or authority to blackmail Federal Judges to ruling favorably in criminal and civil cases, that is highly CRIMINAL and TREASONOUS. Refusal to investigate any credible claims of Federal Judges being blackmailed distorts the trust and

confidence within our federal judiciary. People will no longer trust what a Federal Judge decides in any court by refusal to investigate such claims when coming from an alleged claim by a licensed attorney from Georgia. Attorney Lin Wood is either telling the truth based on his protected source or sources, or he can be disbarred by violating Rule 7.1 of the Georgia Rules of Professional Conduct. When Brian Hill made statements before the District Court over such fears of judges involved with his case being possibly blackmailed due to the blackmail claims last year in January, 2021, based on this “attorney” from Georgia, this creates issues which must be rectified or Lin Wood should be liable for making such false claims if untrue. Why would such an attorney of decorated stature risk possible defamation suits especially from Chief Justice John Roberts if untrue? and why would he be making statements of political individuals and judges being blackmailed in a horrendous scheme of sexual blackmail??? Why would he name names on Twitter of those involved in being blackmailed in this alleged scheme such as Chief Justice John Roberts (Doc. #301-7, Doc. #301-6) and not be sued for defamation by Chief Justice Roberts regarding the timespan between Lin Wood’s claims against John Roberts on January 3 or 4, 2021, and right now???

However, instead the District Court had failed or refused to conduct its ministerial duties in regards to the valid uncontested and

undisputed evidence of a credible and licensed civil Attorney L. Lin Wood who acts as a barrier between his source or sources who claim to have encrypted blackmail video recording of possibly federal and state jurists being videotaped performing sexually repulsive acts of child rape and murder to be blackmailed by unidentified blackmailers in the credible attorney referenced statements in support of the denied motions subject to relief as a matter of law, which challenges the whether unlawful or lawful subject-matter jurisdiction of the judgment(s) before his Court. If the judges were ever proven to have been blackmailed by this alleged blackmail scheme, then every negative judicial decision against Brian David Hill is a nullity, void, and should have no legal consequence on the life of Mr. Hill, no criminal record whatsoever. Every bad decision from the supervised release violation conviction, to the original conviction, to denying the first 2255 motion in 2019, and every other negative decision through the criminal case timeline of United States of America v. Brian David Hill (Case no. 1:13-cr-435-1) since 2013 is a nullity if the judges were ever proven to have been blackmailed with this horrendous sex crime scheme. CHILD RAPE/MURDER.

Brian's 2255 case had a lot of grounds and some of them were: The District Court convicted the Petitioner of a supervised release violation without a constitutional right to a jury, that the Court erred

in finding that the evidence was sufficient, Actual Innocence, Fraud on the Court, and another ground which is relevant for all intents and purposes of the interlocutory appeals. It said:

Citation from Document “#291, pg. 14 and 15 said: GROUND VII — IT IS NOW POSSIBLE AND PETITIONER SUSPECTS THAT THE ORIGINATING JUDICIAL OFFICER WHO REVOKED THE SUPERVISED RELEASE ON DOCUMENT #200 MAY OR MAY NOT BE A TARGET OF A BLACKMAIL SCHEME INVOLVING CHILD RAPE AND MURDER DUE TO CLAIMS BY ATTORNEY L. LIN WOOD ASSERTING IN PUBLIC STATEMENTS THAT “JUDGES” AND “OFFICIALS” WERE BEING ORDERED TO RAPE AND MURDER CHILDREN ON VIDEO RECORDINGS AND THUS WERE COMPROMISED AND NO LONGER IMPARTIAL TO THE DECISIONS THEY MADE WHILE BEING BLACKMAILED. REGARDLESS OF WHETHER THE BLACKMAIL WAS MATERIAL TO ANY DECISIONS MADE AGAINST BRIAN DAVID HILL, IT WOULD STILL MAKE THE JUDGE PARTIAL AND/OR BIASED AND/OR COMPROMISED. THIS VIOLATES THE U.S. CONSTITUTION’S GUARANTEE THAT THE TRIER OF FACT REMAIN IMPARTIAL DURING THE CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS OF A CASE.”

“This issue cannot and could not have been raised on appeal due to it being new evidence from claims surfacing from Attorney L. Lin Wood in January, 2021 which has not been fully developed and requires expansion of the record. It requires that Attorney L. Lin Wood and his source or sources be subpoenaed to obtain the blackmail video recordings which he claimed allegedly to have the encrypted password or key. Attorney Lin Wood does not possess the actual videos but he received this information from his source or sources. His source or sources appear to be involved somehow with American Actor Isaac Kappy who was reportedly killed after falling off of a bridge and died. Attorney Lin Wood suggested or claimed that Isaac Kappy was murdered. Attorney Lin Wood must be subpoenaed to further develop the facts of this GROUND.”

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit (“Appeals Court”) under consolidated appeals case no. #22-6325, #22-6501 (JA 22), is the originating case where the timely filed interlocutory appeal,

was originally filed and the very case, which is being appealed to the United States Supreme Court to undo a miscarriage of justice (violation of the U.S. Constitution, Amendment V, Due Process Clause) of not appointing a Special Master to ask for the alleged blackmail scheme of videos alleging that “judges” and “officials” were raping and murdering children on video camera and were being used by the unidentified blackmailers. A miscarriage of justice by refusing to accept the credibility of Attorney L. Lin Wood (Appeal case no. 22-6501, Doc. 6, pages 27-32) (Appeal case no. 22-6501, Doc. 11, pages 5-6) and that multiple uncontested, undisputed motions with undisputed prime facie facts of a credible licensed attorney, held to tell the truth under Georgia Professional Conduct Bar Rule 7.1, making claims that “judges” and “officials” are being blackmailed with video recordings of child rape and murder being used to compromise the “judges” and “officials”. Blackmailers along with their targets committing the offenses of producing a video depiction of an adult raping a child on video recordings which is legally considered child pornography and snuff films, blackmailing a federal judge or federal judges for the purposes of compromising the federal judiciary, and that creates a loss of jurisdiction by an excess of jurisdiction or NULL AND VOID of jurisdiction all together. As a matter of law, the Motion originally seeking for a Special Master should have been granted. The Appeals



Court failed and refused to hold that the District Court by its own prescribed Local Rules should have granted the original uncontested motions asking for a Special Master to review over the alleged blackmail video recordings. Petitioner fears that he is suffering under void nullity judgments possibly being ordered by blackmailed or compromised judges and is being held hostage to these judgments, which were conjured by unlawful criminal blackmail scheme, and the people behind this we do not even know on a public-scale, aka the John Does and Jane Does. If this alleged blackmail scheme cannot be investigated by anybody including the higher Federal Courts, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), U.S. Department of inJustice (DOJ), then this unresolved alleged blackmail scheme claimed by Attorney Lin Wood destroys any faith left in the federal judiciary, then the lower courts have become compromised, corrupted, and this causes the Judicial Machinery to be completely broken down into distrust and anarchy, destroyed the integrity of the Middle District of North Carolina and the Fourth Circuit of the Appeals Court, a very horrible crime against the Constitution.

Attorney Lin Wood didn't say whether the judges being blackmailed are only restricted to the jurisdiction of federal or state. However, Lin Wood's claims have indicated, by his own mouth or written words and not sourced by Petitioner here, that somebody within

the United States Supreme Court (“SCOTUS”) was being compromised and possibly blackmailed in the horrendous scheme of child rape and murder.

It is due to this fact that it is the duty of Petitioner as a citizen properly applied before this Court to also file alongside this Petition, a MOTION or APPLICATION directed to Chief Justice John Roberts to recuse himself from all proceedings in this Petition for Writ of Certiorari case, and all future Petitions ever filed before SCOTUS in the future, since Petitioner is pushing for investigation of this blackmail scheme originally alleged by Attorney L. Lin Wood. Since Chief Justice John Roberts is directly named as one of the possibly blackmailed federal jurists, this requires the upmost carefulness and delicate handling of this case. Lin Wood had named John Roberts, but did not name BRIAN HILL in any of the tweets but BRIAN HILL did ask for information on which specific individuals were being blackmailed, Brian Hill being the Petitioner in this case. But this must be referenced in the Petition as well to prevent a conflict of interest or a biased or prejudiced desire in a negative outcome to make an accusation go away despite the fact that it was alleged by a credible licensed attorney from Georgia by denying this Petition to make this go away. John Roberts must not be involved with this petition due to Lin Wood’s allegations last year and he must recuse himself, and the evidence of why he should

recuse himself will be attached to the separate APPLICATION or MOTION being filed with this Petition.

#### IV. Opinions Below

The decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals dismissing two consolidated cases of interlocutory appeals (JA 1-4) regarding the judgment of the District Court (JA 1-4) denying the Motion for Special Master and Motion for Reconsideration (JA 6-8, JA 21) is reported in an unpublished opinion as UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. BRIAN DAVID HILL, case No. 22-6501 and 22-6325 (April 27, 2021) by the panel of Judge Wynn, Judge Thacker, and Judge Heytens (JA 1-4). Mr. Hill filed a petition for rehearing dated Sept. 6, 2022. The U.S. Court of Appeals denied Mr. Hill's petition for rehearing or rehearing en banc on October 24, 2022 (JA 24-25).

Citation: That order was unpublished and stated that "PER CURIAM:

"Brian David Hill seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying his motions for appointment of a special master and appointment of counsel, his motion to reconsider, and his motion to extend time for the Government to respond to his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292; Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); *Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp.*, 337 U.S. 541, 545-46 (1949). The orders Hill seeks to appeal are neither final orders nor appealable interlocutory or collateral orders. Accordingly, we dismiss the appeals for lack of jurisdiction. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process."

And opinion denying the petition for rehearing said: “The court denies the petition for rehearing and rehearing en banc. No judge requested a poll under Fed. R. App. P. 35 on the petition for rehearing en banc. Entered at the direction of the panel: Judge Wynn, Judge Thacker, and Judge Heytens.”

## **V. Jurisdiction**

Mr. Hill’s petition for hearing to the U.S. Court of Appeals was denied on October 24, 2022 (JA 24-25). Mr. Hill invokes this Court's jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1), having timely filed this petition for a writ of certiorari within sixty days of the United States Court of Appeal's final judgment under 28 U.S.C. § 2101.

## **VI. Constitutional Provisions Involved**

United States Constitution, Amendment V:

“No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be put twice in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.”

## **VIII. Statement of the Case**

This case presents a very important questions of facts, credible witnesses, and the necessity of requiring a Special Master in any case before a Federal Judge including cases of 2255 motions and 2255 proceedings. When a criminal defendant and 2255 Petitioner

presents evidence from a credible and licensed attorney from the state of Georgia proclaiming in the Court of Public Opinion (online, archived Tweets) that there exists a blackmail scheme which may involve both federal jurists and state jurists, in a horrendous blackmail scheme involving child rape and murder.

If Attorney L. Lin Wood ever lied about or made false statements about the “child rape and murder” blackmail scheme, then last year he could have been held liable under Rule 7.1 of the Georgia Rules of Professional Conduct, where attorneys are prohibited from using false, deceptive, fraudulent or misleading information in any communication, including websites. That would include Twitter. Attorney Lin Wood cannot lie about anything.

This case presents very important questions of exceptional circumstances as to whether the Appeals Court of the United States should have dismissed two interlocutory appeals over a District Court wrongfully denying a request for a Special Master to deal with urgent issues or emergency issues of preventing a potential or possibly compromised judge or even a potential conflict of interest in an outcome from making a decision in a child pornography case of somebody who continuously claimed actual innocence, over and over again, and kept claiming innocence over the years. Petitioner filed petitions before this Court, time and time again claiming actual innocence

and fraud on the court in Supreme Court cases no. 19-8684, 20-7763, 21-6036, 21-6037, 21-6038.

This is not due process of law to ignore credible attorneys and his source or sources who he vetted before making these types of statements under Rule 7.1 of the Georgia Rules of Professional Conduct requiring that Lin Wood tell the truth or be disbarred or sanctioned. The Rules apply to everybody including Lin Wood, all lawyers are officers of the courts who practice before a Court.

Here are the facts for the Justices to consider:

1. The Uncontested, Undisputed Motions by Mr. Hill

On January 28, 2022, Brian Hill filed under Document #294 a "MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL MASTER FOR PROCEEDINGS AND FINDINGS OF FACT OF GROUND VII "...BLACKMAIL SCHEME INVOLVING CHILD RAPE AND MURDER..." Concerning "JUDGES" MOTION AND BRIEF/MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF MOTION by BRIAN DAVID HILL. (1:22CV74) (Butler, Carol) Modified on 1/28/2022 to reflect civil case number. (Butler, Carol) (Entered: 01/28/2022)". That motion was uncontested by the United States Attorney and was denied before potentially any responsive pleading was ever to be considered by the U.S. Attorney in response.

On January 28, 2022, Brian Hill filed under Document #295 a “MOTION FOR CHANGE OF VENUE/TRANSFER OF VENUE TO THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA MOTION AND BRIEF/MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF MOTION by BRIAN DAVID HILL. (1:22CV74) (Butler, Carol) Modified on 1/28/2022 to reflect civil case number.(Butler, Carol) (Entered: 01/28/2022)”. That motion was uncontested by the United States Attorney and was denied before potentially any responsive pleading was ever to be considered by the U.S. Attorney in response.

On January 28, 2022, Brian Hill filed under Dkt. #296 a “MOTION entitled " MOTION FOR APPOINTED COUNSEL TO ASSIST IN 2255 CASE MOTION AND BRIEF/MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF MOTION by BRIAN DAVID HILL. (1:22CV74)(Butler, Carol) Modified on 1/28/2022 to reflect civil case number.(Butler, Carol) (Entered: 01/28/2022)”. That motion was uncontested by the United States Attorney and was denied before potentially any responsive pleading was ever to be considered by the U.S. Attorney in response.

On February 2, 2022, Brian Hill filed under Dkt. #299 a “MEMORANDUM entitled "Additional Evidence Memorandum in Support of the (Doc. #291) Petitioner's Motion to Vacate, Set Aside, or Correct a Sentence by a Person in Federal Custody. Motion under 28

U.S.C. 2255 filed by Brian David Hill; in support of Document #294: "Motion for Appointment of Special Master for Proceedings and Findings of Fact of Ground VII"...Blackmail scheme involving child rape and murder..." Concerning "Judges" Motion and Brief/Memorandum of Law in support of motion by Brian David Hill; and in support of Document #296: Motion for Appointed Counsel to Assist in 2255 case motion" filed by BRIAN DAVID HILL re 291 Motion to Vacate/Set Aside/Correct Sentence. (Attachments: # 1 Envelope - Front and Back) (Garland, Leah) (Entered: 02/03/2022)".

On March 11, 2022, Brian Hill filed under Dkt. #301 a "MOTION To Reconsider the Order/Judgment Under Document #300 Denying Petitioner's Document #294: "Motion For Appointment of Special Master for Proceedings and Findings of Fact of Ground VII"; And Document #296: "Motion For Appointed Counsel to Assist in 2255 Case Motion and Brief/Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion by Brian David Hill." re 300 Order on Motion for Miscellaneous Relief, Order on Motion to Appoint Counsel, 296 MOTION to Appoint Attorney filed by BRIAN DAVID HILL by BRIAN DAVID HILL. Response to Motion due by 4/1/2022 (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit 1, # 2 Exhibit 2, # 3 Exhibit 3, # 4 Exhibit 4, # 5 Exhibit 5, # 6 Exhibit 6, # 7 Exhibit 7, # 8 Exhibit 8, # 9 Exhibit 9, # 10 Exhibit 10, # 11 Exhibit 11, # 12 Exhibit 12, # 13 Exhibit 13, # 14 Exhibit 14, # 15 Exhibit 15, # 16 Exhibit 16, # 17



Exhibit 17, # 18 Exhibit 18, # 19 Attachment, # 20 Envelope - Front and Back) (Bowers, Alexis) (Entered: 03/11/2022)". That motion was uncontested by the United States Attorney since the Clerk added: "Response to Motion due by 4/1/2022". Under Local Rule 7.3 of Middle District of North Carolina, paragraphs (f) and (k), that motion should have ordinarily been granted without further notice.

On April 13, 2022, Brian Hill filed under Dkt. #306 a "Document re 301 MOTION for Reconsideration re 300 Order on Motion for Miscellaneous Relief, Order on Motion to Appoint Counsel, 296 MOTION to Appoint Attorney filed by BRIAN DAVID HILL. (Attachments: # 1 Envelope - Front and Back). (Bowers, Alexis) (Entered: 04/13/2022)".

**2. The Order of the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina denying two motions which would have resolved the issues and fear of the probability that there may be videotapes or video recordings show that federal judges may or may not be blackmailed with child rape and murder.**

On March 2, 2022, The District Court filed a "ORDER signed by MAG/JUDGE JOE L. WEBSTER on 03/02/2022 that the United States Attorney is directed to file a Response to Petitioner's Motion (Docket Entry 291 ) within sixty (60) days from the date of the entry of this Order. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner's Motions (Docket Entries 294, 295,

296, and 297 ) seeking the appointment of a special master, a change of venue, an appointment of counsel, and special filing procedures are denied. (civil case 22cv74) (Bowers, Alexis) (Entered: 03/02/2022)", under Document #300.

On April 21, 2022, The District Court filed with no document number (docket-only text order entry) a "TEXT ORDER denying 301 Motion for Reconsideration. Petitioner has filed a motion (Docket Entry 301) requesting that the Court reconsider an Order directing the Government to file a response to Petitioner's motion brought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 and denying the appointment of a special master, a change of venue, the appointment of counsel, and the adoption of special filing procedures. Petitioner has failed to provide good cause or an adequate reason for the relief requested. The motion is therefore denied. Issued by MAG/JUDGE JOE L. WEBSTER on 4/21/2022. (Lee, Pedra)".

Petitioner had added evidence verifying the credibility of Attorney Lin Wood in his motion to reconsider in Document #301.

Citation from Document #301, pg. 3 and 4 said: "Petitioner requests vacatur or modification of the erroneous judgment / order entered on March 2, 2022, under Document #300 by the District Court. It is erroneous, an error of law or abuse of discretion, and needs to be corrected, modified, or vacated to reflect the facts and legal issues herein. The order is erroneous, an abuse of discretion, and is making erroneous remarks against a highly skilled and highly decorated attorney at law in the United States Judicial Districts of Georgia. Erroneous but Attorney Lin Wood may or may not consider as defamatory remarks such as by labeling Petitioner's entire blackmail scheme claims, evidence and witness or witnesses regarding the "blackmail" video as: "delusional" and "frivolous". Those labels applies not only to Petitioner but applies to Isaac Kappy and Attorney L. Lin Wood, they may disagree with the opinion in Document #300. The order does not specify what is delusional here and why Petitioner is considered "delusional" just for asking for legal

reviewing over the alleged blackmail videos. Petitioner had faxed this attorney last year (See Exhibit 3) asking about who is in the blackmail videos and this Attorney is not confirming or denying if Hon. Thomas David Schroeder and/or Hon. William Lindsey Osteen Junior are in any of the alleged encrypted blackmail videos. This Court and the Prosecutor (after being filed by the Clerk via CM/ECF) now will have the password as well to the encrypted blackmail videos, wherever they are, due to his family obtaining the password by research (See Exhibit 10, and Exhibit 6) under finding evidence from radiopatriot.net which that evidence was printed under Exhibit 6 and Exhibit 7. It verifies the claim is backed by credible solid evidence warranting the need for a Special Master or Appointment of Counsel for further investigation into the alleged blackmail videos.”

“Disclaimer: All of the Petitioner’s printouts and exhibits, as well as any links and videos or any other data of the online information were all given to him by family. The Petitioner did not use the internet in the creation and drafting of this pleading and it’s supporting exhibits. (Citation reformatted).”

Petitioner had even informed the District Court in a written notification letter that the U.S. Attorney did not file any objection or response to the “Doc. #301 MOTION To Reconsider the Order/Judgment Under Document #300 Denying Petitioner's Document #294: "Motion for Appointment of Special Master for Proceedings and Findings of Fact of Ground VII" ...”. Petitioner had stated in the LETTER TO U.S. DISTRICT COURT, directed to “ATTN: The Honorable Magistrate Joe L. Webster”, that “I hereby notify you that the Motion under Document #301, Motion to Reconsider; was uncontested by the Party: United States of America. Response to Motion due by 4/1/2022. It is now April 11, 2022, and I am sending you this letter notifying you that the contentions by Brian David Hill in Document #301 Motion to Reconsider are undisputed.”

Again, it directly cites Local Rule 7.3. Under the Local Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for the Middle District of North Carolina, cited in the LETTER TO THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT under Document #306:

Citation of Local Rule 7.3(k) MOTION PRACTICE said and I quote that: **“Failure to File and Serve Motion Papers. The failure to file a brief or response within the time specified in this rule shall constitute a waiver of the right thereafter to file such brief or response, except upon a showing of excusable neglect. A motion unaccompanied by a required brief may, in the discretion of the Court, be summarily denied. A response unaccompanied by a required brief may, in the discretion of the Court, be disregarded and the pending motion may be considered and decided as an uncontested motion. If a respondent fails to file a response within the time required by this rule, the motion will be considered and decided as an uncontested motion, and ordinarily will be granted without further notice.”** (Citation reformatted).

LR 7.3 MOTION PRACTICE (f) **“Response to Motion and Brief. The respondent, if opposing a motion, shall file a response, including brief, within 21 days after service of the motion (30 days if the motion is for summary judgment; see LR 56.1(d)) (14 days if the motion relates to discovery; see LR 26.2 and LR 37.1). If supporting documents are not then available, the respondent may move for an extension of time in accordance with section (g) of this rule. For good cause appearing therefor, a respondent may be required to file any response and supporting documents, including brief, within such shorter period of time as the Court may specify.**

Those motions were properly filed and properly presented before the District Court.

On March 2, 2022, an order had been filed under document #300 (JA 6-8).

Stating in part that:

CITATION: (#1) **“Petitioner also filed four other motions. The first Motion (Docket Entry 295) seeks the appointment of a special master because an attorney in Georgia stated that unidentified judges somewhere in this country are being blackmailed into raping and murdering children on video recordings and Petitioner fears that judges in this Court, including the ones handling his case, may be affected. The Motion will be denied because**

Petitioner's statement is delusional and frivolous and because Petitioner's request meets none of the requirements for the appointment of a special master. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 53(a)...", and (#2) "...Petitioner's next Motion (Docket Entry 296) seeks to have venue transferred to the Western District of Virginia because Petitioner was on supervised release residing in that district, any violations of the terms of supervised release occurred in that district, the violations involved breaches of Virginia law, and the Court later transferred jurisdiction of Petitioner's supervised release to that district. Although all of these facts are true, Petitioner's supervision was revoked by this Court and Petitioner seeks to challenge its Judgment (Docket Entry 200) revoking supervision. Venue for a § 2255 motion is proper in the court that issued the challenged judgment. 28 U.S.C. § 2255(A). Petitioner also seeks to have venue transferred based on his delusional blackmail theory which fails for the reasons already noted. No change of venue is appropriate and Petitioner's Motion will be denied..."

That sounded erroneous what the District Court had ruled, each denied motion had good reasons why venue needed to be transferred or as to why a Special Master is warranted. The Trial Court's error in law. Erred in facts, erred on record. Is Attorney Lin Wood delusional??? Why is the District Court afraid to have those video recordings/videotapes reviewed??? Why is it not considered warranted for appointment of Special Master or for a change of venue when blackmail videos may find those judges in those videos??? The accused judges will not just review over blackmail videos when it may or may not show themselves in those alleged videos. **It is a potential CONFLICT OF INTEREST to deny a request for a Special Master in this situation** because of the potential issues of the judge involved in the case potentially reviewing over the videos, may or may not see himself in any video if that is ever the case, and

will not admit to possibly being in any blackmail video recordings, even if it may or may not be true. That is the issue warranting a Special Master here.

On March 11, 2022, Mr. Hill had filed a timely “NOTICE OF APPEAL without payment of fees by BRIAN DAVID HILL re 300 Order. (Bowers, Alexis) (Entered: 03/11/2022).”

On April 25, 2022, Mr. Hill had filed a timely “NOTICE OF APPEAL without payment of fees by BRIAN DAVID HILL re Order on Motion for Reconsideration. (Bowers, Alexis) (Entered: 04/26/2022)”

On August 23, 2022, the U.S. Court of Appeals had affirmed the order/judgment of the Trial Court with its docket entry entitled “UNPUBLISHED PER CURIAM OPINION filed. Originating case number: 1:13-cr-00435-TDS-1, 1:22-cv-00074-TDS-JLW. Copies to all parties and the district court/agency. Mailed to: Brian David Hill. [1001216508] [22-6325, 22-6501] KH [Entered: 08/23/2022 09:07 AM]”. JA 1-3. Order entry entitled: “JUDGMENT ORDER filed. Decision: Dismissed. Originating case number: 1:13-cr-00435-TDS-1, 1:22-cv-00074-TDS-JLW. Entered on Docket Date: 08/23/2022. Copies to all parties and the district court/agency. Mailed to: Brian David Hill. [1001216525] [22-6325, 22-6501] KH [Entered: 08/23/2022 09:12 AM]”. JA 4-5.

On October 24, 2022, the U.S. Court of Appeals had denied the petition for rehearing with its docket entry entitled “COURT ORDER filed denying Motion for rehearing and rehearing en banc [11] Copies to all parties. Mailed

to: Brian David Hill. [1001252925] [22-6325, 22-6501] KH [Entered: 10/24/2022 09:50 AM]". See JA 24-25.

It is clear that when judges don't act right, when judges ignore evidence and ignore the law as well as ignore witnesses, it violates the Due Process of Law of the United States Constitution. It also violates the Canons of Professional Conduct or Canons of Judicial Conduct, and it unethical and unprofessional for judges to ignore evidence and witnesses without a good reason such as whether the evidence or witnesses is admissible or not. When judges just outright ignore and ignore the law, it brings a lot of suspicion of things like bribery, behind the scenes threats, blackmail, etc. etc. It is not delusional to start suspecting this with the history of these judges not following any law or rule or anything. Brian Hill had filed other petitions before this Court alleging that the judges are not following the law and are allowing fraud in the court, and they are allowing fraud on their records by refusing to sanction the fraud and refusing to correct the court records to reflect only the truth.

The behaviors of those federal judges are abnormal when they disregard the law, disregard the case law authorities as high as this U.S. Supreme Court. **It is logical to suspect blackmail.** Attorney Lin Wood fanned the flames of suspicion with his claims of this blackmail scheme made on Twitter that Brian's family gave him these screenshots and printouts, knowing that it is on the WayBack Machine and was on Twitter before being censored, forever

printed and screenshot photographed to be preserved in the Internet Archive's Wayback Machine and forever archived in the records of the U.S. District Court. See 1:13-cr-435-1 District Court Documents #290, #290-1, #293-5, #293-6, #293-7, #293-8, #293-9, #293-10, #293-11, #293-12, #293-13, #294, #295, #296, #299, #301, #301-1, #301-2, #301-3, #301-4, #301-5, #301-6, #301-7, #301-8, #301-9, #301-10, #301-11, #301-12, #301-13, #301-14, #301-15, #301-16, #301-17, and #301-18.

See the Petitions previously filed in U.S. Supreme Court cases as to why something is seriously wrong with the Middle District of North Carolina refusing justice for Brian David Hill across the board. See Supreme Court cases #19-8684, 20-7763, 21-6036, 21-6037, 21-6038, and no. 20-6864 with Attorney Edward Ryan Kennedy who was attorney for Petitioner.

It is not delusional but it is logical to suspect blackmail when judges no longer follow the law, allow a repeated pattern of lies, falsehoods, and fraud on their records of the Court and refuse to ever correct lies and fraud. Blackmail is a logical theory and could very well be proven with a Special Master simply ordering that Attorney Lin Wood either provide his source or sources or compel them to produce a copy of those alleged encrypted blackmail videos since the encrypted password was provided to the U.S. District Court in one of Petitioner's filings after Attorney Lin Wood disclosed the encryption password to some place called TLEEGRAM which was published on a blog somewhere for the general public on radiopatriot.net. See



<https://radiopatriot.net/2021/02/01/lin-wood-re-isaac-kappys-discovery-of-pedo-blackmail-tapes/> and archived on Document #301-6 and #301-7.

*II II II*

**IX. REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT**

- A. To protect the integrity, independence, ethics, and constitutionality of the decisions of judges within the District Court and Appeals Court, as well as protecting the Judicial Machinery from the possibility of blackmail of any kind whether or not it is only of the alleged child rape and murder as alleged by Attorney Lin Wood, or of any other kinds of blackmail being used to compromise Federal Judges. The decision by both the District Court and Court of Appeals is in conflict of law, conflict of well-established precedent in federal courts nationwide.

In a lot of different federal cases, it is wrong for a partial judge or even a proven biased judge or conflict of interest to be over a criminal case or even a civil case such as a Habeas Corpus case.

Brian clearly established in his motion to reconsider with evidence that he had faxed a letter to Attorney L. Lin Wood on January 20, 2021 (Document #301-3) entitled: "EMERGENCY LETTER TO ATTORNEY L. LIN WOOD ON TWEETS CONCERNING BLACKMAILED FEDERAL/STATE JUDGES AND POLITICIANS, INQUIRY THAT COULD SAVE MY LIFE FROM BEING TARGETED BY THE CIA/NSA DEEP STATE THUGS". Letter was asking about whether or not the federal judges of the U.S.

Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit were in any of the alleged blackmail videos. It said partially in that letter:

Citation of Document #301-3, pgs. 3, 5, 6 (JA 11-14):

“Dear L. Lin Wood, This is in reference to YOUR tweets. My family took screenshots and gave them to me to use as reference in this EMERGENCY LETTER. These are YOUR tweets. Here they are:”

“@LLinWood

The blackmail targets are approached with a gun, a child, & a camera. The target is ordered to rape the child on video. The target is then ordered to shoot the child on video. The target is then owned & controlled by the blackmailers until blackmail evidence loses its value.

2122 AM - Jan 4, 2021 - Twitter for iPhone

34.7K Retweets 4.4K Quote Tweets 75.3K Likes”

(Citation omitted, onto next reference from another page)

“@LLinWood

Many issues in our world may be tied to blackmail scheme I described tonight, including bizarre behavior of officials & judges in recent election.

@realDonaldTrump must appoint special prosecutor to thoroughly investigate. We need answers. We must investigate. For the children.

4:04 AM «Jan 4, 2021 - Twitter for iPhone

31.5K Retweets 1.4K Quote Tweets 95.5K Likes”

“I like to bring to your attention the following individuals who have been targeting me or have been getting the CIA/NSA to target me, and if they are compromised as you have been saying on Twitter, then I like to have an inquiry on possible blackmail targets who have been making my life a living hell and almost caused me to kill myself back in 2013. Receiving threatening CIA text messages, CIA greeting cards with terms such as “SNOW WHITE” an intelligence Supercomputer, receiving threatening emails in 2013. This involves pedophilia and they set me up with child porn and I suspect that the following individuals have been blackmailed with child rape and murder, and that would give them access to those materials used to try to set me up back in July, 2012.”

**INDIVIDUALS SUSPECTED OF BEING  
BLACKMAILED WITH CHILD RAPE AND MURDER:**

- \* Philip Edward Berger Senior, NC State Senator and President Pro Tempore
- \* Philip Edward Berger Junior, former Rockingham County District Attorney
- \* Federal Judge William Lindsey Osteen Junior, Middle Dist. North Carolina
- \* Federal Judge Thomas David Schroeder, Middle Dist. North Carolina
- \* SBI Agent Rodney V. White
- \* NC Reidsville Detective Robert Bridge
- \* Any or All listed Federal Appellate Court Judges of the Fourth Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals in Richmond, Virginia.
- \* Charles J, Caruso, Mayodan Police Chief
- \* Christopher Todd Brim, Detective Sergeant, Mayodan Police
- \* Attorney Mark Jones, Bell Davis and Pitt law firm”

“I have photographs of criminal case discovery materials that prove alleged child porn was downloading from July 20, 2012, to July 28, 2013. My computer was seized on August 28, 2012. So for 11 months it was downloading to my computer when I didn't even have my computer while it was supposedly in secure law enforcement custody. I have been set up here and I have evidence of it, but the CORRUPT JUDGE Thomas David Schroeder ignores it all. He is probably being blackmailed too like John Roberts.”

“Look sir, I am willing to be executed, murdered, to prove my actual innocence. I am willing to risk my life and my families lives to clear my name. I need to give these individuals names to you and if they are in any of the child rape blackmail schemes evidence that you were tweeting about, then they are the SUSPECTED #1 culprits who SET ME UP WITH CHILD PORN. President Trump would not pardon me even though Roger Stone agreed to get this information to President Trump. He told me through text message today that he was unable to have me on Trump's final pardon list. So now my only option is to prove that any of these individuals were pedophiles blackmailed child rapists being videotaped by the blackmailers of the Deep State Swamp. Compromised.”

(Citation omitted, onto next reference from another section)

“I can use this information to prove my Actual Innocence if Pedophiles or Child Rapers were in charge of investigating me in 2012.”

Then it breaks down confidence in the Judicial System. It breaks down any credibility the Court has had prior to such defrauding by the

usage of blackmail for the other party to succeed all of the time in Court. It makes the legal process as worthless as the paper it is printed on. Nobody can believe whatever is said in Court documents because of such fraud and deceit not being sanctioned, because of the blackmail, and it is not being tackled with reasonability. Then common sense no longer exists in the judicial process, evidence by the federal prosecutor is worthless because evidence is not to be believed when filed in a Court. The Courts fall apart and can no longer function properly if at all, when there is no justice, there is no peace. It invites anarchy; it invites disrespect for the law as well as disrespect for the judges, its enforcers, and other judicial officers of the Courts. It invites the potential for the law of war, where justice cannot be obtained by usage of peaceful means and neither of reasonable arguments. Thus, degrades society slowly into the law of war, into feudalism, the end of diplomacy. After such degradation with pedophiles running high positions of the United States Government including courts, then it may bring by the angry citizens the Revolutions and Civil Wars created and painted under the banner of bringing back vigilance and justice when justice had died. Militias having to defend themselves to the death in order to retain what is left of the Second Amendment, Freedom of speech becomes a myth and Freedom of Press becomes scarce. Activism becomes illegal. Dissent is punished. That is why Courts have to have integrity, to be

honest, and to ensure the proper authority and enforcement measures are taken place to prevent such degradation of the lawful peaceful judicial process. It is part of diplomacy. It degrades the lawful administration of justice when deceit, false evidence, blackmail, and perjury is permitted by an officer of the Court. It taints the record and makes none of its records believable; it all becomes worthless as having no merit or actual cause. No merit or cause to be honest.

Despite the facts then presented, the U.S. Court of Appeals did not exercise its rightful authority to order and remand that a Special Master must be appointed NOW, by granting the uncontested motion for a Special Master and uncontested Motion for Reconsidering the Order denying the Motion for a Special Master as prescribed by its Local Rule 7.3, paragraphs (f) and (k).

- B. To keep in uniformity with the Circuits, to conform with federal law, and to prevent a new conflict of law which would disturb the uniformity of other circuits which all make rulings on requirement of impartiality of federal judges in a case.

This Court has the ability to use its authority to grant the Petition for Writ of Certiorari, then order and remand to keep the uniformity of appellate courts with the multiple authoritative case law decisions, which prevents opening up a conflict of laws, and prevent opening up a conflict with the different circuits. Here are the case laws

from different circuits with that same uniformity, but the decision of both the District Court and Court of Appeals in this appealed case before this Court creates a conflict of laws and opens up a conflict with the other circuits creating a division of the uniformity of laws. This must act to keep the uniformity.

CITATION: Scott v. U.S., 559 A.2d 745, 752-53 (D.C. 1989) ("Id. \_\_\_ U.S. \_\_\_, 108 S.Ct. at 2203, 100 L.Ed.2d at 873-74 (footnote omitted). However, the Court viewed the traditional harmless error prejudice test inappropriate where the appearance of impropriety taints the entire proceeding and inadequate to accomplish what the Court has repeatedly affirmed is vital to that criminal justice system. Id. \_\_\_ U.S. \_\_\_, 108 S.Ct. at 2203, 100 L.Ed.2d at 874-75; see Vuitton, supra, 107 S.Ct. at 2138-40 ("narrow focus of harmless error analysis is not . . . sensitive to this underlying concern [that "an appearance of impropriety diminishes faith in the fairness of the criminal justice system in general"]); Aetna Life Ins. Co. v. Lavoie, 475 U.S. 813, 823, 106 S.Ct. 1580, 1586, 89 L.Ed.2d 823 (1986) (concern about appearances has constitutional dimensions involving due process); see also In re Murchison, 349 U.S. 133, 136, 75 S.Ct. 623, 625, 99 L.Ed. 942 (1955); Offutt v. United States, 348 U.S. 11, 14, 75 S.Ct. 11, 13, 99 L.E. 11 (1954); Tumey v. Ohio, 273 U.S. 510, 532, 47 S.Ct. 437, 444, 71 L.Ed. 749 (1927). It therefore concluded that in determining whether a judgment should be vacated for a violation of § 455, it is appropriate to consider the risk of injustice to the parties in the particular case, the risk that the denial of relief will produce injustice in other cases, and the risk of undermining the public's confidence in the judicial process. We must continuously bear in mind that "to perform its high function in the best way 'justice must satisfy the appearance of justice.' """)

Scott v. U.S., 559 A.2d 745, 753 n.16 (D.C. 1989) (“The Court recalled its recent decision in Aetna Life Ins. Co. v. Lavoie, supra, 475 U.S. 813, 106 S.Ct. 1580, 89 L.Ed.2d 823 holding that there was a violation of due process where, without a finding of actual influence, it was sufficient that sitting on the case " 'would offer a possible temptation to the average . . . judge to . . . lead him not to hold the balance nice, clear and true.' " Id. at 825, 106 S.Ct. at 1587 (quoting Ward v. Village of Monroeville, 409 U.S. 57, 60, 93 S.Ct. 80, 83, 34 L.Ed.2d 267 (1972), in turn quoting Tumey, supra, 273 U.S. at 532, 47 S.Ct. at 444). The Court noted that even "[a] finding by another judge — faced with the difficult task of passing upon the integrity of a fellow member of the bench — that his or her colleague merely possessed constructive knowledge, and not actual knowledge, is unlikely to significantly quell the concerns of the skeptic." Id. \_\_\_ U.S. at \_\_\_, n. 12, 108 S.Ct. at 2205, n. 12, 100 L.Ed.2d at 875 . 12.”)

Child rape and murder is a very dangerous accusation to bring forth in a 2255 criminal and civil Habeas Corpus case matter. If it had come from only Brian D. Hill, then maybe it is only just a mere delusional fear. However, when he brings written or typed statements from an attorney from Georgia who has practiced law before the U.S. Supreme Court with evidence that Petitioner had written this attorney asking for who was blackmailed and gave him a list of suspected individuals. Where Attorney Lin Wood was before the U.S. Court of Appeals over districts in Georgia, and was licensed to practice in the U.S. District Courts in Georgia, well then it creates a whole new situation where even with being given a judge’s labeling of “delusional”, Petitioner may just be right when he voluntarily asks an attorney to

review over evidence or have a Special Master to review over an attorney's proclaimed allegation of evidence of a blackmail scheme possibly with many video recordings. Video recordings of judges and officials raping children and murdering children on video camera recordings, and being blackmailed by various corrupt elements of the United States of America. This was alleged by a licensed attorney, was not disbarred after his statements made on January 3 and 4, 2021, with over 30,000 ReTweets according to the screenshots in the docket court filings.

CITATION: *Liteky v. United States*, 510 U.S. 540 (1994) ("28 U.S.C. §455(a) requires recusal of a judge in any proceeding in which his impartiality may be questioned. The Supreme Court holds that matters arising out of the course of judicial proceedings – either in this case, or in a prior case – are not a proper basis for recusal.")

CITATION: *Hurles v. Ryan*, 752 F.3d 768 (9th Cir. 2011) ("As a matter of due process, a judge who fails the "appearance of impartiality" test may not sit as the judge in the case. In this case, when a pretrial ruling concerning the appointment of additional counsel was appealed, the judge appeared as a nominal party in the appellate court but actually filed a pleading, urging that the ruling was proper and that the simplicity of the case (implying that the evidence of guilt was overwhelming) justified the decision to deny the appointment of two lawyers in this death penalty case. That pleading also questioned the ability of the lawyer who was representing the defendant. The Ninth Circuit held that the state trial judge's participation in the appeal may have rendered her too biased to participate in the death penalty proceedings that ensued in the trial court. A remand for a full evidentiary hearing on the state judge's impartiality was required.")



CITATION: United States v. Paul, 561 F.3d 970 (9th Cir. 2009) ("The Ninth Circuit previously reversed the defendant's 16 month sentence, holding that it was unreasonably harsh. On remand, the district court judge imposed a 15 month sentence. The Ninth Circuit reversed again and ordered a change of judges on remand."). In re Nettles, 394 F.3d 1001 (7th Cir. 2005) ("Where the defendant is charged with targeting a federal courthouse for bombing, every judge (district court and court of appeals) should recuse himself from any participation in the case.")

CITATION: United States v. Andrews, 390 F.3d 840 (5th Cir. 2004) ("The district court departed upward on the Guidelines, expressing dissatisfaction with the sentence that was dictated by the Guidelines. The Fifth Circuit reversed and held that a remand to a different judge was appropriate in this case.")

The case laws in the different United States federal appeal circuits make it clear.

Once you make an accusation against the specific federal judges by name and produce a photocopy of a faxed letter to a credible licensed attorney, still licensed, held to the truth telling standard under Rule 7.1 of the Georgia Bar Rules of Professional Conduct, asking about his claims that allegedly "judges" and "officials" were involved in a blackmail scheme of child rape and murder being videotaped compromising the independence of politicians and judges. Even naming "Chief Justice John Roberts" a federal jurist as one of the "judges" and "officials", then either Lin Wood needs to be disbarred and sued for defamation himself for mentioning John Roberts without any proof, OR

LIN WOOD HAS THE PROOF OR HAD ACCESS TO THE SOURCE OR SOURCES WHO HAS THE PROOF. Proof which could turn the entire federal judiciary on its head. The investigation must find who is blackmailed and must name names of who is blackmailed in the federal judiciary, it must be done or the United States of America is gone forever, it's finished, it's Constitution will become worthless in matters of law as former President George W. Bush had dubbed it as a "goddamned piece of paper" (I apologize to God and Jesus for using those words, but I am quoting what George W. Bush called the U.S. Constitution). The only way the Constitution does not fall into the corruption of blackmailed politicians and judges is abundantly clear. We must hold blackmailed judges accountable, to recuse them or remove them from office.

**It is an EMERGENCY SITUATION.** There needs to be a Special Master because that Special Master would not be tied to any potential blackmail of child rape and murder, and can ensure a fair and impartial review process and discovery process to investigate and look through every blackmail video of child rape and murder. Then make a determination if any of the federal judges involved in this appealed 2255 case are in any of the video recordings. If they are, then the Special Master can recommend criminal referrals and can order the recusal of those federal judges by compelling them to do so under 28 U.S. Code §

455 and have them criminally investigated for being blackmailed with such heinous acts requiring impeachment by U.S. Congress. No judge should ever rape a child, it is immoral, unethical, it is criminal, and negatively impacts the performance of their duties and destroys credibility of the judiciary. It destroys impartiality of the judiciary. This must be nipped in the bud; this blackmail scheme must be taken down by any law enforcement or this Court should Order Remand to rule that the District Court should require a Special Master in this situation to help restore the impartiality and fairness by sorting out which federal judges in the Middle District of North Carolina are in the alleged blackmail video recordings. Truth can only come out by investigation.

Also, if it is proven that a judge was blackmailed with a child sex crime, then can a judge like that be the assigned judge over a child pornography case and not be partial, not be prejudiced, and not be biased??? Does that not require removal of this judge pursuant to 28 U.S. Code § 455 to protect the Constitutional rights of both the defendant and government prosecutor??? Either way does this blackmail not constitute that a person or group of people not a party to a criminal and civil case have the ability to influence the judge to act against the best interest of law, facts, evidence, witnesses, and justice???

X. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Petitioner Mr. Hill respectfully requests that this Court issue a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the U.S. Court of Appeals wrongfully dismissing two interlocutory appeals of the U.S. District Court orders/judgments denying the uncontested Motion for Special Master and uncontested Motion to Reconsider the order/judgment denying the uncontested Motion for Special Master. Petitioner requests that this Supreme Court enter an Order and Remand for further proceedings, and require that the U.S. Court of Appeals reopen the consolidated appeals and instruct the U.S. Court of Appeals to Order and Remand that a Special Master is warranted and appointment of counsel is warranted to review over alleged blackmail videos of child rape and murder for the best interests of justice for the public.

II

DATED this 7th day of November, 2022.

Respectfully submitted,

*Brian D. Hill*  
*Signed*

Brian D. Hill

---

Brian David Hill



Pro Se Petitioner

Ally of QANON and Atty Lin Wood

Former USWGO Alternative News Reporter

310 FOREST STREET, APARTMENT 2

MARTINSVILLE, VIRGINIA 24112

Tel.: (276) 790-3505

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

E-Mail: c/o Roberta Hill rbhill67@comcast.net

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