

No. 22-380

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

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

PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR REHEARING

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

Counsel for Respondents
Elizabeth B. Prelogar
Solicitor General
US Dept. Of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001
202-514-2217



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
POINTS, AUTHORITIES AND ARGUMENTS	1
Supportive Rule for Rehearing	1
ARGUMENT	1
Why should this Honorable Court Grant Rehearing?.....	1
The Oath of Office	1
1. How Important is the Oath of Office?.....	1
2. You must investigate to identify the enemy.....	2
3. Allegations of war should be investigated.	3
4. To petition for redress of grievances.....	4
5. Broad powers of the Supreme Court.....	4
6. Can a US Congressional Session become an administrative act under fraud?	5
7. The doctrine of equitable maxim.	5
CONCLUSION	6
CERTIFICATE OF GOOD FAITH – RULE 44	7

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS	
Amendment XII	2
Article VI clause 3.....	1
 CASES	
18 U.S § 2381	2, 3
US v Burr (1807) 4 Cranch (8 US) 4669, 2 L.Ed. 684	3
 RULES	
S. Ct. R. 17	4
S. Ct. R. 44	7
S. Ct. R. 44.2	1

POINTS, AUTHORITIES AND ARGUMENTS

Supportive Rule for Rehearing

Rehearing of the denial of certiorari is appropriate in situations involving “intervening circumstances of substantial or controlling effect or . . . other substantial grounds not previously presented.” S. Ct. R. 44.2. Because this is such a case, Petitioner moves this Honorable Court to grant this petition for rehearing.



ARGUMENT

Why should this Honorable Court Grant Rehearing?

This honorable Court is needed to resolve serious conflicts that are plaguing American.

This case represents a very powerful domestic covert operation that is so benign that it cannot be seen on how it has breached our national security, and how it is affecting the national security of both Canada and Mexico, and how it has circulated fears that we might soon see the destruction of property along with a large volume of bloodshed in our own streets. All stemming from the fact that our courts have not declared that the Oath of Office is binding with penalties.

The Oath of Office

1. How Important is the Oath of Office?

The U.S. Constitution under Article VI clause 3 states that the Oath “. . . shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation. . .”. If

there is no penalty for violating the Oath then it is not binding.

How can Congress take an oath to uphold the Constitution, then pass laws that allow Congress to be immune from suit for intentionally violating the Constitution up to and including treason?

Currently because of this, members of Congress, with their power to assemble and with their voting powers, can completely redo the Supreme Court of the United States to their likings, like packing the Court.

“I want to tell you Gorsuch, I want to tell you Kavanaugh - you have released the whirlwind, and you will pay the price. You won't know what hit you if you go forward with these awful decisions,” Schumer told a cheering crowd in March 2020. (This statement can be easily found on the internet.)

18 U.S § 2381 states that whoever owing such allegiance violates this allegiance shall be incapable of holding office. What we see is that whoever violates this allegiance can still hold office even though they are incapable of holding this office, isn't this a serious conflict?

2. You must investigate to identify the enemy.

When members of U.S. Congress make a request to the body of Congress to investigate an enemy to the Constitution that is hiding under Amendment XII and under the guise of an 'honest election', then wouldn't it be the duty under their Oath to investigate these claims? How can you know if an enemy exists if you don't investigate?

3. Allegations of war should be investigated.

Allegations that claim the election is rigged should be investigated. If one of the purposes of war is to put into power its victor, and since a rigged election accomplishes the same thing, which is to put into power its victor, then isn't a rigged election an act of war? This Honorable Court has already ruled that one need not pick up arms in order to "levy war" in *US v Burr* (1807) 4 Cranch (8 US) 4669, 2 L.Ed. 684.

The Oath of Office requires that aid and comfort cannot be given to those levying war through a rigged election.

A Presidential rigged election is a threat to the Constitution, therefore, when members of Congress become aware of such allegations an investigation into these allegations is required or they become violators of their Oath of Office.

If a person who takes the Oath of Office owes allegiance to the United States, and if under 18 U.S § 2381 it states that whoever owing such allegiance violates this allegiance shall be incapable of holding office, then wouldn't it be fitting that they shall be removed from office as well?

Obviously the allegiance to the United States requires the necessary steps to defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic. Isn't it proper and fitting that any interpretation of the Constitution that is used to give aid and comfort to such an enemy is nullified?

During the 117 session of Congress a request was made to investigate the allegations that the 2020 Presidential election was rigged, how can Congress use Amendment XII as an excuse to vote against investigating these allegations?

4. To petition for redress of grievances.

The complaint of this case seeks redress of grievances against the Respondents. Nowhere is it written that Brunson cannot do this under the First Amendment and bring his action either in State or Federal courts. The right to seek redress of grievances is protected.

5. Broad powers of the Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court holds all the same powers of lower courts and is the Supreme Court in the land. Pursuant to S. Ct. R. 17 this Court has original jurisdiction, therefore, under the unique circumstances of this case can't this Honorable Court fully adjudicate this case?

When a case like this one comes forward under a petition for writ of certiorari claiming that there exists a serious national security breach, and that this breach is an act of war, and that it requires an act on an emergency level to repair this breach immediately—to stop this war, and that those perpetrators of this breach are the respondents, doesn't this Court have the power to adjudicate these serious claims and to immediately end the conflict and fix the national security breach?

“We the People” have declared that the Constitution was established to secure the “Blessings of Liberty” and have joined with Brunson on a large scale with their souls and prayers that this Court will grant this petition. Google “Raland Brunson” or “Brunson case” and see how much this case brings hope across the globe. Facebook, YouTube, Twitter and other social giant platforms worked vigorously to keep this case from becoming popular.

6. Can a US Congressional Session become an administrative act under fraud?

On page App. 58 of Brunson's writ under the heading "SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION" and with the support of the proper legalese, Brunson points out with the proper legalese that fraud vitiates everything it touches, and that the purpose of the 117 Session of Congress was to count the votes under the 12th Amendment, but because they refused to investigate the allegations that the election was rigged, which is an act of fraud (?), and being that 12th Amendment cannot protect fraud, therefore, didn't the said session of Congress turn into an administrative function making them all liable for suit without the protection of any kind of judicial, jurisdictional or any kind of immunity?

7. The doctrine of equitable maxim.

The doctrine of equitable maxim kills the doctrine of the object principle of justice. Under case No. 18-1147 it states that equitable maxim seriously conflicts with the object principle of justice and provides all the legalese in support of this statement. Both doctrines influenced and or created by this Honorable Court.

Should this Court decide to overturn equitable maxim in favor of the object principle of justice, obviously it would do this because it believes in so doing our courts would no longer be so precarious, trial cases would be much easier with less stress to judge, settlements would grow much higher, less lawsuits would be filed, appeals would be greatly reduced, and our court system would be the most just and highly respected and dearly admired court system more than ever before.

◆

CONCLUSION

Due to the serious nature of this case; a breach of national security arising from an act of war as described above, Petitioner moves this Honorable Court, without delay, to single handily exercise its powers to correct this breach and bring peace and hope back to this land by granting this petition in its fullest request.

Dated: January 18, 2023.

Respectfully submitted,



Raland J Brunson, Petitioner in pro se

Raland J Brunson
4287 South Harrison Blvd., #132
Ogden, Utah 84403
Phone: 385-492-4898

CERTIFICATE OF GOOD FAITH – RULE 44

Pursuant to S. Ct. R. 44, petitioner, to the best of his ability, hereby certifies that that is petition for rehearing complies with the restrictions of this rule and is presented in good faith and not for delay.

Dated January 18, 2023

Respectfully submitted,



Roland J Brunson

Roland J Brunson, Petitioner in pro se