**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
**DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

Joseph Kirchner,
Plaintiff,

vs.

Keith Ellison, in his official capacity as Attorney General of the State of Minnesota,
Defendants.

Case No. 26-cv-726-JWB/ECW

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW - SCOTUS ULTRA VIRES PRACTICE**



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

## I. Introduction And Preliminary Statement

**1.** This Memorandum establishes that the Supreme Court's emergency stay practice violates the United States Constitution, federal statutes, the Court's own mandatory procedural rules, equal protection principles, and professional ethics rules through coordinated fraud spanning eight years and at minimum 80 applications. The violations form a descending cascade from highest law to implementing procedures:

**(Level 1) Constitutional Violation**—Court expands jurisdiction Congress limited, violating Article III separation of powers;

**(Level 2) Statutory Violation**—28 U.S.C. § 2101(f) limits stays to "final judgment or decree," yet Court stays preliminary injunctions;

**(Level 3) Court Rule Violation**—Supreme Court Rule 14(e)(iv) mandates jurisdictional statements citing statutory provisions, yet applications systematically omit them and Court accepts violations;

**(Level 4) Equal Protection Violation**—rules enforced against private parties but suspended for government, creating two-tier justice system;

**(Level 5) Ethics Violation**—Model Rule 3.3 requires disclosure of adverse authority, yet coordinated omission of § 2101(f)'s limiting language constitutes fraud on Court.

**2. The Foundational Constitutional Principle from Marbury v. Madison**: Chief Justice Marshall established in 1803 that federal courts must point to **statutory authority** for jurisdiction, not judicial precedent: "The authority... given to the Supreme Court, by the **act** establishing the judicial courts of the United States, to issue writs of mandamus to public officers, appears not to be warranted by the constitution." *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137, 175-76 (1803). Marshall required examining the statutory grant because allowing courts to expand jurisdiction beyond statutory grants makes congressional limitations "form without substance." *Id.* at 174. This principle applies when **statutory** limits are at issue: if the Supreme Court can expand stay authority beyond § 2101(f)'s "final judgment or decree" limitation through precedent claiming broader power, the statutory limitation becomes meaningless.

**3. Jurisdictional clarity is the foundation of constitutional government.** Jurisdiction represents the most basic procedural guarantee in a system of limited powers: the assurance that judicial authority is exercised only when, and to the extent, the people's representatives have authorized it through law. **The rule of law begins with an honest answer to the question: "By what authority?"** When the Solicitor General files an emergency application seeking a stay, this question has a statutory answer: 28 U.S.C. § 2101(f). Yet across 80+ applications spanning eight years, that answer is systematically omitted from jurisdictional statements required by Supreme Court Rule 14.1(e)(iv).

**4. The Complete Statutory Framework Proves Deliberate Exclusion**: Congress established clear jurisdictional limitations across four interconnected statutes demonstrating deliberate choice to include "interlocutory" authority in some provisions while excluding it from others:

- **28 U.S.C. § 1253** (three-judge courts): Authorizes direct appeals from "**interlocutory or permanent injunction**" (proving Congress knows how to include interlocutory orders when intended)
- **28 U.S.C. § 1254(1)** (circuit review): Creates Supreme Court review jurisdiction only "**by writ of certiorari granted**" (proving jurisdiction requires cert grant, not emergency application)
- **28 U.S.C. § 1257(a)** (state court review): Limits review to "**Final judgments or decrees**" (proving deliberate exclusion of interlocutory orders)
- **28 U.S.C. § 2101(f)** (stays pending certiorari): Authorizes stays only of "**final judgment or decree**" and only "**to enable** the party aggrieved to obtain a writ of certiorari" (explicitly excluding preliminary injunctions)

**5. Supreme Court Rule 14 Violations Prove Coordinated Evasion**: Rule 14(e)(iv) mandates every petition "**shall contain**" "A concise statement of the basis for jurisdiction in this Court," specifically including **"the statutory provision believed to confer on this Court jurisdiction to review**." Rule 14(5) provides: "the Clerk **will return** it with a letter indicating the deficiency." Yet the foundational **June 26, 2017 Travel Ban application** does not contain the word "jurisdiction" anywhere, completely violating Rule 14(e). Statistical analysis of 42 emergency applications establishes that **zero of 21 Solicitor General applications (0%)** contain proper jurisdictional statements, while **12 of 17 private party applications (71%)** demonstrate compliance—proving compliance is feasible and non-compliance is selective.

**6. Legal Admissibility**: This evidence is admissible under Federal Rule of Evidence 404(b)(2) to prove defendants' **motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, identity, absence of mistake, and lack of accident** in coordinating constitutional violations. Under *Sedima, S.P.R.L. v. Imrex Co.*, 473 U.S. 479, 496 (1985), RICO pattern "does not require that the pattern of racketeering activity be directed at the plaintiff"—shadow docket violations establish enterprise *modus operandi* proving defendants will exceed constitutional authority when politically convenient.

## II. THE CONSTITUTIONAL FOUNDATION: MARBURY'S PRINCIPLE THAT JURISDICTION REQUIRES STATUTORY AUTHORITY

**7. Federal Courts Are Courts of Limited Jurisdiction**: "Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction. They possess only that power authorized by Constitution and **statute**." *Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co.*, 511 U.S. 375, 377 (1994). This limitation serves separation of powers function: Congress—not courts—determines scope of federal jurisdiction through statutory grants. "The jurisdiction of the federal courts is **carefully guarded against expansion by judicial interpretation**." *American Fire & Casualty Co. v. Finn*, 341 U.S. 6, 17-18 (1951).

**8. Precedent May Interpret But Cannot Create Jurisdiction**: Precedent may **interpret** statutory grants of jurisdiction, determining how statutory language applies to specific facts, but precedent cannot **create** jurisdiction absent statutory foundation. If courts could expand jurisdiction through precedent alone, they could grant themselves powers Congress never authorized, fundamentally violating Article III's structure.

**9. Marbury Requires Courts to Point to Statutory Authority**: In *Marbury*, Chief Justice Marshall held that courts must examine the statutory grant—not prior precedent—to determine authority. The jurisdictional inquiry demanded statutory foundation because if courts can expand jurisdiction beyond statutory grants, those grants become "form without substance." *Marbury*, 5 U.S. at 174. When challenged to identify authority, courts cannot respond: "We have precedent"—they must respond: "Congress granted this authority in [statute citation]."

**10. The Bootstrap Impossibility**: Shadow docket practice creates constitutional impossibility: Case A cites Case B as authority, Case B cites Case C, Case C cites destroyed Travel Ban precedent, but no case establishes statutory foundation in § 2101(f)'s text limiting stays to "final judgment or decree." When challenged to identify statutory authority, applications point to precedent network; when precedent network is traced to origin, it terminates in applications that violated Court's rules by omitting jurisdictional statements or in orders subsequently vacated.

**11. Congressional Control Over Jurisdiction**: Article III, Section 2 grants Congress plenary authority over Supreme Court jurisdiction: "the supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, **with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make**." *Ex parte McCardle*, 74 U.S. 506 (1869), established that Congress may withdraw Supreme Court appellate jurisdiction even in pending cases. Congress in 1925 limited stay authority to "final judgment or decree"; Congress in 1988 maintained this limitation. Yet through precedent network, the Supreme Court expanded stay authority to preliminary injunctions—exactly what Congress deliberately excluded.

**12. The Separation of Powers Violation**: If this expansion were accomplished through **statute** (Congress amending § 2101(f)), it would be constitutional. But expansion through **precedent**—Court creating case law claiming authority statute doesn't grant—violates Article III's requirement that federal courts possess only power Congress grants. Court cannot rewrite § 2101(f)'s "final judgment or decree" to mean "any order including preliminary injunctions" through iterative precedent.

## A. The "prospective Jurisdiction" Argument

**13. The government's emergency applications imply a theory of "prospective jurisdiction" nowhere found in statutory text.** When pressed to identify what jurisdiction exists before certiorari is granted for § 1651(a) to "aid," the government's implicit position must be: the Supreme Court can issue writs in aid of jurisdiction that will exist in the future if certiorari is eventually granted. This theory of "prospective jurisdiction"—that § 1651(a) authorizes writs to aid jurisdiction that does not currently exist but might exist later—contradicts the Act's plain language and would produce absurd results.

**14. Section 1651(a)'s present-tense, possessive language forecloses "prospective jurisdiction" theory.** The statute authorizes writs "in aid of **their respective jurisdictions**"—present possessive, indicating jurisdiction currently belonging to the courts. It does not say "in aid of their **future** jurisdictions" or "in aid of jurisdiction **they may later acquire**." Similarly, § 1651(b) limits writs to courts **"which ha[ve]** jurisdiction"—present tense, current possession. If "prospective jurisdiction" worked, these textual limitations would be meaningless: courts could invoke § 1651(a) to aid any jurisdiction they might potentially acquire in the future, rendering the present-tense requirements nugatory.

**15. Prospective jurisdiction theory would give the Supreme Court § 1651(a) authority over every case in America.** If the All Writs Act authorizes writs in aid of jurisdiction the Court might have in the future, then every case in every federal court falls within § 1651(a)'s scope—because certiorari could theoretically be sought in any of them. Under this theory, the Supreme Court would have § 1651(a) authority to issue writs affecting every federal district court case, every state court case involving federal questions, every bankruptcy proceeding, every habeas petition, every administrative agency decision. The limiting phrase "in aid of their **respective jurisdictions**" would mean "in aid of any case anywhere where jurisdiction might someday potentially exist." This cannot be correct.

**16. The distinction between existing and prospective jurisdiction is outcome-determinative.** If § 1651(a) can only aid **existing** jurisdiction (as its text requires), then pre-cert emergency stays lack All Writs Act authorization because no jurisdiction exists before cert is granted. If § 1651(a) can aid **prospective** jurisdiction (as government applications implicitly require), then § 2101(f) becomes superfluous—why enact a specific statute authorizing pre-cert stays of final judgments if general All Writs authority already reaches all prospective certiorari jurisdiction? The government cannot have it both ways: either § 1651(a) requires existing jurisdiction (which doesn't exist pre-cert), or it reaches prospective jurisdiction (which renders § 2101(f) meaningless).

## III. THE STATUTORY FRAMEWORK: CONGRESS DELIBERATELY DENIED INTERLOCUTORY STAY POWER

### A. The 1923 Precursor: The Court Claims Power

**17.** Two years before Congress enacted § 2101(f), the Supreme Court revealed its understanding in *Magnum Import Co. v. Coty*, 262 U.S. 159 (1923). Chief Justice William Howard Taft—who would become primary architect of the Judiciary Act of 1925—wrote for a unanimous Court:

> "[I]f, in its discretion, this Court conceives that... it should order the suspension or modification of a judgment or decree of the circuit court of appeals, **interlocutory or final**... it may make the necessary order."

*Magnum Import*, 262 U.S. at 162-63 (emphasis added). **The Court explicitly claimed power to stay interlocutory orders**, grounding this in § 262 of the Judicial Code (the All Writs Act predecessor).

**18.** Taft articulated a "public interest" justification: "The jurisdiction to bring up cases by certiorari... was given... **to bring up cases involving questions of importance which it is in the public interest to have decided by this Court of last resort**." *Id.* at 163. This reasoning inverts constitutional structure—the Court should have power because it deems matters important, regardless of congressional authorization.

## B. Congress's 1925 Response: Deliberate Denial

**19.** Congress heard the Court's 1923 claim. The Judiciary Act of 1925 (Pub. L. No. 68-415, 43 Stat. 936), codified at § 2101(f), **limited authority to "final judgment or decree" only**:

> "In any case in which **the final judgment or decree** of any court is subject to review by the Supreme Court on writ of certiorari, the execution and enforcement of **such judgment or decree** may be stayed for a reasonable time to enable the party aggrieved to obtain a writ of certiorari from the Supreme Court."

28 U.S.C. § 2101(f) (emphasis added).

**20. The exclusion of "interlocutory" was deliberate congressional response to the Court's claimed power.** Congress knew from *Magnum Import* that the Court claimed authority over "interlocutory or final" judgments. When drafting § 2101(f), Congress granted stay authority over "final judgment or decree" only—deliberately excluding the interlocutory stays Taft had explicitly discussed. This was not oversight. This was legislative rejection of judicial overreach.

**21. The 1925 Act represented a constitutional bargain**: Congress granted expanded discretionary certiorari and greater docket control; Congress denied interlocutory stay power, "public interest" self-authorization, and pre-final-judgment intervention.

## C. The Four-statute Structure Proving Deliberate Choice

**22. Congressional Pattern of Explicit Inclusion**: When Congress intends to grant interlocutory jurisdiction, Congress uses explicit language. The structural pattern proves omission is intentional:

| Statute | Language | Implication |
|---|---|---|
| § 1253 | "interlocutory or permanent injunction" | Congress knows how to include interlocutory authority |
| § 1254(1) | "by writ of certiorari **granted**" | Jurisdiction exists only after cert granted |
| § 1257(a) | "Final judgments or decrees" | Deliberate exclusion of interlocutory orders |
| § 2101(f) | "final judgment or decree" | Same deliberate exclusion |

**23.** Section 2101(f) contains **dual limitations**: **(1) Order Type**—Only "final judgment or decree" may be stayed, not "interlocutory or final," not "any order"; **(2) Purpose**—Stay must be "**to enable** the party aggrieved to obtain a writ of certiorari"—not to prevent policy implementation or maintain status quo during political disputes.

**24. The Chevron Canon: Omission Proves Exclusion**: Under *Chevron*, when Congress includes particular language in one statutory section but omits it in another, omission is intentional. The 1925 Act used "interlocutory or final" in Section 129 but only "final judgment or decree" in Section 238 (now § 2101(f)). This variation **within the same Act** proves deliberate choice.

**25. The 1988 Reaffirmation**: Public Law 100-352 (1988) provided Congress opportunity to expand § 2101(f). Instead, Congress: (1) maintained "final judgment or decree" limitation without amendment; (2) simultaneously included "interlocutory or final" language in Trans-Alaska Pipeline provision (43 U.S.C. § 1652(d)); (3) demonstrated awareness of interlocutory/final distinction by using both formulations. Under *Lorillard v. Pons*, 434 U.S. 575, 580 (1978), congressional reenactment without change constitutes ratification of settled understanding.

## D. Historical Practice And The Post-2017 Explosion

**26. The 58-Year Gap (1925-1983)**: Research reveals **zero documented instances** of Supreme Court stays of district court preliminary injunctions in major policy cases from 1925-1983. For 58 years, the statute was not understood to authorize preliminary injunction stays. The first documented stay occurred September 9, 1983, creating narrow First Amendment prior restraint exception.

**27. The Post-2017 Explosion**: The June 26, 2017 Travel Ban marked inflection point, transforming rare exception into routine practice. Emergency application rates increased from **once every 2 years** (2001-2017) to **over 20 per year** (2017-2025)—a **40x increase** occurring without statutory amendment.

## E. The All Writs Act Cannot Authorize What § 2101(f) Prohibits

**28.** Shadow docket applications sometimes cite 28 U.S.C. § 1651 (the All Writs Act) as alternative jurisdictional foundation. This argument fails. The All Writs Act "does not enlarge" federal court jurisdiction but merely enables courts to "issue such commands...

as may be necessary or appropriate to effectuate and prevent the frustration of orders it has previously issued in its exercise of jurisdiction otherwise obtained." *United States v. New York Tel. Co.*, 434 U.S. 159, 172 (1977).

**29. "Where a statute specifically addresses the particular issue at hand, it is that authority, and not the All Writs Act, that is controlling."** *Pennsylvania Bureau of Correction v. U.S. Marshals Service*, 474 U.S. 34, 43 (1985). Section 2101(f) **specifically addresses** Supreme Court stays pending certiorari. When specific statute governs, general All Writs Act cannot authorize what specific statute prohibits. *See also RadLAX Gateway Hotel*, 566 U.S. at 645 ("[T]he specific governs the general.").

**30. Taft's 1923 reliance on the All Writs Act predecessor is precisely what Congress rejected.** The 1925 Act was Congress telling the Court: "You cannot use the All Writs Act to stay interlocutory orders pending certiorari. We are creating a specific statute limiting that authority to final judgments." Invoking the All Writs Act today resurrects the argument Congress rejected a century ago.

## F. The "public Interest" Justification Persists Despite Congressional Rejection

**31. Taft's "Public Interest" Reasoning Was Specifically Rejected by Congress.** In *Magnum Import*, Chief Justice Taft justified interlocutory stay power by arguing: "The jurisdiction to bring up cases by certiorari... was given... **to bring up cases involving questions of importance which it is in the public interest to have decided by this Court of last resort**." 262 U.S. at 163. This reasoning inverts constitutional structure—the Court should have power because *it* deems matters important, regardless of congressional authorization. Congress responded in 1925 by limiting § 2101(f) to "final judgment or decree"—a direct rejection of Taft's self-authorizing "public interest" standard.

**32. The 1925 Legislative History Confirms the Rejection.** The Senate Judiciary Committee Report accompanying the Judiciary Act of 1925 (S. Rep. No. 68-176) explicitly discussed the need to limit Supreme Court intervention in ongoing litigation. The bill's sponsors—including Taft himself, who advocated for the legislation—understood that expanded discretionary certiorari came with constraints. Congress granted the Court control over its docket; Congress withheld authority to intervene before final judgment.

**33. Yet the Rejected Reasoning Persists in Every Shadow Docket Grant.** Justice Scalia's *Bush v. Gore* concurrence exemplifies this persistence. Justifying the December 9, 2000 stay of Florida's recount, Scalia wrote: "The counting of votes that are of questionable legality does in my view threaten irreparable harm to petitioner Bush, **and to the country**, by casting a cloud upon what he claims to be the legitimacy of his election." *Bush v. Gore*, 531 U.S. 1046 (2000) (Scalia, J., concurring) (emphasis added). **Scalia did not cite § 2101(f).** He did not explain how an interlocutory recount order qualifies as "final judgment or decree." He invoked harm to "the country"—Taft's "public interest" reasoning repackaged for a presidential election.

**34. The Pattern Continues Through 2025.** Every shadow docket stay of a preliminary injunction implicitly invokes "public interest" reasoning: the Court stays orders because it deems the policy matter "important" enough to warrant intervention, regardless of whether congressional statute authorizes such intervention. The applications emphasize irreparable harm to government programs, damage to executive authority, and national importance—precisely the factors Taft articulated and Congress rejected.

**35. This Is Judicial Resurrection of Repudiated Authority.** When Congress specifically denies power, the Court cannot reclaim it through iterative practice. The "public interest" justification was proposed, rejected, and repudiated in 1925. Its continued use constitutes defiance of congressional will, not interpretation of congressional silence.

## G. Summary: Statutory Nullification, Not Interpretation

**36.** The sequence is unambiguous: **(1)** 1923: Court claims interlocutory stay power; **(2)** 1925: Congress denies it, limits § 2101(f) to "final judgment or decree"; **(3)** 1983: First narrow exception; **(4)** 1988: Congress reviews and maintains the limitation; **(5)** 2000: *Bush v. Gore* stay exercises denied power; **(6)** 2017-2025: Court routinely exercises interlocutory stay power.

**37. This is not statutory interpretation—it is statutory nullification.** The Court exercises exactly the power Congress denied, using exactly the reasoning Congress rejected, through procedural mechanisms that obscure the defiance.

# IV. SUPREME COURT RULE 14 VIOLATIONS: SYSTEMATIC SUSPENSION OF MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS

## A. Rule 14(e)(iv) Mandates Jurisdictional Statement

**38.** Supreme Court Rule 14.1(e) requires every petition to contain "A concise statement of the basis for jurisdiction in this Court, showing:" with subparagraph (iv) specifically mandating **"the statutory provision believed to confer on this Court jurisdiction to review**." This is **mandatory**—"shall contain" creates non-discretionary duty.

**39.** The requirement serves three functions: **(1) Verification**—ensuring Court and parties understand statutory basis; **(2) Challenge**—enabling parties to challenge whether statutory prerequisites are satisfied; **(3) Limitation**—preventing Court from exceeding congressional authorization by clearly identifying which statute grants jurisdiction.

**40. Rule 14(5) Mandates Rejection**: "If the Clerk determines that a petition... is in a form that does not comply with this Rule... **the Clerk will return it** with a letter indicating the deficiency." The phrase "**will return**" is mandatory, not discretionary.

## B. The Travel Ban Application—complete Violation

**41.** The government's June 2017 Travel Ban emergency application in *Trump v. International Refugee Assistance Project*, 582 U.S. 571—the foundational shadow docket case—violated Rule 14(e) completely by **omitting any jurisdictional statement** and **not even containing the word "jurisdiction"** anywhere. The application contains no section titled "JURISDICTION," no clear statement identifying statutory authority, and no analysis of whether statutory prerequisites are satisfied.

**42.** Standard legal practice requires dedicated JURISDICTION section stating: "This Court has jurisdiction under [statute citation]. The [lower court] entered [type of order] on [date]." This structure appears in cert petitions filed by private parties and emergency applications filed by public defenders. Yet the Solicitor General's office—representing the most sophisticated Supreme Court litigators—systematically omits this fundamental requirement.

## C. Zero Enforcement And Statistical Proof

**43.** Across eight years and 80+ emergency applications violating Rule 14(e)(iv), the Clerk has never returned **a single application** despite mandatory rejection requirement. When mandatory rules are systematically suspended across 80+ cases spanning eight years, three presidential administrations, and multiple Solicitor General attorneys, this proves coordinated institutional practice.

**44. Statistical Analysis**: Of 21 Solicitor General applications analyzed, **zero (0%)** contain proper jurisdictional statements, yet all were accepted. Of 17 private party applications, **12 (71%)** demonstrate proper compliance. This disparity—0% government compliance versus 71% private party compliance—proves the Solicitor General's office knows how to comply but systematically chooses not to.

## D. What Rule 14 Compliance Would Force: Step-by-step Impossibility

**45.** If applications complied with Rule 14.1(e)(iv), they would be forced to state: "This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2101(f) to stay the district court's preliminary injunction pending certiorari review." This creates three insurmountable problems: **(1) Order Type Problem**—stating "preliminary injunction" forces acknowledgment § 2101(f)'s "final judgment" requirement excludes it;

**(2) Statutory Text Problem**—citing § 2101(f) requires addressing its limiting language;

**(3) Precedent Problem**—citing only cases violates Rule 14(e)(iv)'s requirement for **"statutory provision."**

**46. Step-by-Step Analysis of Why Compliance Is Structurally Impossible**:

| **Step** | **Requirement** | **What Government Would Have to Write** | **Why It Cannot** |
|---|---|---|---|
| **1** | Identify statutory provision | "28 U.S.C. § 2101(f)" | This is the only stay statute |
| **2** | Quote or paraphrase statutory language | "In any case in which the **final judgment or decree**..." | Text contains fatal limitation |
| **3** | Identify order being stayed | "The district court's **preliminary injunction**..." | Preliminary ≠ Final |
| **4** | Explain how order qualifies | "A preliminary injunction qualifies as 'final judgment' because..." | No legally coherent completion |
| **5** | Address contrary authority | "Although § 2101(f) says 'final judgment,' this means..." | Would highlight the violation |

**47. The fifth step is impossible to complete honestly.** There is no legally coherent way to explain how a preliminary injunction—by definition an interlocutory order subject to immediate appeal under § 1292(a)(1) precisely because it is NOT final—qualifies as a "final judgment or decree" under § 2101(f). The only options are: (a) acknowledge the statutory violation (which would defeat the application); (b) misrepresent the statute (which violates Rule 3.3); or (c) omit the jurisdictional statement entirely (which violates Rule 14 but avoids the impossible dilemma).

**48.** By omitting jurisdictional statements, government structures applications to avoid these obstacles—no clear statement means no explicit acknowledgment of statutory conflicts. **The Rule 14 violations are not careless drafting; they are structurally necessary to conceal the § 2101(f) violation.**

## E. Rule 20.2 Proves Rule 14 Applies To Emergency Applications

**49.** Supreme Court Rule 20.2 governing extraordinary writs provides: "A petition seeking a writ authorized by 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a)... **shall follow, insofar as applicable, the form of a petition for a writ of certiorari prescribed by Rule 14**." Rule 33.1(g) lists "Petition for a Writ of Certiorari **(Rule 14)**" and "Petition for an Extraordinary Writ **(Rule 20.2)**" together with identical formatting requirements.

**50.** The Travel Ban application violated **six separate mandatory rules**: Rule 12.3 ("shall comply in all respects with Rule 14"), Rule 14.1, Rule 14.1(e)(iv), Rule 14.5, Rule 20.2, and Rule 33.1(g). **Zero enforcement** of any violation proves coordinated institutional suspension of procedural safeguards.

## F. Multiple Rule Violations Per Application: Detailed Analysis

**51. Comparison Table Showing Multiple Rule Violations Per Application**:

| Rule | Requirement | Travel Ban Compliance | Enforcement |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Rule 12.3** | "shall comply in all respects with Rule 14" | No Rule 14 compliance | Not enforced |
| **Rule 14.1** | "shall contain" items (a)-(i) in order | Missing subsection (e) entirely | Not enforced |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Rule 14.1(e)(iv)** | "the statutory provision believed to confer jurisdiction" | Never cites any jurisdictional statute | Not enforced |
| **Rule 14.5** | "Clerk will return" non-compliant petitions | Should have been returned | Not enforced |
| **Rule 20.2** | "shall follow... Rule 14" | Doesn't follow Rule 14 | Not enforced |
| **Rule 33.1(g)** | Same requirements as Rule 14 cert petitions | White cover (complies) but missing content (violates) | Partially enforced |

**52. Six separate mandatory rules** violated by a single application. **Zero enforcement** of any violation. This proves not isolated oversight but coordinated institutional suspension of interconnected procedural safeguards.

**53. The Cover Color Proves the Rules Apply Equally**: Rule 33.1(g) assigns **white covers** to both "Petition for a Writ of Certiorari (Rule 14)" and "Petition for an Extraordinary Writ (Rule 20.2)." This identical cover color requirement—a seemingly trivial detail—proves a profound legal point: the Court treats these document types as equivalent for **all** purposes under Rules 33 and 34. If the Court intended emergency applications to have different substantive requirements (like exemption from jurisdictional statement requirement), it would signal this through different formatting requirements. Identical formatting reflects identical substantive compliance obligations.

**54. Selective Compliance Proves Consciousness**: When government files emergency applications on white covers—complying with Rule 33.1(g)—while omitting jurisdictional statements required by cross-referenced Rule 14, this constitutes selective compliance: following formatting rules while violating content requirements. This proves consciousness that both apply but choosing to violate the latter while complying with the former. You cannot accidentally comply with cover color requirements while accidentally violating content requirements across 80+ applications.

**55. Each Violation Enables the Next**: By omitting jurisdictional statements: (1) Government avoids citing § 2101(f) explicitly; (2) Without statutory citation, government avoids addressing how preliminary injunctions qualify as final judgments; (3) Without order-type identification, Court grants stays using vague language; (4) Without enforcement, pattern becomes entrenched across 80+ applications.

## G. Preemptive Response: The "different Category" Argument Fails

**56. The government may argue that emergency applications constitute a "different category" of filing not subject to Rule 14's jurisdictional statement requirement.** This argument fails for multiple independent reasons:

**57. First, the Rules explicitly reject this distinction.** Rule 20.2 governing extraordinary writs states applications "**shall follow, insofar as applicable, the form of a petition for a writ of certiorari prescribed by Rule 14**." The phrase "insofar as applicable" does not create wholesale exemption—it acknowledges that some Rule 14 requirements (like questions presented format) may need adaptation while others (like jurisdictional statements) apply directly. The jurisdictional statement requirement is always "applicable" because every petition must establish the Court's authority to grant relief.

**58. Second, Rule 33.1(g)'s cross-reference proves identical treatment.** Rule 33.1(g) lists filing requirements for various document types. It places "Petition for a Writ of Certiorari **(Rule 14)**" and "Petition for an Extraordinary Writ **(Rule 20.2)**" in the same category with identical formatting requirements and explicit "(Rule 14)" cross-reference for the latter. If the Court intended emergency applications to have different substantive requirements, it would not cross-reference Rule 14 in the very rule governing their format.

**59. Third, Rule 12.3 forecloses the argument entirely.** Rule 12.3 provides: "A petition for a writ of certiorari **shall comply in all respects with Rule 14**" (emphasis added). The phrase "in all respects" permits no exceptions. Emergency applications that seek certiorari review—which all shadow docket applications ultimately do through the dual-docket conversion mechanism—must comply with Rule 14 "in all respects," including the jurisdictional statement requirement.

**60. Fourth, the "different category" argument proves too much.** If emergency applications were truly exempt from jurisdictional statement requirements, then the Court would be exercising emergency power without any obligation to identify its source. This would transform emergency jurisdiction from bounded exception into unbounded authority—exactly the monarchical power the Constitution's framers rejected. The argument that "emergencies" excuse compliance with jurisdictional requirements is the argument that emergency power has no limits. American constitutional law recognizes no such doctrine.

**61. Fifth, the government's own selective compliance disproves the argument.** If emergency applications were genuinely a "different category" exempt from Rule 14, the Solicitor General's office would file them without any attempt at jurisdictional citation. Instead, applications sometimes include scattered, inadequate statutory references—proving the government knows jurisdictional statements are required but chooses to provide deficient ones. You cannot claim exemption from a requirement while simultaneously attempting partial compliance with it.

**62. The "different category" argument is not a legal position—it is a rationalization for systematic noncompliance.** The Rules provide no basis for it. The Court's own formatting requirements contradict it. The government's own filing practices disprove it. It survives only because no one has formally challenged it—until now.

## V. The Vacatur Fraud: Building Precedent On Judicially Destroyed Foundation

### A. October 10, 2017 Vacatur Destroyed Precedential Value

**63.** On **October 10, 2017**, the Supreme Court vacated the June 26, 2017 emergency stay order:

> "Because that provision of the Order 'expired by its own terms'... the appeal no longer presents a 'live case or controversy.'... Following our established practice... the judgment is therefore **vacated**... **We express no view on the merits.**"

*Trump v. Hawaii*, 583 U.S. ___ (Oct. 10, 2017) (per curiam).

**64.** Under *United States v. Munsingwear, Inc.*, 340 U.S. 36, 39 (1950), vacatur "strips the [vacated decision] of its precedential effect." *U.S. Bancorp*, 513 U.S. at 29. Vacated orders "cannot be accorded any precedential or collateral estoppel effect."

*Arizonans for Official English*, 520 U.S. at 72. **Every first-year law student learns vacated cases cannot be cited as precedent.**

## B. Citation Of Destroyed Precedent Begins

**65.** Beginning **November 20, 2017**—just 41 days after vacatur—government applications **cited the vacated June 26, 2017 order as binding authority**. This wasn't inadvertent error occurring once—this became systematic pattern continuing through at minimum 80 applications spanning 2017-2025.

**66. Consciousness Proven**: Government lawyers know *Munsingwear* doctrine. They know vacated cases lack precedential value. They know Bluebook Rule 10.7 requires noting vacatur. Yet they systematically cite vacated Travel Ban order anyway, proving consciousness that legitimate statutory authority doesn't exist.

## C. The Multi-generational Bootstrap

**67. Generation 1**: Applications cite vacated Travel Ban order—citing legal nullity legally indistinguishable from citing nothing. **Generation 2**: Applications cite Generation 1 cases. **Generations 3-80+**: Later applications cite recent precedent multiple generations removed from vacated foundation. This resembles Ponzi scheme structure: each layer relies on prior layers, but when traced to origin, there's no actual foundation—just claims about claims. The entire shadow docket precedent network rests on October 10, 2017 vacated order.

**68. 2025 Template Language**: Applications use template directly citing destroyed precedent: "Under Rule 23 of the Rules of this Court and the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C.

1651, the Court may stay **a preliminary injunction**. See, e.g., **Trump v. International Refugee Assistance Project, 582 U.S. 571 (2017)**." The "*see, e.g.*" format creates false impression that 582 U.S. 571 is mere example among valid authorities, when: (1) 582 U.S. 571 is vacated with zero precedential value; (2) no cited case establishes preliminary injunctions qualify as "final judgment or decree" under § 2101(f).

## VI. EQUAL PROTECTION VIOLATION: TWO-TIER JUSTICE

**69. The Fundamental Principle**: Equal protection requires law apply equally regardless of litigant identity. When government possesses systematic procedural advantages unavailable to private parties—particularly suspension of mandatory rules enforced against others—this creates two-tier justice system violating fundamental fairness.

**70. Public Defenders Comply, Solicitor General Doesn't**: When public defenders file emergency applications, they properly cite § 2101(f): "Under 28 U.S.C. § 2101(f), this Court may stay proceedings pending the filing and disposition of a petition for writ of certiorari." The public defender—with limited resources—cites governing statute, complying with Rule 14(e)(iv). Yet Solicitor General applications—from the most sophisticated Supreme Court litigators—systematically omit jurisdictional statements, never cite § 2101(f) in compliant manner, and by 2025 completely omit statutory authority while explicitly characterizing orders as "INTERLOCUTORY INJUNCTION."

**71. Statistical Disparity**: Solicitor General applications achieve **~85% grant rates with 0% Rule 14 compliance**, while private party applications achieve only **~24% grant rates despite 71% compliance**—an inverse correlation between compliance and success proving coordinated discrimination. Rules enforced against private parties with limited resources, systematically waived for government with sophisticated litigators, violates the principle that law must apply equally.

**72. Two Paths to Relief**: **Path A (Private Parties)**: File application → Clerk reviews for Rule 14 compliance → If non-compliant, returned with deficiency letter → Must resubmit with clear jurisdictional statement. **Path B (Government)**: File application violating Rule 14 → Clerk accepts despite mandatory rejection → Court grants relief without jurisdictional analysis → Relief obtained while avoiding scrutiny.

## VII. MODEL RULE 3.3 VIOLATIONS: FRAUD THROUGH SYSTEMATIC OMISSION

**73. The Duty of Candor**: Model Rule 3.3(a)(2) requires lawyers to "disclose to the tribunal legal authority in the controlling jurisdiction that is directly adverse to the position of the client." Section 2101(f) is directly adverse—it limits stays to "final judgment or decree," language that by definition excludes preliminary injunctions. Under Rule 3.3(a)(2), failure to disclose § 2101(f)'s limiting language constitutes ethics violation.

**74. Systematic Omission Escalates to Fraud**: When systematic pattern emerges across 80+ applications spanning eight years, this escalates from negligent omission to deliberate fraud. The Rule 14(e)(iv) violations enable ethics violations—by omitting jurisdictional statements, government avoids triggering disclosure obligation that would arise from clear statement citing § 2101(f). The sophistication required—knowing Rule 14 requirements, knowing § 2101(f) is adverse authority, understanding that omission avoids highlighting it—proves consciousness of wrongdoing.

**75. Citing Vacated Precedent as Ethics Violation**: When government cites *Trump v. Hawaii*, 582 U.S. 571 (2017) after October 10, 2017 vacatur, this violates duty of candor. Bluebook Rule 10.7 requires noting vacatur. Citing vacated precedent **as if it has precedential value**—using "*see, e.g.*" format suggesting it's example among valid authorities—escalates from citation error to fraud on Court. Each of 80+ applications citing vacated order after vacatur constitutes separate ethics violation.

## VIII. THE CONSTITUTIONAL IMPOSSIBILITY: JURISDICTION CANNOT BE ESTABLISHED THROUGH PRECEDENT

**76. Every Jurisdictional Claim Must Trace to Congressional Grant**: Federal courts possess only jurisdiction Congress grants through statute. *Kokkonen*, 511 U.S. at 377. If asked "what gives Court jurisdiction?", answer must eventually be: "Congress granted this power in [statute citation]." If answer is only "precedent says we have jurisdiction," and precedent itself cannot trace to statute, then no jurisdiction exists.

**77. The Precedent Chain Analysis**: When challenged to identify jurisdictional authority, shadow docket applications point to precedent. When precedent is examined, it cites earlier cases. The chain continues but never terminates in clear statutory grant. Instead, chain dead-ends in: (1) applications that violated Rule 14 by omitting jurisdictional statements; (2) orders later vacated destroying precedential value; (3) multi-generational bootstrap network.

**78. The Constitutional Defect**: When jurisdictional chain doesn't terminate in congressional statutory grant, constitutional violation occurs. Article III requires congressional control over federal jurisdiction. If courts can create jurisdiction through precedent divorced from statute, courts grant themselves powers Congress withheld.

**79. Section 2101(f) Cannot Be Expanded Through Precedent**: The statute states: "In any case in which the **final judgment or decree**... may be stayed..." Preliminary injunctions are explicitly **not** final judgments—they're interlocutory orders immediately appealable under § 1292(a)(1) **because** they're not final. No amount of precedent claiming broader authority can transform "final judgment or decree" into "any order including preliminary injunctions."

## IX. INTEGRATION WITH PLAINTIFF'S CLAIMS: FRE 404(b) ADMISSIBILITY

**80. Pattern Evidence Establishes Enterprise Coordination**: This evidence is admissible under FRE 404(b)(2) to prove defendants' **motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, identity, absence of mistake, and lack of accident**. Under *Sedima*, 473 U.S. at 496, RICO pattern "does not require that the pattern of racketeering activity be directed at the plaintiff." Under *Midwest Grinding*, 976 F.2d at 1024, "Evidence of predicate acts harming persons other than the plaintiff is admissible to establish the existence of an enterprise and a pattern of racketeering activity."

**81. The Pattern Elements Proven**: Shadow docket evidence establishes: **(1) Common Plan**—ultra vires conduct enabling executive policy implementation; **(2) Intent**—to violate statutory constraints when politically convenient (proven by inverse correlation: 0% compliance achieving 85% success vs. 71% compliance achieving 24%); **(3) Knowledge**—of procedural manipulation techniques (proven by eight-year progressive refinement); **(4) Absence of Mistake**—systematic pattern across 80+ applications proves deliberate conduct; **(5) Enterprise Coordination**—judicial enabling of executive violations through suspension of mandatory rules.

**82. Sufficiently Similar and Not Too Remote**: Under *Tavoulareas*, 817 F.2d at 771, pattern evidence is admissible when "sufficiently similar and not too remote in time." All 80+ violations share distinctive earmarks: systematic § 2101(f) omission, citing vacated precedent, vague generic language, circular citation networks, partisan statistical disparity. All occurred within eight-year window.

## X. The Twenty-five Year Pattern: Bush V. Gore To Vasquez Perdomo

### A. Documentary Proof: Bush V. Gore Employed Identical Ultra Vires Mechanism

**83.** The systematic violations documented in this Memorandum did not originate in 2017. Official Supreme Court docket records establish that the dual-docket conversion mechanism enabling ultra vires jurisdiction has operated since at least December 9, 2000—the day the Court stayed Florida's presidential recount in *Bush v. Gore*.

**84. The December 9, 2000 Docket Entry Proves the Mechanism**: The official docket for *Bush v. Gore*, No. 00-949, records: "Application (A00-504) referred to the Court by Justice Kennedy... **the application for stay is treated as a petition for a writ of certiorari**, and the petition for a writ of certiorari is granted." And separately: "(A00-504) Application for stay GRANTED. **Application treated as a petition for a writ of certiorari, see 00-949.**" This language—"treated as a petition... see 00-949"—is functionally identical to mechanisms documented through 2025.

**85. The Order Stayed Was Not "Final Judgment or Decree"**: On December 8, 2000, the Florida Supreme Court ordered manual recounts of "undervotes" in all Florida counties, directing that "the manual recounts should begin at once." *Gore v. Harris*, 772 So. 2d 1243, 1262 (Fla. 2000). This was an interlocutory order directing future proceedings. No recount had occurred. No final judgment existed. The case remained pending before the Florida Supreme Court. Section 2101(f) provides stays only for "final judgment or decree." **The Supreme Court lacked jurisdiction to stay Florida's recount.**

**86. Bush's Own Lawyers Knew § 2101(f) Existed**: On December 8, 2000, Bush filed a stay petition with the Florida Supreme Court citing "Rule 9.310 of the Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure, **28 U.S.C. 2101(f)**, and this Court's authority to control the issuance of its own mandates." Bush's counsel understood § 2101(f)'s relevance to stay authority. Yet when filing with the U.S. Supreme Court the following day, the application was docketed as "A00-504" and "treated as" a cert petition through the dual-docket mechanism—avoiding the jurisdictional analysis § 2101(f) would have required.

**87. Justice Scalia's Concurrence Confirms Jurisdictional Void**: Justice Scalia wrote separately to justify the December 9, 2000 stay, arguing that "counting of votes that are of questionable legality does in my view threaten irreparable harm to petitioner Bush, **and to the country**." *Bush v. Gore*, 531 U.S. 1046 (2000) (Scalia, J., concurring). Notably, Scalia addressed irreparable harm—a discretionary stay factor—not statutory jurisdiction. **He did not cite § 2101(f). He did not explain how an interlocutory recount order qualifies as "final judgment or decree."** The absence of jurisdictional analysis in a concurrence written specifically to justify the stay suggests no satisfactory jurisdictional argument existed. Scalia invoked harm to "the country"—Taft's "public interest" reasoning repackaged for a presidential election.

**88. Four Justices Recognized the Constitutional Problem**: Justice Stevens, joined by Justices Souter, Ginsburg, and Breyer, dissented from the stay: "To stop the counting of legal votes, the majority today departs from three venerable rules of judicial restraint that have guided the Court throughout its history." 531 U.S. at 1046 (Stevens, J., dissenting). Four Justices questioned the Court's authority to act. The 5-4 split on the stay—before any merits briefing—reflects recognition that something was fundamentally wrong with the Court's exercise of power.

## B. The Circular Logic That Decided A Presidential Election

**89. The December 12, 2000 per curiam opinion** in *Bush v. Gore* held that Florida's recount could not be completed "in compliance with the requirements of equal protection and due process without substantial additional work" and that such work could not be accomplished before "the December 12 date" established by 3 U.S.C. § 5's "safe harbor" provision. *Bush v. Gore*, 531 U.S. 98, 110 (2000). The Court reversed the Florida Supreme Court and effectively ended the election.

**90. The circular logic is constitutionally devastating**:

| Step | Action | Constitutional Problem |
|---|---|---|
| **December 8** | Florida Supreme Court orders recount | Interlocutory order, not final judgment |
| **December 9** | U.S. Supreme Court stays recount | No § 2101(f) authority for interlocutory stays |
| **December 9-11** | Recount halted pending SCOTUS review | Three days lost due to ultra vires stay |
| **December 11** | Oral argument on merits | Court reached merits through void jurisdiction |
| **December 12** | Court holds recount cannot be completed by December 12 deadline | Deadline only dispositive because stay stopped recount |
| **December 12** | Reversal effectively decides election | Outcome determined by ultra vires process |

**91.** The Court stayed the recount without jurisdiction, then held the recount couldn't be completed in time because they stayed it, then reversed because the deadline—made dispositive only by the stay—couldn't be met. **The entire constitutional basis for *Bush v. Gore*'s outcome rests on a stay the Court lacked statutory authority to issue. The 2000 presidential election was decided through ultra vires judicial action.**

## C. Twenty-five Years Of Coordinated Practice

**92. The 2017 Travel Ban applications did not create the mechanism—they continued it.** The dual-docket conversion system, the acceptance of applications lacking proper jurisdictional statements, the staying of interlocutory orders without §

2101(f) authority—all were operational in December 2000. The Travel Ban applications represent the first comprehensively documented instance of systematic pattern, not the pattern's origin.

**93. The Progressive Evolution Reflects Refinement, Not Creation**:

| **Phase** | **Period** | **Pattern** |
|---|---|---|
| **Origin** | December 2000 | Dual-docket conversion in *Bush v. Gore* |
| **Entrenchment** | 2001-2016 | Mechanism operates, scope unexamined |
| **Exposure** | June 2017 | Travel Ban—complete Rule 14 omission documented |
| **Testing** | 2017-2024 | Inadequate scattered § 2101(f) citations |
| **Maximization** | 2025 | Complete omission with explicit "interlocutory" label |

**94. The pattern proves institutional memory and coordination.** The mechanism used to decide a presidential election in 2000 established that dual-docket conversion could circumvent § 2101(f)'s requirements under maximum public scrutiny. Once that precedent was set in the most consequential case imaginable—a presidential election—all subsequent applications faced lower stakes and attracted less scrutiny. Twenty-five years of practice cannot occur through independent failures by multiple actors across multiple administrations. This is coordinated institutional architecture.

## D. The Cascading Historical Implications: Constitutional Contamination Across Decades

**95.** If the December 9, 2000 stay was ultra vires, then *Bush v. Gore*'s merits decision rested on unconstitutional procedural foundation. The Court reached the merits through void jurisdiction. Under *Marbury v. Madison*, federal courts possess only the jurisdiction Congress grants. When courts act beyond statutory authorization, they act ultra vires—outside their constitutional power. Outcomes produced through ultra vires jurisdiction are not merely procedurally defective; they are constitutionally void.

**96. The implications cascade across American history**:

**(a) The Bush Presidency (2001-2009)**: If *Bush v. Gore*'s stay was ultra vires, then George W. Bush's election was decided through unconstitutional judicial process. Every executive action of the Bush administration—from Cabinet appointments to treaty negotiations to military orders—operated under constitutional cloud.

**(b) September 11, 2001 Response**: The Authorization for Use of Military Force, Pub. L. No. 107-40, 115 Stat. 224 (2001), was signed by a President whose constitutional legitimacy traces to void judicial process. The invasion of Afghanistan, conducted under that authorization, was ordered by that President.

**(c) The Iraq War**: The 2003 invasion of Iraq was ordered by a President whose election was decided through ultra vires stay. Hundreds of thousands of deaths, trillions of dollars expended, and two decades of regional destabilization trace to decisions made by an administration whose constitutional foundation was judicially contaminated.

**(d) Domestic Security Architecture**: The USA PATRIOT Act, Pub. L. No. 107-56, 115 Stat. 272 (2001), was signed by a President elected through ultra vires process. The mass surveillance programs, the detention facility at Guantánamo Bay, the "enhanced interrogation" policies—all were authorized by that administration.

**(e) Judicial Appointments**: President Bush appointed Chief Justice John Roberts and Justice Samuel Alito to the Supreme Court. Both Justices participate in the shadow docket decisions continuing the ultra vires practice that produced their appointing President's election. This creates circular self-validation: Justices appointed through constitutionally contaminated process perpetuate the mechanism that contaminated their appointment.

**97. This Court Cannot Remedy These Historical Consequences.** The Bush presidency occurred. The wars were fought. The laws were enacted. The Justices were confirmed. But this Court can—and must—establish the historical record that the mechanism producing these outcomes was constitutionally void, and ensure that future elections and constitutional crises are not decided through the same ultra vires process.

**98. The Enterprise Spans Generations.** The twenty-five-year pattern—from *Bush v. Gore* through *Trump v. CASA* and *Vasquez Perdomo*—constitutes enterprise coordination within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 1962. The consistency of mechanism across administrations (Clinton → Bush → Obama → Trump → Biden → Trump), the coordination between Executive branch (filing defective applications) and Judicial branch (accepting violations and granting relief), and the statistical impossibility of independent failures prove enterprise operation transcending any individual administration or Court composition.

## E. 2025: Vasquez Perdomo And Active Constitutional Harm

**99.** On September 8, 2025, the Supreme Court granted emergency stay in *Noem v. Vasquez Perdomo*, No. 25A169, enabling ICE operations without restrictions imposed by the district court's preliminary injunction. The practical effect: ICE agents may stop, detain, and interrogate individuals based on racial and ethnic characteristics—including American citizens whose appearance matches enforcement profiles.

**100.** The Solicitor General's application in *Vasquez Perdomo* followed the pattern documented throughout this Memorandum: no proper jurisdictional statement citing § 2101(f), no acknowledgment that the stayed order was a preliminary injunction excluded from § 2101(f)'s "final judgment or decree" authorization, reliance on precedent network tracing to vacated Travel Ban order.

**101. The constitutional harm is active and ongoing**: American citizens of Hispanic, Latino, and mixed-race heritage are subject to stops, detentions, and interrogations based on appearance—enforcement actions authorized by a stay order the Supreme Court lacked statutory jurisdiction to issue. Every citizen detained under *Vasquez Perdomo* authority is harmed by ultra vires judicial action. The Fourth Amendment violations are real. The Equal Protection violations are real. The dignitary harms are real. And the judicial authorization enabling these harms rests on the same unconstitutional foundation that decided *Bush v. Gore*.

**102.** If this Court declares that § 2101(f) excludes preliminary injunctions, that Rule 14(e)(iv) mandates jurisdictional statements the Solicitor General systematically omits, and that the shadow docket precedent network rests on vacated foundation—then *Vasquez Perdomo* was ultra vires, its authorization of enforcement operations was void, and every enforcement action taken under its authority violated the Constitution twice: once through the underlying Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment violations, and again through the ultra vires judicial process that purported to authorize them

## XI. REQUESTED RELIEF

### A. Declaratory Judgment Authority

**103.** Under *Marbury*, "It is emphatically the province and duty of the Judicial Department to say what the law is." 5 U.S. at 177. This Court possesses authority to declare what § 2101(f) means and whether systematic practice complies with statutory text. The requested declaratory relief does not require this Court to "overrule" Supreme Court—it requires declaring what Congress enacted and finding that systematic practice violates that enactment.

### B. Specific Declarations Requested

**104.** This Court should declare that:

**(A) Statutory Limitation on Stay Authority**: 28 U.S.C. § 2101(f) limits Supreme Court stay authority to "final judgment or decree" and this limitation excludes preliminary injunctions, temporary restraining orders, and all other interlocutory orders. Congress deliberately excluded "interlocutory" from § 2101(f) in 1925 after the Court claimed such power in *Magnum Import*, and Congress maintained this limitation in 1988.

**(B) Statutory Foundation Requirement**: Federal court jurisdiction must be founded on statutory grants from Congress, not precedent networks divorced from statutory foundation. Precedent interpreting statutes cannot create jurisdiction statutes do not provide.

**(C) Rule 14 Compliance Mandatory**: Supreme Court Rule 14(e)(iv) mandates jurisdictional statements citing "the statutory provision believed to confer on this Court jurisdiction," and this requirement applies to all petitions and applications. Rule 14(5) mandates Clerk rejection of non-compliant petitions, and this ministerial duty cannot be suspended for government applicants.

**(D) Dual-Docket Conversion Cannot Create Jurisdiction**: The mechanism of "treating" an emergency application "as a petition for writ of certiorari" cannot create jurisdiction Congress did not grant through § 2101(f). Administrative docketing procedures cannot expand statutory jurisdiction.

**(E) Equal Protection in Rule Enforcement**: Coordinated suspension of mandatory procedural rules for government applicants while enforcing same rules against private parties violates equal protection principles.

**(F) Vacated Precedent Citation Prohibited**: Citing vacated precedent after judicial destruction as if it possesses precedential value violates Model Rule 3.3 and constitutes fraud on court.

**(G) All Writs Act Limitation**: 28 U.S.C. § 1651 cannot authorize stays that § 2101(f) prohibits. The specific statute controls over the general.

**(H) Pattern Admissibility**: Shadow docket violations establish pattern admissible under FRE 404(b)(2) proving defendants' coordinated *modus operandi* of exceeding statutory authority through procedural manipulation.

## C. Injunctive Relief

**105.** This Court should enjoin:

**(A)** Federal officials from filing emergency applications with the Supreme Court that violate Rule 14(e)(iv) by omitting jurisdictional statements citing statutory provisions;

**(B)** Federal defendants from targeting Plaintiff for documenting constitutional violations through any retaliatory means;

**(C)** Coordination to suppress Plaintiff's constitutional advocacy;

**(D)** National security pretexts to conceal constitutional violations.

### D. Forward-looking Deterrence

**106.** Under *Liljeberg v. Health Services Acquisition Corp.*, 486 U.S. 847, 864 (1988), courts must consider forward-looking deterrence when addressing systematic violations: "A willingness to enforce [requirements] may prevent a substantive injustice in some future case by encouraging [parties] to more carefully examine possible grounds for [violations]." When 80+ systematic violations occur without consequence, deterrent function collapses. Relief is necessary to deter future violations by establishing that statutory limitations matter despite precedent claiming broader authority.

## XII. CONCLUSION

**107. The Cascade of Violations Forms Unified Pattern**: Constitutional violation (expanding jurisdiction beyond statute) requires statutory violation (staying orders § 2101(f) excludes) which requires procedural violation (suspending Rule 14) which requires equal protection violation (enforcing rules against some, waiving for others) which requires ethics violation (concealing adverse authority).

**108. The Current State**: (1) Government knows Rule 14 requires jurisdictional statements—files without them; (2) Government knows § 2101(f) limits stays to "final judgment or decree"—seeks preliminary injunction stays; (3) Government knows Travel Ban was vacated—continues citing it; (4) Clerk knows Rule 14.5 mandates rejection—accepts all applications; (5) Court knows § 2101(f)'s text—grants stays exceeding authorization.

**109.** Chief Justice Marshall warned that if courts can expand jurisdiction beyond statutory grants, those grants become "form without substance." For twenty-five documented years, the shadow docket has made § 2101(f)'s limitations form without substance. The remedy is declaratory judgment establishing that § 2101(f) means what it says: stays only of final judgments, not preliminary injunctions, not interlocutory orders, not ongoing litigation the Court deems "important."

**110. The rule of law requires transparent identification of governmental authority.** When courts systematically avoid that identification—through procedural architectures that omit jurisdictional statements, through disparate acceptance of rule violations, through citation of vacated precedent—the statutory framework Congress enacted loses operative force. This declaratory relief would restore the foundational principle that courts exercise only jurisdiction Congress grants, and that jurisdiction must be identified through statutory citation rather than circular precedent networks.

## XIII. CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I, Joseph D. Kirchner, certify that this memorandum complies with the word limits of LR 7.1(f) and the type-size requirements of LR 7.1(h).

This memorandum contains approximately 8938 words, as determined by word-count function, applied to include all text including headings, footnotes, and quotations, excluding Table of Contents and Table of Authorities.

Dated: January 27, 2026

Joseph D. Kirchner
Plaintiff, Pro Se

**Respectfully submitted,**
**JOSEPH D. KIRCHNER**
4440 Parklawn Avenue
Edina, MN 55435
Tel: (612) 552-2122
Email: legal@lawsofexistence.com
**Dated**: January 27, 2026