

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

222 JOHN Q HAMMONS PKWY

SPRINGFIELD, MISSOURI

A CIVIL ACTION

JERRY D. BRUMBAUGH )  
 PLAINTIFF )  
 )  
 VS. )  
 CLARENCE THOMAS )  
 DAVID H. SOUTER )  
 STEPHEN G. BRYER )  
 ANTONIN SCALIA )  
 RUTH BADER GINSBURG )  
 JOHN PAUL STEVENS )  
 ANTHONY M. KENNEDY )  
 SAMUEL A. ALITO )  
 JOHN G. ROBERTS )  
 DEFENDANTS )

CASE #.... 07-CV-3295-S-RL

PARTIES;

PLAINTIFF

JERRY D BRUMBAUGH, 6176 HWY F, HARTVILLE, MISSOURI 65667  
AMERICAN NATIONAL

DEFENDANTS

ARE JUDGES/ JUSTICES OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, ONE FIRST STREET  
N.E., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20543 RECEIVING THEIR MAIL AT THE  
PRECEDING ADDRESS.

JURISDICTION; ARTICLE III, U.S. CONSTITUTION

TYPE OF ACTION;.....DIVERSITY

CAUSE OF ACTION;..... RULINGS THAT HAVE VIOLATED MY  
CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS. PLAINTIFF HEREBY CHALLENGES VIOLATIONS  
OF MY RIGHTS IN ALL MANNERS, WAYS, AND AREAS OF LAW.

1. VIOLATION OF CIVIL LIBERTIES BY ALLOWING A GRANTED  
CLAUSE OF THE CONSTITUTION TO VIOLATE MY RIGHTS IN  
MANY MANNERS AND WAYS.
2. ALLOWING A CLAUSE TO INTERFERE WITH MY RIGHTS TO USE  
THE COURTS.
3. ALLOWING A CLAUSE TO INTERFERE WITH OTHER INDIVIDUALS  
ASSISTING IN UPHOLDING THE CONSTITUTION BY ASSISTING ME  
IN MY CIVIL ACTIONS, AND/OR IN OTHER WAYS AS WELL.
4. FAILING TO CORRECT VIOLATIONS OF THE CONSTITUTION  
WHICH IT IS THE DUTY OF THE COURT TO DO.
5. ALLOWING UNLAWFULLY THE LOSS OF CIVIL LIBERTIES BY  
CONTRACTUAL MEANS INTO THE SPHERE OF THE  
14<sup>TH</sup>. AMENDMENT.

JURY TRIAL IS NOT REQUESTED AS THIS ACTION IS STRICTLY A MATTER  
OF LAW

RIGHT TO APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL IN A CIVIL CASE:

PLAINTIFF HEREBY CITES HIS ARGUMENT FOR COUNSEL, SUBMITTED TO  
THE 8<sup>TH</sup> CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI, IN THE  
MATTER OF BRUMBAUGH VS TANDY, 07-1909 PENDING, WHICH CASE WAS  
PREVIOUSLY BEFORE THIS COURT, AS PROOF IN LAW FOR APPOINTMENT  
OF COUNSEL, COUNSEL REQUESTED IS GERRY SPENCE OF JACKSON,  
WYOMING.

RELIEF REQUESTED;      A RULING THAT THE JUDGES OF THE U.S.  
SUPREME COURT HAVE VIOLATED THE CONSTITUTION.  
THE NET WORTH OF EACH JUSTICE AS PAYMENT FOR THEIR DERILCTION  
OF DUTY.

PLAINTIFF

JERRY D BRUMBAUGH

AMERICAN NATIONAL

'SUI JURIS'



LAW FOR THE DISTRICT COURT IN THIS CASE;

1. PLAINTIFF ASSERTS THAT THE FEDERAL RULES OF PROCEDURE DO NOT APPLY TO HIM, BEING AN AMERICAN NATIONAL CITIZEN., AS THE BILL OF RIGHTS AMENDED EVERY PRECEEDING CLAUSE,.... AND THAT THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE HEREBY APPLIES TO THIS ACTION AS PER AMENDMENTS;.... AND THAT THE RULES MAY NOT VIOLATE MY SUBSTANTIVE RIGHTS TO BRING SUIT NOR INTERFERE WITH THE FURTHERANCE OF THIS SUIT IN ITS DUE PROCESS IN LAW AND IN THE COURTS.

2. PLAINTIFF HEREBY ASSERTS THAT HE HAS THE RIGHT UNDER CONSTITUTIONAL LAW TO BRING FORTH AND CONTINUE THIS ACTION IN THE COURTS;... AND THAT THIS COURT IS DUTY BOUND TO HEAR THIS CASE .

3. PLAINTIFF HEREBY ASSERTS THAT THE RULES MAY NOT BE USED TO INTERFERE WITH THIS CASE AS APPLIES TO COURT COSTS NOR ANY OTHER COSTS.

4. PLAINTIFF HEREBY ASSERTS THAT UNDER CONSTITUTION LAW , NO CLAUSE NOR POWER MAY BE USED TO INTERFERE WITH THIS ACTION NOR ITS CONTINUANCE BEFORE THE COURTS.

PLAINTIFF

JERRY D BRUMBAUGH