RECEIVED
DEC 03 2021
NORTHERN U.S. DISTRICT COURT
SAN JOSE, CA

United States District Court
Northern District of California

RECEIVED
2021 DEC -3 P 1:16

MOTION REQUESTING AN INJUNCTION FOR H.R. 4502 LABOR, EDUCATION, AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2022

Cornelius Lopes

Plaintiff

C 21 09379 JCS

v.

Nancy Pelosi in her official capacity, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services in his official capacity, "joe" biden in his capacity as a segregationist, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC in her official capacity, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture in his official capacity, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce in her official capacity, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor in his official capacity, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation in his official capacity, Dr. Miguel Cardona in her official capacity in his official capacity, Isabel Guzman in her official capacity, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security in his official capacity

Defendants,

That Justice is a blind goddess

Is a thing to which we poor are wise:

Her bandage hides two festering sores

That once perhaps were eyes

Madison and Jefferson played leading rolls recognizing that the provisions of the First Amendment intended to provide protections against governmental intrusion on religious liberty. Nancy Pelosi played leading rolls recognizing that the provisions of welfare as income for illegal immigrants provides protections against

governmental intrusion on religious liberty which is why she authored H.R. 4502 provides protections against a failing California economy. On June 22, 1807, when the British ship Leopard fired upon and ordered the lowering of an American frigate's (The Chesapeake) flag, Madison told the British Ambassador that the attack on the Chesapeake was a detached, flagrant insult to the flag and sovereignty of the United States. Madison's pronouncements consistently emphasized that insults to the physical integrity of the flag continued to have the same legal significance in a variety of different contexts, abroad, at sea, and at home. To Madison, sovereignty entailed a relationship not only between nations and foreign entities, but between nations and domestic persons in wartime and peacetime like Madison, Thomas Jefferson sought to protect the sovereignty interest in the flag.

The Democratic National Committee are a *queer* bunch of Yankee hicks, in 1992, the Democratic Party had in their platform provisions that said that illegal aliens were coming in this country, committing felonies, sent back and then they were right back across the border to do the same thing. In 1996, the California DNC platform was President Clinton is making our border a place where the law is respected, and drugs and illegal immigrants are turned away. We have increased the Border Patrol by over 40 percent; in El Paso, our Border Patrol agents are so close together they can see each other. Last year alone, the Clinton Administration removed thousands of illegal workers from jobs across the country. Just since January of 1995, we have arrested more than 1,700 criminal aliens and prosecuted them on federal felony charges because they returned to America after having been deported. On immigration, in 1996 the California Democratic Party platform, we believe we must remain a nation of laws. We cannot tolerate illegal immigration and we must stop it. For years before Bill Clinton became President, Washington talked tough but failed to act. In 1992, the borders might as well not have existed. The border was under patrolled, and what patrols there were, were under-equipped. Drugs flowed freely. Illegal immigration was rampant. Criminal immigrants, deported after committing crimes in America, returned the very next day to commit crimes again. In 2000, the DNC platform changed to , The Democratic Party supports restoration of basic due process protections and essential benefits for legal immigrants, so that immigrants are no longer subject to deportation for minor offenses, often committed decades ago without opportunity for any judicial review and are eligible to receive safety net services supported by their tax dollars. In 2020, the democratic party view on immigration policies as an opportunity to renew the American community. they understand the need [for] comprehensive immigration reform, not just piecemeal efforts. Noticeably absent from the party's

platform is reference to the language in their '92, '96 and 2000platform. Rather, "comprehensive" immigration reform remains a top priority for Democrats. It must be clear to the Court that the Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security their departments are lipstick on a pig, everything they say is a lie.
Therefore the defendants, Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security have committed treason on The United States by instituting segregation in California in favor for the Mexican and Central American workers. The defendants Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security, Marcia Fudge Secretary of HUD are treasonous scum Ex-Patriots who provided to the enemy of the United States **on day one** of their jobs within the Biden/Harris Administration food, financial aid, provide healthcare, create unconstitutional guidance's for law informant to follow all for private foreign people of a foreign nation. As the Court explained, a citizen intellectually or emotionally may favor the enemy and harbor sympathies or convictions disloyal to this country's policy or interest, but, so long as he commits no act of aid and comfort to the enemy, there is no treason. On the other hand, a citizen may take actions which do aid and comfort the enemy making a speech critical of the government or opposing its measures, profiteering, striking in defense plants or essential work, and the hundred other things which impair our cohesion and diminish our strength but if there is no adherence to the enemy in this, if there is no intent to betray, there is no treason. In other words, the Constitution requires both concrete action and an intent to betray the nation before a citizen can be convicted of treason; expressing traitorous thoughts or intentions alone does not suffice. The Constitution also narrowed the scope of punishment for treason "Corruption of blood" which prohibited family members from among other things receiving or inheriting property from a person convicted of treason. Under the Constitution, that punishment may not extend beyond the life of the person convicted of treason. The Constitutions' Framers shared the view that all citizens owed a duty of loyalty to their home nation. Clearly, the DNC know nothing about

loyalty to the Nation, but the treason Clause is to guard against the historic use of treason prosecutions by repressive governments to silence otherwise legitimate political opposition. The Constitution specifically identifies what constitutes treason against the United States and, importantly, limits the offenses of treason to only two types of conduct; (1) "levying war" against the United States; or (2) adhering to the enemies of the United States, giving them aid and comfort. The offense of "levying war" against the United States was interpreted narrowly in Ex parte Bollman & Swarthout (1807) an alleged plot led by former Vice President Aaron Burr to overthrow the American government in New Orleans. Chief Justice John Marshall's opinion emphasized, merely to conspire to subvert by force the government of our country by recruiting troops, procuring maps, and drawing up plans. Conspiring to levy war was distinct from actually levying war. Rather, a person could be convicted of treason for levying war only if there was an actual assemblage of men for the purpose of executing a treasonable design. In Cramer v. United States (1945), that case involved another infamous incident in American history the Nazi Saboteur Affair. Cramer was prosecuted for treason for allegedly helping German soldiers who had surreptitiously infiltrated American soil during World War II. In reviewing Cramer's treason conviction, the Court explained that a person could be convicted of treason only if he or she adhered to an enemy *and* gave that enemy aid and comfort.

The defendants, Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security have continued their treason acts, by making of speeches, acritical act to treason. Their rebel yell, "there are jobs in America, Americans won't do" is Nancy Pelosi's signature Aryan Rebel Yell. The Court is aware of race or ancestry has survived Courts scrutinizes and these complaints does not at all disparage any race. There was a time in our nation's history that measures urgency of the situation demanded all citizens of Japanese ancestry to be segregated from the West Coast temporarily, because of evidence of disloyally on the part of some, but the U.S. Government thought the need for action was great, and time was short. Therefore, it would not be the first time Congress and this Court used similar legal avenues as the plaintiff has put forward to protect the American food supply from saboteurs from a foreign nation, illegal immigrants from Central America. The defendants put the plaintiff and the county in an economical, local and national debt by allowing the illegal immigrants from Mexico a foreign national race of people to control the U.S. food supply. This claim does not at all to say one group of people are dangerous (unlike

the defendants' legislations in these complaints which state the Negro is dangerous) but the plaintiff wants to the Court to focus on the history of death caused by dangerous tendencies that occur when pay negotiations are going on with union workers who can and have committed sabotage and espionage of the American food supply. Plaintiff believing in facts that if immigrant legislation didn't go the illegal immigrant's way, our nation's food supply from California would always be poisoned. Illegal immigrants having control of the United States food supply as the United Farm Workers Union currently do is disaster and need to change.

While illegal immigrants have been allowed to take over the nation's food supply, they have caused several E. coli outbreaks across America over the years that have coincided with their wage and citizen threats and demands who they believe are essential workers to the American Negro. The CDC estimates that 265,000 STEC infections occur each year in the United States and E. coli causes more than 36% of these infections and a majority of the E.coli contaminated food has come from California. In September 2006, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) began receiving reports on clusters of patients in various states confirmed to have E. coli infections. By early October, 800 people in 26 states had become ill and 102 people had been hospitalized, 31 had developed hemolytic uremic syndrome (HUS), a type of kidney failure, and three had died. Investigators were able to trace the outbreak back to several farm fields in the Salinas Valley of California. While the investigation continues, there is evidence that nearby livestock, feral pigs, or other environmental sources may have contaminated one or more of the fields. Losses to the industry from the spinach outbreak have been estimated at $100 million. In April 2018 the CDC investigated a multistate outbreak of E.coli infections from Romaine lettuce grown in California. In May 2018 220 people in 36 states contract E.coli from romaine lettuce 5 people die. In November 2018 the CDC investigates another outbreak of E.coli in lettuce ; 43 people sickened in 12 states. In January 2020, A total of 167 people infected with the outbreak strain of E.coli were reported from 27 states. A total of 85 hospitalizations were reported, including 15 people who developed hemolytic uremic syndrome, a type of kidney failure. Although no deaths were reported contaminated romaine lettuce that made people sick in this outbreak harvested from the Salinas Valley growing region in California was no longer available for sale. FDA and states traced the source of some of the romaine lettuce eaten by ill people harvested from the Salinas Valley growing region in California. Defendant's Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo

Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security HATERED towards the plaintiff and the Negro race has affected the business community in the state of California and its hiring practices. The Court must hold the National Security Act of 1947 b)(1) Subsection (a) shall not be deemed to limit or affect the responsibility and power of an agency head pursuant to other law or Executive order to deny or terminate access to classified information if the national security so requires. Such responsibility and power may be exercised only when the agency head determines that the procedures prescribed by subsection (a) cannot be invoked in a manner that is consistent with the national security. Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security, Marcia Fudge Secretary of HUD are also in violation of Sec. 904. 50 U.S.C. §441c, the President may use the authority of sections 901 and 902 to stay the imposition of an economic. Sections 901 and 902 requires there be imposed by the Chemical and Biological Weapons has the responsibility to test the food supply.

This injunction request for H.R. 4502 is for Federal Constitutional "policy" which is in place because Congress will not change the immigration laws which makes H.R. 4502 an operation decision which replaces all pre-existing federal immigration, taxes, social security and work authorization for illegal immigrants. Unlike Roosevelt's New Deal recovery which lifted the US economy by creating the "alphabet agencies" the AAA (Agricultural Adjustment Administration) stabilized farm prices and thus saved farms. The CCC (Civilian Conservation Corps) provided jobs to unemployed youths while improving the environment. The TVA (Tennessee Valley Authority) provided jobs and brought electricity to rural areas for the first time. The FERA (Federal Emergency Relief Administration) and the WPA (Works Progress Administration) provided jobs to thousands of unemployed Americans in construction and arts projects across the country. The NRA (National Recovery Administration) sought to stabilize consumer goods prices through a series of codes. The effects of the Depression were intensified by drought and dust storms, simply abandoned their farms and headed for California in hopes of finding the "land of milk and honey." Gangs of unemployed youth, whose families could no longer support them, rode the rails as hobos in search of work. This makes H.R. 4502 tax fraud a "political" Act amount to slavery of the Negro race and violated their Fifth Amendment, as well as the Fourteenth Amendment protects even those presence in this country is unlawful, involuntary,

or transitory is entitled to that constitutional protection. Wong Yang Sung, supra; Wong Wing, Supra. Graham v. Richardson, 403 U.S. 365, This case holds the strongest support if welfare benefits for immigrants or an immigrant not meeting a residence within the U.S., violates the Equal Protection Clause. In short, citizens and those who are most like citizens qualify. Those who are less like citizens do not.

This injunction request is the harm done to the American Negro race by 'joe" who is "evil" and the author of laws and in many cases the primary architect of "evil" of those laws in every significant federal bill that has brought peonage to the American Negro are: (1) 2018 Federal Criminal Justice Reform Bill; (2) violent crime control act of 1994; 1994 War on Drugs; (3) A Ban On Affirmative Action; federal crime bill of 1994; (4) 1991 Police Officers Bill of Rights; (5) welfare reform bill of 1994; (6) 1994 Deferral Crime Bill; (7) work responsibility act of 1994; (8) 1994 Social Security Improvements; (9) family self-sufficient act of 1994; (10) 2011 Federal Definition of What is a Gang; (11) War on drugs 1995; (12) War on crime; (13) real welfare reform 1994; (14) federal definition of a gang member of 2011; (15) sentencing reform and correction act of 2017 and (16) federal criminal reform of 2018 each of these federal laws exclude the illegal immigrant from Mexico and Central American and the 300,000 Afghanistan refugees who have been given American citizenship who will never face federal criminal charges within these federal laws. This case holds the strongest support if welfare benefits for immigrants or an immigrant not meeting a residence within the U.S., violates the Equal Protection Clause. In short, citizens and those who qualify for social services without amended constitutions or state laws. As "joe" biden explained when the Biden/Harris Administration air 300,000 Taliban into the United States stated, "We made them a promise". As a result, "Build Back Better" is based on social services the Biden/Harris Administration has taken away from the American Negro race by increasingly incarcerating them so their social benefits can be used for the 3000,000 Taliban in the United States and 7 or 8 or 10 million illegal immigrants in the United States. Then the Court reads the historical record on immigrants voting, immigrants getting social services, immigrants being eligible for Federal Pell Grants and Scholarships, immigrants health care and immigrants working and city employees being able to offer immunity into the U.S. and immunity of all criminal crimes in order the Court to show that one plausible interpretation of the defendant's non-violation of the Elections Clause is that it is fundamentally about congressional sovereignty. In the plaintiff's view and I hope the Court adopts it, Reconstruction or "Build Back Better" is a constitutional interpretation of Congresses enforcement authority under the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, DACA is an Amendment to the Constitution and changed the fabric of the U.S. federal system in United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542,

556 (1876) here the Court must hold, the right to vote in the States comes from the States; but the right of exemption from the prohibited discrimination comes from the United States. H.R. 4502 will just continue to exacerbate and continues to mass incarceration of black men and women so their government representation and social services and now homes they use to occupy become, regentrification by illegal immigrants. The plaintiff is relying on executive order and Proclamation 95 issued September 22, 1862, by President Abraham Lincoln the Emancipation Proclamation **TRUMP's** "Joe" executive orders he issued after the incursion on the Capitol by city police and the military was asking, "Where's Nancy". Unlike "Build Back Better" the U.S. Constitution is clear that welfare benefits for citizens does not require it to provide like benefits for all aliens, nor does Congress treat aliens differently from American citizens and itself does not imply different or separate treatment. If the Court reads the holding in Mathhers v. Diaz, 426 U.S. 67, 96 S.Ct (1976), it becomes clearer that lawful aliens admitted to the U.S. lawfully and refused Medicare Part B, and the Court reversed a lower court's order the found unconstitutional for aliens to receive benefits. Here, illegal immigrants do not receive social benefits and therefore, H.R. 4502 is unconstitutional, but the benefits belong to the American people not the refugees, illegal immigrants or those DAPA things. Therefore, the social benefits are to only be serviced for the American people and partners and vendors of states ae not enumerated in the constitution only people are enumerated.

"joe" bidens' sickness is segregation, he has the disease as a Whiteman he defines it as a "good catholic" means the same thing, which has unconscionably injured the plaintiff and the Negro race by denying enforcement of the after the plaintiff and the Negro race have been induced by his prior laws and know with H.R. 4502 which is an illegal immigrant work, healthcare and educational contract specifically for illegal immigrants the unjust enrichment by giving them tax credits which also allows them to go back two years to receive credits for payments not made into the U.S. tax system. Which result if refugees illegally in the U.S. received the benefits the others' performances were allowed to rely upon the statute. Thus, only the refugees in the U.S. illegally from Mexico and Central America's position have changed as it relies on the defendant's statues and in that poison, their reliance is upon the taxes of the Negro whose performance benefits Nancy Pelosi's contract and the American Negro suffers an unjust injury, while the refugees in the U.S. illegally reap the benefits. In the 1970's SSA became responsible for a new program, Supplemental Security Income (SSI). In 1972, Congress federalized the "adult categories" by creating the SSI program and assigned responsibility for it to SSA which SSI created Cost-of-Living - Adjustments (COLAs) which created provisions for increasing Social Security

benefits for certain categories of beneficiaries. A minimum retirement benefits; an adjustment to the benefit formula governing early retirement at age 62 for men. For women Medicare to those who have received benefits for at least two years with Chronic Renal Disease; liberalized the Retirement Test to increase the benefits who delayed retirement past age 65. Providing illegal immigrants social benefits will drain the services the American Negro's social benefits.

H.R. 4502 appropriations has a special admissions program that are denied to American citizens and H.R. 4502 is in violation of the equal protection of laws under the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution and harms the American Negro; as well as and are guilty of violating 18 U.S. Code § 1581 which brings the plaintiff and American Negro into peonage by an Aryan named "joe". The Court must hold, H.R. 4502 a Federal Bill is in violation of 18 U.S. Code § 1581 (a) whoever holds or returns any person to a condition of peonage or arrests any person with the intent of placing him in or returning him to a condition of peonage, or an attempt to kill, the American Negro shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for any term of years or life, or both. (b) whoever obstructs, or attempts to obstruct, or in any way interferes with or prevents the enforcement of this section, Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Labor, Secretary of transportation, Dr. Miguel Carona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security be liable to the penalties prescribed in subsection (a). This is unconstitutional, just like slavery had to be outlawed, here we go again dealing with laws of peonage. The Fourteenth Amendment inescapably imposes upon this Courts to exercise judgement upon all the claims before the Court; whether they offer fairness in the laws. My complaint is that Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security, Marcia Fudge Secretary of HUD exclude immigrants from Mexico and central America from being charged with crimes by giving them immunity. The judicial judgement of the Court in applying the Due Process Clause must move and lean toward the notion that justice cannot be delegated to one race over others based upon the idiosyncrasies of a merely personal judgement. Furthermore, the plaintiff looks to Justice Black's decision in Twining which reaffirms my request to have the Court lean towards justice in this claim. There, the constitutional theory spelled out in Twining v. New Jersey, 211 U.S. 78, the Court is endowed by the Constitution under 'Natural law" periodically to expand the contract constitutional

standards to conform to "civilized decency and fundamental liberty and justice. The Courts power to prevent state violates of the plaintiff's individual civil liberties is guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. Since Marbury v Madison was decided, courts can strike down legislative enactments which violate the Constitution. In Griffin v. California, 380 U.S. 609 (1965), the court found it unconstitutional that a rule permitting comment on the defendants' failure to testify. The fact of that case is, on the night that Essie Mae was found she had been seen by a Mr. Villasenor in an alley with petitioner Griffin. Griffin who was later convicted of the first-degree murder of Essie Mae, after a jury trial in a California court. He did not testify at his trial, and while the trial court instructed the jury on the issue of guilt, stating that a defendant has a constitutional right not to testify, it also told the jury that they may take into consideration the fact that the defendant did not testify as tending to indicate the truth of the evidence and that of the inferences drawn from the evidence those unfavorable to the defendant are the more probable. The court also stated that the failure of a defendant to deny or explain the evidence of which he had knowledge does not create a presumption of guilt nor by itself warrant an inference of guilt nor relieve the prosecution of any of its burden of proof. During the trial, the prosecutor drew a great deal of attention to the fact that Griffin did not testify with such statements as, "Essie Mae is dead, she can't tell you her side of the story. The defendant won't." Griffin received the death penalty, and the California Supreme Court affirmed this sentence. Similar to the unconstitutionally Griffin v. California. San Francisco, California passed the "Due Process for All" Ordinance which prohibits City employees from using City funds or resources to assist Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) in the enforcement of Federal immigration law. Here, the defendants like in Griffin in the way that the defendants, make a great of attention to the fact that illegal immigrants should not be arrested for similar crimes as citizens in America. The failure to allow illegal immigrants the opportunity to deny crimes after they have committed them is based on the defendant's legislative enactments which violate the plaintiff due process rights and the Constitution. This is violations for the plaintiff's Fourth Amendment and "conduct that shocks the conscience; at issue does the "incorporation" of "specific" rights afforded DACA recipients and SB54 recipients violate the plaintiff's Fourteenth Amendment Rights? Plaintiff claims the defendant's emphasis that the plaintiff and his Negro race be predictability in the belief they should be the default criminal of all crimes alleged in criminal complaints by state officials, police and district attorneys' offices.

Clearly the Court must agree, the security of one's privacy against arbitrary intrusion by the defendants, legislators of the state of California and the people the plaintiff's voter for several decades and I based that on prior elections and what the

DNC was going to do for my Negro race. The Due Process Clause is the concept of ordered liberty and as such is enforceable against the states by Courts. Congress gave no authority for the DHS to meddle in states' rights issues and create immigration laws for any state and contain no indication that DHS can, at will, create its own categorical financial policies for deferred action. California is home to approximately 183,000 DACA recipients the total shifts monthly as the two-year status expires and some recipients renew it. About 105,000 recipients are currently employed. An estimated 40,000 are students at a California Community Colleges. California's Constitutions AB540 Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program passed in 2001 in addition, the state passed AB 130 and AB 131 in 2011, which allows state and institutional financial aid to be given to students eligible under AB 540 approximately quarter of a million Californians covered by DACA. waives the nonresident portion of tuition for undocumented childhood arrivals as long as they meet certain criteria, including spending three or more years in California K–12 schools, graduating from a California high school. California has made its own efforts to ensure that these illegal immigrants are able to take advantage of educational opportunities. A suite of legislation collectively known as California's Dream Act part of the pandemic-related CARES Act to reach undocumented community college students.

To have a chance at the remaining slots, an applicant under the California admissions policy of Mexican or Central American Heritage and ethnicity is Latin needed to have an academic index (AI) of 0.00 or 2.0. The AI is a calculation based upon the applicant's class rank and ACT/SAT scores. Plaintiff's and American Negro's AI was 3.1. In short, they do not qualify for admission to California's, and race plays a part in their denial. For an illegal immigrant (DACA) applicant who had an AI of at least 2.0, the applicant's personal achievement index (PAI) played no part in whether he or she was offered admission. PAI considers scores on two essays; leadership; extracurricular activities; awards/honors; work experience; service to school or community; and seven unusual circumstances, only DACA recipients either 105,000 recipients are currently employed or the estimated 40,000 are students at a California Community Colleges. California's Constitutions AB540 Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program passed in 2001 in addition, the state passed AB 130 and AB 131 in 2011, which allows state and institutional financial aid to be given to students eligible under AB 540 approximately quarter of a million Californians covered by DACA. waives the nonresident portion of tuition for undocumented childhood arrivals as long as they meet certain criteria, including spending three or more years in California K–12 schools, graduating from a California high school. California has made its own efforts to ensure that these illegal immigrants are able to take advantage of educational opportunities. A suite of legislation collectively known as California's

Dream Act part of the pandemic-related CARES Act to reach undocumented community college students. For an American Negro applicant who had an AI of at least 3.1above or below, the applicant's personal achievement index (PAI) played a part in whether he or she was offered admission. PAI considers scores on two essays; leadership; extracurricular activities; awards/honors; work experience; service to school or community; and seven unusual circumstances, no applicant was submitted based on race only educational qualifications. Here the California admissions is you must my illegal immigrant with no IQ to base an PAI consideration. For example, om United Farm Workers v. The United States Department of Labor for wages not baes on education but certification required to work in the US here the California law known as DACA is based on a requirement to stay in the US or be deported. Prior to 1978, the California Constitution expressly required segregated schools for white and American Negro children. For many years thereafter, in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, California failed to eliminate the vestiges of de jure segregation in public higher education and in all other levels of public education. California has failed to reach its goals of integrating the State's predominantly white colleges and universities, with the result that the proportion of African Negro students at Regents of California Colleges is far smaller than the percentage of African Americans in the general Texas population. The resulting lack of diversity disadvantages students throughout California's, regardless of any individual student's race. Any UC program to increase diversity must fight the contrary forces exerted by persisting de facto segregation in California's secondary education system. Indeed, the one partial remedy implemented by California that Petitioner does not challenge the so-called Top Ten Plan that guarantees that admission to UC is offered to California residents graduating in the top 10% of their high school classes has had a positive (albeit limited) impact on diversity at UC only because racial segregation in California public high schools remains so pervasive.

These are illegal immigrants who have no rights to federal services like financial aid or any services from state or federal governments benefits. Similar to their parents or relatives who benefit from a generous H-2A agriculture guestworker program which permits agricultural employers to hire foreign workers on a temporary basis under certain circumstances. The H-2A program is formulated from the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, which created a class on non-immigrant H visas for temporary admission of foreign workers to provide seasonal labor. As amended the INA prohibits the United States Department of Homeland Security from issuing H-2A visa unless the employer seeks to hire foreign guestworkers has applied for and received a certification from the DOL that: (a) there are not sufficient workers who are able, willing and available to do work in

American that Americans can do, (b) foreign workers temporary employment "will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers in the United States similarly employed. Further, this federal certification requirement furthers the INA's purpose of protecting U.S. workers from the potential adverse effects on an influx of guestworkers in that certification prohibits agricultural employers from hiring foreign guestworkers unless they have shown that the U.S. labor market cannot supply the required workers.

H.R. 4502 is written exclusively for California which violates the preemption doctrine in Supremacy Clause because these California Legislations AB131, AB130, AB2779, SB1310, SB141, AB2792, SB54, AB1593 do not follow the Constitution, laws, and treaties of the federal government in matters which are directly or indirectly within the government's control by creating as a "policy" multidistrict remedies for situations which allow de jure segregation exists in the partnership between Fraternal Order of Police or their affiliated municipalities police department; as well as, Police Benevolent Association of the City of New York and their affiliates with municipalities police departments and therefore, all the illegal immigrant laws in California law are unconstitutional. The challenge constitutionality is that simple justice requires that public funds, to which all taxpayers of all races contribute, not be spent in any fashion which encourages, entrenches, subsidizes or results in racial discrimination. H.R. 4502 is direct discrimination by Federal, State or local governments is prohibited by the Constitution. But indirect discrimination, through the use of Federal funds, is just as invidious; and is necessary to resort to this Court to prevent H.R. 4502 from becoming a U.S. Constitution.

Many statutes providing Federal financial assistance, however, define with such precision both the Administrator's role and the conditions upon which specified amounts shall be given to designated recipients under the U.S. Constitution and not States Constitutions that the amount of administrative discretion remaining which might be used to withhold funds if discrimination were not ended is at best questionable. Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security are administrators in their departments have the unlimited authority to invoke the Constitution in opposition to the mandate of the Congress. Nor the withdrawal or adding of any Federal funds from programs in H.R. 4502 or any legislation coning out of the Biden/Harris Administration as it relates to illegal immigrant legislations of

amended constitutions, Presidential Executive Orders or Memorandums from the DHS as this Court will undoubtedly read their laws languages are based on discrimination.

In H.R. 4502 there is language that allows for federal funds and Pell grants to be awarded to illegal immigrants but there is also language in 42 U.S.C. § 2000d-5, enacted in 1966, which prohibits illegal immigrants from getting funds or federal grants for college which can be found in Title VI's standard of the Constitution. Section 2000d-5 provides that for the purpose of determining whether a local educational agency is in compliance with Title VI, compliance by such agency with a final order or judgment of a Federal court for the desegregation of the school or school system operated by such agency shall be deemed to be compliance with Title VI, insofar as the matters covered in the order or judgment are concerned. This provision was clearly intended to avoid subjecting local educational agencies simultaneously to the jurisdiction of the federal courts and the federal administrative agencies in connection with the imposition of remedial measures designed to end school segregation. Its inclusion reflects the congressional judgment that the requirements imposed by Title VI are identical to those imposed by the Constitution as interpreted by the federal courts. The legislative history of Title VI intent to prohibit a racially conscious admissions program designed to assist those who are likely to have suffered injuries from the effects of past discrimination. In the first place, these statements must be read in the context in which they were made. The concern of the speakers was far removed from the incidental injuries which may be inflicted upon non minorities by the use of racial preferences. It was rather with the evil of the segregation of Negroes in federally financed programs and, in some cases, their arbitrary exclusion on account of race from the benefits of such programs. Indeed, in this context there can be no doubt that the Fourteenth Amendment does command color blindness and forbids the use of racial criteria. No consideration was given by these legislators, however, to the permissibility of racial preference designed to redress the effects of injuries suffered as a result of one's color. Significantly one of the legislators, Senator Pastore, and perhaps also Senator Kuchel, who described Title VI as proscribing decision making based upon skin color, also made it clear that Title VI does not outlaw the use of racial criteria in all circumstances. Moreover, there are many statements in the legislative history explicitly indicating that Congress intended neither to require nor to prohibit the remedial use of racial preferences where not otherwise required or prohibited by the Constitution.

It appears to the plaintiffthar in the United Sates legislative history of the American people when any representative in Congress, Senate or the local City Council will address any social service to the American people this way, the problem of preferential treatment, our constituents, indicates a great degree of misunderstanding about this bill and benefits. Constituents complain about racial 'balancing' in the public schools, about open occupancy in housing, about preferential treatment or quotas in employment. There is a mistaken belief that Congress is legislating in these areas in this bill or benefit. When drafted this bill for a benefit the benefit is excluded these issues largely because the problems raised by these controversial questions are more properly handled at a governmental level close to the American people and by communities and individuals themselves. The Court the legislative history of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e (1970 ed. and Supp. V), which supports the injunction of H.R. 4502 because the injunction will prohibits employment discrimination on the basis of race and ethnicity in terms somewhat similar to those contained in Title VI, see 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2(a)(1) which makes H.R. 4502 unconstitutional as it is unlawful "to fail or refuse to hire" American applicants because of such individual's race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, to the effect that H.R. 4502 is a deliberate attempt by Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security the employer in H.R. 4502 to maintain a racially balance, 110 Cong. Rec. 7214 (1964). Once again, there is no indication that Congress intended to bar the voluntary use of racial preferences to assist minorities to surmount the obstacles imposed by the remnants of past discrimination. Even assuming that Title VII prohibits employers from deliberately maintaining a particular racial composition in their work force as an end in itself, this does not imply, in the absence of any consideration of the question, that Congress intended to bar the u e of racial preferences as a tool for achieving the objective of remedying past discrimination or other compelling ends. The former may well be contrary to the requirements of the Fourteenth Amendment (where state action is involved), while the latter presents vastly different constitutional considerations. Indeed, as discussed, this Court has construed H.R. 4502 under Title VII as requiring the use of racial preferences for the purpose of hiring and advancing those who have been adversely affected by past discriminatory employment practices, even at the expense of other employees of discrimination, Franks v. Bowman Transportation *Co.*, 424 U.S. 747, 767-768, 96 S.Ct. 1251, 1265-1266, 47 L.Ed.2d 444 (1976). Although Title VII clearly does not require employers to take

involved), while the latter presents vastly different constitutional considerations. Indeed, as discussed, this Court has construed H.R. 4502 under Title VII as requiring the use of racial preferences for the purpose of hiring and advancing those who have been adversely affected by past discriminatory employment practices, even at the expense of other employees of discrimination, Franks v. Bowman Transportation *Co.*, 424 U.S. 747, 767-768, 96 S.Ct. 1251, 1265-1266, 47 L.Ed.2d 444 (1976). Although Title VII clearly does not require employers to take action to remedy this injunction does and H.R. 4502 has disadvantages to all American and imposed upon racial minorities by hands other than their own, such an objective is perfectly inconsistent with the remedial goals of the Constitution.

It is not correct to say that Title VII prohibits employers from making race or national origin a factor for consideration at any stage in the process of obtaining employees. Here H.R. 4502 is interstate commerce as the illegal immigrant is commerce and the activity. Federal Constitution H.R. 4502 regulates illegal immigrants from Mexico and Central American are adopted as a work preference, a work order, a work endorsement that Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security, Marcia Fudge Secretary of HUD impose on interstate commerce an introduce it as such to the American people, and whether the relative weights of the state and national interests involved are such as to make inapplicable the laws of the State of California are commerce are AB1576, AB2779, SB1236, AB130, AB131, AB4, Post-Secondary non-resident scholarship, ABX1SBX1, AB236, AB1593, AB1024, SB54, SB1310, SB477, SB141, SB1159 and AB2792, generally observed these are all wage, work or educational commerce activity that the free flow of interstate commerce from California to every other state plus the people in those states local restraints in matters requiring uniformity in the workplace or uniformity of regulations are interests safeguarded by the commerce clause from state interference. The Courts' standard of Commerce Clause re-view of state laws and regulations, or having an impact on, interstate commerce was adopted by the Court in Southern Pacific Co. v. Arizona. Chief Justice Stone's dissenting opinion on whether a state or local regulation was valid depended upon a reconciliation of the conflicting claims of state and national power that is to be attained only by some appraisal and accommodation of the competing demands of the state and national interests involved, Southern Pacific Co. v. Arizona, 325 U.S. 761, 768–69 (1941). Therefore, compliant is to show H.R, 4502 is unconstitutional and this Court must determine whether the defendants' Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of

burdens of H.R. 4502 will be tolerated will of course depend on the local interests involved; that is why this compliant is before the Court H.R. 4502 allows for their interest to kill off the Negro race by their exclusive Police Officers Boll of Rights and Government Code Sections 3300-3312 to be using exclusively on the American Negro race so their social benefits will be given since not used to the illegal immigrants by characterizing the illegal immigrants as "minorities" for the purpose of providing state and federal benefits to them.

H.R. 4502 is discrimination and is an evolving one just like the other discriminatory ; "joe" the architect of "evil" has authored like his 1991 S.1043 the Police Officers Bill of Rights which came from the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, to encourage States to enact Police Officers Bills of Rights and to provide standards and protections for the conduct of internal police investigations. On legislative day, April 25, 1991, Mr. Joe Biden introduced by the Senate and House of Representatives an Act cited as the 'Police Officers Bill of Rights Act of 1991, rights of law enforcement officers. In Section 819 (a) Political Activity, Except when on duty or acting in an official capacity no law enforcement officer shall be prohibited from engaging in political activity or be denied the right to refrain from engaging in such activity. In every significant federal bill violent crime control act of 1994, federal crime bill of 1994, welfare reform bill of 1994, work responsibility act of 1994, family self-sufficient act of 1994, War on drugs 1995, War on crime, real welfare reform 1994, federal definition of a gang member of 2011, sentencing reform and correction act of 2017 and federal criminal reform of 2018 which exacerbated and continues to mass incarceration of black men and women. The pure "evil" from the Department of Homeland Security Janet Napolitano came as a memorandum, which is a "policy" to implement nationwide for illegal immigrants known as DAPA nor can the DHS's November 20, 2014 memorandum expanding the parameters of DACA and creating a new policy called Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents ("DAPA") and not be in contempt by publication, clear and present danger of the "substantive evil" of the impact on the judicial process. H.R. 4502 is in violation of Title VII U.S. Supreme Court's decision in the Bostock case regarding Title VII and H.R. 4502 is offering employment to illegal immigrants as procreation which is discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity. Congress has been here before and struck down race bases laws in Contractors Assn. of Eastern Pa. v. Secretary of Labor, 442 F.2d 159 (C.A.3), 404 U.S. 854, 92 S.Ct. 98, 30 L.Ed.2d 95 (1971) held, that race-conscious affirmative action was permissible under Title VI in this case both involved were American Citizens which excludes illegal immigrants from that holding moreover, a similar holding is in Southern Illinois Builders Assn. v. Ogilvie, 471 F.2d 680 (C.A.7 1972). The Congress, in

enacting the 1972 amendments to Title VII, explicitly considered and rejected proposals to alter Exec. Order No. 11246 and the prevailing judicial interpretations of Title VII as permitting, and in some circumstances requiring, race-conscious action.

H.R. 4502 is in violation of the National Labor Relations Act the, Section 8(a)(1) of the Act makes H.R. 4502 an unfair labor practice, which make H.R. 4502 unlawful for Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security are interfering with the plaintiff's and the Negro race to unionize, to join together to advance their interests as free citizens to create businesses or non-competitive employment "policy" for defendants H.R. 4502causes restrain, or coerce of the personal, constitutional and religious rights of theirs have been violated in the exercise of the live, liberty and happiness as a citizens rights. Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security are employers of illegal immigrants which is the Democratic National Committee not the American people burden nor expense as they use their employees to monopolize the American workforce as illegal immigrants. The defendants under H.R. 4502 are self-funding by providing credits for past years even thought the illegal immigrant was not in the United States during the years 2019 and 2020. The illegal immigrants from Mexico and Central American under H.R. 4502 are allowed to go back by amending the IRS laws in favor of one ethnic group from Mexico and Central America through the tax dollars of the plaintiff's race and used for the entire race in the U.S. of illegal immigrants in leu of the happiness of the plaintiff to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employment or self-employment in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in Section 7 of the Act. For example, an employer **Shall Not...**

- Support a union membership, engage in union activity in deciding what race or region of a people will join that union, or select a union to represent them, here is the United Farm Workers Union and Janitorial unions.
- Threaten employees with adverse consequences if they engage in protected, concerted activity. In DACA there are rules put in place to assure the illegal immigrant is not part of the mass incarceration the plaintiff's race has

experienced, similar to the legislation of abortion in 1973 which played an important part in devastating the plaintiff race. As we as, Ronald Reagan Anti-Drug Abuse Act which established mandatory minimum sentences for drug possession, or Lyndon Johnson's Safe Street Act of 1968, which increased the flow of federal money to local and state police. These are only a few of many pieces of "punitive" sanctions the federal and state governments put on the plaintiff and the Negro race which in 1995 there were 101,162 inmates today it's more than 500,000 people in prison in the Unites States.

- Promise employees benefits if they reject the union. Here, DACA and SB54 offer benefits paid for out of the General Fund of California.
- Imply a promise of benefits by soliciting grievances from employees during a union organizing campaign. Here, California has offered immigrant children the comically call dreamers free college education, free Medicare and the plaintiff a citizen must comply to the California Healthcare Foundation or The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. These are mandated by law, but the to illegal immigrants are riding on the plaintiff's coattail and are treated differently under the law.
- Promulgate, maintain, or enforce work rules that reasonably tend to inhibit the plaintiff and his Negro race from exercising their rights under the Act.

In Grove City College v. Bell, 465 U.S. 555 (1984), the court held that Title VI applied only to programs receiving Federal assistance, here the federal assistance would be a grant from any of "joe's" crime bills mentioned earlier in these causes. Title VII protects against discrimination in Equal Employment Opportunities like a school's board engagement by a police officer in a dress of dress blues whichever. The Voting Rights Act of 1965, 79 Stat. 437, 42 U.S.C. subsection 1973, the central theory of the Act is to move beyond case-by-case litigation covered jurisdictions, states and political subdivisions that uses literacy tests as a qualification for voting. After the Jews assassinated Dr. Martin Luther king in 1968, the Civil Rights Act of 1968 was passed, H.R. 2516, Title VII prohibits discrimination in housing provided for enhanced enforcement as well as adding to the categories of prohibited discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin. The Court must hold, Government Code Sections 3300-3312violates the Civil Rights Act that Congressional power to enforce the Thirteenth Amendment extends to private racial discrimination. In United States v. Guest supra, the court agreed section five of the Fourteenth Amendment empowers Congress to enact laws punishing private interference with Fourteenth Amendment rights. In that same Gust majority, the court concluded that a conspiracy to deny victims fourteenth amendment rights can be prosecuted under subsection 241 if proof of state action. The six Justices in Guest expanded other cases where private

individuals effectively destroy or interfere with victims' rights against the state. Specific provisions of 18 U.S.C. deny other because of their right to attend public schools, participate in programs provided or administered by the state, United States v. Harris, 106 U.S. 629 (1883), to punish members of a lynch mob who took a prisoner from state custody. Similarly, State statutes violate the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution by granting refugees or illegal immigrants job opportunities over America citizens. Of course, there is a rational relationship test, and that Article is 5949(2), it bears a rational relationship to states interests in the proper and orderly handling of importance to the state, Vargas v. Strake, 710 F.2d 190, 195 (1983). As a general matter, a State law that discriminates on the basis of alienage can be sustained only if it can withstand strict judicial scrutiny and in order for that, the law must advance a compelling State interest by the least restrictive means available.

The defendant's activity and purpose is consistent with the holding in Mitchell, that identifiable acts of political management and political campaigning are prohibited on the part of federal employees. In this Court's judgement on constitutionally the proscription of identifiable partisan conduct language in H.R. 4502 maybe it's judgement, 5 U.S. Code Subsection 7324(a)(2). Subsection 7324(a) could be read to preclude political activity at any time by these individuals. H.R. Rep. No. 103-16, at 22 (1993). Because the on-duty prohibitions were therefore unworkable for the subsection 7324(b) employees, Congress allowed those employees to engage in political activity, but only if the costs associated with that political activity are not paid for by money derived from the Treasury of the United States. In 5 U.S.C. subsection 7324(b)(1) and in subsection 7324(b) Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security use the federal salary-allotment system to make political contributions to themselves as the illegal immigrants are not their constituents. The Court should consider these contributions to PACs, formulated and benefiting the DNC because the costs incurred in making such contributions specifically to their political party, and the costs of processing and transmitting the money to the PACs would be paid for by money derived from the Treasury of the United States in which the defendants control. An act of Congress in which a city or government employee, here it is Nancy Pelosi has taken an active role in political management or political campaigns for the illegal immigrant and has been ruled before as prohibitive. Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe"

biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security, Marcia Fudge Secretary of HUD are in violation of United Public Workers v. Mitchell, 330 U.S. 75 (1947), there the holding was Congress can prevent another person from holding a party office, working the polls, and acting like a party paymaster for other party workers. An act of Congress going no further would in the courts view unquestionably be valid. Here the defendants Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security are persons holding a party office, working the polls by going on Tour like the Jackson Five and promoting "Build Back Better", and acting like a party paymasters for illegal immigrants by having a payment for procreation as a job in H.R. 4502 exclusively for illegal immigrants from Mexico and Central America. In Ambach v. Norwick, 441 U.S. 68 (1979), the court held a State may bar aliens who have not declared their intent to become citizens from teaching like police, possess a high degree of responsibility of a governmental obligation. Here, the illegal immigrants all 300,000 plus thousand are here on behalf of the invitation from Gavin Newsom, the Oriental chick, "joe" biden and Nancy Pelosi which makes all 300,000 plus thousand the Democratic National Committee's employees and problem this is not a taxpayer problem nor does the U.S. Constitution make it them the American people's problem The DNC invited them, the DNC must take responsibility for them. That is what this entire complaint is about, the illegal immigrant is under contract with the Democratic National Committee and there is no federal law they can conjure up that will disprove this is a DNC contract, and therefore a DNC problem. Not the American Negro problem just our concern.

H.R. 4502 violates racial discrimination in housing And Title I, for use of force or threats to interfere with the plaintiff and Negro races "federally protected activities", 18 U.S.C subsection 245. Title VII Sections 801-819 which prohibits discrimination because of race, color, religion and national origin in the sales or rental of housing. This U.S Constitution is in violation of the plaintiff and the Negro races civil rights specifically, The Civil Rights Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 241) Title II Discrimination in Places of Public Accommodations 42 U.S.C. subsection 2000a plaintiff seeks injunctive relief against this U.S Constitution H.R. 4502, as it discriminates in public accommodations. Marcia Fudge Secretary of HUD announced on September 1, 2021, the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) Section 542 (c) Housing Finance Agency Risk-Sharing Program with the

Department of Treasury's Federal Financing Bank (FFB Risk-Sharing) which provides low-cost capital needed to spur development of rental housing in cooperation with state Housing Finance Agencies (HFAs). The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is taking as part of the Biden-Harris Administration's plan to create, preserve, and sell nearly 100,000 additional affordable homes for homeowners and renters across the country over the next three years. HUD Secretary Fudge vowed to deliver to construct 1.5million housing single-family homes available to individuals, families, and non-profit organizations in the future by prioritizing homeownership and limiting the sale to large investors of certain FHA-insured and HUD-owned properties, in addition to expanding and creating exclusivity periods in which only governmental entities, owner occupants, and qualified non-profit organizations are able to bid on certain FHA-insured properties. The Section 542(c) Housing Finance Agency Risk-Sharing program allows eligible Housing Finance Agencies (HFAs) to enter into contracts with HUD that provide FHA insurance on Multifamily mortgages for properties with affordable housing units underwritten by an HFA, and where HUD and the HFA share the risk of any potential loss if the mortgage defaults. With the FHA insurance credit enhancement, the Federal Financing Bank will purchase the mortgage, generating capital funds for the HFA to lend to private developers building or rehabilitating multifamily properties that provide affordable rental homes, including refinance of properties for low, extremely low, and extremely low-income individuals. FHA will continue to seek necessary authority to further enhance the mortgage securitization eligibility features of the program.
The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) includes a $5.4 billion expansion of housing vouchers to cover 200,000 additional families. it would put HUD's budget at $68.7 billion for fiscal year 2022. This is another example of "Build Back Better" is apartheid, in the HUD proposal for housing its segregated by make more single-family homes available to individuals, families, and non-profit organizations in the future by prioritizing homeownership and limiting the sale to large investors of certain FHA-insured and HUD-owned properties, in addition to expanding and creating exclusivity periods in which only governmental entities, owner occupants, and qualified non-profit organizations are able to bid on certain FHA-insured properties. This is exclusively for illegal immigrants for example,



the Democrats believe that by expanding H.R. 4502 social benefits, work contract, medical benefits, college grants and homeownership exclusively for illegal immigrants from Mexico and Central America and by creating exclusivity periods in which only governmental entities, owner occupants, and qualified non-profit organizations supporting illegal immigrants and are able to bid on certain FHA-insured properties should be exclusively for illegal immigrant from Mexico, Central America and the Taliban is both an economic and a moral imperative and by ensuring every illegal immigrant parent (DAPA) and every illegal immigrant child (DACA) can make the American citizens homeless by creating laws like SB1236. SB54, SB4 which allows the taking their American jobs since 1994 and now in 2021 the Democrats have created H.R. 4502 to make jobs exclusively for illegal immigrants and the American citizens families in California's Bay Area and beyond is made homeless and jobless and transforming every neighborhood in the United States into thriving neighborhoods of illegal immigrant suburbs using Aire B & B a federal partner and by expanding IRS credits and welfare benefits and expanding rental assistance by paying the illegal immigrants rent for twelve-month out of the year and as a federal employees they are paid $15 an hour to procreate and $600 a month per illegal immigrant they spit-out and for home ownership the Democrats under H.R. 4502 have an exclusive racist loan programs which segregates federal borrowing only to be an illegal immigrants, H.R. 4502 is the American dream. California cities of Oakland, San Jose, San Francisco and Los Angeles are building "essential worker" communities which is funded by H.R. 4502 which is clearly apartheid. This Court must understand H.R. 4502 is a federal constitution is exclusive to illegal immigrants where the entire ethnic group can go into the federal exchange not the open market like the peons, we American Negro's are but the illegal immigrants per the United States of America has FHA-insured exclusively. This Court must understand, N-33-20 is a California Constitution exclusive to illegal immigrants where the entire ethnic group is given work contracts, healthcare, grants for education and go into the federal exchange not the open market and get loan, grants and healthcare.

Similar to federal law H.R. 4502 with language in there for workers compensation and "essential works" laws is California's Constitutions SB1159, AB685, SB275

and N-33-20 which is an Executive Order. Each law both federal and state mirror one another, they are exclusively for illegal immigrants, and they use the American Negro's tax dollars. The Court must hold, H.R. 4502, California's Constitutions SB1159, AB685, SB275 and N-33-20 which is an Executive Order are in violation of the National Labor Relations Act the sections 8(a)(1) of the Act makes it an unfair labor practice and Executive Order 11246, sections - sections 405. H.R. 4502 is American's immigration system intrinsically linked with the country's economic development follows the illegal immigrant invasion in the first eleven months of the Biden/Harris administration which is an expansion of concentrated federal and states systems of capital accumulation for illegal immigrants with grants, microloans based on IRS credits, SBA loans, state's paying utilities and rent for twelve month out of the year among creates a middle-income of illegal immigrants by starting from the bottom. H.R. 4502 is apartheid and like "joe's" crime bills and effects H.R. 4502 will cause trauma to the American Negro race the apartheid system has often been described as a major cause of mental distress and psychiatric disorder in South Africa which was funded by Israel, the United States and Great Britain by the way the U.S. and Great Britain created Israel. H.R. 4502 like Israel laws are at least two different views of the mental health consequences of apartheid in the United States and apartheid in Israel for the Palestinian people. The first states that apartheid was a major stressor that led to significant mental disorders like psychiatric disorders was significant across mood, anxiety, and substance use disorders in the fully adjusted models. A contrasting approach is that the political struggle against apartheid fostered resilience among those who were engaged in it, Basoglu et al., 1994; Stein, 1998. The adverse effects of unfair treatment on physical and mental health are well documented (Adams, 1965; Krieger, 1990). Williams, Yan, Jackson, and Anderson (1997), for example, found that perceived discrimination, both economic and noneconomic, plays an incremental role in accounting for racial differences in health status in the United States. H.R.4502 will lead to the American Negro's having PTSD is that it is a normal, albeit exaggerated, emotional response to severe or abnormal stress based on the new and greatest threat of being killed buy one's own government. Consistent with this view, progressive practitioners have argued that apartheid has resulted in a chronic PTSD in many South Africans (Foster, Davis, & Sandler, 1987). It has been argued in the reading preparing for this compliant that the revenge of those who survived the Holocaust was not the Nuremberg trials but rather going forward and succeeding with life (Stein, 1998).H.R. 4502 is apartheid and the defendants have committed crimes against humanity and is in line with the (UN) Security Council at that time although the UN General Assembly declared that apartheid was a crime against humanity, the US and the UK (both permanent members of the Security Council) voted against approving this description. But

this cannot obscure the UN's repeated condemnation of apartheid and imposition of wide-ranging sanctions against South Africa. Apartheid was also included as a "crime against humanity" in the Rome Statute that set up the International Criminal Court. This appears to reinforce a wider perception that many white people have never been obliged to confront, properly, the evils of the past. This is in part, perhaps, because apartheid ended through "*HOPE*". The Court must hold, H.R4502 is in violation of H.R. 2516, Title VII prohibits discrimination in housing provided for enhanced enforcement as well as adding to the categories of prohibited discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin. The Court must hold, California's N-33-20 is in violation of H.R. 2516, Title VII prohibits discrimination in housing provided for enhanced enforcement as well as adding to the categories of prohibited discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin. The defendants are in violation of The Civil Rights Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 241) Title II Discrimination in Places of Public Accommodations 42 U.S.C. subsection 2000a. The defendants are guilty of brining the plaintiff and American Negro into peonage and they must be arrested and tried for treason against the United Sates of America. H.R. 4502 is in violation of the Peonage Act of 1867 and H.R. 4502 is an attempted to outlaw peonage based on Congress' enforcement powers under the Thirteenth Amendment. The defendants have violated the plaintiff and the American Negro's Thirteenth Amendment Rights. Plaintiff wishes to make a citizen's arrest on the private citizens the defendants in their official rolls and their rolls in the Democratic National Committee.

In any area where the new law does not address itself, or in any areas where a specific contrary intent is not indicated, it was assumed that the present case law as developed by the courts would continue to govern the applicability and construction of Title VII. Legislative History of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972; or the holding by Justice White in United Jewish Organizations v. Carey, 430 U.S. 144, 97 S.Ct. 996; or the conclusion cannot be resisted, that no reason for the refusal to issue permits to Chinese exists except hostility to the race and nationality to which the petitioners belong discrimination is, therefore, illegal; even in Plessy v. Ferguson the Court recognized that a classification by race that presumed one race to be inferior to another would have to be condemned. See 163 U.S., at 544-551, 16 S.Ct.; or when the Court used "strict scrutiny" standard in race cases, Hirabayashi v. United States, 320 U.S. 81, 63 S.Ct. 1375, 87, 1774 (1943), and Korematsu v. United States, 323 U.S. 214, 65 S.Ct. 193, 89, 194 (1944). In Hirabayashi, for example, the Court, responding to a claim that a racial classification was rational, sustained a racial classification solely on the basis of a conclusion in the double negative that it could

not say that facts which might have been available could afford no ground for differentiating citizens of Japanese ancestry from other groups in the United States. Generally, the manner in which a California chooses to delegate governmental functions is for it to decide but not when providing funding, education, healthcare and a political party for illegal immigrants through committee votes but when they put to the voters in California laws which bring the American Negro into peonage then the Courts take a strict scrutiny view at their laws and policies they make into laws, For example, the Trustees at the Regents of California provide education and accept funds from California and went to Court on behalf of illegal immigrants. California, by constitutional provision, has chosen to place authority over the operation of the University of California in the Board of Regents, Cal. Const., Art. 9, subsection 9 (a). The Court is aware the control over the University is to be found not in the legislature, but rather in the Regents who had been vested with full legislative (including policymaking), administrative, and adjudicative powers by the citizens of California. Ishimatsu v. Regents, 266 Cal.App.2d 854, 863-864, 72. 756, 762-763 (1968); IN Goldberg v. Regents, 248 Cal.App.2d 867, 874, 57, 463, 468 (1967); in 30 Op. Cal. Atty. Gen. 162, 166 (1957) the Court held that the Regents, not the legislature, have the general rulemaking or policy-making power in regard to the University. The Court must hold, defendant Nancy Pelosi a representative of California is certainly the permissible choice of authority in deciding or by force to allow illegal immigrants attending any University of California campuses. H.R. 4502 because it is unconstitutional cannot grant Nancy Pelosi authority or power to link tuition for the University of California Colleges for illegal immigrants in California under any federal bill coming from the traders of America the Biden/Harris Administration. Secretaries in education , agriculture, commerce and labor will not find nothing in the Equal Protection Clause that requires t Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security, Marcia Fudge Secretary of HUD to force, persuade or entice by fraud by infusing the US Regents with credits, tax exemptions which is to force the UC Regents to departing from established principle by limiting the scope of power the Regents may exercise more narrowly than the powers that may constitutionally be wielded by the Assembly by creating laws in California in 2021 which only allow illegal immigrants to attend UC Regents Campuses, free under H.R. 4502. Because the Regents can exercise plenary legislative and administrative power, it elevates form over substance to insist that Nancy Pelosi a representative from California uses race-conscious remedial programs in violation of the Constitution or an

antidiscrimination statute. For, if the Equal Protection Clause required such a violation as a predicate, the Regents could simply have promulgated any policy similar to H.R. 4502 and prohibit disparate treatment not justified by the need to admit non-qualified students.

If the Court frames beneficiary disputes as the plaintiff has laid them out the Court will see the defendants power of authority in providing illegal immigrants benefits although the Constitution expressly states it is illegal as discriminatory and analyze them in terms of the four-part Cort v. Ash test, 422 U.S. 66, 78, 95 S.Ct. 2080, 2087, 45 L.Ed.2d 26. The Court will come to the conclusion that all four parts of the test are satisfied. (1) American Negro's the plaintiff race's status as the potential beneficiaries of a federally funded programs, grants, wages, healthcare, monies and procreation right definitely brings them within the class for whose especial benefit form H.R. 4502 under the Constitution as it was enacted. (2) American Negro's cause of actions are based on race discrimination traditionally relegated to federal laws. (3) Plaintiff's voluminous legislative searches and legislative histories suggests that Congress did not intend to create a private cause of action for illegal immigrants as it pertains to wage, social services and U.S citizenship and in the opinion of Justice Powell, at 283 n. 18, an examination of the entire legislative history makes it clear that Congress had no intention to foreclose a private right of action for American citizens. (4) There is ample evidence that Congress considered private causes of action to be consistent with, if not *essential* to, the legislative scheme. It is clear to the plaintiff and the Court must hold, this complaint has come then to the crux of the dispute how the plaintiff and the American Negro have the right to participate in federally funded programs without discrimination and will be protected by this injunction of H.R. 4502. And even this issue becomes clear upon this Judiciary analysis. If Federal funds are to be dispensed on a nondiscriminatory basis, the only possible remedies must fall into one of two categories: First, action to end discrimination by granting the injunction on H.R. 4502; or second, action to end the payment of funds to illegal immigrants by granting the injunction for H.R. 4502. Obviously, action to end discrimination is preferable since that reaches the objective of this complaint and extending the funds on a nondiscriminatory basis the American citizen, similar in length , payments and H.R. 4502 allows for increase in benefits as inflation rises. These benefits belong to the American people of all races , faiths as the U.S. Constitution states, illegal immigrants do not get anything. The injunction for H.R. 4502 is approves which stops discrimination in social benefits illegal immigrant services are effectively terminated, how else can the principle of nondiscrimination be vindicated except by nonpayment of funds to illegal immigrants from Mexico and Central America.

The plaintiff has shown a clean understanding that the principle embodied in § 601 involves personal federal rights the American Negro has that H.R. 4502 procedures would not, for the most part, be able to protect those rights without the injunction on H.R. 4502. For the defendants to author and bring to the floor on Congress and the Senate and to have a healthy old pedophile as "joe" biden is has violated the American Negro's the plaintiff's race voting rights, within the Voting Rights Act of 1965, 42 U.S.C. § 1973. It is clear the defendants violated both the Voting Rights Act of 1965, 42 U.S.C. § 1973 and Title VI personal rights no person shall be denied; both Acts were drafted with broad remedial purposes in mind; and the effectiveness of both Acts would be "severely hampered" without the existence of a private remedy to supplement administrative procedures found within this complaint. The Court's injunction has reached private rights denied similar to the holding in Allen v. State Bd. of Elections, 393 U.S. 544, 556, 89 S.Ct. 817, 826, 22 L.Ed.2d 1. In that case Allen, the court found a private right of action under the Voting Rights Act; therefore H.R. 4502 is in violation of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, 42 U.S.C. § 1973 and Title VI and invalid law.

This now brings the Court to two questions regarding Nancy Pelosi extending wages to illegal immigrants in 2021 under federal law H.R. 4502 and why in 2020 California election the wage increase was denied to U.S. citizens by the California Legislature? (1) What effects, if any does H.R. 4502 which provides employment for illegal immigrants by the appointing powers Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security . Under H.R. 4502 it induces and reduce illegal immigrants worktime to procreation the intent is for them to be paid by the California state budget and by giving them credits which allows illegal immigrants to go back to the 2019 tax yar and get a federal refund for 2019, 2020 and also 2021 which is basically their jobs to collect social benefits and the illegal immigrants has a budget on the California State Budget. (2) What effect does the provisions for illegal immigrants in the 2021-22 federal budget which Nancy Pelosi increased the debt ceiling to accommodate for future illegal immigrant payments as she increased appropriations for illegal immigrant compensation for 2021-22 fiscal years in an amount incomparable to the federal and state laws. (3) the validity of the Governors revised budget, and (4) the remedy to which the American people, the voters, the constituents will receive labor contracts and educational vouchers for our children and themselves? The answer to the Court is Nancy Pelosi's legislations segregate federally and in the State of California. `The

defendants' actions must be deemed State Actions, under the Fourteenth Amendment. Although California not private citizens but those clothed with the authority and influence which official positions affords liability and union members, and unions are liable. The application of the prohibition of the Fifteenth Amendment to 'any State' is translated by legal jargon to read 'State action.' This phrase gives rise to a false direction in that it implies some impressive machinery or deliberative conduct normally associated with what orators call a sovereign state. The vital requirement is California's responsibility that somewhere, somehow, to some extent, there be an infusion of conduct by officials who panoplied with State power, into any scheme related to illegal immigrants by which the American Negro citizens are denied their voting rights merely because they are Americans and American Negro's. The defendants H.R. 4502 denies to all Americans the right to be represented in a labor union and work as thy are American doing jobs only American can do and they need and are going to get the services from their government which include Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, Agriculture, Rural Development, Energy and Water Development, Financial Services and General Government, Interior, Environment, Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act. The Court's injunction will "Make American Great Again" which TRUMP's "Build Back Better."

This injunction request is for H.R. 4502 which is appropriate here as it violates The Miller-Tydings Act which exempts from the operation within H.R. 4502 the Sherman Act contracts or agreements prescribing minimum prices for the resale that H.R. 4502 is offering illegal immigrants from Mexico and Central American. Under the Sherman Act H.R. 4502 as a contracts or agreements prescribing minimum prices for the resale commodities are lawful as applied to intrastate transactions under local law. The Sherman Act contracts or agreements prescribing minimum prices for the resale for U.S. citizens which makes it lawful as applied to intrastate transactions. H.R. 4502 is in violation of Title 8, U.S.C. § 1324(a) defines several distinct offenses related to aliens. Subsection 1324(a)(1)(i)-(v) prohibits alien smuggling, domestic transportation of unauthorized aliens, concealing or harboring unauthorized aliens, encouraging or inducing unauthorized aliens to enter the United States, and engaging in a conspiracy or aiding and abetting any of the preceding acts. Subsection 1324(a)(2) prohibits bringing or attempting to bring unauthorized aliens to the United States in any manner whatsoever, even at a designated port of entry. Subsection 1324(a)(3).

Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture,

Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security who are responsible for delivering social benefits to illegal immigrants in their official capacities are in violation of Title 8, U.S.C. § 1324(a) defines several distinct offenses related to aliens. Subsection 1324(a)(1)(i)-(v) prohibits alien smuggling, domestic transportation of unauthorized aliens, concealing or harboring unauthorized aliens, encouraging or inducing unauthorized aliens to enter the United States, and engaging in a conspiracy or aiding and abetting any of the preceding acts. Subsection 1324(a)(2) prohibits bringing or attempting to bring unauthorized aliens to the United States in any manner whatsoever, even at a designated port of entry. Subsection 1324(a)(3).
Domestic Transporting -Subsection 1324(a)(1)(A)(ii) makes it an offense for any person who knowing or in reckless disregard of the fact that an alien has come to, entered, or remains in the United States in violation of law, transports, or moves or attempts to transport or move such alien within the United States by means of transportation or otherwise, in furtherance of such violation of law.

Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security are guilty of delivering social benefits, wages and education to illegal immigrants in their official capacities are in violation of harboring illegal immigrants and they are in violation of subsection 1324(a)(1)(A)(iii) makes it an offense for any person who knowing or in reckless disregard of the fact that an alien has come to, entered, or remains in the United States in violation of law, conceals harbors, or shields from detection, or attempts to conceal, harbor, or shield from detection, such alien in any place, including any building or any means of transportation.

Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security who are responsible for delivering social benefits to illegal immigrants in their official capacities are in violation of Encouraging/Inducing illegal immigrants in providing them social services in violation of subsection 1324(a)(1)(A)(iv) makes it an offense for any person who encourages or induces an alien to come to, enter, or reside in the

United States, knowing or in reckless disregard of the fact that such coming to, entry, or residence is or will be in violation of law.

Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security who are responsible for delivering social benefits to illegal immigrants in their official capacities are in violation of conspiracy/Aiding or Abetting and are guilty of violating subsection 1324(a)(1)(A)(v) expressly makes it an offense to engage in a conspiracy to commit or aid or abet the commission of the foregoing offenses.

Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security who are responsible for delivering social benefits to illegal immigrants in their official capacities are in violation of bringing aliens to the United States and are in violation of subsection 1324(a)(2) makes it an offense for any person who -- knowing or in reckless disregard of the fact that an alien has not received prior authorization to come to, enter, or reside in the United States, to bring to or attempts to bring to the United States in any manner whatsoever, such alien, regardless of any official action which may later be taken with respect to such alien.

The Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA), enacted on September 30, 1996, added a new 8 U.S.C. § 1324(a)(3)(A) which makes it an offense for Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security who are responsible for delivering social benefits to illegal immigrants in their official capacities are in violation of, during any 12-month period, to knowingly hire at least 10 individuals with actual knowledge that these individuals are unauthorized aliens. The Court must look broadly at the plaintiff's arguments which are written by the defendants to re-institute segregation in California and considered the scope of the privileges as applied to the facts of the present case mentioned in these claims. The holding from Justice Miller stated in a similar case before the Courts In Kilbourn case: 'It is not necessary to decide here that there

may not be things done, in the one House or the other, of an extraordinary character, for which the members who take part in the act may be held legally responsible. After reading the complaints the Court must conclude only that in these complaints the individual defendants and the legislative committee were not acting in a field where legislators traditionally have power to act. Plaintiff recognizes when legislature itself seeks to act as executor of its own laws, it is no longer legislating and is no more immune from process than administrative officials it supersedes; legislative committee members have no immunity against proceeding to enjoin its interference with local school board's federal court ordered desegregation efforts, Bush v Orleans Parish School Bd. (1960, ED La) 188 F Supp 916, (1961) 365 US 569, 5 L Ed 2d 806, 81 S Ct 754.

Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security guilty of providing social benefits to illegal immigrants in their official capacities are in violation of Unit of Prosecution with regards to offenses defined in subsections 1324(a)(1)(A)(i)-(v), alien smuggling, domestic transporting, harboring, encouraging/inducing, or conspiracy/aiding or abetting each alien with respect to whom a violation occurs constitutes a unit of prosecution. Prior to enactment of the IIRIRA, the unit of prosecution for violations of 8 U.S.C. § 1324(a)(2) was each transaction, regardless of the number of aliens involved. However, the unit of prosecution is now based on each alien in respect to whom a violation occurs.

Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security are guilty of delivering social benefits to illegal immigrants has knowledge of violations of the U.S. Constitution. As it relates to illegal immigrants receiving social services knowingly took part in the act may be held legally responsible prosecuted for alien smuggling, 8 U.S.C. § 1324(a)(1)(A)(i). Plaintiff has shown proof that defendants knew that "joe" biden, the Democratic National Committee, and Nancy Pelosi asking illegal immigrants from Mexico and Central America to come to the United Stated and then the defendants knew "joe" biden, the Democratic National Committee, and Nancy Pelosi flew 300,000 Taliban from Afghanistan to the United States during the Covid-19 pandemic which cased low medical supplies getting to the American

people and given to the illegal immigrants and the Taliban. With regard to the other violations in 8 U.S.C. § 1324(a), plaintiff has supplied proof of knowledge or reckless disregard of alienage is sufficient.

Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security must be held accountable for their crimes and the maximum penalties should apply. The basic statutory maximum penalty for violating 8 U.S.C. § 1324(a)(1)(i) and (v)(I) (alien smuggling and conspiracy) is a fine under title 18, imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both. With regard to violations of 8 U.S.C. § 1324(a)(1)(ii)-(iv) and (v)(ii), domestic transportation, harboring, encouraging/inducing, or aiding/abetting, the basic statutory maximum term of imprisonment is 5 years, unless the offense was committed for commercial advantage or private financial gain, in which case the maximum term of imprisonment is 10 years. In addition, significant enhanced penalties are provided for in violations of 8 U.S.C. § 1324(a)(1) involving serious bodily injury or placing life in jeopardy. Moreover, if the violation results in the death of any person, the defendant may be punished by death or by imprisonment for any term of years. The basic penalty for a violation of subsection 1324(a)(2) is a fine under title 18, imprisonment for not more than one year, or both, 8 U.S.C. § 1324(a)(2)(A). Enhanced penalties are provided for violations involving bringing in criminal aliens, 8 U.S.C. § 1324(a)(2)(B)(i), offenses done for commercial advantage or private financial gain, 8 U.S.C. § 1324(a)(2)(B)(ii), and violations where the alien is not presented to an immigration officer immediately upon arrival, 8 U.S.C. § 1324(a)(2)(B)(iii). A mandatory minimum three-year term of imprisonment applies to first or second violations of § 1324(a)(2)(B)(i) or (B)(ii). Further enhanced punishment is provided for third or subsequent offenses.

It is clear to this Court that if an injunction on H.R. 4502 is not granted the American Negro will continue to suffer harm from Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security. This Courts authority comes from the Supreme Court's decision in United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542, 555–56 (1876), and United States v. Reese, 92 U.S. 214, 217–18 (1876), may be read to support the

contention. Similar to this complaint in Yarbrough, 110 U.S. 651 (1884), involved a federal election and the assertion of congressional power to reach private interference with the right to vote in federal elections, but the Court went further to broadly state the power of Congress to protect the citizen in the exercise of rights conferred by the Constitution, among which was the right to be free from discrimination in voting protected by the Fifteenth Amendment. The plaintiff has been harmed by the defendants Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security legislations are in collision with the constitution. The United States is a constitutional democracy. Its organic law grants to all citizens a right to participate in the choice of elected officials without restrictions by any State because of race. This grant to the people of the opportunity for choice is not to be nullified by a State through casting its electoral process in a form which permits a private organization to practice racial discrimination in the election. Constitutional rights would be of little value if they could be thus indirectly denied. Their harm had deluded the rights of citizens of the United States to vote and they were denied and abridged on by private parties who are contractors, vendors and illegal immigrants and by the State of California on account of race, color, nationality which their laws previous and current put the American citizen in conditions of servitude, which is State Action. The defendants violate the plaintiff's rights under State Action section 1 of the Fourteenth, section 1 of the Fifteenth Amendment prohibits official denial of the rights therein guaranteed, giving rise to the "state action" doctrine. Nevertheless, the Supreme Court in two early cases seemed to be of the opinion that Congress could protect the rights against private deprivation, on the theory that Congress impliedly had power to protect the enjoyment of every right conferred by the Constitution against deprivation from any source. The Court must hold, legislation based on the Fifteenth Amendment that attempts to prohibit private as well as official interference with the right to vote on racial grounds was unconstitutional. The Court's interpretation of the "state action" requirement in cases brought under section 1 of the Fifteenth Amendment narrowed the requirement there and opened the possibility, when these decisions are considered with cases decided under the Fourteenth Amendment, that Congress is not limited to legislation directed to official discrimination. The defendants also harmed the plaintiff though § 80.3(b)(6)(ii), in the absence of such prior discrimination, a recipient in administering a program may take affirmative action to overcome the effects of conditions which resulted in limiting participation by persons of a particular race, color, or national origin. The Court must hold

California appropriations on the 2021-22 state budget show prior discrimination and even in the absence of such prior discrimination, illegal immigrants are recipients in UC, private colleges and junior colleges in California's administering program for college and it may take affirmative action to overcome the effects of conditions which resulted in limiting participation of citizens by persons of a particular race, color, or national origin, illegal immigrants are not grated services under federal law as it applies to tuition, taxes or voting.

U.S. Federal Amended Constitution H.R. 4502 has social services Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, Agriculture, Rural Development, Energy and Water Development, Financial Services and General Government, Interior, Environment, Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act. Which proves the U.S. Government the defendants in this complaint are treasonous dogs and H.R. 4502 brings the American Negro into peonage for example in the social services offered to illegal immigrants which violate the Constitution are:

Earned income tax credit: The expanded earned income tax credit would be extended through 2022, helping 17 million low-wage childless workers. It nearly triples the maximum credit childless workers can receive, extends eligibility to more people, reduces the minimum age and eliminates the upper age limit. This credit, along with the enhanced child tax credit, would cost $200 billion, according to the White House. The earlier House bill would have extended it permanently. California's Constitution AB1593 sponsored by CA Assembly member Eloise Reyes, allows for illegal immigrants to apply for and receive federal and state tax refunds. AB1593 amends the state income tax law, for tax purposes an individual of citizenship of immigration status. Be eligible for earned income tax credits subject for the individual taxpayer. SB1593 then imposes a mandate that requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state . . . impose a state-mandates local program. . . establishes the continuously appropriated Tax Relief and Refund Account and provides that payments required to be made to taxpayers or other persons from the Personal Income Tax Fund are to be paid from that account, including any amount to be paid as an earned income tax credit in excess of any tax liabilities. H.R. 4502 is money laundering and in violation of 31 U.S.C. 5312(b)(2)(Y) and the ENABLERS ACT. This federal law H.R. 4502 is paying for and mirrors California law AB1593 which only benefits illegal immigrants and is unconstitutional. Both this provision in H.R. 4502 and AB1593 are in violation of the Supremacy Clause

v Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000d *et seq.*, and the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The applicability of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is the legislative history of Title VI reveals a congressional intent to halt federal funding of entities that violate a prohibition of racial discrimination similar to that of the Constitution. An injunction is needed as H.R. 4502 continues to harm the American Negro and the balance of equities tips in their favor and that an injunction is in the public's interest; moreover, the causes reflect that they are likely to succeed on the merits. The harm to the American Negro the moving party if relief is not granted and the hood of the American Negro the moving party success.

Home health care: The framework calls for permanently improving Medicaid coverage for home care services for seniors and people with disabilities, with the goal of reducing the more than 800,000 people on state Medicaid waiting lists. The measure would cost $150 billion, according to the White House. Originally, Biden had hoped to shower $400 billion on this effort as part of his infrastructure package. This federal provision is in violation of California's AB 781, which is the Dymally-Alatorre Bilingual Services Act ("the Act"). Section 1.4132.10 (e) the department shall not approve a request for authorization of pediatric day health care if the department determines that the total cost incurred by the Medi-Cal program for providing pediatric day health care services and all other medically necessary services to the illegal immigrants. Their beneficiary is greater than the total cost incurred by the Medi-Cal program in providing medically equivalent services at the legitimate State's beneficiary's otherwise appropriate level of institutional or home care. The defendants Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security
are in violation of, Medi-Cal (f) Coverage for pediatric day health care services shall be available only to the extent that federal financial participation in the cost of providing these services. The federally approved state plan amendment including those services as a Medi-Cal program benefit, are not available to Illegal immigrants, because they do not qualify for federal benefits, therefore, illegal immigrants are not entitled to California or federal benefits. This federal legislation, Home Health Care is mirrored in the following California legislations DACA, AB130, AB131, AB1593, AB2792, SB1159, SB141, DAPA, SB477, SB1236, AB1024, AB263, AB2279 and AB1576 which all have health care

provisions are in violation of the Statute of frauds Civil Code subsection 1624; Code Civ. Proc. Subsection 1973, **TRUMP's** the defendants' federal Home health care for illegal immigrants. An injunction is needed as Home Health Care in H.R.4502 and any other Biden/Harris Administration might contain similar language will continue to harm the American Negro and the balance of equities tips in their favor and that an injunction is in the public's interest; moreover, the causes reflect that they are likely to succeed on the merits. The harm to the American Negro the moving party if relief is not granted and the likelihood of the American Negro the moving party success.

Affordable Care Act subsidies: The enhanced federal premium subsidies would be extended through 2025 under the framework. It would reduce the cost of coverage on the Obamacare exchanges, particularly for moderate-income and middle-class Americans. The boost, also part of the Democrats' relief package, is currently set to expire after 2022.This provision, along with Medicaid expansion, would cost $130 billion, according to the White House and the initial House bill would have made the enhancement permanent. The Affordable Care Act subsidies provisions in H.R. 4502 and any federal legislation from the Biden/Harris Administration which only benefits illegal immigrants is in violation of the Affordable Care Act (PPACA) which mandates all the purchase of medical coverage and the Commerce Clause. Here the Commerce Clause challenge to Nancy Pelosi's Affordable Care Act subsidies for illegal immigrants in federal legislation is relating to public health have had important implications for public health policy, procedures and practice relating to commerce which makes Nancy Pelosi's Affordable Care Act subsidies are unconstitutional. The Affordable Care Act subsidies in H.R.4502 and in other federal legislation proposed by Nancy Pelosi mirror California's Constitutions ABXl 1 and SBXl 1 it allows expanded Medi-Cal to 1.4 million illegal immigrant's adults, children, part of the Affordable Care Act that allows for FREE healthcare, which is unconstitutional as ABXl 1 and SBXl 1 and the Affordable Care Act subsidies each legislation takes taxes from the American Negro the plaintiff race and diverters it to the illegal immigrants in California and the other 10 Sanctuary Cites are authored by one person, Nancy Pelosi. Nancy Pelosi is in violation of the Supremacy Clause within Article VI of the U.S. Constitution which dictates that federal law is the "supreme law of the land." This means that this Court must follow the Constitution, laws, and treaties of the federal government in matters which are directly or indirectly within the government's control and rule the Affordable Care Act subsidies in H.R. 4502 and in any federal legislation for illegal immigrants is unconstitutional because H.R. 4502 regulates commerce. An injunction is needed as the Affordable Care Act subsidies in H.R. 4502, or any other Biden/Harris Administration will continue to

harm the American Negro and the balance of equities tips in their favor and that an injunction is in the public's interest; moreover, they are likely to succeed on the merits. In Title 8 Aliens and nationality (F)(i), the federal laws here are clear not state, no employee of the state or federal government can give immunity.

The Medicaid expansion of "Build Back Better" is not a means-tested benefit. In June 2012 Supreme Court decision, allowed states face a decision about whether to adopt the Medicaid expansion and twelve states opted out of Obamacare Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Utah, Texas, Wisconsin and Wyoming as there is no penalty nor deadline for states to implement the Medicaid expansion. Therefore, the only conclusion is this is FREE Medicaid coverage for illegal immigrants or the 300,000 Taliban that the Biden/Harris Administration is forcing the American Negro race to pay for which is unconstitutional. Illegal immigrants and Refugee are not the American Negro's problem there have been many promises the Whitman has made to the American Negro and the illegal immigrants and Refugees do not deserve social services from the Federal Government not States. Federal law is clear here, illegal immigrants are not under no circumstances entitled to and to enroll in either Medicare Part A or Part B. Again, an individual must either be a U.S. citizen they are illegal or be lawfully present in the United States and; therefore, it is unconstitutional. The defendants are offering illegal immigrants social services, education and in order to receive compensation they must procreate and get $600 per child per month. The defendants Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security in H.R. 4502 allow for illegal immigrants to obtain intermediate care facilities California but they are in violation of 42 USCS § 1983 and in order for the defendants to obtain intermediate care facilities or homecare facilities in California, Under 42 USCS §§ 1396a(a)(8), (10) and 1396d (a)(15) because sections explicitly created rights for which they could seek vindication under 42 USCS § 1983. H.R. 4502 will not pass the Blessing test in order for the Blessing test to be satisfied the defendants need to prove to the Court: (1) plaintiffs and American Negro's are not the intended beneficiaries of 42 USCS §§ 1396a(a)(8), (10) and 1396d(a)(15), (2) rights sought to be enforced by them were specific and enumerated, and (3) obligation imposed on California was unambiguous and binding; relevant terms of Medicaid Act were mandatory and contained no provision explicitly precluding individual actions. Sabree v Richman (2004, CA3 Pa) 367 F3d 180 (criticized in Bertrand v Maram (2006, ND Ill) 2006 US Dist. LEXIS 68935. Here the defendants will not

be able to prove illegal immigrants deserve under the U.S. Constitution not under policy of "Build Back Better" which under BBB illegal immigrants get Medicaid, enabling them to get FREE Obamacare policies afforded to the American Negro who have to pay monthly premiums that under H.R. 4502 illegal immigrant premiums are paid by the American Negro's tax dollars. In this scenario, the plaintiff and American Negro are paying twice for the same services and those services are distinctly different than the illegal immigrants, therefore, H.R. 4502 discriminates and is unconstitutional. illegal immigrants. The laws enacted in 1996 for immigrants was when Congress imposed new barriers for immigrants to access means-tested federal public benefits under the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act. This greatly restricted immigrants' access to Medicaid, CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program), TANF (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families), SNAP (Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program) and SSI (Supplemental Security Income). The existing law allows the Act to created new categories of immigration status known as "qualified" and not qualified. DACA and DAPA is a work around to the qualified immigrants include individuals with statuses such as lawful permanent resident (LPR/green card holder), refugees, asylees, abused spouses, and trafficking survivors. To be clear, illegal immigrants are not eligible for these programs today with or without a memorandum, older immigrants must have an eligible immigration status (or citizenship) and satisfy the benefit program's requirements such as residency, work history, disability determination, and income, which may vary by state. Eligibility for federal benefits that are not means tested such as Medicare and Social Security have their own unique considerations. The Affordable Care Act of 2010 (ACA) encompassed in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Pub. Law No. 111-148) as amended by the Health Care and Education Act of 2010 (Pub. Law No. 111-152) is the law the Court needs to follow since "joe" seems to be seminal and has no clue what is in the United States Constitution. "joe" biden is a senile old Whiteman who has the disease of segregation he likes to call it "Build Back Better".

The Court must hold, under "joe" biden's "Build Back Better" illegal immigrants cannot receive any form of social services and under the Medicaid expansion, Biden is calling for providing Affordable Care Act premium subsidies for low-income Americans in the 12 states that have not expanded Medicaid, enabling them to buy Obamacare policies with no monthly premiums. Here, under "Build Back Better" by offering the 12 states that have not expanded Medicaid, enabling them to buy Obamacare policies with no monthly premiums is segregation is medical and social service. Currently under the Affordable Care Act (ACA) the number of uninsured by providing a continuum of affordable coverage options through Medicaid and the Health Insurance Marketplaces which requires

California requires U.S citizens, U.S nationals and permanent residents. Under California law in order to get ACA to have health coverage that meets the minimum requirements. Unless you qualify to be exempted, you could pay tax penalties if you go for more than two months without any coverage. California law requires lawfully present individuals in the United States are:

- U.S citizens and U.S nationals
- Permanent residents (green card holders)
- Temporary residents (Refers to an alien who seeks temporary entry to the United States for a specific purpose.)
- People running away from persecution (refugees and asylees)
- Humanitarian immigrants (those given temporary protected status)
- Non-immigrants (workers and student visas)

The plaintiff and American Negro's have provision, along with the facts on enhanced Affordable Care Act subsidies that will cost $130 billion to the American Negro taxpayer while benefiting illegal immigrants in California so they can get FREE Medicaid expansion provision under H.R. 4502, which is Treasonous by President 'joe" biden and Nancy Pelosi's these two-dementia old ass white people.
T
Here demented "joe" and a chick named Nancy are in violation of 42 USCS § 1983, and Blessing test (1) plaintiff and the American Negro are the only intended beneficiaries of 42 USCS §§ 1396a(a)(8), (10) and 1396d(a)(15), (2) rights sought to be enforced by them were specific and enumerated, and (3) obligation imposed on states tax payers are unambiguous and binding; relevant terms of Medicaid Act were mandatory and contained no provision explicitly precluding individual actions, Sabree v Richman (2004, CA3 Pa) 367 F3d 180 (criticized in Bertrand v Maram (2006, ND Ill) 2006 US Dist. LEXIS 68935). The original House bill would have provided premium subsidies to low-income Americans until the Department of Health and Human Services would have set up a federal Medicaid expansion program that would have picked up the entire tab for illegal immigrants, so they are provided FREE medical care. Under 42 USCS § 1983 the Committee of Ways and Means is the chief tax-writing committee of the United States House of Representatives is being sued and challenged; as well as Nancy Pelosi in this complaint. This injunction for H.R. 4502 is supported by 42 USCS § 1983 to STOP intermediate care facilities medical care services that state was required to provide under 42 USCS §§ 1396a(a)(8), (10) and 1396d (a)(15) for American citizens because sections explicitly created rights for the plaintiff and American Negro which they could seek vindication. The Court must hold, the laws enacted in 1996 for immigrants was when Congress imposed new barriers for immigrants to access means-tested federal public benefits under the Personal Responsibility and

Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act. This greatly restricted immigrants' access to Medicaid, CHIP (Children's Health Insurance Program), TANF (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families), SNAP (Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program) and SSI (Supplemental Security Income). Under existing law allows the Act to created new categories of immigration status known as "qualified" and not qualified. H.R. 4502 like California Constitutions DACA and DAPA is a work around created by Nancy Pelosi unconstitutionally to the Qualified illegal immigrants include individuals with statuses such as lawful permanent resident (LPR/green card holder), refugees, asylees, abused spouses, and trafficking survivors. To be clear, illegal immigrants are not eligible for these programs today with or without a memorandum, older immigrants must have an eligible immigration status (or citizenship) and satisfy the benefit program's requirements such as residency, work history, disability determination, and income, which may vary by state and use the American Negro's taxes against them as they are for these unconstitutional benefits exclusively for illegal immigrants. An injunction is needed as Medicaid expansion in H.R. 4502 will continue to harm the American Negro and the balance of equities tips in their favor and that an injunction is in the public's interest; moreover, the causes reflect that they are likely to succeed on the merits. In Title 8 Aliens and nationality (F)(i), the federal laws here are clear not state, no employee of the state or federal government can give immunity.

Climate change: This provision in H.R. 4502 is unconstitutional since it is for illegal immigrants from Mexico and Central American who cannot get federal loans for housing nor are they authorized for work. It offers tax credits to illegal immigrant's families from Mexico and Central American. The Court must hold, in Hoffman Plastic Compounds, Inc. v. NLRB, 535 U.S. 137 was federal immigration policy, as expressed by Congress in IRCA, foreclosed the Board from awarding backpay to an undocumented alien who has never been legally authorized to work in the United States.

Affordable housing: The framework would enable the construction, rehabilitation and improvement of more than 1 million affordable homes that would address the capital needs of public housing in big cities and rural America and would provide rental assistance to hundreds of thousands of additional families. The measure would also invest in down payment assistance and in community-led redevelopment projects in under-resourced neighborhoods, which is segregation. The Court must hold, in Hoffman Plastic Compounds, Inc. v. NLRB, 535 U.S. 137 was federal immigration policy, as expressed by Congress in IRCA, foreclosed the Board from awarding backpay to an undocumented alien who has never been

legally authorized to work in the United States and this affordable housing provision will get b used to get all the homeless American's into housing and the American Negro can moved to the "Burbs", to live next to Nancy Pelosi's nine grandchildren.

Pell grants: The President's measure would increase the maximum Pell grant by $550 for more than 5 million students enrolled in public and private nonprofit colleges and expand access to undocumented students brought to the US as children, who are known as Dreamers which is unconstitutional. The Court must hold, in Hoffman Plastic Compounds, Inc. v. NLRB, 535 U.S. 137 was federal immigration policy, as expressed by Congress in IRCA, foreclosed the Board from awarding backpay to an undocumented alien who has never been legally authorized to work in the United States the Pell grants are for the American citizens, not illegal immigrants.

Children's nutrition: The framework would expand free school meals to 8.7 million children during the school year and provide the parents of 29 million kids a $65 per child per month benefit to purchase food during the summer. The defendants in their first four months in the Biden/Harris Administration has allows 200,000 illegal immigrant children in the United States and this provision is for the American people. The Court must hold, in Hoffman Plastic Compounds, Inc. v. NLRB, 535 U.S. 137 was federal immigration policy, as expressed by Congress in IRCA, foreclosed the Board from awarding backpay to an undocumented alien who has never been legally authorized to work in the United States.

Immigration: The President is calling for a $100 billion investment to reform the nation's immigration system, as well as reduce backlogs, expand legal representation and make changes to the asylum system and border processing. On "joe's" immigration investment to reform the nation's immigration system is unconstitutional as "joe's" legacy of segregation is granting illegal immigrants' immunity by his immigration investment to reform the nation's immigration system. The Court must hold, For example, On Dec. 14, 1994, U.S. District Court Judge Mariana Pfaelzer issued a preliminary injunction, blocking implementation on a majority of the measure's provisions. Jan. 1995, the state pushed back, filing an appeal against the injunction in San Francisco Superior Court. But it was too late - the injunction was upheld, and in Aug. 1996, President Bill Clinton signed a new welfare reform law which strengthened the argument against Prop 187. Judge Pfaelzer ruled that the measure was unconstitutional in

Nov. 1997. As the Court cam see there are laws already in place dealing with "immigration investment to reform the nation's immigration system" that prohibit illegal immigrants from using non-emergency health care, public education, and other services. Here the unjust enrichment to illegal immigrants from Mexico and Central American causes injury to the plaintiff and the Negro race. The "immigration investment to reform the nation's immigration system" keeps in place "Joe's" 1994 Crime Bill, H.R.3355 - 103rd Congress, Violent Crime Control and *Law* Enforcement Act which encouraged states to pass truth-in-sentencing-laws *by* instituting the death penalty for nearly 60 more crimes, and even encouraged the prosecution of young people as adults; as well as, hiring 100,000 cops and backed grant programs that encouraged police officers to carry out more drug-related arrests an escalation of the war on drugs. In 1994, "joe" reportedly called a three-strikes provision that escalated prison sentences up to life for some repeat offense's "wacko" and illustrative of Congress's "tough on crime" attitude. "joe's" Immigration investment and reform is in violation of Title 8 Aliens and nationality (F)(i), the federal laws here are clear not state, no employee of the state or federal government can give immunity. Nancy Pelosi's authorizing, endorsing and asking the House Ways and Means to justify via the tax code H.R. 1177 U.S. Citizen Act mandates (1) redefines for immigration purposes the term conviction to exclude convictions that have been expunged or vacated (2) requires the Department of State to implement a strategy to advance reforms in Central America and address key factors contributing to migration from the region to the United States (3) requires the State Department to establish refugee processing centers in Central America (4) requires Customs and Border Patrol sectors and stations to have a certain number of employees with certain qualifications such as paramedic training (5) generally prohibits religious discrimination in granting or denying immigration benefits, and (6) establishes grant programs for providing training and services to immigrants (7) provides permanent resident status to certain applying noncitizens, specifically for eligible noncitizens (8) provides jobs in certain amount of agricultural labor (9) allows illegal immigrants to join the Federal Employee's Union (10) immediately makes them employees of the federal government (10) guarantees university education. This is a conspiracy to overthrow the United States started in a 1994 brief by the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund in a case that went to the Supreme Court Hoffman Plastics Compound v. National Labor Relations Board. That case was asking the Supreme Court for reparations for illegal immigrants and when Biden/Harris Administration took office all their legislation like those in this compliant at bar

are, reparations of illegal immigrants that the American Negro taxes are being used for without representation by "joe" and Nancy Pelosi. An injunction is needed as H.R. 4502 continues to harm the American Negro and the balance of equities tips in their favor and that an injunction is in the public's interest; moreover, the causes reflect that they are likely to succeed on the merits.

H.R. 4502 is to evangelize the pagan illegal immigrants from Mexico and Central America and take active part in moving people across U.S. States lines and within other States but also lived from it, gravely profited from it and depended heavily on it for their sustenance. Millions of the blood money accruing from this baneful traffic in humans in prisons and made to work as States use prisoners for Federal and State work as they contract out that FREE labor force were investments are made like television shows and in providing infrastructure labor in Build Back Better" initiative for the education and training of city and state employees belonging to the Jesuits Congregation and other women and men Religious Orders. In the words of the historian Françoise Latour da Veiga Pinto stated, "The state religion (Catholic Church), up to the 18th century, not only gave its moral sanction to the traffic in human beings through baptism but also made a profit out of it." In October of 2021 Pope Francis is the 266th Pope of the Catholic Church stated, "President *Joe Biden is* a "good Catholic." "joe" biden authored H.R. 4502 which is apartheid which is "moral sanction to the traffic in human beings through baptism." "joe's" Presidential leadership is based on the teachings of the Church, following the teaching of Christ should brace it up to be in the vanguard in the call for reparations for American Negro's as there was official issuing of reparations by the Apostolic writings through which an apology from the wise counsel of St. Gregory of Nyssa in 1807, 1818 and 1833 respectively as did the popes of the renaissance Catholic Church after the Church authorized the kings of Portugal to lead Black Africans into perpetual servitude ever know that they also indirectly authorized by God. This injunction om Federal Law H.R. 4502 is rendered to the peoples and regions of Black Africa whose continent and children must bore the brunt of the Biden/Harris Administrations :Build Back Better" which is the 2021 Transatlantic slave trade for so long a time, as the Nancy Pelosi's 2021-'22 budget debt ceiling increase funds last. This injunction request is for H.R 4502 which is exclusively for illegal immigrants, and it brings the American Negro into is "slavery" which indicates chattel slavery, and "involuntary servitude" indicates other forms of compulsory services. The plaintiff seeks an injunction on H.R. 4502 because the "policy" is not a constitutional law which is "manifestly contrary" to the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA). The INA "expressly and carefully provides legal designations allowing defined classes" to "receive the benefits"

associated with "lawful presence" and to qualify for work authorization. The basis of SB54 is the 2012 memorandum from then-Secretary of Homeland Security Janet Napolitano who announced, by memorandum, a new "prosecutorial discretion" policy known as DACA. Congress may prohibit the second category of hate crime acts that would be proscribed certain instances of actual or attempted violence directed at persons because of their actual or perceived religion, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, or disability, subsection 249(a)(1)(A) pursuant to its power under the Commerce Clause of the Constitution, art. I., subsection 8, cl. 3. Congress has the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation. The language in H.R. 4502 indicates the determinative reason for the final action taken, the defendants Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security have elaborated why those reason for the final action taken, in implementing SB54 is to segregate the races by giving the illegal immigrant the American Negro's tax dollars and the American Negro not being able to use or acquire in the future their tax dollars in a similar way as the illegal immigrants.

The Court is aware neither a state nor Federal Government can set up a church. Neither the State of California nor their employees can pass laws which aid religion laws like, **SB54** unionizing the entire illegal immigrant race nationwide, **DACA** deferred action for childhood arrivals, **H.R. 177** PROPEL Act, **H.R. 1319** American Rescue Plan Act of 2021, **S.53** Raise the Wage Act of 2021, **H.R. 4502** Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, Agriculture, Rural Development, Energy and Water Development, Financial Services and General Government, Interior, Environment, Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act 2022, **H.R 98** Covid-19 Victims Compensation Fund Act, **H.R.1603** Farm Workforce, **H.R. 3590** Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, **H.R. 5430** United States-Mexico agreement. These are laws and US Constitutions are religious based for illegal immigrants and do not benefit and American people at all more importantly any of the Court decisions concerning an individual's religious freedom rendered the Fourteenth Amendment as interpreted to make the prohibitions of the First Amendment to state actions abridging religious freedom by the Court application of the First Amendment to the states by the Fourteenth. These Court decisions concerning an individual's religious freedom is every reason to give the same application to the broad interpretation to the "establishment of religion" clause. In Watson v. Jones, 13 Wall. 979 held, The structure of our government has, for the preservation of

civil liberty, rescued the temporal institutions from religious interference. On the other hand, it has secured religious liberty from the invasion of the civil authority. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect a wall of separation between church and State. Measured by these standards the Court can say that the First Amendment prohibits California from spending taxes raised to pay to education illegal immigrants as the California voters acknowledged in 1994 with the overwhelming passage of Proposition 187. The religious tenets from the Presidential Executive Orders offer salaries of California employees to segregate and to educate and provide social services to illegal immigrants which becomes and is part of California's general fund which allows illegal immigrants to attend public schools and receive public services. The First Amendment requires the state to be neutral in its relations with groups of religious believers and non-believers. Here the defendants, Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security favor religion(s) which is a handicap to the plaintiff and American Negro as their religions are evil and in their favor of state aid to illegal immigrants confirms the plaintiff's conclusion that these laws and Constitutional Amendments advance official establishment of religion, sect, creed. There is no separation from the civil authority, city employee, federal contractor or the Pope as they are all equal under California amended constitution and amended U.S. Constitution which was amended by the defendants. Authoritative interpretations of the First Amendment guarantees have consistently refused to recognize an exception for any test to truth whether administered by judges, juries, or administrative official or politicians especially Madam Speaker of the House.

This injunction is for H.R. 4502, and it is distinct to a specific person(s) or entity which outlines who has been harmed, what harm was caused, and each offers a remedy from that harm. It conforms to FRCP Rule 8(a)(1) which allows the pleading of conclusions, Rule 12(e) allows (motion for more definite statement), and Rule 12(f) allows (motion to strike) the plaintiff's pleadings are not vague and can withstand any of the defendants' responsive pleadings. The Court will conclude the defendant's "joe," Kamala and an Israelite named Chuck violated the equal protection whenever they made the affluence of the American Negro voters or payments of any fees an electoral standard, this is how California allows illegal immigrants to vote in state elections which effects the Presidential election. With that said this injunction request will prove the defendants Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO

of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security have been involved in gerrymandering voter qualifications which impacts local and federal elections since 1995. Since 1995 the American Negro in California have not received any political representation, but their taxes are used to pay of the illegal immigrant's way of life. The Court must hold, equal protection restrains the defendants from fixing voter qualifications which invidiously discriminate, and California may not deny the opportunity to represent a bona fide citizen which benefits their family and procreation which is fundamental to the survival of the American Negro race.

The American Negro has been here too many times and know it's coming from illegal immigrants who are backed by Silicon Valley Leadership Group and the hundreds of company members and the State of California the opportunity to vote and then represent as constituents bona fide residents merely because the American Negro is a citizen of the United States although Nancy has touted, "there are jobs in American will not do", clearly calling the American Negro, "not American". In the causes before the Court are statues and legislations that impede the flow of commerce the States and people of the States and defining "people" as commerce for State "employee's" and legislations created by foreign nations and Oxford University and California Universities, California State Employee Unions and non-profits associated with California and the defendants. The Court will find the conflict is between local interests in crating regulations and the economic interests of California which must be resolved effectively by the Court. The basis for the Courts involvement is the commerce clause of the Constitution as preventing the laws within this complaint each cause independent need support by the Court as in intervention of these laws being implemented within the Constitution. The Court is aware of the three strands to the commerce clause theory (1) test governs state legislation that discriminates against interstate commerce, which is unconstitutional legislation; (2) test applies to the State's proprietary activities or immune from restrictions from the commerce clause and (3) test applies to the remaining forms of state legislations. The Court will hold after reading these causes Israelites named Chuck Schumer and Kamila Harris "are evil of protectionism which reside in these legislations means as well as these legislations ends." The Court should take noted in a CNN news article three states have fully vaccinated 2/3 of their residence (1) Vermont, (2) Connecticut and (3) Massachusetts and coincidently these three cities are ten cities with the highest vaccination because they chose to be sanctuary cites and vaccinate illegal immigrants as "essential workers" alongside of police, fire person and city

employees hence the CDC and tax payers are paying to vaccinate the 20 million illegal immigrants before the American people received their vaccinations. Which is a coup d'état of America by the Democratic National Committee and the Hispanic Congressional Caucus these causes articulate their coup d'état of America.

BACKGROUND

H.R. 4502 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, Agriculture, Rural Development, Energy and Water Development, Financial Services and General Government, Interior, Environment, Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act, 2022 is prohibited by Congress as a hate crime and therefore in violation of the American Negro's Thirteenth Amendment which involves eliminating the badges and incidents of slavery in California specifically by Kamila Harris and Nancy Pelosi. Both women within their private activity within a private organization like the Democratic National Committee are controlled by the holdings in Boerne v. Flores. 521 U.S. 507 (1997), and United States v. Morrison. 120 S. Ct. 1740 (2000), involved legislation that was found to exceed Congress's powers under the Fourteenth Amendment. Their action is why Congress could not control them, they lacked the power to enact the civil remedy of the Violence Against Women Act ("VAWA"), 42 U.S.C. § 13981, pursuant to the Fourteenth Amendment because that amendment's equal protection guarantee extends only to "state action," and the private remedy there was not. For the plaintiff to put them in their place he looks to the court holding in Morrison which emphasized that even under our modern, expansive interpretation of the Commerce Clause, Congress' regulatory authority is not without effective bounds because there is an explicit and discrete connection between the proscribed conducts of Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security and their interstate or foreign commerce violations and to show connections that the defendants have been proven to be shown this complaint. The Court must then hold, under these circumstances H.R. 4502 exceeds Congress's power to regulate interstate commerce because the prohibited conduct that does "substantially affect" interstate commerce. The plaintiff, therefore, moves the Court to grant an injunction that H.R. 4502 is in collision with the U.S. Constitution and the moving party is more than likely to

succeed on the merits; the possibility of irreparable harm to the moving party if relief is not granted. To the extent to which the plaintiff who is s democrat and voted for the defendant's "joe", and a bunch of wannabe Israelites Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security the race regrets voting for. This Court must then balance of the hardships that favor the plaintiff and the American Negro favors the respective party and grant the injunction of H.R. 4502 from going into effect until the end of a jury trial to determine the constitutionality of the draconian Christian law. In Lopez, the Court considered Congress' power to enact a statute prohibiting the possession of firearms within 1000 feet of a school. In Morrison, the Court applied its holding in Lopez to find unconstitutional the civil remedy provided in VAWA, 42 U.S.C. § 13981. Although the VAWA statute was supported by extensive congressional findings of the relationship between violence against women and the national economy, the Court was troubled that accepting this as a basis for legislation under the Commerce Clause would permit Congress to regulate anything, thus obliterating the distinction between what is truly national and what is truly local.

The Court is aware that bill, S. 909, the Matthew Shepard Hate Crimes Prevention Act establish two criminal prohibitions called hate crime acts the first proposed section 249(a)(1) would not require the prosecutor to prove that the victim was or had been participating in or enjoying any benefit, service, privilege, program, facility or activity provided or administered by any State or subdivision thereof. The second section 249(a)(2) prohibit certain forms of discriminatory violence namely, violence committed because of a person's actual or perceived gender, sexual orientation, gender identity or disability. If H.R. 4502 would become law the American Negro will be the slave to every foreign-born person allowed to enter the United States under the laws authored, written and legislated by the Biden/Harris administration within the first eight month of their joined shared Christian/Jew which is the Biden/Harris administration. H.R. 4502 is in violation of the Thirteenth Amendment, Congress has the authority not only to prevent the and therefore implementing H.R. 4502 is "actual slavery and involuntary servitude," under federal law and "badges and incidents" of slavery or involuntary servitude exists under states laws. The plaintiff asks the Court to view this case similar to Griffin v. Breckinridge, 403 U.S. 88, 105 (1971) and Jones v. Alfred H. Mayer Co. 392 U.S. 409, 440-43 (1968) both held Congress's power to eliminate the "badges," "incidents," and "relics" of slavery has the power under the Thirteenth Amendment rationally to determine what are the badges and incidents

of slavery, and the authority to translate that determination into effective legislation. Therefore, H.R. 4502 is inconsistent with the courts holding in Griffin, 403 U.S. at 105; Jones, 392 U.S. at 440; also, Civil Rights Cases, 109 U.S. 3, 21 (1883) and Congress has a right to enact all necessary and proper laws for the obliteration and prevention of slavery, in with H.R. 4502 including all legislative branches of government are legislations of badges and incidents of slavery upon the plaintiff and American Negro.

California's Nancy Pelosi gerrymandering of the voting proves is perhaps no surprise to this Court were both party and race come into play when sorting voters to achieve either partisan or racial advantage, The redrawing of district boundaries after each election either state or federal which is achieved by allowing illegal immigrants into the Country via California which is the State's immigration plan is achieved through redistricting which is gerrymandering for the purposes of dilute by racial which creates political minorities who have become the political majority although they have no constitutional rights but are given citizen rights by the defendants, "joe", Kamala and a Israelite named Chuck which are the Democratic National Committee and the Hispanic Congressional Caucus. In 2016 the Democratic National Committee allows illegal immigrants as members of the conventions credential and platform committees to address and take part in the Democratic National Convention highlighted by Hilary Clinton instead of inviting Americans their constituents or veterans they chose as presidential nominees the first time a major U.S. political party's convention has featured so many undocumented workers among its ranks and a 23 illegal immigrant from Bolivia who was approved under a deferred action program, was picked for the credentials committee a sympathy support move to get 70 percent support illegal immigration to back her, compared with 9 percent for Trump, according to recent Reuters/Ipsos polling, suggesting that she could have a strong chance in states like Florida, Nevada and Colorado that swing between voting Democratic and Republican in presidential elections. Therefore, the fate of a district in California rests on whether it is race or politics that predominated the legislative decisions to sort voters into distinct districts, illegal immigrants' districts and American districts. Which is based on zip codes, for example in the City of Newark California, see exhibit below. The shaded part in the City of Newark California is the only place in the city the federal or state money can be spent, it is zip code based. This and all zip codes which are shaded in dark to symbolize "evil" are the only area in California that CalPERS and the defendants have agreed will receive federal and state stimulus funding which is the Biden/Harris "build back better" initiative which was first introduced New Orleans after hurricane Katrina and there, "build back better" like here is segregation.



Article IV, section 12 of the California Constitution provides in part that the Legislature shall pass the budget bill by midnight on June 15 of each year, but in recent years the timely adoption of the budget bill in California budget compromise is $262.2 billion. California finances are immune to the coronavirus pandemic. This complaint arises out of the American Negro's in California, taxpayers, in the wake of the California State Budget 2021-22 seeking an emergency court ordered injunction barring the Controller from making payments from the state treasury in absence of a legal budget which is one hundred percent has appropriations for illegal immigrants listed above which is borne by the federal constitution. The plaintiff asks the Court to grant this injunction until the end of trial and the Court has seen and will at the end of the trial conclude that the issues presented by the plaintiff this proceeding are important and likely to recur, but will regularly evade timely appellate review and the Court will consider this matter, including (1) when payment is authorized by a "continuing appropriation" enacted by the Legislature which does not include appropriations to illegal immigrants, (2) when payment is authorized by a self-executing provision of the California Constitution for example, the payment of certain funds for public schools under art. XVI, subsection 8.5 of the Cal. Const., and the payment of elected state officers' salaries under art. III, subsection 4 of the Cal. Const, and (3) when payment is mandated by federal law for example, the prompt payment of those wages mandated by the federal Fair Labor Standards Act, and the prompt payment of benefits mandated under federal food stamp, foster care and adoption, child support, and child welfare programs.

While COVID-19 has killed more than 63,000 Californians and wrecked the lives of countless others, the $262.6 billion budget signed into law late last month uses a record surplus to give rebates of up to $1,100 to 15 million households, send every 4-year-old to kindergarten and give health insurance to low-income undocumented immigrants 50 and older, among other priorities for illegal immigrants only, Golden State Stimulus money directly into the pockets of two out of every three Californians; Small business relief, including money for microbusinesses and street vendors; Renters assistance; Medi-Cal expansion; Expansion of Project Home key and funds to cities to help combat homelessness; Funding for affordable housing; Universal Pre-K; Funding for college savings accounts; Wildfire preparation; Climate action; Drought response; Building a better power grid; Expansion of summer youth programs; Help for those facing eviction or are behind on power and water bills; Cost-free universal school breakfast and lunch. The budget also funds projects specific to the Inland Empire primarily the physical border is Riverside and San Bernadino and this is where CalPERS -AFLCIO, Governor Newson and Nancy Pelosi have decided to put California infrastructure and they believe until this compliant that they were only going to hire illegal immigrants and pull off the overthrow of the United States by illegal immigrants using federal and state money to accomplish this Democratic National Committee and the Hispanic Congressional Caucus state involvement. For a broader look at the fraud, embezzlement within the California budget also funds projects specific to the Inland Empire are:

UC Riverside

- The budget spends $15 million on the first phase of a new clean technology center that will link UC Riverside's engineering college with the California Air Resources Board's Southern California headquarters that's being built in Riverside.
- "This will help California meet its clean energy and environmental targets while transforming the future of our region by creating high-skill, high-wage jobs in the clean energy and environmental sectors," read a news release from state Sen. Richard Roth, D-Riverside.
- Also, in the budget is $25 million for "expanded enrollment and operational costs" at UCR's medical school, according to the office of Assemblywoman Sabrina Cervantes, D-Riverside. The school, which is in a region with a chronic shortage of physicians, welcomed its first class of students in the fall of 2013.

San Bernardino Valley College

- The budget includes $37 million from state construction bonds approved by voters in 2016 that will help build a new workforce training center at San Bernardino Valley College in San Bernardino.

- The 99,500-square-foot building "will replace one of the most aged and maintenance-intensive facilities on the campus with space that simulates real-world working environments."

Crafton Hills College

- The construction bond money also will pay for a new performing arts center at Crafton Hills College in Yucaipa.
- The existing center "has numerous structural safety issues" and the new building will be more functional and flexible, according to Reyes' office.

Colton Fire Department

- The budget includes $1.5 million to buy a 100-foot ladder truck for Colton firefighters.
- The truck will let firefighters "more effectively reach lengths needed to fight large warehouse and other fires," read a release from Sen. Connie Leyva, D-Chino.
- The budget includes $8.1 billion in rebates illegal immigrants with children and how taxes have been filed.
- Illegal immigrants with children who earn $30,000 a year or less will get $500. That's in addition to the $600 checks they got earlier this year, for a total of $1,100.
- Illegal immigrants who earn between $30,000 and $75,000 will get $600 if they don't have children and $1,100 if they do.
- Illegal immigrants who file their taxes using a taxpayer identification number only illegal immigrants get more. Illegal immigrants with children earning $30,000 or less will get $1,000. Adults with children who earn between $30,000 and $75,000 will get $1,000. Illegal immigrants who are not citizens get more money because they were excluded from federal pandemic relief checks.
- The budget also includes $1.5 billion in grants for illegal immigrants' small businesses harmed by the pandemic money they don't have to pay back, this entire budget is fraud.
- The budget provides ongoing funding to expand the state's two-year kindergarten program to include all illegal immigrant 4-year-olds for free. The program would phase in the expansion to everyone by the 2025-26 school year at a cost of $2.7 billion per year. Right now, abut 91,000 4-year-olds are enrolled in "transitional kindergarten." This proposal would boost that to about 250,000 children.
- The budget would pay the health care costs for low-income illegal. The state immigrants who are 50 and older and living in the country illegally by making them eligible for Medicaid. It would eventually cost $1.3 billion per year when fully implemented. The budget also eliminates a rule that makes more people 65 and older eligible for Medicaid a State nor city employee can give federal benefits to illegal immigrants.

MONEY FOR MORE COLLEGE STUDENTS

- The budget includes $155 million to make more illegal immigrants eligible for Cal Grants money to help illegal immigrants pay for college that they don't have to pay back. This money will help students who are older and have been out of high school longer qualify for these grants.

MORE IN-STATE STUDENTS AT CALIFORNIA COLLEGES

- The budget requires three of the state's most popular public universities to admit more in-state students, this only applies to illegal immigrants. Under the plan, UCLA, UC Berkeley and UC San Diego would replace 900 out-of-state students with California students each year. Out-of-state students pay more tuition, so the state would pay those schools $184 million over the next three years.

FREE SCHOOL LUNCH

- The budget includes $54 million this year and $650 million in future years to pay for free breakfast and lunch for all public-school students.

The defendant's "joe," Kamala and an Israelite named Chuck offer free education, union job recruitment to the California State Budget 2021-22 specifically in 2019-2020 state budget when assembly member Gonzales stated, The Latino Caucus has worked hard to make sure this community is prioritized in this year's budget. With leading facts will not protects the defendant's "joe," Kamala and an Israelite named Chuck as legislative immunity will not protect them from the disclosure by a state senator document showing all allocations of money paid or made to illegal immigrants under administrative actions be it by voting in legislative hearings or in the budget process and a legislative action. Manzi v. DiCarlo, 982 F. Supp. 125 (E.D.N.Y. 1997). On its face SB1310 and SB54 are discriminatory against the Negro in the ability to procreate; sterilization laws are a violation of due process of laws and of the constitutional guarantee of equal laws. The Court must apply strict scrutiny here. Also, here in the case before the Court, the defendants had committed monies in the state budget and was advocating for them in the hall of Congress prior to SB54, SB1310 went into law. The plaintiff asks the Court when the time comes to consider a motion to dismiss 28 U.S.C. subsection 1291. The Court consider under the collateral doctrine, an order denying a motion to dismiss a complaint against these defendants above are immediately reviewable to the extent that the denial has turned into an issue of law, Locurto v. Safir, 264 F.3d 154, 164 (2d Cir.2001). In Baker v. Carr (1962), a suit in a Federal District Court in Tennessee under 42 U.S.C. 1983, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated, to redress the alleged deprivation of their federal constitutional rights by legislation classifying voters with respect to representation in the General Assembly. The Court held, (1.) The District Court had authority of the subject matter of the federal constitutional claim asserted in the complaints. (2.) Appellants

had standing to maintain this suit. (3.) The complaint's allegations of a denial of equal protection presented a justiciable constitutional cause of action upon which appellants are entitled to a trial and a decision. The Court also held "Jurisdiction 369 U.S. 186, 199 of the Subject Matter", the only matter set forth in the complaint does arise under the Constitution and is within 28 U.S.C 1343.
In the California 2021-22 budget Governor Newsom is making undocumented residents aged 60 and older eligible for Medi-Cal, while the Legislature wanted to offer it to those age 50 and up. California the first state in the nation to provide government health insurance to undocumented immigrants at age 50 covering health care for more people the state's ongoing spending will not be able to afford in a future recession without raising more taxes on the American Negro who is the plaintiff community. Then that brings the Court to the threshold questions as to the State action on creating wealth for and exclusively to illegal immigrants from Mexico, Asia or Afghanistan. Wealth discrimination by California and by several other states on school, Medicare, healthcare and union recruitment by union members regarding states' financing laws have been struck down by the courts. The California Legislature is giving local public health departments an additional $200 million annually to add bilingual (illegal immigrant jobs) staff and modernize equipment. In the end, the budget gives them $300 million a year which is indentured servitude upon the American Negro as the AFL-CIO CalPERS is politically supporting and providing jobs for illegal immigrants as well as advocating that is union busting to let them join city unions. The $262.6 billion spending plan for the fiscal year that begins July 1 was fueled by a $76 billion state surplus and $27 billion in federal aid. Democrats who control the Capitol wanted to use the state's top earners to continue to accrue wealth from a strong stock market backed by state spending in certain "zip codes" and invest city employees investments in certain areas of growth if the state in which they can control, make them prosper, educated, employable, and creating new housing in line with state with federal appropriations yearly only for one race of people, those who are not American citizens. The defendant Nancy Pelosi through the California budget segregated which they also create apartheid in booming tech sectors and rising home values, low-wage Californians suffered from job losses, while illegal immigrants are getting wealthy off welfare, childcare cutbacks and a dysfunctional unemployment insurance system plague the American Negro created and authored by Americans to Americans. The state's progressive tax structure allows Newsom and lawmakers to infuse social service programs for only poor illiterate illegal immigrants and make them middle class and once they have those laws in place they will legislate in Congress making the illegal immigrant citizens; therefore, the U.S. Constitution amended will have the American citizen paying taxes for the new American citizen who has been legislated in prior laws for the free social

services listed above with billions of dollars largely circulating in certain zip codes in California who are the new wealthy non-taxpayers. The Court must find this injunction unique features of alleged discrimination within the defendants legislations and state budget suspect classifications through a simplistic process of analysis for purposes of consideration under the Constitution that the class of disadvantaged "poor" red blooded Americans who are not and cannot under their laws and amendments identify or define in customary equal protection term, and whether the relative rather than absolute nature of asserted deprivation are of significant consequences. The Court then must hold, California laws and amendments and the justifications for the classifications they created are subject to strict judicial scrutiny, the Courts threshold considerations must be analyzed more closely than they were, when passed by the California Assembly, Committee or governing body.

Analysis

To analyzed more closely there are three ways in which the discriminations claimed here can be described. The California system of school finance might be regarded as discriminating (1) against the American Negro who is "poor" considering the financial and social services the American defendants have given to the illegal immigrant who they describe as under-resources schools, under-resources communities which is basically affirmative action for the illegal immigrant (2) against those who are relatively poorer than others, like the American homeless, or (3) against all those who, irrespective of their personal income happen to reside in communities or live in zip codes where the California 2021-22 resources have been allocated by the Governor for illegal immigrants. Therefore, the task before the Court is to ascertain whether in fact the California system has been shown to discriminate on any of those bases and, if so, whether the resulting classifications may be regarded as suspect; therefore, strict scrutiny of their legislation must be applied. The proceedings in this complaint provide the proper starting point. Prior court holding who have described individuals or groups of individuals who constituted the class discriminated against in court prior cases. There is absolutely no basis from the defendants' records of Census Data records that illegal immigrants are constituents of the Democratic Party; moreover, there is no constitution the defendants, the Democratic National Committee can bring before any Court even small claims court that will show a constitutional law the illegal immigrants are the constituents of a political party or benefit from state or federal social services. The question to the Court is whether the quality of education may be determined by the amount of money expanded for it and the quality between two different schools is determined by looking at the difference in per-pupil expenditures, here the defendants are giving away the plaintiff's taxes to

be used per-pupil of illegal immigrants. Therefore, the defendant violate the plaintiff's and American Negro's Equal Protection Clause as the evidence of their financing system discriminates against the American Anglo, American Negro and immigrant citizen who is in this county legally but not able to benefit from the deprivation of financial educational services against the "poor" American's people it results in absolute deprivation of education the disadvantaged classes is not susceptible of identification in traditional terms of their inability to pay absolutely precluded from receiving an education by the State of California. For these reasons this case presents a far more compelling set of circumstances for judicial assistance California has undertaken to do a good deal more than provide an education for those who constitutionally do not deserve state and federal financial services. By the supported facts it appears the legislative classification scheme can be defined and district wealth discrimination as all the state budget is going to specific zip codes since the only correlation indicated by the evidence is between district property wealth and expenditures, creating State sponsored discrimination is found with regard to individual incomes which is also created by State discrimination in regards in crating individual incomes characteristics of illegal immigrants in specific districts which is zip code based.

This depravations in this cause stated in 1994 the plaintiff and Negro race voted for the California ballot initiative Proposition 187 which stated illegal immigrants were taking jobs from American's and they did not deserve social service programs but SB54, Birthright Citizenship Act of 2021 and Raise the Wage Act of 2021 in conjunction with H.R. 4502 which were all written by democratic leaders of the U.S. Therefore, the Court must turn to the question, whether H.R. 4502 has a right to convert the plaintiff and American Negro's vote; as well as the value of the vote which propelled the DNC into the US Presidency which falls under the protection of the law of property, enforceable by a suite of conversion. Biden/Harris ticket stated they would stop the killing of American Negro's by American; moreover, Biden/Harris ticket has chosen to convert the Negro vote and benefits to illegal immigrants and make them employees of the US Government and their job is procreation. Proposition 187 which stated illegal immigrants were taking jobs from American's and they did not deserve social service programs but SB54, Birthright Citizenship Act of 2021 and Raise the Wage Act of 2021 in conjunction with H.R. 1319 American Rescue plan were all written by democratic leaders from California. The California voters overwhelmingly chose to pass Proposition 187 forged the indorsement of the California voters into laws and California Constitution, bill, AB 1593 sponsored by CA Assembly member Eloise Reyes by expanding EITC to include undocumented tax filers, who are illegal immigrants violates U.S. Tax Law. Assembly bill introduced by Reyes, Section 1, I

A working parent with two children can receive a CalEITC of up to $2,467. Section 2 continues the tax scheme by duplicating how they created the budget for the Cash Assistance Program within the State Budget under Emergency service, CalFire. The illegal immigrants are allowed to go went back to 2015 so the illegal immigrant can receive CalEITC of up to $2467. The Court is aware, to qualify for the Earned Income Tax Credit one of many qualifiers is that unemployment is ineligible to receive money from the government if (1) not an American (2) state welfare/payment to not work does not count. Immigrant Service Funding and Cash Assistance Funding also stated in 2015. The "One California" Immigration Services Funding program was established in 2015-16 budget and is administered by the California Department of Social Services. Starting in 2016, the program has funded cash for free immigration services, through qualified nonprofits; some affirmative immigration remedies including the DACA program. For example, in the 2019-'20 Governor's Budget Proposal Higher Education Highlights, California State University proposal. Governor Newsom's first budget proposal calls for the CSU to receive a total increase of $562 million over this current year. This includes a base (ongoing) increase of $300 million as well as $247 million in one-time money. The segregation in California University is ongoing because segregation is funded by the state of California. This is an unprecedented 8% increase to the state general fund allocation to the CSU. This brings the total CSU budget to more than $7.8 billion for immigrant services only. Newson and Pelosi are assholes! In contrast, Governor Moonbeam in his January 2018 budget proposal for 2019-20 called for $92.1 million in new ongoing money for the CSU, a 3% increase to the state general fund allocation. The budget proposal also includes $7 million for legal services for undocumented students, faculty, and staff through the Health and Human Services budget. The January budget proposes $10 million of the ongoing money to convert funding for enrollment allocated for immigrant services in the 2018-19 budget as one-time money into ongoing funding. The budget proposal also includes $5.3 million ongoing for improved immigrant Mental Health services and improving Counselor-to-Student ratios. On the ballet California in 2020 is a repeal to affirmative action, which confidently applies only to UC hiring and students in the UC system. The proposed repeal affirmative action is to hire Spanish speaking counselors and initiatives for immigrant services. This is highly illegal and unconstitutional, and the defendants clearly are in violation of California law, Affirmative Action. Prior complaints in the Court have been about affirmative action for Negro's and affirmative action was no longer necessary for opportunities for minorities was stated to have been equalized or at least are not worth the "cost" of depriving deserving individuals of jobs based on their demographics instead of their ability. Tax evasion comes to mind regarding the defendants' laws and in the words of Justice Frankfurter,

because important issues are raised concerning the rights of individuals and the power of the State Legislature. The plaintiff asks this Court to address the defendants conduct against the Speech or Debate Clause and question the scope of immunity afforded defendants legislatures under the Clause. This is a conspiracy to deprive the vulnerable communities of the California Negro race and plaintiff of liberty, happiness and the enjoyment of life and the opportunity to procreate. The deprivation of the Negro races' state funds similarly to that of the illegal immigrant is a violation of 42 U.S.C subsection 1981, 1983 and 1983(3).

Legislators are not immune from suit under 42 USCS § 1983 by voter alleging that failure of legislature to reapportion districts for more than 55 years to adjust to population shifts deprived plaintiff of due process and equal protection of law in his right of suffrage. Dyer v Abe (1956, DC Hawaii) 138 F Supp 220, on other grounds (1958, CA9 Hawaii) 256 F2d 728. The Court must hold, the defendants reapportion of districts are matters close to the core of the constitutional system and that interest of the State, when it comes to voting, is limited to the power to fix qualifications. Edwards V. California, 314 U.S. 160, 184-185. The defendant's legislative fraud places the California Department of Social Services known as CDSS as its main source of receiving the money from the state and then like "gang member" they organize in a group with criminal activities as the primary focus, and with the intent to promote and further criminal activity and their activity is the legal fits the definition of a gang member in California. One of sixteen departments in the California Health and Human Services Agency, the California Department of Social Services mission statements says on their website, they provide aid, services and protection of the poor immigrant children and families. The defendants "schemozzle" with financing of the illegal immigrant community involves the CDSS. Some of the immigrant services are financed from the California General Fund and some through The CARES ACT and soon to be the Heroes Act of 2020. In the 2020 California Budget are several budget lines for illegal immigrant services in California and the CDSS; their premise reflects the cost of providing services to immigrants who reside in California. These services include (1.) assistant to help applicants obtain DACA or other immigration remedies, (2.) assistance to help applicants with naturalization, (3.) legal training and technical assistance to CDSS contractors that provide immigration legal services to these applicants, (4.) education outreach activities to immigrant communities about DACA or other immigration remedies for naturalization.

The plaintiff's case will succeed on its merits as the defendant's fraud, embezzlement, murder of the American Negro by kills of police and the steadily incarceration of this race now more prevalent as the defendant allow illegal

immigrant to vote and site in a jurist in a tribunal against the American people. The defendants and their political base in 1994 their irreparable harm continues in Hoffman Plastics Compounds, Inc. v. NLRB, 535 U.S. 137 an Amici Curiae brief by the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund bought to the Supreme Court an argument on reparations based on an unfair U.S. immigration policy and the way of no path to citizenship. The amicus brief is a concern for immigrant workers, their legal rights and to change the U.S. INS conditions for illegal immigrants. In 2012 The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) issued a memorandum announcing an immigration relief program known as Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), which allows certain unauthorized aliens who arrived in the United States as children to apply for a two-year forbearance of removal. In 2014 DHS expanded DACA eligibility and created a related program known as Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents (DAPA) and those granted such relief become eligible for work authorization and various federal benefits. In 2019 Department of Homeland Security v. Regents of University of California a lawsuit supported DACA and illegal immigrants. H.R. 1319 American Rescue Plan is arbitrary and capricious in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) and infringed the equal protection guarantee of the Fifth Amendment's Due Process Clause. District Courts in California (Regents, No. 18–587), New York (Batalla Vidal, No. 18–589), and the District of Columbia (NAACP, No. 18–588) this Court must rule in the plaintiff favor.

The establishment of the Bureau for the Relief of Freedmen and Refugees, enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled the plaintiff race, then known as refugees continued protection as freedmen abandoned lands during the then Civil War the US Government in 1862 the Secretary of War may direct such issues of provisions, clothing, and fuel, as he may deem needful for the immediate and temporary shelter and supply of destitute and suffering refugees and freedmen and their wives and children, under such rules and regulations as he may direct the President may, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate shall have authority to set apart, for the use of loyal refugees and freedmen, such tracts of land within the insurrectionary states as shall have been abandoned, or to which the United States shall have forty acres of such land, and the person to whom it was so assigned shall be protected in the use and enjoyment of the land . At the end of said term, or at any time during said term, the occupants of any parcels so assigned may purchase the land and receive such title thereto as the United States can convey, upon paying therefor the value of the land, in SEC. 5. And be it further enacted That all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act, are hereby repealed.

On March 3, 1865, Congress passed "An Act to establish a Bureau for the Relief of Freedmen and Refugees" to provide food, shelter, clothing, medical services, and land to displaced Southerners, including newly freed African Americans seven million newly emancipated African Americans into the political life of the nation. Iowa senator James Grimes claimed. "Are they free men, or are they not? If they are free men, why not let them stand as free men?" he asked. Senator Sumner countered that assistance was a necessity during the transition from slavery to freedom. "The curse of slavery is still upon them," he insisted. "Call it charity or duty," he said, regarding the creation of the Freedman's Bureau, "it is sacred as humanity." On January 5, 1866, Illinois senator Lyman Trumbull introduced a bill to extend the provisions of the Freedmen's Bureau Act by removing an expiration date and encompassing freedmen and refugees everywhere in the United States—not just in the ex-Confederate states. His bill also expanded the power of military governors to enforce provisions to protect African Americans and defined the organization of interim governments in the South under conditions prescribed by Congress. Now a senator from a Southern State of Kentucky a Democrat John Yamuth under an agriculture created H.R. 1319 American Rescue Plan 2021, which brings the American Negro the plaintiff back into slavery but for several foreign countries.

Therefore, H.R. 1319 American Rescue Plan Section 1005 and section provides funding for USDA to pay off outstanding farm loan debts of socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers and Section 1006 provides funding for USDA to address historical discrimination and disparities in the agriculture sector and Specifically, USDA must use specified amounts to, provide outreach, mediation, training, and assistance on issues concerning food, agriculture, agricultural credit, agricultural extension, rural development, or nutrition to certain socially disadvantaged groups, including socially disadvantaged farmers, ranchers, or forest landowners; provide grants and loans to improve land access for such groups; fund one or more equity commissions to address racial equity issues within USDA and its programs; support and supplement agricultural research, education, and extension, as well as scholarships and programs that provide internships and pathways to federal employment; and provide financial assistance to socially disadvantaged farmers, ranchers, or forest landowners who are former farm loan borrowers and suffered related adverse actions or past discrimination or bias in USDA programs, are in violation of the plaintiff and American Negro's, Freemen's Act which establishes the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress to provide, supervision and management subject to freedman from operations by the Army, regulations or rules for the purpose of taxation. The plaintiff and American Negro cannot be put on peonage nor slavery

as we are protected by Federal law never to be put into bondage, the federal law is CHAP. XC. – An Act to establish a Bureau for the Relief of Freedmen and Refugees. The plaintiff seeks an injunction and seeks to create apartheid in the US after he was voted into office by the plaintiff and American Negro vote. The plaintiff and Negro race were never given their Forty acers and we have no intention on paying off the illegal immigrants' debt; therefore, creating slaves for and to the to illegal immigrants which is a law created by the to illegal immigrants and Jewish People which is mimicking apartheid in Israel. Israel just evicted Palestinians from their homes and the coordinated effort in 2021 to evict the Palestinian people and American Negro simultaneously while assassinating Haiti's President because he extended his term in office. Joe is correct, "America is Back" America will kill so you will not VOTE. The plaintiff seeks a stay in this draconian law until the court can determine its constitutionality. The Court must hold, 42 U.S.C. subsection 1985(3), provides a civil action for private conspiracies to deny an y person "equal privileges or immunities under the law," continue to be relevant and H.R. 4502 is written to accommodate the private conspiracy of the Democratic National Committee and the Hispanic National Caucus to overthrow the United States of America.

The defendants conspired to intimidate the plaintiff and the American Negro community in their right to travel in the interstate, work in the interstate and educate themselves in the interstate of California. The plaintiff has shown in this and other causes before the Court is their lifestyle which has been codified by federal and state laws which have manifested into H.R. 1177 U.S. Citizen Act. This is a conspiracy to overthrow the United States and make the American Negro a "slave" to the Whiteman and the Mexican. H.R. 1177 U.S. Citizen Act mandates (1) redefines for immigration purposes the term conviction to exclude convictions that have been expunged or vacated (2) requires the Department of State to implement a strategy to advance reforms in Central America and address key factors contributing to migration from the region to the United States (3) requires the State Department to establish refugee processing centers in Central America (4) requires Customs and Border Patrol sectors and stations to have a certain number of employees with certain qualifications such as paramedic training (5) generally prohibits religious discrimination in granting or denying immigration benefits, and (6) establishes grant programs for providing training and services to immigrants (7) provides permanent resident status to certain applying noncitizens, specifically for eligible noncitizens (8) provides jobs in certain amount of agricultural labor (9) allows illegal immigrants to join the Federal Employee's Union (10) immediately makes them employees of the federal government (10) guarantees university education. This is a conspiracy to overthrow the United States started in a 1994 brief by the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund in a case that

went to the Supreme Court Hoffman Plastics Compound v. National Labor Relations Board. That case was for reparations for illegal immigrants. In 2001 the US Supreme Court handing their decision in Hoffman Plastic Compounds, Inc. v. NLRB, 535 U.S. 137 was federal immigration policy, as expressed by Congress in IRCA, foreclosed the Board from awarding backpay to an undocumented alien who has never been legally authorized to work in the United States. The Court must hold H.R. 117 is unconstitutional U.S. federal immigration policy forecloses that Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security, Marcia Fudge Secretary of HUD from awarding backpay to an undocumented alien who has never been legally authorized to work in the United States. Therefore, "joe" has no legal standing the President of Mexico to convert the plaintiff and American Negro's rights as they are protected by the Constitution.

Based on the 1994 Supreme Court holding in Hoffman Plastic Compounds, Inc. v. NLRB, 535 U.S. 137 and the Democratic National Committee based immigration reform on "HOPE", have the defendants committed 27 years of voter fraud? Now the question before the Court since the DNC and HNC have conspired to overthrow the U.S. is Jos Biden the legitimate president of the United States as the DNC as made every federal and state law only applicable to the illegal immigrant. Then the question to the Court, on January 6, 2021 did the United States military and police know the Democratic National Committee had taken the steps, actions and conspiracies which lead to the U.S. military and police who under the police officers bill of rights have the right to protest, meet and do so as the Police Officers Bill of Rights is for the National Guard and police in every city, Therefore, with their immunity the U.S. military and nations police must take the defendants into custody as they have conspired to overthrow the United States of America. Even in 1787, the founders were attempting to form a union and preserve the nascent United States. This imperfect compromise allowed for preservation of the republic while also confronting the moral and systemic evils of slavery. In 1994 the Hispanic Congressional Caucus formed a union of illegal immigrants this compromise allowed for preservation of the moral and systemic evils of apartheid and codified it as SB54 "essential workers". Article I, Section 2 of the U.S. Constitution states: Representatives and direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons, including those bound to Service for a Term of Years, and excluding

Indians not taxed, three fifths of all other Persons. The "other Persons" were slaves.
Social Security in 2012, the fund will begin to draw on its accounting reserves. By the year 2032, the program will have exhausted these reserves and be unable to pay benefits and adding illegal immigrants and giving them credits means there is money going out and it is not being replenished when the plaintiff and American Negro retires, here the plaintiff conversion claim, damages to chattel (SSI) is so egregious as to merit is that Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security, Marcia Fudge Secretary of HUD must repay in full the value of the American Negro's property, their SSI benefits since they pay-as-you-go. The Social Security reform debate is dominated by two basic approaches. The current program structure intact is achieved by reforms that reduce benefits and raise payroll taxes. Under the Reconstruction which is Biden-Harris Dems platform will require millions of individuals to build personal reserves in private mutual funds or other investments as the State will implement a new law mandating a pension plan. In H.R. 1319 American Rescue Plan 2012 has it a U.S. Constitution under H.R. 1319 will mandate the plaintiff and American Negro community to pay for the illegal immigrant's pension as their job is to collect unemployment and get paid to procreate. In the 1970's SSA became responsible for a new program, Supplemental Security Income (SSI). In 1972, Congress federalized the "adult categories" by creating the SSI program and assigned responsibility for it to SSA which SSI created Cost-of-Living -Adjustments (COLAs) which created provisions for increasing Social Security benefits for certain categories of beneficiaries. A minimum retirement benefits; an adjustment to the benefit formula governing early retirement at age 62 for men. For women Medicare to those who have received benefits for at least two years with Chronic Renal Disease; liberalized the Retirement Test to increase the benefits who delayed retirement past age 65. In 1996 in an affirmation to the plaintiff and California voters "Welfare reform" legislation, terminated SSI eligibility for most non-citizens. Then the defendants created California's Constitutional laws are, H.R. 5252 specifically for illegal immigrants like California Food Assistance Program of 1997 (AB 1576), Immigration Reform and Responsibility Act 1996, California Food Assistance Program of 1997, Cash Assistance Program 1994 (AB2779), Public Post-Secondary, free exemption for non-resident tuition in 2001 (AB 540), Employment Acceleration Act (SB 1236) in 1998, California Dream Act/Scholarship Eligibility in 2001 (AB 130), California Dream Act/Student Financial Aid in 2011 (AB 131),

TRUST Act (AB 4), Medi-Cal Eligibility in 2011 (ABX1 1 and SBX1 1), Retaliation against Immigrant Workers in 2013 (AB 263), Admission to Practice Law in 2013 (AB 1024), Sentencing in 2013 (SB 1310), Registration for Foreign Labor Contracting in 2013 (SB 477), Restoring Higher Education Access and Affordability 2014 (SB 141), Expanding Access to Professional Licenses in 2014 (SB 1159); (SB54) in since 2018 the free Jr college and University of California education for their children until infinity; Domestic Workers Bill of Rights in 2013 (AB 241); Retaliation against Immigrant Workers in 2013 (AB 263); Empowering Immigration to Exercise Rights Under the Law Without Fear of Retaliation in 2013 (SB666); Expanding Access to Professional Licenses (SB1159); Access to Education for Survivors of Crime in 2012 (AB 1899); Restoring Higher Education Access and Affordability in 2013 (AB141); Expanding Access to Higher Education in 2014 (AB2000); Limiting Car Impounding in 2011 (AB353). The Court must hold, in 1996 Welfare reform legislation, terminated SSI eligibility for most non-citizens the above California Legislations are unconstitutional. Also, the courts holding in Hoffman Plastic Compounds, Inc. v. NLRB, 535 U.S. 137 made it clear illegal immigrants are not due back pay nor reparations as written in the federal laws H.R. 1319 American Rescue Plan, S.53 Raise the Wage Act or H.R. 1177 Citizen Act. Therefore, H.R. 4502 is unconstitutional, and the Court needs to grant the injunction to determine the constitutionality of the very old white chick, Nancy Pelosi's authored and aligned with illegal immigrants in California.

The defendant Kamila Harris's as an American Negro sponsored H.R. 4502 which is in violation of Act Bureau for the Relief of Freedmen and Refugees. In CHAP. XC.–An Act to establish a Bureau for the Relief of Freedmen and Refugees, enacted *by* the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby established in the War Department, to continue during the present war of rebellion, and for one year thereafter, a bureau of refugees, freedmen, and abandoned lands, to which shall be committed, as hereinafter provided, the supervision and management of all abandoned lands, and the control of all subjects relating to refugees and freedmen from rebel states, or from any district of country within the territory embraced in the operations of the army, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the head of the bureau and approved by the President. The said bureau shall be under the management and control of a commissioner to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, whose compensation shall be three thousand dollars per annum, and such number of clerks as may be assigned to him by the Secretary of War, not exceeding one chief clerk, two of the fourth class, two of the third class, and five of the first class. And the commissioner and all persons appointed under this act, shall, before entering upon

their duties, take the oath of office prescribed in an act entitled "An act to prescribe an oath of office, and for other purposes," approved July second, eighteen hundred and sixty-two, and the commissioner and the chief clerk shall, before entering upon their duties, give bonds to the treasurer of the United States, the former in the sum of fifty thousand dollars, and the latter in the sum of ten thousand dollars, conditioned for the faithful discharge of their duties respectively, with securities to be approved as sufficient by the Attorney-General, which bonds shall be filed in the office of the first comptroller of the treasury, to be by him put in suit for the benefit of any injured party upon any breach of the conditions thereof.

SEC. 2. And be it further enacted That the Secretary of War may direct such issues of provisions, clothing, and fuel, as he may deem needful for the immediate and temporary shelter and supply of destitute and suffering refugees and freedmen and their wives and children, under such rules and regulations as he may direct.

SEC. 3. And be it further enacted, That the President may, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint an assistant commissioner for each of the states declared to be in insurrection, not exceeding ten in number, who shall, under the direction of the commissioner, aid in the execution of the provisions of this act; and he shall give a bond to the Treasurer of the United States, in the sum of twenty thousand dollars, in the form and manner prescribed in the first section of this act. Each of said commissioners shall receive an annual salary of two thousand five hundred dollars in full compensation for all his services. And any military officer may be detailed and assigned to duty under this act without increase of pay or allowances. The commissioner shall, before the commencement of each regular session of congress, make full report of his proceedings with exhibits of the state of his accounts to the President, who shall communicate the same to congress, and shall also make special reports whenever required to do so by the President or either house of congress; and the assistant commissioners shall make quarterly reports of their proceedings to the commissioner, and also such other special reports as from time to time may be required.

SEC. 4. And be it further enacted, That the commissioner, under the direction of the President, shall have authority to set apart, for the use of loyal refugees and freedmen, such tracts of land within the insurrectionary states as shall have been abandoned, or to which the United States shall have acquired title by confiscation or sale, or otherwise, and to every male citizen, whether refugee or freedman, as aforesaid, there shall be assigned not more than forty acres of such land, and the person to whom it was so assigned shall be protected in the use and enjoyment of the land for the term of three years at an annual rent not exceeding six per centum upon the value of such land, as it was appraised by the state authorities in the year eighteen hundred and sixty, for the purpose of taxation, and in case no such appraisal can be found, then the rental shall be based upon the estimated value of

the land in said year, to be ascertained in such manner as the commissioner may by regulation prescribe. At the end of said term, or at any time during said term, the occupants of any parcels so assigned may purchase the land and receive such title thereto as the United States can convey, upon paying therefor the value of the land, as ascertained, and fixed for the purpose of determining the annual rent previously mentioned.
SEC. 5. And *be it* further enacted That all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act, are hereby repealed, which was approved by Congress on March 3, 1865.

The Court must hold, Kamila Harris's as an American Negro's and author and supported H.R. 4502 is a work contract and written as reparations for illegal immigrants who have no constitutional right to work or receive social benefits based on the Supreme Court holding in Hoffman Plastics Compounds, Inc. v. NLRB, 535 U.S. 137 (2002) is very clear, federal immigration policy, as expressed by Congress in IRCA, foreclosed the Board awarding backpay to undocumented aliens who have never been legally authorized to work in the United States. Which is from the Brief of Amici Curiae Mexican American National Law project from UC Berkeley to the United States Court of Appeal for the District of Columbia Circuit in 1994, which is based on humane immigrant rights based on employer abuse in Silicon Valley California. The amicus brief is a cry for immigrant workers change the U.S. INS conditions for illegal immigrants in the United States. In 2012 The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) issued a memorandum announcing an immigration relief program known as Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), which allows certain unauthorized aliens who arrived in the United States as children to apply for a two-year forbearance of removal. In 2014 DHS expanded DACA eligibility and created a related program known as Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents (DAPA) and those granted such relief become eligible for work authorization and various federal benefits. In 2019 Department of Homeland Security v. Regents of University of California a lawsuit supported DACA and illegal immigrants. H.R. 1319 American Rescue Plan is arbitrary and capricious in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) and infringed the equal protection guarantee of the Fifth Amendment's Due Process Clause. District Courts in California (Regents, No. 18–587), New York (Batalla Vidal, No. 18–589), and the District of Columbia (NAACP, No. 18–588) this Court must rule in the plaintiff favor. Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals violates the Elections Clause that gives Congress final policymaking authority over setting the times, places, and manner of federal elections. Unlike the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, a context in which the Court imposes some federalism limitations on the exercise of

federal power, the Clause allows Congress to legislate without regard for state sovereignty. The Elections Clause highlights the importance of applying a theoretical framework to Congress's authority over elections that properly accounts for the presence of multiple, and sometimes conflicting, sources of federal power. The Clause allow the federal government to disregard state sovereignty, but the line between voter qualification standards, on one hand, and time, place, and manner regulations, on the other, is significantly more blurred than the caselaw indicates, resulting in the existence of hybrid regulations of uncertain constitutional mooring. Congress's sovereign authority under the Elections Clause is broad enough to reach restrictive and oppressive voter qualification standards that affect federal elections, a category that the Court has held falls squarely within the province of state authority; as well as the presence of multiple sources of constitutional authority, means that, in some limited instances, Congress can aggressively police state action under the Elections Clause to protect the fundamental right to vote. the Elections Clause is an expansive and far-reaching source of federal authority which took the first crack at defining the Clause's meaning and scope in a systematic way, deliberately interpreted the Clause in a manner that freed it from the federalism constraints that had come to define the Reconstruction Amendments in which Congress unilaterally imposed federalism constraints during the Antebellum era to a provision that vindicated the broad Reconstruction-era legislation that were clear affronts to state sovereignty. In the case at bar the Court is called upon to reinforce the power of the Election Clause over California sovereign authority (1) cannot "make immigration laws" in the War On Crime and War on Drugs era, even "granting immunity to foreign nationals" when the assertion of this power was controversial, and (2) the Court's jurisprudence on the Reconstruction Amendments to the U.S. Constitution and California's Constitution to accommodate illegal immigrants and the Elections Clause explicitly distanced the Clause from California immigration laws. The Elections Clause by showing that: (1) Congress exercised its independent authority to "make law" in the pre-Civil War era, even when the assertion of this power was controversial, and (2) the Court's jurisprudence on the Reconstruction Amendments and the Elections Clause during the late nineteenth century explicitly distanced the Clause from the federalism pathologies that had limited the reach of the Reconstruction Amendments. Here, the court is asked to reinforce Congresses federal power with this Court ruling on the defendant's deferential posture towards with respect to the regulation on California's State elections as it pertains to the presidency of the United States. The Court must hold, DACA is unconstitutional.

The establishment of the Bureau for the Relief of Freedmen and Refugees, enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled the plaintiff race, then known as refugees continued protection as freedmen abandoned lands during the then Civil War the US Government in 1862 the Secretary of War may direct such issues of provisions, clothing, and fuel, as he may deem needful for the immediate and temporary shelter and supply of destitute and suffering refugees and freedmen and their wives and children, under such rules and regulations as he may direct the President may, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate shall have authority to set apart, for the use of loyal refugees and freedmen, such tracts of land within the insurrectionary states as shall have been abandoned, or to which the United States shall have forty acres of such land, and the person to whom it was so assigned shall be protected in the use and enjoyment of the land . At the end of said term, or at any time during said term, the occupants of any parcels so assigned may purchase the land and receive such title thereto as the United States can convey, upon paying therefor the value of the land, in SEC. 5. And be it further enacted that all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act, are hereby repealed.

The plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits as the plaintiff and American Negro will suffer irreparable harm in the absence of injunctive relief from the Court and the facts before the Court will tip in favor of the plaintiff as the injunction is in the public interest as the University of Oxford in their official capacity and Louise Richardson FRSE Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford and Peter Mancini in his official capacity and Angela Chan in her official capacity and Kevin DeLeon in his official capacity and Rob Bonta in his official capacity Asian Law Caucus Advancing Justice in their official capacity are in violation the Nuremberg Code. Nuremberg Code with 1931 Guidelines that the person involved should have legal capacity to give consent; should be so situated as to be able to exercise free power of choice, without the intervention of any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, overreaching, or other ulterior form of constraint or coercion; and should have sufficient knowledge and comprehension of the elements of the subject matter involved as to enable him to make an understanding and enlightened decision. On March 27, 2019, the Asian American Advancing Justice-Asian Law Caucus Advancing Justice; Border Criminologists, and the University of Oxford Centre for Criminology authored a report "Turning the Golden State into a Sanctuary State" which impacted SB54 the California Constitution which prohibit state and local law enforcement agencies, including school police and security departments, from investigate, interrogate, detain, detect, or arrest persons for immigration enforcement. The author's Peter Mancina is a Research Associate at the Centre for Criminology and Border Criminologist, and Angela Chan is a Policy Director and

Senior Staff Attorney managing the Criminal Justice Reform Program at Asian Americans Advancing Justice. Angela has focused on defending and passing Sanctuary Ordinances to limit local and state law enforcement entanglement with immigration enforcement. Angela served on the San Francisco Police Commission from 2010–2014, which is a chartered city civilian commission that decides officer disciplinary cases and sets policies for the police department. She was a judicial law clerk to the Honorable Napoleon A. Jones in the Southern District of California. In October 2017, California Governor Jerry Brown signed into law the "California Values Act," also known by its legislative bill number SB 54, authored by Senate President Kevin de León, to limit local law enforcement entanglement with immigration enforcement. This sanctuary state law restricts local law enforcement agencies (LEAs) in California from expending agency resources for the purpose of assisting U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) or U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) in identifying, detaining, arresting, and transferring custody of immigrants to these agencies for deportation purposes. On March 1, 2019, because of the recommendations by a foreign nation and foreign educational institution and a private non-profit linked to the military and the Democratic National Committee the recommendations from "Turning the Golden State into a Sanctuary State" led to Xavier Becerra the Attorney General of California and Kevin DeLeon to author in the California Senate Bill Law Enforcement: sharing data law. The defendants Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security, Marcia Fudge Secretary of HUD made the affirmative decision to make the American Negro the experimental subject of their school paper they did not make the plaintiff's race known the nature, duration, and purpose of the experiment; the method and means by which it is to be conducted; all inconveniences and hazards reasonably to be expected; and the effects upon their health or persons which may possibly come from his participation in the experiment. The defendants had and had a duty and responsibility for ascertaining the quality of the consent rests upon everyone within the Negro race in California and throughout the states who have initiated, directed or engaged in the experimentation of the plaintiff and American Negro race. It is their personal duty and responsibility which may not be delegated to another with impunity. The Court must hold, the implementation amended changes to a law that stated out as a school project which involves human experimentation and the human subjects are the American Negro in which a European Nation and its Educational System and a private citizen who is linked to the U.S. Federal Government have brought this

experiment which has no end and has caused the physical or mental state of the plaintiff and American Negro to deteriorate as this continuation of the experiment seems to be the science the Biden-Harris Administration has been talking about as the Biden-Harris administration have sent to Congress in his first three months in office, H.R. 1177 U.S. Citizen Act; H.R. 1319 American Rescue Plan 2021; S.53 Raise the Wage Act of 2021. The defendants are no different than the Nazi doctors accused of conducting murderous and torturous human experiments in the concentration camps these so-called Doctors are no different than "joe's" Scientist and Experts in his administration. At Nuremberg after World War II was conducted by the International Military Tribunal the United States conducted 12 additional trials of representative Nazis from various sectors of the Third Reich, including law, finance, ministry, and manufacturing, before American Military Tribunals, also at Nuremberg. Here, the Court must indict the defendants in its Tribunal so the defendants can be found guilty and sentenced to death by hanging. As the Court is aware after World War II and after the sentences were confirmed by the military by the International Military Tribunal the U.S. Supreme Court declined to review the case, the executions were carried out at the Landsberg prison, by the military. Here, the military is associated with the Asian American Advancing Justice-Asian Law Caucus Advancing Justice and Angela Chan. Therefore, University of Oxford and Peter Mancina and Angela Chan and Kevin DeLeon and Rob Bonta Asian Law Caucus Advancing Justice have violated the Nuremberg Code.

H.R. 4502 is in violation Executive Order 11246, U.S. Department of Labor in Subpart A Section 201, The Secretary of Labor shall be responsible for the administration and enforcement of Parts II and III of this Order. The Secretary shall adopt such rules and regulations and issue such orders as are deemed necessary and appropriate to achieve the purposes of Parts II and III of this Order. In Subpart B Section 2020 (1) The contractor will not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, or national origin. The contractor will take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed, and that employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, or national origin. (2) The contractor will, in all solicitations or advancements for employees placed by or on behalf of the contractor, state that all qualified applicants, which means American citizens are qualifies applicants and will receive consideration for employment without regard to race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, or national origin. (3) The contractor will send to each labor union or representative of workers with which he has a collective bargaining agreement or other contract or understanding,

a notice, to be provided by the agency contracting officer, advising the labor union or workers' representative of the contractor's commitments under Section 202 of Executive Order No. 11246 of September 24, 1965, and shall post copies of the notice in conspicuous places available to employees and applicants for employment. (4) The contractor will include the provisions of paragraphs (1) through (8) in every subcontract or purchase order unless exempted by rules, regulations, or orders of the Secretary of Labor issued pursuant to Section 204 of Executive Order No. 11246 of September 24, 1965, so that such provisions will be binding upon each subcontractor or vendor. Therefore, the $15 minimum wage in "joe's" Executive Order on Increasing the Minimum Wage for Federal Contractors violates is in violation Executive Order 11246, U.S. Department of Labor in Subpart A Section 201, The Secretary of Labor shall be responsible for the administration and enforcement of Parts II and III of this Order and is unconstitutional. The $15 minimum wage was authorized by "joe" as one of many of his segregation laws written in the first four months of him being President of Mexico and the Executive Order for $15 an hour was written for the State of California specifically as a wage for "essential workers" and this is how Nancy Pelosi is linked to federal monies from the Biden/Harris Administration are trying to get them amnesty in the reconciliation bills but prior to that they intend to made them wealthy by providing all illegal immigrants welfare under the constitution, federal jobs under the constitution and all while being essential workers. Currently in San Francisco and Oakland and Los Angeles the Biden/Harris Administration is building houses for illegal immigrants and they are providing subsidized loans to get illegal immigrants into the inner cities and have then take over America under welfare laws authorized by American citizens some city employee, other contracts and some even foreign nations. Have come together at the Democratic National Committee to overthrow the United Sates of America in eleven months from 'joe" biden as presidenta of Mexico. For example, under Nancy Pelosi laws in California "essential works" who are getting federal money under "joe" are warehouse operators, workers that manage health plans, workers who communicate public health information, workers who support food for economically disadvantaged (code words for Illegal immigrants) , workers who coordinate with other family members. Your Honor , the plaintiff walks his dog every day and under California law the plaintiff should be a "essential worker". Clearly H.R. 4502 allows for procreation, therefore, FUCKING one's wife is "essential" but not "work". as "essential Worker" is segregation under California Law and hoe H.R. 4502 has adapted it in its language which makes H.R. 4502 in violation of Executive Order 11246, U.S. Department of Labor in Subpart A Section 201, The Secretary of Labor shall be responsible for the administration and enforcement of Parts II and III of this Order. Moreover, California Executive Order N-33-20 signed by

Governor Gavin Newsom on March 19, 2020, which makes illegal immigrants "essential workers" which is also in violation of Executive Order 11246, U.S. Department of Labor in Subpart A Section 201, The Secretary of Labor shall be responsible for the administration and enforcement of Parts II and III of this Order. The Court must hold, California Executive Order N-33-20 is in violation of Executive Order 11246, U.S. Department of Labor in Subpart A Section 201, The Secretary of Labor shall be responsible for the administration and enforcement of Parts II and III of this Order. H.R. 4502 is in violation of Executive Order 11246, U.S. Department of Labor in Subpart A Section 201, The Secretary of Labor shall be responsible for the administration and enforcement of Parts II and III of this Order. In this Court's opinion if the injunction is not grated for H.R. 4502 the American Negro race will continue to suffer harm and it is in the best interest of the country to invalidate H.R. 4502 as unconstitutional and the injunction is approved for H.R. 4502 until the end of the trial and which time the Court will determine its constitutionality.

As Amended in 1965 The plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits as the plaintiff and American Negro will suffer irreparable harm in the absence of injunctive relief from the Court and the facts before the Court will tip in favor of the plaintiff as the injunction is in the public interest. Here the conversion is the substantive tort theory underlying common law for trover and the most distinctive feature of conversion is its measure of damages, which is the value of goods converted. The Restatement (SECOND) of Torts defines conversion, an intentional exercise of domain or control; over a chattel which so interferes with the right of another to control. The measure of damages in trespass is not the whole value of the property, the actual diminution in its value caused by the interference. Conversion of property one can obtain damages and by showing trespass to chattel can be shown by property interfered; summary judgement for liability cannot be granted on a theory of trespass to chattel without an undisputed showing of actual damages to the property in question. The plaintiff and American Negro suffer irreparable harm because they voted for the Biden/Harris Democratic Ticket in 2020 presidential election based on the African Diaspora the Biden/Harris spoke to the American Negro community and pledged his presidential champaign on. After the election on day one Joe Biden the Democrat issued twelve presidential executive orders on his first three days all related to immigration and especially granting illegal immigrants $15 minimum wage and $110 minimum wage for H1 and B1 immigrants; moreover, California Constitution SB54 was supported by Xavier Becerra who is now head of Health and Human Services who also oversees the grants, pay and health insurance and pension the illegal immigrants will retire off of welfare from and then receive a pension that Xavier Becerra oversees. This

is Treason by the DNC, Joe Biden and Devin Nunes a Senator from California who authored SB54 which gives illegal immigrants immunity from deportation and Eloise Reyes authored H.R.140 Birthright Citizenship Act of 2021 which gives illegal immigrants US citizenship and Senator Diane Feinstein of California supported S.53 known as Raise the Wage Act of 2021 which codifies illegal immigrants as "disabled" and get paid $15 an hour and under H.R. 1319 Xavier Becerra HHS head is allowed to increase their wage every two years. The $15 pay is from "joe's" first three days in office when he gave illegal immigrants $15 pay to be a federal employee. In 1984 the plaintiff and Negro race voted for the California ballot initiative Proposition 187 which stated illegal immigrants were taking jobs from American's and they did not deserve social service programs but SB54, Birthright Citizenship Act of 2021 and Raise the Wage Act of 2021 in conjunction with H.R. 1319 American Rescue plan were all written by democratic leaders from California. Therefore, the Court must turn to the question, whether H.R. 1319 American Rescue Plan the appellee has a right to convert the plaintiff and American Negro's vote; as well as the value of the vote which propelled the DNC into the US Presidency which falls under the protection of the law of property, enforceable by a suite of conversion. Biden/Harris ticket stated they would stop the killing of American Negro's by the Whiteman and that hasn't happened; moreover, Biden/Harris ticket has chosen to convert the Negro vote and benefits to illegal immigrants and make them employees of the US Government and their job is procreation. The Court must conclude "joe" biden is an idiot and his H.R. 4502 is unconstitutional illegal immigrants cannot get federal and state social services and H.R. 4502 is in violation of 45 CFR subsection 80.3 discrimination prohibited and that's under the Department of Health and Human Services, Xavier Becerra is the HHS director, he should know this since he's managing 20 million illegal immigrants.

"joe" biden in his official capacity as authored and supported H.R. 4502 and converted of the plaintiff's and American Negro's vote and trespass to chattel their vote to a work contract for illegal immigrants from Mexico and Central America. As a result of H.R. 4502 the plaintiff and the American Negro race will suffer irreparable harm in the absence of the Court not granting injunctive relief. When H.R. 4502 takes effect on August 27, 2021, it will under what Congress passes on March 3, 1865, Congress passed "An Act to establish a Bureau for the Relief of Freedmen and Refugees" to provide food, shelter, clothing, medical services, and land to displaced Southerners, including newly freed African Americans seven million newly emancipated African Americans into the political life of the nation. Iowa senator James Grimes claimed. Are they free men, or are they not? If they are free men, why not let them stand as free men? Senator Sumner countered that

assistance was a necessity during the transition from slavery to freedom. The curse of slavery is still upon them, he insisted. "Call it charity or duty," he said, regarding the creation of the Freedman's Bureau, "it is sacred as humanity." On January 5, 1866, Illinois senator Lyman Trumbull introduced a bill to extend the provisions of the Freedmen's Bureau Act by removing an expiration date and encompassing freedmen and refugees everywhere in the United States—not just in the ex-Confederate states. His bill also expanded the power of military governors to enforce provisions to protect African Americans and defined the organization of interim governments in the South under conditions prescribed by Congress. Now a senator from a Southern State of Kentucky a Democrat John Yamuth under an agriculture created H.R. 1319 American Rescue Plan 2021.
Therefore, Kamila Harris's as a American Negro's authored, supported and benefited from H.R. 1319 American Rescue Plan Section 1005 and section provides funding for USDA to pay off outstanding farm loan debts of socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers and Section 1006 provides funding for USDA to address historical discrimination and disparities in the agriculture sector and Specifically, USDA must use specified amounts to, provide outreach, mediation, training, and assistance on issues concerning food, agriculture, agricultural credit, agricultural extension, rural development, or nutrition to certain socially disadvantaged groups, including socially disadvantaged farmers, ranchers, or forest landowners; provide grants and loans to improve land access for such groups; fund one or more equity commissions to address racial equity issues within USDA and its programs; support and supplement agricultural research, education, and extension, as well as scholarships and programs that provide internships and pathways to federal employment; and provide financial assistance to socially disadvantaged farmers, ranchers, or forest landowners who are former farm loan borrowers and suffered related adverse actions or past discrimination or bias in USDA programs, are in violation of the plaintiff and American Negro's, Freemen's Act which establishes the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress to provide, supervision and management subject to freedman from operations by the Army, regulations or rules for the purpose of taxation. The plaintiff and American Negro cannot be put on peonage nor slavery as we are protected by Federal law never to be put into bondage, the federal law is CHAP. XC. – An Act to establish a Bureau for the Relief of Freedmen and Refugees. The plaintiff seeks an injunction and seeks to create apartheid in the US after he was voted into office by the plaintiff and American Negro vote. The plaintiff and Negro race were never given their Forty acers and we have no intention on paying off the illegal immigrants' debt; therefore, creating slaves for and to the illegal immigrants which is a law created by the illegal immigrants and JEW (the people who own Kamila) which is mimicking apartheid in Israel. Israel

just evicted Palestinians from their homes and the coordinated effort to evict the Palestinian people and American Negro simultaneously while assassinating Haiti's President because he extended his term in office. Joe is correct, "America is Back" America will kill you so you will not VOTE. The plaintiff seeks a stay in this draconian law until the court can determine its constitutionality. The Court must hold "joe" biden is in violation of Bureau for the Relief of Freedmen and Refugees if Congress did not give 40 acres to former slaves of the America, Kamila Harris's as a American Negro is now the VP and she cannot offer the illegal immigrants from Mexico and Central American relief as the VP she refuses to identify herself as an American Negro and therefore she's passing as White and she would rather offer unconstitutional relief to illegal immigrants as well as miss identify herself as an immigrant, what the hell. Ironically, CHAP. XC. –An Act established a Bureau for the Relief of Freedmen and Refugees who were former Negro slaves, so why is she changing her race at age 88. She heritage is a Negro slave refuge and currently under the constitution she sponsored constitutional laws to create the race she chose not to be a Negro but turn the American Negro into a slave for the illegal immigrant in which she is now a member of, per her admission. Kamila Harris's as an American Negro is now the VP is in violation of Act Bureau for the Relief of Freedmen and Refugees passed by Congress in 1865. The Court when balancing the equities of injunctive relief, you must see the likely the plaintiff and American Negro will suffer irreparable harm because Kamila Harris who the American Negro voted for in the 2020 election told the American people in 2021, she is not Negro, which shows by the democrats the injures still will occur knowing mental retardation is the leadership of the United States of America.

The plaintiff and American Negro truly regret voting for the Biden/Harris ticket is the reasons below is why the Court must grant the injunction as the plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits before the Court if the Court does not grant the injunction the American Negro race will cease to exist as "joe" and the oriental chick seem to have created laws which kill off the Negro race, and he's only been in office for eight months. "joe" biden H.R. 4502 is a constitutional amendment that is a bill of attainder which the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit have held two main criteria that the courts use to determine whether legislation is a bill of attainder are (1) whether "specific" individuals, groups, or entities are affected by the statute, and (2) whether the legislation inflicts a "punishment" on those individuals. H.R. 4502 authored by defendant Linda Sanchez who legislations are all for illegal immigrants which is in violation 18 U.S. Code subsection 611 (a). H.R 4502 meets that criterion and is unlawful because aliens, illegal immigrants, because H.R. 4502 gives them the right to vote because it benefits only that race which allows them to cast a vote. If H.R. 4502

becomes law then any future election will solely or in part for the purpose of electing a candidate for the office of President, Vice President, Presidential elector, Member of the Senate, Member of the House of Representatives, Delegate from the District of Columbia, or Resident Commissioner will be in the hands of one race, one nationality, one religion and they are not even Americans but illegal immigrants given all rights, the very rights the defendants have taken away which allows them to create such legislations.

The Court must hold plaintiff and the American Negro community in the 2020 district elections and the primary vote are that the "real party in interest" who casted the votes in all state election? "joe" biden's legislations and his 'political' representations for illegal immigrants becomes treason upon the United States and violates the plaintiff and Negro races Fifth Amendment rights. Kamila Harris as well violates the plaintiff and American Negro's races Fourteenth Amendment rights which protects even those presence in this country is unlawful, involuntary, or transitory is entitled to that constitutional protection. Wong Yang Sung, supra; Wong Wing, Supra., Graham v. Richardson, 403 U.S. 365. This case holds the strongest support that voting, specifically on welfare benefits for immigrants or an immigrant not meeting a residence within the U.S., violates the Equal Protection Clause. In short, citizens and those who are most like citizens qualify. Clearly the democratic party is party of treason. The defendants Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security, Marcia Fudge Secretary of HUD violate the language in subsection, 78 Stat. 252, like that of the Equal Protection Clause, it is majestic in its sweep. Although the Court is aware no person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance, but when dealing with "joe" there is a double standard and that is the American Negro does not get the benefit of their vote, the illegal immigrant becomes the American he wants to be American, "joe" is a demented old white man.

The Court must hold, "joe" biden is guilty of treason upon the United States of America because the plaintiff has proven all of the legislations and city employees met the two main criteria that the courts look to in order to determine whether legislation is a bill of attainder are (1) whether specific or identifiable individuals are affected by the statute (specificity prong), and (2) whether the legislation

inflicts a punishment on those individuals (punishment prong). The defendants Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security, Marcia Fudge Secretary of HUD stablish California Constitutions and local laws exclusively for illegal immigrants such as, DAPA, SB54, SB1593, AB2792, SB141, SB1310, ABX1, SBX1, AB131, AB130, AB1236, AB2779,AB2279, AB1576, SB1236, SB1159, SB477, AB263, AB2792, AB1576 all are in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1101, Section (8) and these laws purpose was to punish the American Negro and the plaintiff for their 1984 vote for Proposition 187 and the O.J. Simpson verdict and the way the American Negro responded to that verdict, which allowed the defendants to implement their 30 year regulatory scheme. In San Diego Building Trades Council v. Garmon, 353 U.S. 26 (1957) held that the National Labor Relations Board had exclusive authority of the labor dispute, and the state court was without authority to enjoin the picketing or the secondary pressure. Guss v. Utah Labor Relations Board, the court made it clear that a denial of the ability to engage financially with the United States can fulfill the punishment prong of the test. The Court has specified that legislative acts, no matter what their form, which apply either to named individuals or to easily ascertainable members of a group in such a way as to inflict punishment on them without a judicial trial are bills of attainder prohibited by the Constitution. The ills, of slavery in the States, were cured by Lincoln's panacea when it was ratified in December 1865 that was until defendant Napolitano memorandums violates which the plaintiff rights and that of the Negros, the rights to organize as they infringe on the freedoms of expressions and associations which is a staple of the Supreme Court's business and a frequent inquiry by the Negro race. Clear and present danger, the Court must agree these California Constitutions written by illegal immigrants, Jews and Orientals who are the Democratic National Committee's and the Congressional Progressive Caucus leaders put the plaintiff and the Negro race into California State sponsored slavery. 'Symbolic expression' cases have been those the Court contains the critical testing of the core of doctrines or memorandums that introduces problems to free expression. As "joe" and Kamila as they propose into law H.R. 4502 it will and does violate8 U.S. C. 47(3) If two or more persons in any State or Territory conspire, or go in disguise on the highway or on the premises of another, for the purpose of depriving, either directly or indirectly, any person or class of persons of the equal protection of the laws, or of equal privileges and immunities under the laws; or for the purpose of preventing or hindering the constituted authorities of any State or Territory from or securing to all persons within such State or Territory

the equal protection of the laws; or if two or more persons conspire to prevent by force, intimidation, or threat, any citizen who is lawfully entitled to vote, from giving his support or advocacy in a legal manner, toward or in favor of the election of any lawfully qualified person as an elector for President or Vice-President, or as a member of Congress of the United States; or to injure any citizen in person or property on account of such support or advocacy; in any case of conspiracy set forth in this section, if one or more persons engaged therein do, or cause to be done, any act in furtherance of the object of such conspiracy, whereby another is injured in his person or property, or deprived of having and exercising any right or privilege of a citizen of the United States, the party so injured or deprived may have an action for the recovery of damages, occasioned by such injury or deprivation, against any one or more of the conspirators. The Court is aware that Kilbourn v. Thompson, 103 U.S. 168, held legislative immunity to have some limits. And today's decision indicates that there is a point at which a legislator's conduct so far exceeds the bounds of legislative power that he may be held personally liable in a suit brought under the Civil Rights Act. I agree with the Court's reasoning and its conclusion.

The plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits as the plaintiff and American Negro will suffer irreparable harm in the absence of injunctive relief from the Court and the facts before the Court will tip in favor of the plaintiff as the injunction is in the public interest as Chuck Schemer and the Democratic National Committee authored H.R. 4502 and converted of the plaintiff's and American Negro's vote and trespass to chattel their vote to a work contract for illegal immigrants from Mexico and Central America. This conversion is the substantive tort theory underlying common law for trover and the most distinctive feature of conversion Is its measure of damages, which is the value of goods converted. The Restatement (SECOND) of Torts defines conversion, An intentional exercise of domain or control; over a chattel which so interferes with the right of another to control. The measure of damages in trespass is not the whole value of the property, the actual diminution in its value caused by the interference. Conversion of property one can obtain damages and by showing trespass to chattel can be shown by property interfered; summary judgement for liability cannot be granted on a theory of trespass to chattel without an undisputed showing of actual damages to the property in question.

The plaintiff and American Negro voted for the Biden/Harris Democratic Ticket in 2020 presidential election based on the African Diaspora the Biden/Harris spoke to the American Negro community and pledged his presidential champaign on. After the election on day one Joe Biden the Democrat issued twelve presidential executive orders on his first three days all related to immigration and especially granting illegal immigrants $15 minimum wage and $110 minimum wage for H1

and B1 immigrants; moreover, California Constitution SB54 was supported by Xavier Becerra who is now head of Health and Human Services who also oversees the grants, pay and health insurance and pension the illegal immigrants will retire off of welfare from and then receive a pension that Xavier Becerra oversees. This is Treason by the DNC, Joe Biden and Devin Nunes a Senator from California who authored SB54 which gives illegal immigrants immunity from deportation and Eloise Reyes authored H.R.140 Birthright Citizenship Act of 2021 which gives illegal immigrants US citizenship and Senator Diane Feinstein of California supported S.53 known as Raise the Wage Act of 2021 which codifies illegal immigrants as "disabled" and get paid $15 an hour and under H.R. 1319 Xavier Becerra HHS head is allowed to increase their wage every two years. The $15 pay is from 'joe's' first three days in office when he gave illegal immigrants $15 pay to be a federal employee. In 1994 the plaintiff and Negro race voted for the California ballot initiative Proposition 187 which stated illegal immigrants were taking jobs from American's and they did not deserve social service programs but SB54, Birthright Citizenship Act of 2021 and Raise the Wage Act of 2021 in conjunction with H.R. 1319 American Rescue plan were all written by democratic leaders from California. Therefore, the Court must turn to the question, whether H.R. 4502 converts the plaintiff and American Negro's vote; as well as the value of the vote which propelled the DNC into the US Presidency which falls under the protection of the law of property, enforceable by a suite of conversion. Biden/Harris ticket stated they would stop the killing of American Negro's by the Whiteman and that hasn't happened; moreover, Biden/Harris ticket has chosen to convert the Negro vote and benefits to illegal immigrants and make them employees of the US Government and their job is procreation. Chuck Schemer and the Democratic National Committee's H.R. 1319 is unconstitutional as it only benefits illegal immigrants who cannot get federal, and state social services and Chuck Schemer and the Democratic National Committee's is in violation of 45 CFR subsection 80.3 discrimination prohibited and that's under the Department of Health and Human Services.

As a result, Chuck Schemer and the Democratic National Committee is liable and guilty of human rights abuse. Elements of criminal responsibility under domestic law must be established that the prohibited and it must be established that the party had a guilty state of mind for criminal liability, and it depends on the way the particular offence is constituted like in legislation or under common law but in many cases will require proof of either criminal intent, or recklessness as to whether the prohibited outcome occurred or not, and in some cases merely negligence. The plaintiff will have to show proof "beyond reasonable doubt" of "strict" or "absolute" liability, to prove intent or recklessness to establish liability.

Democratic National Committee corporate criminal responsibility can be proven under their domestic penal code, meaning that all offences that potentially attract individual criminal liability carry the possibility of corporate criminal responsibility as well as, corporate culpability": attribution of the DNC leaders actions, intent and negligence to corporate entities Before a natural person can be held criminally liable for a serious criminal offence, it is usually necessary for the prosecution to prove not only that the individual engaged in prohibited behavior, but that he or she intended that behavior, or a certain outcome, or both. DNC's entities; partners; vendors and employee; individual people within the DNC are abstract legal constructions, acting as human agent's human agents. Therefore, whether the relevant offences are defined as "criminal" or "administrative", the DNC methods need to attribute human acts and omissions to a corporate entity, along with a test to establish whether those acts or omissions should attract criminal liability. There are two main approaches to the question the Democratic National Committee's culpability. First, the "identification" method, by which the acts and intentions of corporate officers and senior managers are "identified" as having. Court holding show it's usually sufficient for the person to have been acting broadly within the scope of their duties and with actual or apparent authority. The court holding allow prosecutors to "aggregate" the knowledge of a group of individuals to meet the relevant tests of culpability, United States v Bank of New England (1987) 821 F2d 844. Corporate entities can be held vicariously liable for the wrongful actions of its agents depending on the type of offences.
The wrongful acts are not treated as the company's own. Instead, the Democratic National Committee is held responsible based on the employer-employee relationship they have with the illegal immigrant as their employer. As there is no need to attribute any mental element to the company itself, this form of liability is, technically speaking, "strict" or "no fault" liability as far as the company is concerned. The basic requirements for corporate criminal liability on this basis are that there is an employment relationship, a wrongful act has been committed by the employee, and that this wrongful act took place in the course of the employee's employment. This last requirement can be difficult to apply in practice, especially when the employee has been acting contrary to corporate policies or the express instructions of managers. This will not necessarily absolve the company from responsibility, however, if there was, on the facts, some connection between the wrongful activity of the employee and his or her duties.

The plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits as the plaintiff and American Negro will suffer irreparable harm in the absence of injunctive relief from the Court and the facts before the Court will tip in favor of the plaintiff as the injunction is in the

public interest because H.R. 4502 is in violation of Section 2000e, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act which prohibits employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex and national origin. The laws are clear here SEC. 2000e-1. (Section 702) (b)shall not be unlawful under section 2000e-2 or 2000e-3 of this title (section 703 or 704) for an employer (or a corporation controlled by an employer), labor organization, employment agency, or joint labor-management committee controlling apprenticeship or other training or retraining (including on-the-job training programs) to take any action otherwise prohibited by such section, with respect to an employee in a workplace in a foreign country if compliance with such section would cause such employer (or such corporation), such organization, such agency, or such committee to violate the law of the foreign country in which such workplace is located. SEC. 2000e-5. (Section 706) (2)(m)(B)(i) an individual proves a violation under section 2000e-2(m) of this title (section 703(m)) and a respondent demonstrates that the respondent would have taken the same action in the absence of the impermissible motivating factor, the court (i) may grant declaratory relief, injunctive relief except as provided in clause (ii), pursuit of a claim under section 2000e-2(m) of this title (section 703) (m) *it* shall not award damages or issue an order requiring any admission, reinstatement, hiring, promotion, or payment, described in subparagraph (A). In SEC. 2000e-1. (Section 702) (C) the employer control of corporation incorporated in foreign country (2) Sections 2000e-2 and 2000e-3 of this title (sections 703 and 704) shall not apply with respect to the foreign operations of an employer that is a foreign person not controlled by an American employer (3) the determination of whether an employer controls a corporation shall be based on (A) the interrelation of operations; (B) the common management; (C) the centralized control of labor relations; and (D) the common ownership or financial control, of the employer and the corporation. H.R. 450 is based on California law since it is being implemented in California and as the employer of 20 million illegal immigrants Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security are in control of human resources, budget, PR campaigns, spokes persons for and employer to the entire illegal immigrants race from Mexico and Central American and Asia invited to work in the U.S. with the promise of education, healthcare and monetary compensation based on welfare to in foreign country person(s). In sections 2000e-2 and 2000e-3 (sections 703 and 704) shall not apply with respect to the foreign operations of an employer that is a foreign person not controlled by an American employer (3) the determination of whether an employer controls a corporation shall be based on (A) the interrelation

of operations; (B) the common management; (C) the centralized control of labor relations; and (D) the common ownership or financial control, of the employer and the corporation.
H.R. 4502 makes the U.S. the employer, corporation and makes illegal immigrants employees of a state, city or county agency and federal government but it also allows them to join CalPERS-AFL-CIO which is a State Union and become union members such organizations, such agencies, or such committees that violate the law of the foreign country with foreign workers in which such workplace is located under sections 2000e-2 or 2000e-3 of this title (section 703 or 704) as an employer or a corporation controlled by an employer, labor organization, employment agency, or joint labor-management committee controlling apprenticeship or other training or retraining including on-the-job training programs and take any action otherwise prohibited by such section, with respect to an employee, who is an illegal immigrant unlawful to work in the U.S., is in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The defendants Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security are guilty of violating Title VII volume 42 of the United States Code, beginning at section 2000e which prohibits employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex and national origin.

The plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits as the plaintiff and American Negro will suffer irreparable harm in the absence of injunctive relief from the Court and the facts before the Court will tip in favor of the plaintiff as the injunction is in the public interest because "joe's" H.R. 4502 discriminates within Section 8(a) (3). NLRA Section 8 subsection 158 (a) Unfair labor practices by employer (b)(1) Unfair labor practices by labor organization, (2) to cause or attempt to cause an employer to discriminate against an employee in violation of subsection (a)(3) to refuse to bargain collectively with an employer, (4) (i) to engage in, or to induce or encourage any individual employed by any person engaged in commerce. Employers engaged in honest but mistaken beliefs, the Board held that employers' actions were unfair labor practices in violation of both 8 (a) (1) and 8 (a) (3) of the Act, Cusano v. NLRB and NLRB v. Industrial Cotton Mills, were cited with approval by the court in the Radio Officers case. Also, in Labor Trust laws Union as Beneficiary of a trust of a local trade or federal labor union, central body or state branch, all funds and property of any character shall revert to the American Federation of Labor. Trusts established for the benefit of the local will then be open to question as to their validity. AFL-CIO-CalPERS are certainty of

beneficiary of the private valid trust and the benefit of that trust fund should be applied for the purposes of union members and the trust is held for illegal immigrants then it should be void for lack of "certainty of beneficiary" then the Court must emphasize the impossibility of deciding what was supposed to have done with their money if it is a private trust, Heiss v. Murphy, Wisconsin 276 (1876). Labor unions are an unincorporated association Unincorporated Associations as Cestuis under common law that such unincorporated associations are private trusts for unincorporated associations, under one theory or another. Some courts recognize such associations as de facto legal entities and validate the trust for the association. The Court must decide whether a trust with a trade union as beneficiary is charitable or private. The Court must choose the latter classification, the question of sufficient definiteness of the beneficiary will arise; for while in a charitable trust the cestuis are necessarily indefinite, in a private trust "there must be certainty as to the beneficiaries" if the trust is to be valid.
It is settled in labor law and under the act, it is that membership in a union does not guarantee the member against discharge as such. It affords protection against discharge only where it is established that the discharge is because of union activity. AFL-CIO-CalPERS discrimination which subsection(s) 8(b) (2) and 8(a) (3) out-laws is that related to 'union membership, loyalty, acknowledgment of union authority, or the performance of union obligations. AFL-CIO-CalPERS union membership is encouraged or discouraged whenever a union causes an employer to affect an individual's employment status. That an 8(a) (3) or 8(b) (2) violation does not necessarily flow from the conduct which has the foreseeable result of encouraging union membership, but that given such 'foreseeable result' the finding of a violation may turn upon an evaluation of the disputed conduct 'in terms of legitimate employer or union purposes. Justice Brennan in Branti v. Finkel, a patronage system, including placing supporters in government jobs not made available by political discharge, granting supporters lucrative governmental contracts and giving favored awards and improved public services is a compelling governmental interest in maintaining a political sponsorship system for public employment. DeLeon entered into an agreement with the United Farm Workers Union to unionize these workers under California law. The plaintiff has shown that the DeLeon entered into an agreement with one or more people (conspirators) to engage in criminal activity to overthrow the United States. This agreement is explicit that it is written in the California Constitution that grants from USDA and California is given to illegal immigrant farmers who have contracts with the State to provide food for schools and the California Food Assistance Program started in 1997. It is California Legislation (AB 1576), and we can provide proved circumstantial evidence as well. The Court must hold DeLeon conspiracy planed and put into actions and was aided at least by one conspirator commit an overt act,

Nancy Pelosi. DeLeon's overt act furthered the conspiracy within the Congressional Hispanic Conference to continue the ball rolling on the California Blueprint for immigration. he Democratic National Committee hires illegal immigrants and unionizes them as essential *works* under California law SB54 and now have them defined as disability under federal law H.R. 1319 the defendants negligently created an emergency at the Southern Border on January 1, 2021, conduct by the DNC is deemed foreseeable. In Leflar and Kantrowicz, Tort Liability of the States, 39 N.Y.U.L Rev. 1363, 1407 (1954) it outlines State and Local Governmental Entities immunities, immunity for basic policy or "discretionary" decisions for tort immunity can retain state and local entity by liability insurance as a result some degree of responsibility for wrongful injury is recognized; moreover, Nancy Pelosi is a state employee. Nancy Pelosi created union work and member status to the illegal immigrant under H.R. 1319. Nancy Pelosi cannot make or create jobs as Nancy Pelosi is a State employee. Devin Nunes's SB54 unionized the entire illegal immigrant community as "essential workers" and which also provided immunity, which violates the American Federation of Labor provisions in the constitutions of certain unions which involve the establishment of trusts. American Federation of Labor provides that upon the dissolution, suspension, or revocation of the charter of any local trade or federal labor union, central body or state branch, all funds and property of any character shall revert to the American Federation of Labor. It shall be held in trust until such time that the suspended or defunct organization may be reorganized and ready to confine its activities to conform with recognized enforceable laws of the American Federation of Labor. The situation envisioned by this constitutional provision has been arising with special frequency in recent years with the defections of federal labor unions and local trade unions from the AFL to the CIO. For 30 years the Newsom, Pelosi, Nines, Becerra, Napolitano Reyes DeLeon and Congressional Hispanic Conference has used the California unions all teachers, Nurses, City personnel and Fire and Police unions by labeling the illegal immigrants with the union label of "essential workers" in which Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security, Marcia Fudge Secretary of HUD allowed all illegal immigrants to receive the Covid19 vaccine in the first round with the California unions all teachers, Nurses, City personnel and Fire and Police unions. The State has given all illegal immigrants hazard pay during the year of 2020. The defendants as their employer are a private nonprofit 501 3 c which invited and took on the responsibility of labeling them and giving them union benefits. But the

defendants have not paid CalPERS-AFLCIO union dues in 30 years. It all started with the reaction the American Negro community had during the OJ Simson trial, then KSFO Radio 1310 was having news programs on how to fire a black worker without getting into trouble, and from there came the defendants legislation and at the same time in 1994 South Africa apartheid was unconstitutional and then "joe" authored S.1043 Police Officers Bill of Rights, Social Security Improvements 1994, Federal Crime Bill - Grants for prisons, Welfare Reform, Work Responsibility Act, Family Self Sufficiency Act and S.1972 Federal Crime Control Act of 1989. It must be clear to this Court since Silicon Valley Leadership Group under Carl Guardino entered into a conspiracy to do an unlawful thing against the United States but in conjunction with the defendants the United States, and, in order to accomplish their purposes together, advise illegal immigrants of their rights and allow them to work, knowing that violence and wrong will be the probable outcome, neither in law nor in morals can they escape responsibility.

The plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits as the plaintiff and American Negro will suffer irreparable harm in the absence of injunctive relief from the Court and the facts before the Court will tip in favor of the plaintiff as the injunction is in the public interest Nancy Pelosi's H.R. 4502 is in violation of California Constitution, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000d, and the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Moreover, in explaining the scope of its holding, the court clearly state that Nancy Pelosi, Xavier Becerra Secretary of Health and Human Services, "joe" biden, Seema Nanda CEO of the DNC, Tom Vilsack Secretary of Agriculture, Gina Raimondo Secretary of Commerce, Marty Walsh Secretary of Labor, Pete Buttigieg Secretary of Transportation, Dr. Miguel Cardona, Isabel Guzman, Alejandro Mayorkas Secretary of Homeland Security, Marcia Fudge Secretary of HUD are prohibited from taking race into account in any way in making admissions decisions. Therefore, the defendants are in violation of California law against affirmative action. The defendants amended their states constitution with laws listed above in these complaints and created memorandums as state actors, as employers for the illegal immigrants from Mexico and Central America.
Prior complaints in the Court have been about affirmative action for Negro's and affirmative action was no longer necessary for opportunities for minorities was stated to have been equalized or at least are not worth the "cost" of depriving deserving individuals of jobs based on their demographics instead of their ability. Tax evasion comes to mind regarding the defendants' laws and in the words of Justice Frankfurter, "because principal issues are raised concerning the rights of individuals and the power of the State Legislature. The plaintiff asks this Court to address the defendants conduct against the Speech or Debate Clause and question

the scope of immunity afforded defendants legislatures under the Clause. This is a conspiracy to deprive the vulnerable communities of the California Negro race and plaintiff of liberty, happiness and the enjoyment of life and the opportunity to procreate. The deprivation of the Negro races' state funds similarly to that of the illegal immigrant is a violation of 42 U.S.C subsection 1981, 1983 and 1983(3). Legislators are not immune from suit under 42 USCS § 1983 by voter alleging that failure of legislature to reapportion districts for more than 55 years to adjust to population shifts deprived plaintiff of due process and equal protection of law in his right of suffrage on other grounds (1958, CA9 Hawaii) 256 F2d 728. The Court must hold, the defendants reapportion of districts are matters close to the core of the constitutional system and that interest of the State, when it comes to voting, is limited to the power to fix qualifications. Edwards V. California, 314 U.S. 160, 184-185. The plaintiff asks the Court to hold, defendants violate affirmative action in education, the argument for merit here in these complaints because it's the employment setting, as well as school admission settings. The two legal systems one for the American Negro and the other for illegal immigrants from Mexico and Central America, have different paths of citizenship. in 2018 the Regents of University of California v. DHS and the State of California files a Supreme Court brief in representing illegal immigrants for affirmative action laws for illegal immigrants, 2019 in the law allows an earned income tax credit against personal income tax and a payment from the Tax Relief and Refund Account for immigrant undocumented and in 2019 the Regents of University of California v. DHS and the State of California files a second Supreme Court representing illegal immigrants affirmative laws for education and every state(s) health and food stamp benefits. DACA is affirmative action quotas which allow a race from Mexico and Central America to catch up to American's intellectually. Hence, the controversies in these claims are between states' rights versions citizen rights; between citizen rights and foreign-born person(s) rights and between the citizen verses California 's Legislature who are defending foreign rights over the American Constitution. These complaints enable the parties under authority of the Court and Congress to be heard and tried to determine if the United States citizen, the plaintiff and the Negro race, are peonage to the state of California the state defends segregation for foreign illegal immigrants from Mexico and Central America. The Court must stay DACA until a trial no more funding should be approved, and all illegal immigrants must be held to all laws in the U.S. and find it unconstitutional and find Regents of the University of California as agents and employers to illegal immigrants unconstitutional. The Court must hold, Janet Napolitano's as President of Regents Of The University Of California as plaintiffs in several Federal and State court cases on behalf of illegal immigrants in violation of California Constitution, Title

VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000d, and the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.
Having considered the arguments of the plaintiff the Court concludes that the balance of hardship is in this case tip in favor of granting injunctive relief on H.R. 4502.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65 (c) Security Bond

The Court will waive Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 650(c) so that it may issue the injunction particularly because plaintiff has no money. The Court, therefore, finds that requirement of a security deposit unwarranted. The balance of the hardship weighing strongly in the plaintiff favor and there is a significant public interest underling action.

Conclusion

Those who won our independence believed that the final end of the State was to make men free to develop their faculties, and that in its government the deliberative forces should prevail over the arbitrary. They valued liberty both as an end and as a means. They believed liberty to be the secret of happiness and courage to be the secret of liberty. They believed that freedom to think as you will and to speak as you think are means indispensable to the discovery and spread of political truth; that without free speech and assembly discussion would be futile; that with them, discussion affords ordinarily adequate protection against the dissemination of noxious doctrine, that the greatest menace to freedom in an inert people; that public discussion is a political duty,; and that this should be a fundamental principle of the American government. They recognized the risk to which all human institutions are subject. But they knew that order cannot be secures merely through fear of punishment for its infraction; that it is hazardous to discourage through, hope and imagination; that fear breeds repression; that repression breeds hate; that hate menaces stable government; that the path of safety lies in the opportunity to discuss freely supposed grievances and proposed remedies, and that the fifing remedy for evil counsels is good ones. Believing in the power of reason as applied through public discussion, they eschewed silence coerced by law the argument of force in its worst form, Recognizing the occasional tyrannies of governing majorities, they amended the Constitution so that free speech and free people can assemble. In U.S. Constitution H.R. 4502 is evil legislation created by the forces of evil; therefore, the injunction for H.R. 4502 is granted until the end of trial and the Court can determine its constitutionality.