1	Pierre Genevier
2	711 South Westlake Ave., # 205
3	Los Angeles, CA 90057-4128
4	Email: <u>pierre.genevier@laposte.net</u>
5	
6	IN THE
7	SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
8	
9	Pierre Genevier (Petitioner) No:_09-8222
10	VS
11	Brian DeMore (Respondent)
12 13 14	Reply to (or supplemental brief after) the Solicitor General's waiver to file a response to the petition. Following the Solicitor General's waiver to file a response to the
15	petition for writ of certiorari filed on 1-21-10, petitioner would like to make
16	one comment on this filing by the Solicitor General as allowed in rule 15
17	['Any party may file a supplemental brief at any time calling attention to
18	other intervening matter <u>not available at the time of the last filing</u> '].
19	As the Court knows, Rule 15 requires the opposing party to 'address
20	any perceived misstatement of fact and law in the petition that bears on
21	what issues properly would be before the Court if certiorari were granted', and
22	it admonishes the counsel that 'they have an obligation to the court to
23	point out in the brief in opposition, and not later, any perceived
	Page 1 of 4 2/1/2010 Reply or Supplemental Brief File name: replysupcourtus2-1-10

misstatement made in the petition'. Since the petition (rightfully) alleges		
explicit facts and grave wrongdoings during the procedures below that bear		
'on what issues would be before the Court if certiorari were granted' [see		
petition page 14 'The removal also covers up the grave administrations'		
wrongdoings The initial lies at the INS on petitioner refugee status were		
followed by a deluge of grave wrongdoings, even criminal ones', on		
page 24 'the removal is even more unfair because the various		
administrationsrepeatedly and unfairly delayed the honest review of		
petitioner's refugee documents to prevent the resolution of the problems		
earlier, to harass petitionerand to hurt him', on page 25 'Laske		
and Robinson have also repeatedly lied in their briefs and other pleadings to		
cover up the wrongdoings which is also criminal', on page 24		
"Petitioner is a refugee entitled to adjustment of status", on page 26 "the		
removal cover up their grave wrongdoings and would even be criminal, and it		
$\mathit{leads}\ \mathit{to}\ \mathit{a}\ \mathit{gross}\ \mathit{miscarriage}\ \mathit{of}\ \mathit{justice}$], the lack of opposition from the		
Solicitor General is a 'technical' or 'practical' admission that these		
statements are true.		
The record presented to the Ca9 Appeals Court contains a lot of		
documents that establish petitioner's good faith and prove the wrongdoings		
mentioned in the petition [including various criminal complaints and		

employees misconduct complaints filed at the DHS, USA offices] - documents

that cannot be presented to this Court with a petition for writ of certiorari for

46	clarity reasons - but the Solicitor General had the record and could verify the
47	allegations made and their veracity, so the waiver to file an opposition is a
48	'practical' admission of the grave wrongdoings from civil servants
49	(including USDOJ employees), and of petitioner good faith, it also confirms
50	petitioner's refugee status and entitlement to adjustment of status to
51	permanent resident status, and it supports the well-founded of the petition
52	on the jurisdiction and transfer issues.
53	The role of the Supreme Court is not to investigate crimes (like the
54	FBI) or to prosecute them (like the USA offices), but the Supreme Court's
55	work still has to do with justice and correcting injustice, so when it is
56	presented with a 'practical' admission of grave wrongdoings and of the good
57	faith of a petitioner , by the Solicitor General, one of the highest officials at
58	the USDOJ, and presented with an unopposed petition containing few
59	exhibits also supporting these two points, then it certainly has means to point
60	out an inappropriate behavior from civil servants, to render justice, to correct
61	a grave injustice and to improve society without taking too much time on the
62	Court's very busy schedule on a fairly simple case like this one.
63	Respectfully submitted
64	Yours sincerely,
65	Dated: January , 2010.
66	By:
67	Pierre Genevier
68	

Reply or Supplemental Brief

69	No. 09-8222
70	IN THE
71	SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
72	Pierre GENEVIER (Pro se) — PETITIONER
73 74	vs. Mr. Brian DeMore
75	Respondent
76	PROOF OF SERVICE
77 78 79 80 81 82	I, Pierre Genevier, do swear or declare that on this date, February , 2010, as required by Supreme Court Rule 29, I have served the enclosed 'Reply to (or supplemental brief after) the Solicitor General's waiver to file a response to the petition' on each party to the above proceeding or that party's counsel, and on every other person required to be served, by faxing and mailing the above documents.
83	The names and addresses of those served are as follows:
84 85 86 87 88 89	Mr. Tim Laske, Assistant US Attorney, Attorney for Mr. DeMORE, at Room 7516 Federal Building, 300 North Los Angeles Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012, Fax: (213) 894-7819. The Solicitor General of the United States, Room 5614, Department of Justice, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20530-0001.
91	I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.
92 93	Executed on February , 2010
94 95	Pierre Genevier
96	I ICITO GONOVIOI
	Page 4 of 4 2/1/2010 Reply or Supplemental Brief

Page 4 of 4 2/1/2010 File name: replysupcourtus2-1-10