



From the desk of: **Gordon W. Watts**
821 Alicia Rd., Lakeland, FL 33801-2113
GordonWatts.com / GordonWayneWatts.com
PH: (863) 688-9880

Hon. Justice _____
Supreme Court of the United States of America
1 First St. NE
Washington D.C. 20543

Date: _____

RE: Feedback to The Court on issues of importance

Your Honor:

When speaking, recently, by phone with Denise McNerney, one of the veteran merit's clerks, she suggested that I write to The Justices individually to express my concerns. I did not even know that this was permitted, since I thought that "ex parte" communication with Judges/Justices was strictly forbidden, and I told her that I felt more comfortable bringing any grievances to The Court the 'regular' way, e.g., by petition, *amicus* brief, etc.

However, the more I thought about this, the more I realised that, in spite of sharp differences of opinion on certain legal matters we had, Ms. McNerney was wise and experienced in these matters, and so I decided to do a little research first to make sure I followed the proper protocol & rules in writing to The Justices, and to this end, I found 2 interesting articles: The first, by *The Post Mail*, was titled: 'U.S. Supreme Court Clerk: Letters to Justices have been "thrown away": Link: <http://www.thepostemail.com/2010/08/19/u-s-supreme-court-clerk-letters-to-justices-have-been-thrown-away/> **This scared me to death!** However, a 2nd letter, "Supreme Court justice answers girl's gay marriage letter," by *The Wilson Times* (link: <http://www.wilsontimes.com/News/Feature/Story/18779627---Friend-of-the-court>) inspired confidence that her suggestion was good advice. (You may check with Ms. McNerney to verify that she suggested this to me.)

I, likewise, would like to offer feedback on the 'Gay Marriage' issue. The article mentioned that "[Justice Sonia] Sotomayor wrote that she couldn't comment on issues that might come before the court, so she didn't divulge her views on same-sex marriage," which is quite reasonable: Your Court must avoid the appearance of bias; however, like the other letter writer, I, too feel the need to bring to your attention certain time-sensitive issues:

First off, were I writing to you about a pending case, I would probably need to serve all the parties, so I think I'll just avoid that problem altogether; however, in a short while, I expect you to receive an *ex parte* petition from me asking for the Extraordinary Writ of *Habeas Corpus*. Since this pleading is *ex parte*, by definition, there *are* no other parties: just me and This Court, so, this time, it is OK for me to directly write The Court, which brings me up to my main point:

I imagine that there's going to be a backlog of the items on docket, due in part to the recent snow storm that DC has experienced, and so my petition, which I filed in This Court (on Sat. 14 Feb. 2015, by *FedEx* overnight) may actually get to you after you receive this letter. Before I go any further, one thing probably needs to be mentioned: I'm going to be offering feedback on some "deep" legal issues surrounding Gay Marriage, and since you don't know me, I think it would be wise for me to show you that, while I'm not a lawyer, I'm no dummy. In case you haven't heard: **I'm the guy whose recent petition to be Terri Schiavo's 'Next Friend' was almost granted, and here are the cites to verify this:**

[1] In *Re: GORDON WAYNE WATTS (as next friend of THERESA MARIE 'TERRI' SCHIAVO)*, No. SC03-2420 (Fla. Feb.23, 2003), denied 4-3 on rehearing. (Watts got 42.7% of his panel)

<http://www.floridasupremecourt.org/clerk/dispositions/2005/2/03-2420reh.pdf>

[2] In *Re: JEB BUSH, GOVERNOR OF FLORIDA, ET AL. v. MICHAEL SCHIAVO, GUARDIAN: THERESA SCHIAVO*, No. SC04-925 (Fla. Oct.21, 2004), denied 7-0 on rehearing. (Bush got 0.0% of his panel before the same court) <http://www.floridasupremecourt.org/clerk/dispositions/2004/10/04-925reh.pdf>

[3] *Schiavo ex rel. Schindler v. Schiavo ex rel. Schiavo*, 403 F.3d 1223, 2005 WL 648897 (11th Cir. Mar.23, 2005), denied 2-1 on appeal. (Terri Schiavo's own blood family only got 33.3% of their panel on the Federal Appeals level) <http://media.ca11.uscourts.gov/opinions/pub/files/200511556.pdf>

Additionally, if you look on the U.S. 11th Circuit's docket for the four (4) recent 'Gay Marriage' cases (*Brenner v. Armstrong*, *Grimsley v. Armstrong*, *Searcy v. Strange*, & *Strawser v. Strange*), you'll notice that, while all other *pro se amici* were routinely denied there **and** in the courts below, my *amici* are the most recent items on docket in all 4 cases. Lastly, if you look at the front page news of *The Register* (GordonWatts.com or GordonWayneWatts.com), you'll see a screenshot of **This Court's** docket, documenting that my recent petition for leave to file an *amicus pro se* was temporarily placed on docket, in response to my motion for leave to file a *pro se amicus*. While The Clerk's denied my motion, my O+40 briefs, in the little 6 1/8-by 9 1/4-inch booklet format, were good enough to look like those of

a real lawyer, even though I clearly stated that I was a non-lawyer seeking leave to file *pro se*!

All this suggests that I may be able to offer some helpful analysis of the 'Gay Marriage' analyses Your Court is facing.

Since I know that The Justices (and your staff) are quite busy, I'll cut right to the "bottom line":

I fear that the backlog will cause my recent petition for the Extraordinary Writ of *Habeas Corpus* to get to you "too late" to offer relief sought. Why, you may ask? Well, while *Habeas normally* issues to test illegal detention of prisoners, and such, I found case law that held *Habeas* may issue to test the particular deprivation of liberty I'm facing, namely that I am denied Due Process of access to The Courts to file an *amicus* brief "*pro se*" in a certain case: Even in cases that are not "my" case, I do have 1st Amendment Redress access to the courts, and Equal Protection demands that *amici* be treated... well,... "Equally," whether or not they (we) can afford a lawyer, and likewise, Due Process guarantees that there be some "Process" to afford me Redress, and there (at present) is not such Due Process, due chiefly to RULE 37 of the Supreme Court (which prohibits *pro se amici*), which is why I asked for the Writ that I expect you to soon receive.

Since the case in which I wish to file has time-deadlines that are about to expire, I'd like to remind you that even if you receive my petition *after* the deadlines to file *amici* pass, and then Grant The Writ (and allow me to file), The Clerk's Office has said that my petition (and thus my proposed *amicus* brief) would be timely since it is time-stamped when received, and FedEx confirms that it was received only a few days after I sent it on Sat. 14 Feb 2015.

There is the chance that you won't receive it in time, and so here's an alternate method for you to get a copy of my petition: Go to GordonWatts.com or GordonWayneWatts.com, in other words, The Register, my blog, and see the front-page news items. You may download a copy in PDF format.

The first time I attempted to file an *amicus* brief in one Gay Marriage case, January 2015, I placed the motion for leave to file in the little 6 1/8-by 9 1/4-inch brief, itself. The clerks have said they would return my O+40, but I have yet to receive them back. (Note: these briefs omit key arguments; rely instead upon the Feb.2015 filing below.)

The second time (14 Feb 2015) I tried to file an *amicus* in a 'Gay Marriage' case (where normally I'd be allowed to file –since both sides have granted blanket consent to *amici* supporting either/neither side), I filed my Motion for leave the "right" way, i.e., as a separate pleading, styled "In re: Gordon Wayne Watts," and cited case law that proved that *Habeas will* issue to test this particular deprivation of liberty.

Please note: While my January brief was a vast improvement over what I filed in Circuit Court, I inadvertently left out a few key arguments. The only brief that you need to concern yourself with is the one in my February petition. Granted, it still has a few scrivener's errors (the most updated version is online), but I (and many others) have proof-read it 'til we got a headache, and any errors in it are "*de minimus*," if you know what I mean. You may safely rely upon my February *amicus* to get the full legal analysis. In case you're uncertain, the current revision has this in its style and table of contents:

AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF OF GORDON WAYNE WATTS, IN SUPPORT OF NEITHER PARTY: FAVOURS STATES' LAWS, BUT SUPPORTIVE OF MANY PETITIONER GRIEVANCES

Argument

I. Polygamy has more legal precedent than gay marriage, implicating equal protection.....5-10
II.(A) prejudice is wrong ((A) prejudice against homosexuals (gays) is wrong:.....11-14
II.(B) prejudice is wrong ((B) prejudice against heterosexuals (straight people) is wrong:.....14-17
III. A solution: separating the treatment (e.g., mistreatment) of persons from the marriage status, and, instead, link 2 similar marital statii (gay unions and polygamy) for a more accurate assessment.....17-18
IV. Application of: *Baker, Romer, Lawrence, Lofton, and Windsor*.....18-22
V. Correcting common errors of 'Traditional Marriage' advocates.....22-24
VI. Correcting common errors of 'Gay Marriage' advocates.....24-29
VII. Proposed order.....29-31
VIII. Inferior Federal Courts didn't even have jurisdiction to address 'Gay Marriage' dispute.....31-33
IX. Conclusion.....33-36

Again, if my Petition for the Extraordinary Writ of *Habeas Corpus* (seeking to test the deprivation of Due Process and Equal Protection in regards my inability to file an *amicus*) doesn't arrive in time, you may safely download the most current copy at GordonWatts.com or GordonWayneWatts.com, and rely solely upon it; it is the most recent news item therewith.

Sincerely,

s/ _____

Gordon W. Watts