

From the Desk of Philip A Rafferty, Esq.

Dear Chief Justice Roberts, et al: The following short piece might be worth a look.  
Vty, Philip A Rafferty, September 27, 2013

An Invitation to Practice Hope and a Letter to the Supreme Court Justices

Someone has asked me the practicality of a prospective father's going to court, on behalf of his unborn child (and in his capacity as his unborn child's guardian ad litem ) to stop (through obtaining an injunction or other legal remedy ) the aborting of his child. Do a good read of my UFL Presentation and Letters to Js. Scalia and Sotomayor in this website ([www.parafferty.com](http://www.parafferty.com) ), and also pp. 225-233 in my Unraveling book. Then, let a reader find for me in California a child -of an unborn - father/client who, knowing that he will not be able to save his unborn child in the case at hand, is still willing to pursue his unborn child's case to the US Supreme Court (which almost certainly will deny granting a hearing, ie., his petition for hearing on behalf of his unborn child almost certainly will not garner the necessary 4 votes in favor of the Court accepting the case for review), and I will do the father's/unborn child's case pro-bono, except for expenses, which could amount to relatively more than a small or modest sum.

The beauty of this legal avenue or case-method is that it can be repeated endlessly so long as in each repeat there is always a different unborn child ( which makes each such case a different or separate case), until the U S Supreme Court relents, and agrees to do its moral and constitutional duty of granting a hearing to the father on behalf of his unborn child. So, always there would be, here, true hope. With the exception (as well as the exception put forth in the proceeding paragraph ) that my case - method would originate in a state court rather than in a federal court, it does not differ materially from the methods employed in such cases as Roe v Wade (1973) and Dred Scott v Sanford (1857).

While initially running for President, as well as for re-election President Obama committed the constitutionally immoral and outrageous act –because it contradicts the constitutionally/ due process mandated principle of the “ impartiality of the adjudicator “ of promising repeatedly to nominate for a US Supreme Court justice only persons who would commit in advance to upholding Roe v Wade , should that case ever be reconsidered by the Court. ( Google, e.g., “ Sotomayor in line on abortion rights White House says“ : see my Unraveling book at pp. 175-77 at n. 6. ) Therefore, in conjunction with my petition for hearing, I would file simultaneously a petition to constitutionally force the recusals of Justices Sotomayor and Kagan ( as well as any Obama appointee to the extent that there will still remain 6 justices. ) A Court quorum is 6 justices, and in which case, all that would be needed if there are 6 or 7 justices on the case is that four (4) of them vote that the father's unborn child qualifies as a 14<sup>th</sup> (5<sup>th</sup>) Amendment, due process clause person. To be sure this is a shot in the dark; but what to-be aborted child would not want to take that shot?