

**ORIGINAL**

No. **23-117**

**FILED**  
**AUG 02 2023**  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

---

In the  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

JOHN ANTHONY CASTRO,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

DONALD J. TRUMP,  
*Respondent.*

---

**On Petition for Writ of Certiorari  
Before Judgment  
to the United States Court of Appeals  
for the Eleventh Circuit**

---

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
BEFORE JUDGMENT**

---

JOHN ANTHONY CASTRO  
12 Park Place  
Mansfield, TX 76063  
(202) 594-4344  
J.Castro@JohnCastro.com

*Pro Se Petitioner*

---

Becker Gallagher · Cincinnati, OH · Washington, D.C. · 800.890.5001

**RECEIVED**  
**AUG -7 2023**  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

**QUESTION PRESENTED FOR REVIEW**

Does a political candidate have constitutional standing to challenge the eligibility of another political candidate who competes for the same nomination by the same political party to be that political party's nominee for the same political office based on a political competitive injury in the form a diminution of votes?

## STATEMENT OF RELATED PROCEEDINGS

In accordance with Supreme Court Rule 14.1(b)(iii), the following is a list of all proceedings in state and federal trial and appellate courts that are directly related to this case:

United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida. Docket No. 23-80015-CIV. John Anthony Castro v. Donald J. Trump. Judgment entered June 26, 2023.

United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit. Docket No. 23-10429. In Re John Castro. Mandamus regarding electronic case filing rights. Judgment entered denying relief on April 11, 2023.

United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit. Docket No. 23-10531. In Re John Castro v. Donald Trump. Mandamus regarding disqualification. Judgment entered denying relief on May 3, 2023.

United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit. Docket No. 23-11837. In Re John Castro. Mandamus regarding usurpation of judicial power. Mooted by ruling and subsequent appeal.

United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit. Docket No. 23-12111. John Castro v. Donald Trump. Judgment pending.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTION PRESENTED FOR REVIEW.....i

STATEMENT OF RELATED PROCEEDINGS..... ii

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES..... viii

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
BEFORE JUDGMENT.....1

OPINIONS BELOW .....1

JURISDICTION .....2

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOKED .....2

STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....2

*Course of Proceedings and Dispositions Relevant  
to Standing and Recusal* .....2

*Statement of the Facts* .....3

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....4

I. PETITIONER HAS POLITICAL  
COMPETITOR STANDING GRANTING  
THE DISTRICT COURT SUBJECT  
MATTER JURISDICTION OVER THIS  
CASE .....4

A. Castro's Injury-in-Fact .....6

1. Diminution of Votes and/or Fundraising .....	7
2. Ripeness of the Injury .....	9
(a) <i>Fitness of the Issue</i> .....	12
(i) Petitioner is a Bona Fide and Active 2024 Republican Presidential Candidate .....	12
(ii) Not Remote or Abstract: The Competition for Voters and Donors Has Already Begun.....	16
(b) <i>Threat of Severe Hardship if Judgment Withheld</i> .....	18
(i) Withholding consideration would result in Petitioner losing voters and donors to a constitutionally ineligible candidate.....	19
(ii) Withholding consideration would risk the controversy not being timely addressed by the U.S. Supreme Court before the primary elections thereby mooting the issue and forever denying Petitioner any relief and redressability .....	20

(iii) Withholding consideration would compel Petitioner to Invest Millions of his own funds to campaign with lower odds of success .....	22
3. Petitioner is Within the Zone of Interests Sought to Be Protected.....	22
B. Traceability .....	23
1. Petitioner's Injury to Traceable to Respondent's Unconstitutional Candidacy .....	23
C. Redressability .....	23
1. Federal Question Being Answered is a Prerequisite to Relief .....	24
2. Declaratory Judgments are the Remedies that Would Redress Petitioner's Injury by Aiding in the Removal of an Unconstitutional and Disqualified Political Competitor .....	25
(a) <i>Declaration Whether Trump             Provided Aid or Comfort to             Insurrectionists</i> .....	25

- (b) *If Trump was Found to Have Provided Aid or Comfort to the Insurrection, Could Trump be Enjoined from Campaigning as that Would Be Knowingly Fraudulent Misrepresentation.....*25
  
- (c) *If Trump was Found to Have Provided Aid or Comfort to the Insurrection, Could Trump Be Enjoined from the Unconstitutional Act of Submitting a State Ballot Access Application .....*26
  
- (d) *If Trump was Found to Have Provided Aid or Comfort to the Insurrection, Could the Declaratory Judgment Permit State-Level Enforcement to Enjoin State Election Authorities from Accepting the Ballot Application .....*26
  
- (e) *Does Petitioner Have Standing to Enjoin the Republican Party from Nominating Trump.....*27
  
- (f) *Alternatively, as a Write-In General Election Candidate, Does Petitioner Have Standing to Enjoin Trump's Inauguration .....*27

<i>(g) Lastly, Declaratory Relief Act Relaxes Redressability Analysis</i> .....	28
<i>(h) Closing</i> .....	28
CONCLUSION .....	28
APPENDIX	
Appendix A Order Granting Defendant's Motion to Dismiss and Closing Case in the United States District Court Southern District of Florida West Palm Beach Division (June 26, 2023) .....	App. 1

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Aaron Enterprises, Inc. v. Federal Insurance Company</i> , 415 F.Supp. 3d 595 (E.D. Pa. 2019) ....	10
<i>Abbot Labs. v. Gardner</i> , 387 U.S. 136 (1967) .....	9
<i>Aralac, Inc. v. Hat Corp. of Am.</i> , 166 F.2d 286 (3d Cir. 1948).....	24
<i>Art-Metal-USA, Inc. v. Solomon</i> , 473 F. Supp. 1 (D.D.C. 1978) .....	18
<i>Competitive Enter. Inst. v. NHTSA</i> , 901 F.2d 107 (D.C. Cir. 1990) .....	23
<i>Conforti v. Hanlon</i> , No. CV2008267ZNQTJB, 2022 WL 1744774 (D.N.J. May 31, 2022) .....	8
<i>Dayao v. Staley</i> , 303 F. Supp. 16 (S.D. Tex. 1969), <i>aff'd</i> , 424 F.2d 1131 (5th Cir. 1970) .....	10
<i>Doe v. Mattis</i> , 928 F.3d 1 (D.C. Cir. 2019) .....	18
<i>Duggins v. Hunt</i> , 323 F.2d 746 (10th Cir. 1963) .....	24

<i>Fulani v. Brady</i> , 935 F.2d 1324 (D.C. Cir. 1991) .....	5
<i>Fulani v. League of Women Voters Educ. Fund</i> , 882 F.2d 621 (2d Cir. 1989).....	8
<i>Golden v. Zwickler</i> , 394 U.S. 103 (1969) .....	17, 18
<i>Gottlieb v. FEC</i> , 143 F.3d 618 (D.C. Cir. 1998) .....	5, 6
<i>Gov't Emp. Ins. Co. v. LeBleu</i> , 272 F. Supp. 421 (E.D. La. 1967).....	11
<i>Great Am. Ins. Co. v. Houston Gen. Ins. Co.</i> , 735 F. Supp. 581 (S.D.N.Y. 1990) .....	11
<i>GTE Directories Pub. Corp. v. Trimen America, Inc.</i> , 67 F.3d 1563 (11th Cir. 1995) .....	10
<i>Hardware Mut. Cas. Co. v. Schantz</i> , 178 F.2d 779 (5th Cir. 1949) .....	11
<i>Hassan v. FEC</i> , 893 F. Supp. 2d 248 (D.D.C. 2012), <i>aff'd</i> , No. 12- 5335, 2013 WL 1164506 (D.C. Cir. 2013) .....	5, 6
<i>Hum. Res. Mgmt., Inc. v. Weaver</i> , 442 F. Supp. 241 (D.D.C. 1977) .....	19
<i>League of Women Voters of the U.S. v. Newby</i> , 838 F.3d 1 (D.C. Cir. 2016) .....	20

<i>Lexmark Int'l, Inc. v. Static Control Components, Inc.</i> , 572 U.S. 118 (2014) .....	23
<i>Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife</i> , 504 U.S. 555 (1992) .....	5
<i>Massachusetts L. Reform Inst. v. Legal Servs. Corp.</i> , 581 F. Supp. 1179 (D.D.C. 1984), <i>aff'd sub nom.</i> , 737 F.2d 1206 (D.C. Cir. 1984) .....	18
<i>McGraw-Edison Co. v. Preformed Line Prod. Co.</i> , 362 F.2d 339 (9th Cir. 1966) .....	24
<i>Nat'l Cancer Hosp. of Am. v. Webster</i> , 251 F.2d 466 (2d Cir. 1958).....	24
<i>New World Radio, Inc. v. FCC</i> , 294 F.3d 164 (D.C. Cir. 2002) .....	6
<i>Plains All Am. Pipeline L.P. v. Cook</i> , 866 F.3d 534 (3d Cir. 2017).....	9
<i>Public Citizen v. FEC</i> , 788 F.3d 312 (D.C. Cir. 2015) .....	23
<i>Raines v. Byrd</i> , 521 U.S. 811 (1997) .....	4
<i>Richardson v. Trump</i> , 496 F. Supp. 3d 165 (D.D.C. 2020).....	21
<i>Scott-Burr Stores Corp. v. Wilcox</i> , 194 F.2d 989 (5th Cir. 1952) .....	11

<i>Shays v. FEC</i> , 414 F.3d 76 (D.C. Cir. 2005) .....	5, 6
<i>Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins</i> , 578 U.S. 330 (2016) .....	5
<i>Step-Saver Data Sys., Lnc. v. Wyse Tech.</i> , 912 F.2d 643 (3d Cir. 1990).....	9
<i>TikTok Inc. v. Trump</i> , 507 F.Supp. 3d 92 (D.D.C. 2020).....	19, 20
<i>United States v. Fisher-Otis Co.</i> , 496 F.2d 1146 (10th Cir. 1974) .....	11
<i>Walker Process Equip., Inc. v. FMC Corp.</i> , 356 F.2d 449 (7th Cir. 1966) .....	24
<b>Constitution and Statutes</b>	
U.S. Const. art. III, § 2 .....	4
U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 3.....	8
28 U.S.C. § 2201(a) .....	10, 11, 25-28
28 U.S.C. § 2201(e) .....	1, 2
<b>Rule</b>	
Sup. Ct. R. 11.....	1

**Other Authorities**

Emily Birnbaum and Chris Mills Rodrigo,  
 Twitter falling short on pledge to verify  
 primary candidates, February 25, 2020,  
[https://thehill.com/policy/technology/484453-  
 twitter-falling-short-on-pledge-to-verify-  
 primary-candidates/](https://thehill.com/policy/technology/484453-twitter-falling-short-on-pledge-to-verify-primary-candidates/)..... 14

RJ Frometa, Republican Candidate John  
 Anthony Castro Raises His Voice in Support of  
 George Floyd Protesters, June 19, 2020,  
[https://ventsmagazine.com/2020/06/19/republican-  
 an-candidate-john-anthony-castro-raises-his-  
 voice-in-support-of-george-floyd-protesters/](https://ventsmagazine.com/2020/06/19/republican-candidate-john-anthony-castro-raises-his-voice-in-support-of-george-floyd-protesters/) ..... 14

Xander Landen, Ron Johnson Takes Heat for  
 Linking School Shootings to ‘Wokeness’, May  
 28, 2022, [https://www.newsweek.com/ron-  
 johnson-takes-heat-linking-school-shootings-  
 wokeness-1711136](https://www.newsweek.com/ron-johnson-takes-heat-linking-school-shootings-wokeness-1711136) ..... 14

Peter J. Reily, Wrong Signature Voids Million-  
 Dollar Plus Refund Claim, February 24, 2020,  
[https://www.forbes.com/sites/peterjreilly/2020/0  
 2/24/wrong-signature-voids-million-plus-  
 refund-claim/?sh=423bc0a44cf2](https://www.forbes.com/sites/peterjreilly/2020/02/24/wrong-signature-voids-million-plus-refund-claim/?sh=423bc0a44cf2) ..... 13

Darragh Roche, Neil Gorsuch Just Said the Quiet  
 Part Out Loud, December 28, 2022,  
[https://www.newsweek.com/neil-gorsuch-quiet-  
 part-out-loud-supreme-court-1769854](https://www.newsweek.com/neil-gorsuch-quiet-part-out-loud-supreme-court-1769854) ..... 15

Alia Slisco, Elon Musk Ridiculed Over Twitter Deal Backtrack: 'Rocket Boy Taps Out', July 8, 2022, <https://www.newsweek.com/elon-musk-ridiculed-over-twitter-deal-backtrack-rocket-boy-taps-out-1723122>..... 15

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
BEFORE JUDGMENT**

John Anthony Castro, a current candidate for the Republican nomination for the Presidency of the United States respectfully petitions this Honorable Court for a Writ of Certiorari, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201(e) and Supreme Court Rule 11, to review the judgment of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida, which implicates the eligibility of former President Donald J. Trump to pursue and hold public office given his alleged provision of aid or comfort to the convicted criminals and insurrectionist that violently attacked our United States Capitol on January 6, 2021. To delay this case risks a constitutionally ineligible individual holding public office in direct conflict with the United States Constitution. As such, it is unquestionably a matter of imperative public importance to such a grave extent as to justify deviation from normal appellate practice and to require immediate determination in this Court.

**OPINIONS BELOW**

The decision by the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida dismissing Petitioner John Anthony Castro's civil action on the grounds that he lacks constitutional standing to sue another candidate who is allegedly unqualified to hold public office in the United States pursuant to Section 3 of the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution. That order is attached at Appendix ("App.") at 1.

## JURISDICTION

United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida entered judgment on June 26, 2023. See Appendix A. This petition is filed pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 11. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2201(e).

## CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOKED

This case involves Section 3 of the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution, which is self-executing and provides independent grounds for a federal cause of action.

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

### Course of Proceedings and Dispositions Relevant to Standing and Recusal

On January 6, 2023, Petitioner John Anthony Castro, a 2024 Republican Presidential Candidate, filed a civil action against Respondent Donald J. Trump on the basis of a political competitive injury seeking a declaratory judgment that Respondent Trump is constitutionally ineligible to hold public office pursuant to Section 3 of the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution for his aid and comfort to the convicted criminals and insurrectionists that violently attacked our United States Capitol on January 6, 2021. ECF 1, Compl.

On February 15, 2023, Respondent Trump filed a Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject Matter

Jurisdiction and Failure to State a Claim. ECF 18, MTD.

On February 28, 2023, Petitioner filed his Response in Opposition to Respondent Trump's Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction and Failure to State a Claim. ECF 26, Resp. in Opp'n to MTD.

On March 7, 2023, Respondent Trump filed his Reply to the Response at which point the Motion to Dismiss was fully briefed. ECF 28, Reply to Resp. in Opp'n to MTD.

On June 26, 2023, Judge Aileen Mercedes Cannon dismissed Petitioner John Anthony Castro's civil action against Respondent Trump for lack of standing. ECF 32, Order Granting MTD.

*Statement of the Facts*

Petitioner Castro is an FEC-registered Republican presidential candidate actively pursuing the nomination of the Republican Party to pursue the Office of the Presidency of the United States. Respondent Trump is an FEC-registered Republican presidential candidate actively pursuing the nomination of the Republican Party to pursue the Office of the Presidency of the United States. Respondent Trump is causing a political competitive injury upon Petitioner Castro in the form of diminution of potential votes, political support, and political campaign contributions.

On January 6, 2023, based on this competitive injury traceable to Respondent Trump, Petitioner Castro commenced a civil action against Respondent Trump to obtain a declaratory judgment regarding his eligibility to hold public office in the United States given his aid and comfort to the convicted criminals and insurrectionists that violently attacked our United States Capitol on January 6, 2021, which results in disqualification to hold public office pursuant to the self-executing nature of Section 3 of the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution.

### REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

#### I. PETITIONER HAS POLITICAL COMPETITOR STANDING GRANTING THE DISTRICT COURT SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION OVER THIS CASE

The Constitution limits the jurisdiction of the federal courts to actual cases or controversies.<sup>1</sup> “One element of the case-or-controversy requirement is that [plaintiffs], based on their complaint, must establish that they have standing to sue.”<sup>2</sup> The doctrine of standing, “rooted in the traditional understanding of a case or controversy... developed... to ensure that federal courts do not exceed their

---

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Const. art. III, § 2, cl. 1, *see also Raines v. Byrd*, 521 U.S. 811, 818 (1997).

<sup>2</sup> *Raines*, 521 U.S. at 818.

authority as it has been traditionally understood.”<sup>3</sup> “[T]he ‘irreducible constitutional minimum’ of standing consists of three elements.”<sup>4</sup> The “plaintiff must have (1) suffered an injury in fact, (2) that is fairly traceable to the challenged conduct of the defendant, and (3) that is likely to be redressed by a favorable judicial decision.”<sup>5</sup>

The United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit has recognized the concept of *Political Competitor Standing* on the basis that an injury would logically be diminution of votes traceable to the political competitor and redressable by a court.<sup>6</sup> Political Competitor Standing, however, is only available to plaintiffs who can show that they “personally compete[] in the same arena with the same party.”<sup>7</sup> The D.C. Circuit has also held that if a

---

<sup>3</sup> *Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins*, 578 U.S. 330 (2016).

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* (quoting *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560 (1992)).

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*

<sup>6</sup> See *Shays v. FEC*, 414 F.3d 76, 87 (D.C. Cir. 2005).

<sup>7</sup> *Gottlieb v. FEC*, 143 F.3d 618, 621 (D.C. Cir. 1998) (internal quotation marks omitted); see also *Fulani v. Brady*, 935 F.2d 1324, 1327-28 (D.C. Cir. 1991) (holding that presidential candidate did not have “competitor standing” to challenge CPD’s tax-exempt status where the candidate was not eligible for tax exempt status); *Hassan v. FEC*, 893 F. Supp. 2d 248, 255 (D.D.C. 2012), *aff’d*, No. 12-5335, 2013 WL 1164506 (D.C. Cir. 2013) (“Plaintiff cannot show that he personally competes in the same arena with candidates who receive funding under the Fund Act because he has not shown that he is or imminently will be eligible for that funding.”).

plaintiff can show that he is a “direct and current competitor,” then competitor standing must be recognized as a matter of law.<sup>8</sup> The federal judiciary has recognized that a candidate, as opposed to “individual voters and political action groups” would have “standing based upon a ‘competitive injury’” if, again, the candidate can show that he “personally competes in the same arena with the same party.”<sup>9</sup>

Petitioner John Anthony Castro (hereinafter “Castro”) is an FEC-registered 2024 Republican Presidential candidate and is currently directly competing against Respondent Donald John Trump (hereinafter “Trump”) for the Republican nomination for the Presidency of the United States. As such, Castro has political competitor standing to bring this suit.

#### A. Castro’s Injury-in-Fact

To establish standing, a plaintiff must show that the plaintiff has suffered an “injury in fact caused by the challenged conduct [of the defendant] and redressable through relief sought from the court.”<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> *New World Radio, Inc. v. FCC*, 294 F.3d 164, 170 (D.C. Cir. 2002)

<sup>9</sup> *Hassan*, 893 F. Supp. 2d at 255 n.6 (D.D.C. 2012) (emphases added) (quoting *Gottlieb*, 143 F.3d at 621)

<sup>10</sup> *Shays*, 414 F.3d at 83 (internal citation omitted).

Despite Castro's clear allegations contained in his complaint, the lower court presumably concluded, without any analysis whatsoever, that Castro has not established that he has suffered an injury-in-fact.

### 1. Diminution of Votes and/or Fundraising

Castro and Trump are not only competing for the same political position within the same political party but are also appealing to the same voter base. Castro retains support from unions and his extensive experiences with union organizing is appealing to working class Americans. Similarly, Trump also does not appeal to big donors and most of his donations consist of donors giving small amounts. Consequently, Castro will be primarily targeting the same voters as Trump, and Castro will allocate a significant portion of his campaign finances to such cause.

In fact, throughout his campaigning efforts to date, Castro has spoken to thousands of voters who have expressed that they would vote for Castro *only if* Trump is not a presidential candidate as they maintain political loyalty to Trump.

Trump did not refute that Castro will suffer an injury-in-fact based on a diminution of votes and political support. On this basis alone, an injury-in-

fact has been not only established but conceded by Trump.<sup>11</sup>

A primary candidate has judicial standing to bring a claim challenging the eligibility of a fellow primary candidate for competitive injury in the form of a diminution of votes and/or fundraising if the primary candidate believes that the fellow primary candidate is ineligible to hold public office and to prevent actions irreconcilable with the U.S. Constitution.<sup>12</sup>

Castro will *further* suffer *irreparable* competitive injuries if Trump, who is constitutionally ineligible to hold office, is able to attempt to secure votes in primary elections and raise funds. Trump's constitutionally unauthorized undertaking will put Castro at both a voter and donor disadvantage.

Trump, without judicial relief to Castro, will siphon off votes in violation of Section 3 of the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.<sup>13</sup> In fact, Trump conceded in his motion to dismiss that there

---

<sup>11</sup> See *Conforti v. Hanlon*, No. CV2008267ZNQTJB, 2022 WL 1744774, at \*12 (D.N.J. May 31, 2022).

<sup>12</sup> See *Fulani v. League of Women Voters Educ. Fund*, 882 F.2d 621 (2d Cir. 1989).

<sup>13</sup> U.S. Const., amend. XIV, § 3 "No person shall be a[n]...elector of President...or hold any office... under the United States,...who,...shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof."

<sup>13</sup> See *Fulani*, 882 F.2d at 628.

are only "162 Republican Party candidates" for the Presidency of the United States thereby identifying the actual named individuals with particularity that his candidacy is injuring.<sup>14</sup> By definition, this "particularizes" the injury.

## 2. Ripeness of the Injury

"If further factual development would help the court adjudicate the case, the case may be unripe and therefore nonjusticiable."<sup>15</sup>

Trump's argument that this action is not yet ripe is contradicted by his active campaigning to secure the support of voters and donors for his Presidential candidacy. Trump's argument that Castro fails to show ripeness of the injury can only be sustained if Trump were not actively campaigning. Like Castro, Trump is a declared candidate currently courting voters and seeking funds on his campaign website: [www.DonaldJTrump.com](http://www.DonaldJTrump.com). Castro also has an active campaign website: [www.JohnCastro.com](http://www.JohnCastro.com). Put plainly, Trump and Castro are both pursuing the same voter and donor pies, and Trump is currently taking a slices of the voter and donor pie that

---

<sup>14</sup> See ECF 18, MTD p.12.

<sup>15</sup> *Abbot Labs. v. Gardner*, 387 U.S. 136 (1967). Within the Third Circuit, the Step-Saver Test is applied in declaratory judgment cases and looks to "(1) the adversity of the parties' interests, (2) the conclusiveness of the judgment, and (3) the utility of the judgment." *Step-Saver Data Sys., Lnc. v. Wyse Tech.*, 912 F.2d 643 (3d Cir. 1990); see *Plains All Am. Pipeline L.P. v. Cook*, 866 F.3d 534, 539-540 (3d Cir. 2017).

logically reduces the available pie left for Castro. The injury is factually real and presently happening at this very moment. We need not wait until voters actually cast their ballot since that would make the injury an irreparable harm, render those votes irrelevant, and possibly transform this controversy into a nonjusticiable political question.

Under the Declaratory Judgment Act, a case or controversy must exist at the time the declaratory judgment action is filed.<sup>16</sup> However, despite Castro evidencing the ripeness of this controversy, the Declaratory Judgment Act was designed to declare the rights and legal relations and issues between parties prior to ripeness and to assist the parties in determining possible options for redressability, if any.<sup>17</sup> The Declaratory Judgment Act is designed to enable courts to declare rights of adverse parties to lawsuit even though that suit may not have ripened to a point at which an affirmative remedy is needed.<sup>18</sup> As such, the standard for a judgment under the Declaratory Judgment Act is whether such judgment would *merely* be useful.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> *GTE Directories Pub. Corp. v. Trimen America, Inc.*, 67 F.3d 1563 (11th Cir. 1995).

<sup>17</sup> 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a) (“[W]hether or not... relief... could be sought.”)

<sup>18</sup> *Dayao v. Staley*, 303 F. Supp. 16 (S.D. Tex. 1969), *aff’d*, 424 F.2d 1131 (5th Cir. 1970)

<sup>19</sup> *Aaron Enterprises, Inc. v. Federal Insurance Company*, 415 F.Supp. 3d 595 (E.D. Pa. 2019).

A declaratory judgment is an opportunity for a party to determine the point at which a controversy would ripen in order to seek prompt resolution by a court rather than waiting for an opposing party with a ripe injury or controversy to sue, particularly where delay in seeking judicial intervention will cause substantial prejudice to a declaratory judgment plaintiff.<sup>20</sup>

Castro intends to use this declaratory judgment to swiftly enjoin both Trump's submission of a ballot application as well as any state's acceptance of the ballot application.

The purpose of 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a) is to clarify rights and legal relations in actual controversies before they ripen into actual violations of law or unconstitutional conduct.<sup>21</sup> There are no further factual developments required. Castro is being politically injured, and the time has come for the federal judiciary to address this issue.

---

<sup>20</sup> *Great Am. Ins. Co. v. Houston Gen. Ins. Co.*, 735 F. Supp. 581 (S.D.N.Y. 1990)

<sup>21</sup> *Hardware Mut. Cas. Co. v. Schantz*, 178 F.2d 779, 780 (5th Cir. 1949), *see also United States v. Fisher-Otis Co.*, 496 F.2d 1146 (10th Cir. 1974), *see also Scott-Burr Stores Corp. v. Wilcox*, 194 F.2d 989 (5th Cir. 1952), *see also Gov't Emp. Ins. Co. v. LeBleu*, 272 F. Supp. 421 (E.D. La. 1967)

**(a) *Fitness of the Issue***

**(i) Petitioner is a Bona Fide and  
Active 2024 Republican  
Presidential Candidate**

The lower court presumably adopted Trump's characterization of the underlying civil action as a "publicity stunt" by Castro. Such an assertion can only be interpreted as Castro initiating an action either for an improper purpose or as a planned civil action having the effect of drawing the public's attention to Castro's presidential campaign. Because the lower court neither received a request for sanctions nor imposed sanctions *sua sponte*, the characterization must be the latter.

Trump is effectively arguing that one of Castro's motivating factors for bringing this civil action is to draw the public's attention to Castro's Presidential campaign. While Castro is not denying that this action has the potential to elevate his political status, demonstrate his legal ingenuity, and display his executive leadership by single-handedly ending Trump's political career, Castro's sole motivation to bring this suit is to remedy an actual injury-in-fact.

Castro's 2024 Republican Presidential Campaign activities have included building a comprehensive campaign website, a campaign store with merchandise, campaign photo sessions to highlight public support for his candidacy, and a current effort to sell his tax software, AiTax, for an

estimated \$180 million to self-finance his Presidential campaign with \$100 million of his own funds.

With regard to Castro's campaign website, it was originally designed as part of his 2020 Republican Primary Campaign for U.S. Senate against Senator John Cornyn (R-TX). Castro's campaign slogan at that time was "One America United." From the onset, Castro intended this Senate race to be a precursor to his 2024 Republican Presidential Campaign. As part of that campaign, Castro designed his campaign website, his campaign logo, and his campaign merchandise.

Castro ran again for U.S. Congress in 2021 with the unexpected death of Congressman Ron Wright. After that campaign ended, Castro was quoted in the Fort-Worth Star Telegram that Trump was a "false prophet" and that he would not support him.

On February 24, 2020, Forbes reported that "Mr. Castro is running for the Republican nomination to be the US Senator from Texas."<sup>22</sup>

On February 25, 2020, The Hill, a nationally recognized politically focused news agency, reported on Castro's 2020 Republican Senatorial Campaign

---

<sup>22</sup> See Peter J. Reily, Wrong Signature Voids Million-Dollar Plus Refund Claim, February 24, 2020, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/peterjreilly/2020/02/24/wrong-signature-voids-million-plus-refund-claim/?sh=423bc0a44cf2>

and his efforts to get “Verified” on social media platform Twitter.<sup>23</sup>

On June 19, 2020, Vents Magazine covered “Republican Candidate John Anthony Castro” and his efforts to address police reform.<sup>24</sup>

On February 6, 2022, the Washington Post reported: “John Anthony Castro is a declared candidate for the Republican nomination” and discussed Castro’s efforts to disqualify Trump.

On May 28, 2022, Newsweek quoted John Anthony Castro and described him as “a Republican candidate who is running for president in 2024.”<sup>25</sup>

On July 28, 2022, Newsweek quoted John Anthony Castro’s ridicule of Elon Musk describing

---

<sup>23</sup> See Emily Birnbaum and Chris Mills Rodrigo, Twitter falling short on pledge to verify primary candidates, February 25, 2020, <https://thehill.com/policy/technology/484453-twitter-falling-short-on-pledge-to-verify-primary-candidates/>

<sup>24</sup> See RJ Frometa, Republican Candidate John Anthony Castro Raises His Voice in Support of George Floyd Protesters, June 19, 2020, <https://ventsmagazine.com/2020/06/19/republican-candidate-john-anthony-castro-raises-his-voice-in-support-of-george-floyd-protesters/>

<sup>25</sup> See Xander Landen, Ron Johnson Takes Heat for Linking School Shootings to ‘Wokeness’, May 28, 2022, <https://www.newsweek.com/ron-johnson-takes-heat-linking-school-shootings-wokeness-1711136>

him as “Rocket Boy” and referred to Castro as “a Republican 2024 presidential candidate.”<sup>26</sup>

On December 12, 2022, Newsweek mentioned John Anthony Castro and directly quoted his description as a “2024 Republican Presidential Candidate Suing Trump to Disqualify Him for January 6.”<sup>27</sup>

Castro has been mentioned and/or covered in the Washington Post, Forbes, The Hill, and Newsweek regarding his Republican candidacy. In particular, the Washington Post and Newsweek have identified him as a 2024 Republican Presidential candidate. Castro’s efforts to earn this media coverage demonstrate the seriousness with which he is pursuing the Presidency of the United States without regard to other self-serving interests, such as books deal, media deals, or cabinet positions. Castro fully intends on being the President of the United States of America and Commander-in-Chief of the United States Armed Forces.

Lastly, Castro has already reached out and connected with New Hampshire and Iowa Republican Party leadership. Castro has also arranged for

---

<sup>26</sup> See Alia Slisco, *Elon Musk Ridiculed Over Twitter Deal Backtrack: ‘Rocket Boy Taps Out’*, July 8, 2022, <https://www.newsweek.com/elon-musk-ridiculed-over-twitter-deal-backtrack-rocket-boy-taps-out-1723122>

<sup>27</sup> See Darragh Roche, *Neil Gorsuch Just Said the Quiet Part Out Loud*, December 28, 2022, <https://www.newsweek.com/neil-gorsuch-quiet-part-out-loud-supreme-court-1769854>

various trips to the state this summer to begin his grassroots door-to-door campaign, which will involve a novel and unique plan to build enough political support to have a break-out performance. While intense campaigning is not required to be recognized as a candidate, Castro nevertheless meets the standard of a very serious candidate who is genuinely pursuing the Republican nomination for the Presidency of the United States.

**(ii) Not Remote or Abstract: The Competition for Voters and Donors Has Already Begun**

This complaint is not remote or abstract. Both Castro and Trump are registered and declared candidates. Nikki Haley announced her Presidential campaign releasing only a website and a single campaign video. Castro, on the other hand, has been actively seeking to declare Trump constitutionally unqualified since early 2022 as Trump pointed out in his motion to dismiss.<sup>28</sup> In effect, Trump has admitted that Castro has been actively pursuing his legal strategy as part of his Presidential campaign for over a year now.

Trump is clearly conflating active candidacy with ballot access while ignoring the fact that many states allow for write-in candidacies. Ballot access does not control the determination of whether an individual is a candidate. There are many examples

---

<sup>28</sup> See ECF 18, MTD pp. 5-6

of successful write-in candidacies by candidates who did not appear on the ballot. Castro has a campaign website, publicly declared his candidacy *before* Trump, has been actively campaigning for political support on social media, has been pursuing Trump's disqualification for over a year, and has been covered by the media for his pursuit of Trump's disqualification. Whether or not the lower court likes it, Castro is a current and active 2024 Republican Presidential candidate.

Furthermore, there is no basis for the lower court's presumed adoption of Trump's assertion that the U.S. Supreme Court case of *Golden v. Zwickler* analyzed whether an individual was a "bona fide political candidate" as Trump claimed in his motion to dismiss.<sup>29</sup> That is patently false and misleading. The U.S. Supreme Court case of *Golden v. Zwickler* involved a First Amendment challenge to a "state statute making it a crime to distribute anonymous literature in connection with an election campaign."<sup>30</sup> Because Mr. Zwickler had left Congress for a 14-year term as a State Supreme Court Justice, the U.S. Supreme Court concluded that the fact that "it was most unlikely that the [former] Congressman would again be a candidate for Congress precluded a finding that there was 'sufficient immediacy and reality' here" regarding the risk of criminal prosecution for future violations.<sup>31</sup> This case actually highlights the

---

<sup>29</sup> See ECF 18, MTD p. 11

<sup>30</sup> *Golden v. Zwickler*, 394 U.S. 103, 109 (1969).

<sup>31</sup> *Id.*

importance of hearing this case now since, by the time it reaches the U.S. Supreme Court, the issue could be moot as it was in *Golden v. Zwickler*.

***(b) Threat of Severe Hardship if  
Judgment Withheld***

A lack of court intervention would result in an irretrievable loss of both votes and donor funds. Castro has been and *presently is* being harmed by Trump's actions. As such, relief at later time would not compensate Castro for his competitive injuries in the form of diminution of votes and funds.<sup>32</sup> Both issues must be properly considered in determining the ripeness of this controversy.<sup>33</sup> There is no mechanism to redistribute cast primary ballots or refund political contributions that donors make to Trump in order to make those votes and funds available to eligible candidates. Cash is an inherently finite and limited resource. As such, once those voters have cast their ballots and/or donors have given their available dollars to an ineligible candidate, they are forever lost.

When an individual has no other opportunity to pursue judicial review, there is irreparable harm.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> *Massachusetts L. Reform Inst. v. Legal Servs. Corp.*, 581 F. Supp. 1179, 1187 - 1188 (D.D.C. 1984), *aff'd sub nom.*, 737 F.2d 1206 (D.C. Cir. 1984)

<sup>33</sup> *Art-Metal-USA, Inc. v. Solomon*, 473 F. Supp. 1 (D.D.C. 1978)

<sup>34</sup> *Doe v. Mattis*, 928 F.3d 1 (D.C. Cir. 2019)

Additionally, the federal court is the appropriate judiciary; Castro cannot pursue judicial review of the competitive injury in the form of diminution of votes and funds at the state level because the injury stems from Trump's ineligibility pursuant to Section 3 of the 14th Amendment, which is a federal question removable to and/or reversible by a federal court. Hence, Castro seeks a declaratory judgment now in aid of future litigation, including, but not limited to, state-level litigation to avoid the inevitable appeal and/or removal to the federal judiciary that would delay a final judgment until after the primary elections.

While the mere presence of a constitutional question is not *de jure* irreparable harm, the controversy is ripe for judicial action if it causes an injury to an individual, is within the zone of interests sought to be protected by a constitutional provision, is based on a lack of alternative and timely remedies, and threatens the loss of votes and donors.<sup>35</sup>

**(i) Withholding consideration would result in Petitioner losing voters and donors to a constitutionally ineligible candidate**

In *Tiktok v. Trump*, the D.C. District Court held that an *irreparable* competitive injury will be found if the alleged misconduct pushes monetizable

---

<sup>35</sup> *Hum. Res. Mgmt., Inc. v. Weaver*, 442 F. Supp. 241 (D.D.C. 1977).

individuals to alternative options because those individuals are unlikely to return after they have chosen another option, which results in an eroding of a competitive position.<sup>36</sup>

Here, the fact pattern is legally identical: Castro declared his candidacy before Trump and is now losing potential supporters and donors to Trump, which is eroding his competitive position as those potential supporters and donors would be unlikely to ever return unless Trump was no longer a candidate.

**(ii) Withholding consideration would risk the controversy not being timely addressed by the U.S. Supreme Court before the primary elections thereby mooting the issue and forever denying Petitioner any relief and redressability**

Where there could be no redress after a coming deadline, there will be a finding of irreparable harm.<sup>37</sup> Here, any delay risks this injury becoming irreparable and possibly mooting or transforming the case into a non-justiciable political question as the 2024 Presidential Election nears closer. It is prudent to address these issues early, and now is the appropriate time.

---

<sup>36</sup> *TikTok Inc. v. Trump*, 507 F.Supp. 3d 92 (D.D.C. 2020).

<sup>37</sup> *League of Women Voters of the U.S. v. Newby*, 838 F.3d 1 (D.C. Cir. 2016)

The risk of violating the U.S. Constitution and the fact that there could be no do-over or redress once the election has begun is sufficient to establish a ripeness of the controversy, a justiciable injury-in-fact, and the very real threat of irreparable harm by erosion of competitive position.<sup>38</sup>

This case will involve inevitable appeals. Castro cannot wait until late 2023 when both Castro and Trump are state-registered candidates because that would guarantee that the injury would become irreparable, possibly moot the case, possibly transforms the case into a non-justiciable political question, or expose the Republican Party to irreparable harm as they could lose their party's presumptive or actual nominee after millions of Americans cast their ballots in the primaries. Delaying judicial review of these questions would be a constitutional crisis of the federal judiciary's own making. Castro implores the federal judiciary to avoid unintentionally engineering a crisis. If the federal judiciary addressed these issues now via the Declaratory Judgments Act, the Republican Party would have time to recover by funding, supporting, and nominating a constitutionally eligible candidate.

---

<sup>38</sup> *Richardson v. Trump*, 496 F. Supp. 3d 165 (D.D.C. 2020).

**(iii) Withholding consideration would compel Petitioner to Invest Millions of his own funds to campaign with lower odds of success**

Withholding consideration at this stage would compel Castro to spend millions of dollars of his own funds to continue being competitively injured and to compete against a constitutionally unqualified and ineligible candidate with much lower odds of success. For that reason, it is prudent for the federal judiciary to exercise its jurisdiction and consider these matters now.

### **3. Petitioner is Within the Zone of Interests Sought to Be Protected**

Section 3 of the 14th Amendment protects a person from having to politically compete against a pro-insurrectionist politician. This is a federally protected interest under Section 3 of the 14th Amendment.

Section 3 of the 14th Amendment was specifically designed to ensure that non-insurrectionists did not have to politically compete with the more politically popular pro-insurrectionist politicians in the South. The framers of Section 3 of the 14th Amendment specifically designed it to remove overwhelming popular pro-insurrectionists from the ballot. As such, Castro is not simply within the "zone" of interests; Castro is the precise type of person that the framers of Section 3 of the 14th

Amendment specifically sought to politically protect while Trump is the precise type of person they sought to disqualify.

Although the U.S. Supreme Court arguably abolished the doctrine of prudential standing in *Lexmark*,<sup>39</sup> Castro satisfies prudential standing in that his injury is particularized and concrete, he satisfies Article III standing (injury, traceability, and redressability), and he is within the zone of interests sought to be protected by Section 3 of the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.<sup>40</sup>

## **B. Traceability**

### **1. Petitioner's Injury to Traceable to Respondent's Unconstitutional Candidacy**

It is undisputed that Castro's injury-in-fact is traceable to Trump.

## **C. Redressability**

"Plaintiffs need not prove that granting the requested relief is certain to redress their injury, especially where some uncertainty is inevitable."<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> *Lexmark Int'l, Inc. v. Static Control Components, Inc.*, 572 U.S. 118 (2014)

<sup>40</sup> *Public Citizen v. FEC*, 788 F.3d 312 (D.C. Cir. 2015).

<sup>41</sup> *Competitive Enter. Inst. v. NHTSA*, 901 F.2d 107, 118 (D.C. Cir. 1990).

Nevertheless, the “Declaratory Judgment Act created... a new remedy.”<sup>42</sup> The following are the more definitive statements on the precise types of declaratory relief Castro seeks:

**1. Federal Question Being Answered is a Prerequisite to Relief**

Whether Trump’s actions, words, and/or conduct with regard to the January 6, 2021, insurrectionary attack on the United States Capitol rise to the level of providing “aid or comfort” to the insurrection is a question of federal law. Before Castro can pursue any relief, this federal question must be answered. The process by which that question is answered can be had through the Declaratory Judgments Act. A declaratory judgment would answer all of these questions and clarify the rights and legal relations between Castro and Trump.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> *Walker Process Equip., Inc. v. FMC Corp.*, 356 F.2d 449, 451 (7th Cir. 1966); also see *Nat’l Cancer Hosp. of Am. v. Webster*, 251 F.2d 466 (2d Cir. 1958); *Aralac, Inc. v. Hat Corp. of Am.*, 166 F.2d 286, 290 (3d Cir. 1948).

<sup>43</sup> See *McGraw-Edison Co. v. Preformed Line Prod. Co.*, 362 F.2d 339, 342 (9th Cir. 1966) (“The purpose of the Declaratory Judgment Act is to afford an added remedy to one who is uncertain of his rights and who desires an early adjudication thereof without having to wait until his adversary should decide to bring suit, and to act at his peril in the interim.”); also see *Duggins v. Hunt*, 323 F.2d 746, 748 (10th Cir. 1963) (“The general purpose of the Declaratory Judgment Act... is to provide an immediate forum for the adjudication of rights and obligations in actual controversy where such controversy may be settled in its entirety and with expediency and economy.”).

**2. Declaratory Judgments are the Remedies that Would Redress Petitioner's Injury by Aiding in the Removal of an Unconstitutional and Disqualified Political Competitor**

Castro provides the following more definitive statements on his claims upon which relief can be granted:

***(a) Declaration Whether Trump Provided Aid or Comfort to Insurrectionists***

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a), a Court "may declare the rights and other legal relations of" Castro and Trump, including whether Trump is constitutionally eligible to pursue and/or hold the Office of the Presidency of the United States on the factual assertion that he provided aid or comfort to the January 6 Insurrectionists.

***(b) If Trump was Found to Have Provided Aid or Comfort to the Insurrection, Could Trump be Enjoined from Campaigning as that Would Be Knowingly Fraudulent Misrepresentation***

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a), a Court "may declare" whether, if Trump was found to have provided aid or comfort to the January 6 Insurrectionists, Castro has the legal right to enjoin Trump from campaigning for the Presidency since

that would violate Section 3 of the 14th Amendment, FECA, and/or constitute knowingly fraudulent misrepresentation regarding eligibility.

*(c) If Trump was Found to Have Provided Aid or Comfort to the Insurrection, Could Trump Be Enjoined from the Unconstitutional Act of Submitting a State Ballot Access Application*

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a), Castro asked the lower Court to “declare the rights” of Castro as to whether he can secure an injunction to prevent the unconstitutional act of Trump submitting a state ballot access application. In other words, whether the Court can issue an injunction preventing Trump from engaging in the unconstitutional act of submitting a state ballot access application since that would be violative of his disqualification from public office pursuant to Section 3 of the 14th Amendment.

*(d) If Trump was Found to Have Provided Aid or Comfort to the Insurrection, Could the Declaratory Judgment Permit State-Level Enforcement to Enjoin State Election Authorities from Accepting the Ballot Application*

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a), Castro asked the lower Court to “declare the rights” of Castro as to whether he has standing and the right to secure an

injunction to prevent individual state election authorities from accepting and processing Trump's state ballot access application.

***(e) Does Petitioner Have Standing to Enjoin the Republican Party from Nominating Trump***

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a), Castro asked the lower Court to "declare the rights" of Castro as to whether he would have standing and the right to secure an injunction against the Republican Party to prevent his formal nomination at the Republican National Convention if Trump won the primary election.

***(f) Alternatively, as a Write-In General Election Candidate, Does Petitioner Have Standing to Enjoin Trump's Inauguration***

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a), Castro asked the lower Court to "declare the rights" of Castro as to whether he, having declared and verified his intention to be a write-in candidate for the general election if he is unsuccessful in securing the nomination of the Republican Party, would have standing and the right to secure an injunction against the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies preventing the inauguration of Trump if Trump won the general election.

***(g) Lastly, Declaratory Relief Act  
Relaxes Redressability Analysis***

The Declaratory Judgment Act does not even require that relief could be sought. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a), a Court “may declare the rights and other legal relations of” Castro and Trump on “whether or not further relief is or *could be sought*.” The key phrase here is “whether or not further relief... *could be sought*.” According to 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a), it is not required that relief could be sought at the time of the filing. A Court can still “declare the rights” of Castro and Trump, including their “legal relations,” such as the constitutional disqualification of Trump and Castro’s standing to disqualify Trump from pursuing and/or holding public office.

In essence, the redressability inquiry is relaxed because the declaratory judgments are the redressable relief that would remedy Castro’s injuries.

***(h) Closing***

Based on all of the foregoing, Castro has constitutional standing to pursue this civil action. And by implication of redressability, Castro has stated claims upon which relief can be granted.

**CONCLUSION**

The judgment below should be vacated and the case remanded for trial.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN ANTHONY CASTRO  
12 Park Place  
Mansfield, TX 76063  
(202) 594-4344  
J.Castro@JohnCastro.com

*Pro Se Petitioner*

## **APPENDIX**