

No.

In THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JONATHAN TAYLOR WILSON - PETITIONER

VS.

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, REAL
RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

JONATHAN TAYLOR WILSON

1144 ILLINOIS ROUTE 29 SOUTH

TAYLORVILLE, ILLINOIS 62568

(217) 824-4004

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

THIS PRISONER'S CASE NO. 97-CR-17161-01, HAS BEEN THE SUBJECT OF JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION AND SPITZED LEGAL DEBATE. BOTH STATE AND FEDERAL COURTS, IN ASSESSING (THESE CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES) HAVE ARRIVED AT VARYING CONCLUSIONS.

THIS PRISONER, WAS NEVER GIVEN THE PROPER MIRANDA WARNINGS. MIRANDA V. ARIZONA, 384 U.S. 436, 86 S.Ct. 1602 (1966).

AFTER HIS ARREST ON: JUNE 9, 1997. DURING HIS DETENTION AND INTERROGATION CONDUCTED BY CHICAGO POLICE INVESTIGATOR, COLLINS, SEAR #40146.

THEREAFTER, THE PRISONER WAS DENIED COUNSEL AT THE FOLLOWING CRITICAL STAGES OF THE STATE'S PRE-TRIAL PROCEEDINGS.

A) WHEREAS, "WHERE RIGHTS SECURED"

Question(s) (Answer)

By the (State) States (organization) are
 involved, if there can be any
 rule making or legislation
 which would (organization) State
 (organization) A.R. 207A, 384 U.S. 436, @ 491,
 84 S.Ct. 1402, @ 1436 (1964).

B) Whether "it is in (organization) State
 the (organization) (organization) in the
 organization of the (organization) States
 (organization) to (organization) may (organization) be
 (organization) out of (organization) State."
 (organization) v. (organization) 364 U.S. 339,
 @ 345, 81 S.Ct. 125, @ 129.

C) Whether the (organization) States
 (organization) (organization) (organization) (organization)
 be (organization) (organization) (organization) (organization)
 as well as (organization) (organization) (organization)
 of (organization) (organization) (organization) (organization)
 (organization) U.S. (organization) (organization) (organization) (organization)
 1842, @ 1867.

Question(s) Presented

1) WHETHER THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION'S RIGHT TO COUNSEL, WHICH BE OF LITTLE VALUE IF THAT RIGHT TO COUNSEL, COULD BE INDIRECTLY DENIED. U.S. Term Limits, Inc. v. Thornton (2d).

E) WHETHER IT IS SETTLED THAT WHERE THE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL IS A CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENT, DOES THE RIGHT TO BE FURNISHED COUNSEL DEPEND ON A REQUEST. MIRANDA V. ARIZONA, 384 U.S. @ 471, 86 S.Ct. @ 1626.

F) WHETHER THESE CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES ARE AN INNOVATION IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT'S JURISPRUDENCE (OR) ARE APPLICATIONS OF PRINCIPLES LONG RECOGNIZED AND APPLIED IN OTHER CRIMINAL COURT SETTINGS. MIRANDA, @ 491, @ 1610.

LIST OF PARTIES

☒ All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

☐ All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	
JURISDICTION	1/2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3 & HERE 7
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	8 & HERE 13
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	14 & HERE 28
CONCLUSION	28

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

ORDER OF APPELLATE COURT OF ILLINOIS, FIRST DISTRICT,
NO. 1-15-3024 DATE: DECEMBER 4, 2017 (A-9)

ORDER OF SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS NO. 123213
DATE: MARCH 21, 2018

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX B

EXHIBIT "A" (ORDER OF COMMITMENT AND SENTENCE TO ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS) A-3.

EXHIBIT #19 "G-J-H" (GRAND JURY TRANSCRIPTS) A-2

EXHIBIT A-#22 (CERTIFIED STATEMENT OF CONVICTION / DISPOSITION) A-4

EXHIBIT #35 AFFIDAVIT OF COURT REPORTER, ANGELA PERAZZI A-7

APPENDIX C

EXHIBIT MARCH 14, 2017 (CHICAGO) DAILY LAW BULLETIN... VOLUME 163, NO. 50

EXHIBIT "W-J#1" (ORDER OF COMMITMENT AND SENTENCE TO ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS)

INDEX TO APPENDICES
APPENDIX (1) (CONTINUED)

EXHIBIT "W-J#2" (GRAND) JURY
TRANSCRIPTS (COVER-SHEET)

EXHIBIT "W-J#3" (CERTIFIED) STATEMENT
OF CONVICTION / DISPOSITION

EXHIBIT "T-T#1" (City of Chicago /
Department of Police / Identification
Section)

EXHIBIT "T-T#2" (GRAND) JURY
TRANSCRIPTS (COVER-SHEET)

EXHIBIT "T-T#3" (CERTIFIED) STATEMENT
OF CONVICTION / DISPOSITION
APPENDIX (1)

EXHIBIT (1) 11-1 TABLE 11-1 (TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS) A-5

EXHIBIT (S) 1-K#1 AND 1-K#2 LETTER FROM:
ASSISTANT PUBLIC DEFENDER, DORINE A. KUPFER A-6

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (CIRI)

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

CARLEY V. COLKRAY, 369 U.S. 506, 82 S.Ct. 881

19

FREY V. (CIRI) SEARS, 293 F.1013(1).C.(1923)

12-13

GILKON V. WINGWRIGHT, 372 U.S. 335, 83 S.Ct. 792

27

Commission V. WIGGLESWORTH, 364 U.S. 339, 81 S.Ct. 125

II

MIRANDA V. ARIZONA, 384 U.S. 436, 86 S.Ct. 1602

I, II, III, 8, 9

14, 19, 20,

(CIRI) SEARS V. CRONIC, 466 U.S. 648, 104 S.Ct. 2039

23, 26,

(CIRI) SEARS V. GONKIL, 467 U.S. 180, 104 S.Ct. 2292

23, 26,

U.S. Term Limits, Inc. V. Thornton, 514 U.S. 779, 115 S.Ct. 1842

II

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (i.e.)

STATUTES AND RULES PAGE NUMBER

Illinois Compiled STATUTES

725 ILCs 5/112-4(b) 5, 16

725 ILCs 5/113-1 5, 10, 16, 17

725 ILCs 5/113-3 (2)(b) 5, 6, 11, 17, 18

United STATES Constitution

42nd Amendment 3, 14

52nd Amendment 3, 9, 14

62nd Amendment 3, 4, 9, 10, 16, 22, 26, 27

132nd Amendment 4

142nd Amendment 4, 9, 10, 16

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (PREF)

Illinois Constitution (1970) ARTICLE I

SECTION(S) §

PAGE NUMBER

SECTION 2 DUE PROCESS AND EQUAL PROTECTION
6, 7, 16, 17

SECTION 8 RIGHTS AFTER INJURY
7, 17

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

☒ For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☒ is unpublished.

The opinion of the ILLINOIS FIRST DISTRICT APPELLATE court appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☒ is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was _____.

☐ No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. ____ A _____.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

☒ For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was APRIL 21, 2018.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix A.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. ____ A _____.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Amendment IV

Section 1. UNREASONABLE SEARCH AND SEIZURE
THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE TO BE SECURE IN
THEIR PERSONS, ** AGAINST UNREASONABLE
SEARCHES AND SEIZURES, SHALL NOT BE
VIOLATED, AND NO WARRANTS SHALL ISSUE,
BUT UPON PROBABLE CAUSE, **.

Amendment V

Section 1. RESTRICTIONS ON PROSECUTIONS
NO PERSON SHALL BE HELD TO ANSWER FOR
A CAPITAL, OR OTHERWISE INFAMOUS CRIME,
UNLESS ON A PRESENTMENT OR INDICTMENT
OF A GRAND JURY, ** NOR BE DEPRIVED
OF LIFE, LIBERTY, OR PROPERTY, WITHOUT
DUE PROCESS OF LAW; **.

Amendment VI

Section 1. RIGHT TO A SPEEDY TRIAL
IN ALL CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS, THE ACCUSED
SHALL ENJOY THE RIGHT ** TO BE CONFRONTED
WITH THE WITNESSES AGAINST HIM, TO

Constitutional and Statutory Provisions
Involve

HAVE Compulsory Process for obtaining
witnesses in his favor, and to have
the assistance of Counsel for
his defense

Amendment XIII

Section 1. SLAVERY ABOLISHED

Neither slavery nor involuntary
servitude, except as a punishment
for crime whereof the party shall
have been duly convicted) **.

Amendment XIV

Section 1. Due Process and Equal Protection

** Nor shall any State deprive any
person of life, liberty, or property,
without due process of law; nor
deny to any ~~person~~ person within
its jurisdiction the equal protection
of the laws.

Constitutional And Statutory Provisions Involved

Illinois Compiled Statutes

(725 ILCS 5/112-4(b)) RIGHTS OF GUARDIAN JURY
AND STATE'S ATTORNEY (b) ** ANY PERSON
SUBPOENAED WHO IS ALREADY CHARGED WITH
AN OFFENSE OR AGAINST WHOM THE STATE'S
ATTORNEY IS SEEKING A BILL OF INDICTMENT
SHALL HAVE THE RIGHT TO BE ACCOMPANIED
BY COUNSEL WHO SHALL ADVISE HIM OF
HIS RIGHTS DURING THE PROCEEDINGS BUT
MAY NOT PARTICIPATE IN ANY OTHER WAY. **
* AND THAT HE WILL HAVE COUNSEL
APPOINTED FOR HIM IF HE CANNOT AFFORD
ONE.

(725 ILCS 5/113-1) PROCEDURE ON ARRESTMENT
BEFORE ANY PERSON IS TRIED FOR THE COMMISSION
OF AN OFFENSE HE SHALL BE CALLED INTO
OPEN COURT, INFORMED OF THE CHARGE
AGAINST HIM, AND CALLED UPON TO PLEAD
THERE TO. *** AN ENTRY OF THE
ARRESTMENT SHALL BE MADE OF RECORD.

(725 ILCS 5/113-3(2)(b)) COUNSEL AND

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

EXPERT WITNESS; FEES AND EXPENSES

(2) EVERY PERSON CHARGED WITH AN OFFENSE SHALL BE ALLOWED COUNSEL BEFORE PLEADING TO THE CHARGE.

IF THE DEFENDANT DESIRES COUNSEL AND HAS BEEN UNABLE UNABLE TO OBTAIN SAME BEFOREarraignment THE COURT SHALL RECESS COURT OR CONTINUE THE CASE FOR A REASONABLE TIME TO PERMIT DEFENDANT TO OBTAIN COUNSEL AND CONSULT WITH HIM BEFORE PLEADING TO THE CHARGE. ***

(d) IN ALL CASES EXCEPT WHERE THE PENALTY IS A FINE ONLY, IF THE COURT DETERMINES THAT THE DEFENDANT IS INDIGENT AND DESIRES COUNSEL, THE PUBLIC DEFENDER SHALL BE APPOINTED AS COUNSEL. **

Illinois Constitution (1970)
ARTICLE I

SECTION 2 DUE PROCESS AND EQUAL

Constitutional And Statutory Provisions Involved

Illinois Constitution (1970)

ARTICLE I
Continued

Protection... No person shall be
deprived of life, liberty or property
without due process of law nor
be denied the equal protection
of the laws.

Section 6 Rights After Indictment
... In criminal prosecutions, the
accused shall have the right to
appear and defend in person and
by counsel; to demand the nature
and cause of the accusation
and have a copy thereof; **

Summary of the Case

1) Law Enforcement Officials took the Prisoner into custody on June 9th, 1997 and interrogated him in a police station under custody.

The Police did not effectively advise Prisoner of his Constitutional Rights under Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, 86 S.Ct. 1602 (1966).

The Prisoner indicated that he wished the assistance of Counsel while in Police custody. But the Law Enforcement Authorities ignored and denied Prisoner's request on the basis that the Prisoner did not have (or) could not afford a retained attorney.

Police Investigator Collins, SAR #40146, never informed the Prisoner that if he was indigent, a lawyer would be appointed to represent

Summary of the Case

1) In violation of the 5th, 6th and 14th Amendments to the United States Constitution.

2) Due to the extrinsic fraud, the occurred during the Cook County, Illinois Grand Jury proceedings "GJ No: 599". Held on: the 20th day of June, A.D. 1997. The Circuit Court never lawfully acquired personal jurisdiction over the petitioner.

Where, A.S.A. Patrick Finney, intentionally circumvented, the petitioner's constitutional and statutory right to be present at all critical stages of the pre-trial proceedings with the assistance of counsel for his defense.

Where, the petitioner was held in the County Jail, in Court custody. In violation of the United States Constitution's 6th and 14th Amendments.

Summary of the Case

3) During the Arraignment Hearing held on: July 11, 1997. Judge Hon W. Shultz (FBI) to advise the Petitioner of the charges against him, and his Constitutional Right to Counsel.

In Violation of the 6th and 14th Amendments to the United States Constitution.

The Actions of Judge Shultz during the Arraignment Hearing, were also in violation of the mandatory statutory requirements of (925 ICS 51413-1) Procedure on Arraignment.

Which requires the Court to make a Verbatim Record of the Arraignment Hearing. But, the Official Court Record is silent, in regards to the Petitioner being represented by Counsel or being informed of the charges during the Arraignment Hearing. See: the Affidavit of

Summary of EAE Case

COURT REPORTER, ANGELA PERAZZI
(EXHIBIT #35) A-G...

NO, ARE THERE ANY COURT RECORDS,
THAT SHOW, THAT, THE PRISONER,
KNOWINGLY WAIVED HIS CONSTITUTIONAL
AND STATUTORY RIGHT TO COUNSEL DURING
THE ARRAIGNMENT HEARING.

4) THE ACTIONS OF JUDGE SHAUER, ON:
July 11, 1997, WERE ALSO IN VIOLATION
OF THE MANDATORY STATUTORY REQUIRE-
MENTS OF 425 ILCS 5/113-3(2)(b)
COUNSEL AND EXPERT WITNESSES;
FEE'S AND EXPENSES.

WHERE, AN INDIGENT DEFENDANT,
DOES POSSESS A STATUTORY RIGHT
TO COUNSEL.

5) THE PRISONER HAS RECEIVED THE
INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF TRIAL COUNSEL.
WHERE, COURT APPOINTED COUNSEL (ASSISTANT
PUBLIC DEFENDER, NICOLA CAZZAR-WOLFORD).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

REFUSED TO REQUEST OR FILE A MOTION TO DISMISS THE INDICTMENT. BECAUSE OF THE MICHIGAN VIOLATIONS AND THE EXTRINSIC FACTS THAT OCCURRED DURING THE GRAND JURY PROCEEDINGS. NOR WOULD SHE REQUEST A FRYE HEARING. FRYE V. UNITED STATES, 293 F. 1013 (1. C. CIR. 1923).

IN ORDER TO EXAMINE THE DIFFERENCE STANDARD USED BY THE STATE'S EXPERT WITNESS (ANGELA RICH) FOR THE ALLEGED DNA ANALYSIS. BEFORE IT WAS PRESENTED TO THE TRIAL JURY UNCORRECTED. SEE: EXHIBIT 1 (TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS 7-1 THRU 7-4) A-5

(6) THE PETITIONER HAS RECEIVED THE INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF TRIAL COUNSEL. WHERE, (ASSISTANT PUBLIC DEFENDER, DORANE H. KUTTER). REFUSED TO FILE PETITIONER'S MOTION TO DISMISS THE INDICTMENT. BECAUSE OF THE MICHIGAN VIOLATIONS. OR THE MOTION

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

FOR A FIVE HEARING (ID). (SEE: EXHIBIT
D-K #1 AND #2) A-6

WHERE IT SAYS: "8. THE JUDGE
WILL NOT ACCEPT ANY PRO SE MOTION
FROM YOU. YOU ARE REPRESENTED BY
COUNSEL AND ONLY MOTIONS FROM
YOUR COUNSEL WILL BE ACCEPTED
BY THE COURT. I AM NOT GOING
TO PROCEED ON ANY OF YOUR PRO
SE MOTIONS."

"6. THERE WILL BE NO FIVE HEARING ON YOUR CASE.
THE TECHNIQUES USED IN YOUR CASE HAVE BEEN THE
SUBJECT OF A FIVE HEARING IN THE PAST AND
THAT HEARING HAS BEEN MET. THE COURTS
REQUIRE ONLY ONE HEARING - NOT A
HEARING IN EACH CASE."

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

1) THE PETITIONER WAS ARRESTED AND FORMALLY CHARGED WITH THE ALLEGED OFFENSE ON: JUNE 9, 1997 (06/09/97). DURING THE PETITIONER'S DETENTION AND QUESTIONING / INTERROGATION WHILE IN CUSTODY AT THE POLICE STATION.

POLICE INVESTIGATOR COLLINS SEAR #40146. FAILED TO GIVE THE PETITIONER NOTICE OF HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS UNDER MIRANDA V. ARIZONA 384 U.S. 436, 86 S.Ct. 1602 (1966). IN VIOLATION OF THE 4TH AND 5TH AMENDMENTS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION. (SEE: EXHIBIT "A" (ORDER OF COMMITMENT AND SENTENCE TO ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS) A-3).

THE PETITIONER'S CONVICTION CANNOT STAND BECAUSE HE WAS INTERROGATED WITHOUT THE PROPER MIRANDA WARNINGS. HE TO TIME, DID PETITIONER, WAIVE HIS RIGHT TO COUNSEL.

Remains for growing the children

During the Police investigation #40146

asked the children if he (John)

is willing to take a lie detector

test. He (John) says his children

say he (John) only took

a lie detector test if he (John)

consent. He (John) says his children

are willing to take a lie detector

test if he (John) says his children

are willing to take a lie detector

test if he (John) says his children

are willing to take a lie detector

test if he (John) says his children

are willing to take a lie detector

test if he (John) says his children

are willing to take a lie detector

test if he (John) says his children

are willing to take a lie detector

test if he (John) says his children

are willing to take a lie detector

test if he (John) says his children

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

EXCEPTIONALLY (CIRCUMSTANCES) THE PETITIONER'S CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY RIGHTS TO BE PRESENT AT ALL CRITICAL STAGES OF THE PRE-TRIAL PROCEEDINGS WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL FOR HIS DEFENSE. DURING THE LOCK-COURTY, ILLINOIS (GRAND) JURY PROCEEDINGS "G-J NO: 599". HELD ON: THE 20TH DAY OF JUNE, A.D. 1997. (SEE: EXHIBIT #19 "G-J-H" GRAND JURY TRANSCRIPTS G-J NO: 599) A-Z.

IN VIOLATION OF THE 14TH AND 15TH AMENDMENTS TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION. ALSO, IN VIOLATION OF THE ILLINOIS CONSTITUTION (1970), ARTICLE I SECTION 2 DUE PROCESS AND EQUAL PROTECTION AND THE ILLINOIS CRIMINAL STATUTE (725 ILC 5/112-4(b)) DUTIES OF GRAND JURY AND STATE'S ATTORNEY.

4) DURING THE ADJUDICATORY HEARING, HELD ON: JULY 11, 1997. JUDGE LON W. SCHULTZ, FAILED TO ADVISE THE PETITIONER OF THE CHARGES AGAINST

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

THE OFFICIAL RECORD IS SILENT IN REGARDS TO THE PETITIONER BEING REPRESENTED BY COUNSEL OR BEING INFORMED OF THE CHARGES DURING THE ALCAIGMENT HEARING. SEE: THE AFFIDAVIT OF COURT REPORTER ANGELO PERUZZI (EXHIBIT #35) A-7.

NOT ARE THERE ANY RECORDS THAT SHOW THAT PETITIONER KNOWINGLY WAIVED HIS RIGHT TO COUNSEL DURING THE ALCAIGMENT HEARING.

5) THE ACTIONS OF JUDGE SHULTZ ON: July 11, 1994. WERE ALSO IN VIOLATION OF THE MANDATORY STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS OF (725 ICS 5/113-3(2)(b)). WHERE, AN INDIGENT DEFENDANT, DOES POSSESS A STATUTORY RIGHT TO COUNSEL.

6) CHIEF Cook County, Illinois, Circuit Judge Timothy C. Evans, HAS ACKNOWLEDGED,

Reasons for granting the Revision

The Special Long's that are in the
writing the look-cour, Illinois Juvenile
System. In relation to the Long's
of Counsel to persons held in Police
(custody). By using his authority to
Issue (1) Administrative Order 2017-01
(See: Exhibit March 14 2017) (Higley
Daily Law Bulletin Volume 103, p. 50.

The Order 2017-01 is used to assist
Counsel in the judicial cases to effectively
make the arrangements as soon as a person
in Police custody makes the request
for a lawyer using a Police Call.

7) The Illinois U.S. Supreme Court
has held that the assistance of Counsel
is a Constitutional Right. The
Right to be Fair (Hill) Counsel (Hill)
not (Hill) on the request. (Hill)
V. Hill 384 U.S. 436, @ 471
(quoting) (Hill) v. Hill 369
U.S. 506, @ 513, 82 S. 2d 884 @ 889.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

"WHERE RIGHTS SECURED BY THE CONSTITUTION ARE INVOLVED, THERE CAN BE NO RULE MAKING OR LEGISLATION WHICH WOULD ABROGATE THEM." MIRANDA, @ 472, @ 1626.

REVIEW OF THE ERRONEOUS ACTIONS OF THE COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS, JUDICIAL AUTHORITIES, IS NOT ONLY IMPORTANT IN THIS PETITIONER'S CASE (94-CR-17161-01). BUT ALSO FOR OTHER SIMILARLY SITUATED DEFENDANTS AND THE GENERAL PUBLIC AT LARGE. WHERE, THERE ARE OTHERS WHO WERE DENIED THEIR MIRANDA WARNINGS, DURING CHICAGO POLICE DETENTION AND CUSTODY.

A) WILBERT JACKSON

1) IN THE CASE OF: MR. WILBERT JACKSON, CASE NO. (98-CR-20288-01). THE DEFENDANT WAS ARRESTED AND FORMALLY CHARGED AND HELD IN CUSTODY FOR THE ALLEGED OFFENSE ON: JULY 14, 1998 (07/14/98).

Reasons for denying the denial

(SEE: EXHIBIT "U" - J#1" (ORDER OF "COMPETENCE" AND) SET ASIDE 20 Illinois) (REMARKS OF COOPERATION).

THE OFFICIAL RECORDS BEFORE THE GRAMMY
July of Cook County, July, 1998 "GJ#108"

SUMMARY: TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY TAKEN
ON THE ABOVE - EXHIBIT) MADE ON
THE 27th DAY OF JULY, 1998.

PRESENTER: MR. PAUL BERRY, HUSBAND, SISTER'S
HEZORNEY

RECORDED BY: JIMMY D. BRYAN (EXHIBIT)
SHORTHAND) RECORDED Illinois Illinois
70.084-002028

LIST OF WITNESSES: (EXHIBIT RECORD)
SEE: EXHIBIT "U" - J#2" (GRAMMY) JULY
JAMES COOPER (COVER-SHEET).

THE OFFICIAL COURT DOCUMENTS REMAIN
THE (EXHIBIT) PAGE. THE (EXHIBIT) PAGE
RECORDING) (TO THE GRAMMY) (REMARKS).

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

DURING THE GRANT JURY HEARING, NEITHER THE DEFENDANT, NOR ANY ATTORNEY ON HIS BEHALF, WERE IN PRESENCE DURING THE COOK-COUNTEY GRANT JURY PROCEEDINGS. IN VIOLATION OF THE DEFENDANT'S

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO THE EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL DURING A CRITICAL STAGE OF THE ADVERSARIAL JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS.

A.S.A. PAUL BERVIL, DENIED THE DEFENDANT, WILBERT JACKSON, HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO THE EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL. BY CONDUCTING THE GRANT JURY HEARING WITHOUT THE DEFENDANT OR HIS DEFENSE COUNSEL BEING PRESENT... NOTE: THE DEFENDANT WAS HELD IN COURT CUSTODY AT THE TIME OF THE GRANT JURY HEARING.

"THE 14TH AMENDMENT GUARANTEES THAT, IN ALL CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS, THE ACCUSED SHALL ENJOY THE RIGHT *** TO HAVE THE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL FOR HIS DEFENSE.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION
INCLUDING DURING PRE-TRIAL. "CRUZIKI"
SERRES V. GOUNGHA, 467 U.S. 180, 104
S.Ct. 2292.

IF AN ACCUSED IS DEPRIVED OF COUNSEL
AT ANY OF THESE CRITICAL STAGES, HE
IS ENTITLED TO RELIEF WITHOUT
SHOWING THAT HE WAS PREJUDICED
THEREBY. THE DEPRIVATION OF COUNSEL
IS ITSELF PER SE REVERSIBLE
ERROR. "CRUZIKI" SERRES V. CROVIC, 466
U.S. 648, 104 S.Ct. 2039.

3) THE CIRCUIT COURT'S "CERTIFIED" STATEMENT
OF CONVICTION / DISPOSITION" (EXHIBIT W-J#3).
SHOWS THAT THE CIRCUIT COURT CLAIMS THAT
THE "PUBLIC DEFENDER APPOINTED" ON:
08/20/98... BUT THE COOK-COUNTY
GRAND JURY TRANSCRIPTS (COVER-SHEET),
SHOWS THAT THE GRAND JURY HEARING
WAS HELD ON: "THE 2ND DAY OF JULY, A.D.
1998." (SEE: EXHIBIT "W-J#2).

THEREFORE, THE COURT'S OWN OFFICIAL

REASONS FOR GRANTING EAE PETITION

RECORDS REVEALS EAE FACE, EHAZ WILBERT JACKSON, CASE NO. (98-CR-20288-01). HAD NOT RECEIVED EAE REQUIRED MIRANDA WARNINGS. NOR DID HE HAVE COUNSEL FOR HIS DEFENSE, DURING EAE GRAND JURY PROCEEDINGS. LIKE EAE PETITIONER IN HIS CASE NO. (97-CR-17161-01)

B) Tommy Thomas

1) IN EAE CASE OF: MR. TOMMY THOMAS, CASE NO. (95-CR-31444-01). HE WAS ARRESTED AND FORMALLY CHARGED AND HELD IN CUSTODY. ON: OCTOBER 23, 1995 (23/OCT/95). SEE: EXHIBIT "1-1#1" (CITY OF CHICAGO / DEPARTMENT OF POLICE / IDENTIFICATION SECTION).

MR. THOMAS, HAD NOT RECEIVED EAE REQUIRED MIRANDA WARNINGS DURING HIS DETENTION. LIKE EAE PETITIONER IN HIS CASE NO. (97-CR-17161-01).

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

THE OFFICIAL RECORDS BEFORE THE (GRANT) JURY OF COOK COUNTY, DECEMBER, 1995 "G.J. # 1002"

SHEETS: "TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY TAKEN BY THE ABOVE-ENTITLED JURY ON THE 1ST DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1995."

PRESIDE: M. DAN RABINOVITZ, ASS. SHERIFF
SHEETS'S ATTORNEY

REPORTED BY: DONNA J. O'CONNOR (CERTIFIED)
SKETCHING REPORTER IN LICENSE NO.
084-003579

LIST OF WITNESSES:

DETECTIVE ALGINS" SEE: EXHIBIT "T-T # 2"
(GRANT) JURY TRANSCRIPTS COVER-SHEETS).

2) THE (GRANT) JURY TRANSCRIPTS (COVER-SHEETS) SHOWS THAT, ON: "THE 1ST DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1995." M. DAN RABINOVITZ, (DEFENDANT) THE DEFENDANT, HIS RIGHT TO COUNSEL. BY CONTINUING THE (GRANT) JURY HEARING WITHOUT THE DEFENDANT

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

OR HIS DEFENSE COUNSEL BEING PRESENT,
WHILE HE WAS HELD IN COERCE CUSTODY.
JUST LIKE THIS PETITIONER IN HIS
CASE NO. (97-CR-17161-01).

THE 6TH AMENDMENT GUARANTEES THE
ACCUSED THE RIGHT TO COUNSEL. THIS APPLIES
TO ALL CRITICAL STAGES OF THE PROSECUTION
INCLUDING PRE-TRIAL (UNICK) STAGES
V. GONZALEZ (2d).

IF AN ACCUSED IS DEPRIVED OF COUNSEL,
THE DEPRIVATION OF COUNSEL IS DEEMED
PER SE REVERSIBLE ERROR (UNICK)
STAGES V. CROON (2d).

3) THE CIRCUIT COURT'S "CERTIFIED STATEMENT
OF CONVICTION / DISPOSITION" (EXHIBIT "T-T#3")
SHOWS THAT THE CIRCUIT COURT CLAIMS THAT
THE "PUBLIC DEFENDER APPOINTED" ON:
11/22/95... BUT THE GRAND JURY PROCEEDINGS
WERE HELD ON: "THE 1ST DAY OF NOVEMBER,
1995." (SEE: EXHIBIT "T-T#2").

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

THEREFORE THE COURT'S OWN OFFICIAL RECORDS REVEAL THAT THE DEFENDANT TOMMY THOMAS HAD NO COUNSEL FOR HIS DEFENSE DURING THE GRAND JURY PROCEEDINGS. WHILE HE WAS HELD IN COURT CUSTODY. JUST LIKE THIS PETITIONER IN HIS CASE NO. (97-CR-17161-01).

4) THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTIONS OF THESE INDIVIDUAL ASSISTANT STATE'S ATTORNEYS. THESE VIOLATE THEIR FEDERAL CUSTOM POLICY AND PRACTICE.

IN VIOLATION OF THE 6TH AMENDMENT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, AS MADE OBIGATORY UPON THE STATES BY THE 14TH AMENDMENT OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION. GILKON V. WAINWRIGHT, 372 U.S. 335, @ 342, 83 S. CT. 792, @ 795.

THE COMPLAINT OF THIS LEGAL VIOLATION IS NOT OF THE COMMISSION OF MERK ERROR. BUT OF A WRONG SO

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

FUNDAMENTAL, THAT IT MAKES THE GRAND JURY PROCEEDINGS IN EACH OF THE ABOVEMENTIONED DEFENDANT(S), THE PETITIONER, AND OTHER SIMILARLY SITUATED DEFENDANTS CASE(S), A MERE PRETEXT, AND MAY RENDER, THEIR CONVICTIONS VOID.

THE NATIONAL IMPORTANCE OF HAVING THE SUPREME COURT ADDRESS THESE CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES. IS TO GIVE THE MUCH NEEDED LEGAL CLARIFICATION TO STATE AND COUNTY OFFICIALS AND THE NATION'S PUBLIC IN GENERAL, IN REGARDS TO THESE CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES.

Conclusion

THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS SHOULD BE GRANTED.

Respectfully Submitted,

John W. Wil
DATE: June 19th, 2018