

No.  
by EHE

Supreme Court of the State of Illinois

John Taylor Wilson - Petitioner

vs.

People of the State of Illinois, et al.  
Respondent(s)

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to

Supreme Court of the State of Illinois

Petition for Writ of Certiorari

John Taylor Wilson

1144 Illinois Route 29 South

Taylorville, Illinois 62568

(217) 824-4004

## QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

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

THIS DEFENDANT 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 IDENTIFICATION AND INTERROGATION CONDUCTED BY CHICAGO POLICE INVESTIGATOR, COWHIGS, SEAR #40146.

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

A) WHETHER "WHERE RIGGS HID

Question (8) ANSWER

## QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

D) WHETHER, THE CHIEF SEZER'S CONSTITUTION'S RIGHT TO COUNSEL, WHICH IS OF LITTLE VALUE IF THE RIGHT TO COUNSEL COULD BE INDIRECTLY DENIED. U.S. TITANIC, INC. v. ADRIAN (2d5).

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 REASONABLE ATTENDANT. V. ARIZONA, 384 U.S. 471, 86 S.Ct. 1626.

F) WHETHER, THESE CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES ARE AN INNOVATION IN THE CHIEF SEZER'S SUPREME COURT'S JURISPRUDENCE, OR ARE APPLICATIONS OF PRINCIPLES LONG RECOGNIZED AND APPLIED IN OTHER CRIMINAL COURTS SETTING (S. M. RAND, 2d 491, 2d 11610.

## 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 THROUGH 7
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	8 THROUGH 13
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	14 THROUGH 28

Conclusion	28
------------	----

### INDEX TO APPENDICES

#### APPENDIX A

ORDER OF APPELLATE COURT OF ILLINOIS, FEBRUARY 1, 2018,  
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 COMMENCEMENT  
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 CONV  
REPORER, ANGELA PEZZUZZI A-7

APPENDIX C

EXHIBIT MARCH 14, 2014 CHICAGO DAILY  
MAIL BULLETIN... VOLUME 163, NO. 50

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

APPENDIX TO APPENDICES  
APPENDIX C CONTINUATION

EXHIBIT "W-J#2" (Gray) 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" (Gray) Jury  
Transcripts (Cover-Sheet).

EXHIBIT "T-T#3" "CERTIFIED STATEMENT  
OF CONVICTION / DISPOSITION"

APPENDIX D

EXHIBIT 1) M-1 TABLE M-1 (TRAIL TRANSCRIPTS) A-5

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

# TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (C.E.)

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
CARLTON v. COCHRAN, 369 U.S. 506, 82 S. Ct. 881	19
FRIES v. U.S. (1921) 272 U.S. 293 F. 1013 (1). C. C. 1923)	12, 13
GARDNER v. WILSON (1942), 342 U.S. 335, 83 S. Ct. 792	27
COMMISSION v. WIGGINS FOOT, 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,
U.S. (1921) 272 U.S. 293 F. 1013 (1). C. C. 1923	23, 26,
U.S. (1921) 272 U.S. 293 F. 1013 (1). C. C. 1923	23, 26,
U.S. TERM LIMITS, INC. v. THOMAS, 514 U.S. 779, 115 S. Ct. 1842	II

# TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (CONT.)

## SEARCHES AND RULES → PAGE NUMBER INWITNESS COMPILATION SEARCHES

725 InCS 5/112-4(f) 5, 16

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

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

## ARTICLES → SEARCHES CONSTITUTION

42A AmEd) m/s/2 3, 14

52A AmEd) m/s/2 3, 9, 14

62A AmEd) m/s/2 3, 4, 9, 10, 11e, 22, 26,  
27

132A AmEd) m/s/2 4

142A AmEd) m/s/2 4, 9, 10, 16

# TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (CONT.)

## Illinois Constitution (1970) ARTICLE I

SECTION(S) §	PAGE NUMBER
Section 2 <u>Due Process</u> and <u>Equal Protection</u>	6, 7, 16, 17
Section 8 <u>Rights After Incarceration</u>	7, 14

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 July 21, 2018.  
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix 7.

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, ITM. 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  
(to solve)

HAN'S Compulsory Process for Obtaining  
Witnesses in His Favor, and to have  
the Assistance of Counsel for  
His Defense

Amendment XII

Section 1. Slavery Abolished

Neither Slavery nor involuntary  
Service, except as a Punishment  
for Crime whereof the Party shall  
have been duly Convicted.\*\*

Amendment XIII

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~~ <sup>6210</sup> within  
its Jurisdiction the Equal Protection  
of the Laws.

Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved

## ILLINOIS COMPILED STATUTES

(725 ILCS 5/112-4(b) DEFENSE OF GUILT) JURY  
AN) SAFE'S ATTORNEY (b) \*\* ANY PERSON  
SUBPOENAWI) WHO IS ALREADY CHARGED) WITH  
AN OFFENSE OR AGAINST WHOM THE SAFE'S  
ATTORNEY IS SEEKING A BENCH OF INJUNCTION  
SHALL HAVE THE DIAZ TO BE ACCOMPANIED  
BY COUNSEL WHO SHALL ADVISE HIM OF  
HIS RIGHTS DURING THE PROCEEDINGS But  
NOT PARTICIPATE IN ANY OTHER WAY.\*\*  
\* (b) THAT HE WILL HAVE COUNSEL  
APPOINTED) FOR HIM IF HE CANNOT AFFORD  
ONE.

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

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

## CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

### EXPERE 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 TO OBTAIN SAME BEFORE APPOINTMENT THE COURT SHALL RECESS COURT OR CONTINUE THE CAUSE FOR A REASONABLE TIME TO PERMIT DEFENDANT TO OBTAIN COUNSEL AND CONSULT WITH HIM BEFORE PLEADING TO THE CHARGE. \*\*\*

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

ILLINOIS CONSTITUTION (1970)  
ARTICLE I

SECTION 2 due PROCESS AND EQUAL

Constitutional &) Statutory Provisions involved)

Illinois Constitution (1970)  
Article I  
Constitution

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 of Rights after indictment  
... by Criminal Prosecution, THE  
ACCUSED SHALL HAVE THE RIGHT TO  
APPEAR AND DEFEND IN PERSON AND  
BY COUNSEL; TO DEMAND THE NAME  
AND CAUSE OF THE ACCUSATION  
AND HAVE A COPY THEREOF; \*\*

# STATEMENT OF THE CASE

1) WHEN ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS TOOK THE PETITIONER INTO CUSTODY ON JUNE 26, 1997 AND INTERROGATED HIM IN A POLICE STATION UNDER COERCION,

THE POLICE DID NOT EFFECTIVELY ADVISE PETITIONER OF HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS UNDER MIRANDA V. ARIZONA, 384 U.S. 434, 86 S.Ct. 1602 (1966).

THE PETITIONER INDICATED THAT HE WANTED THE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL WHILE IN POLICE CUSTODY. BUT, THE LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY IGNORED AND DENIED PETITIONER'S REQUEST ON THE BASIS THAT THE PETITIONER DID NOT HAVE (OR COULD NOT AFFORD) A RETAINED ATTORNEY.

POLICE INVESTIGATOR COLLINS, SAR #40146, NEVER INFORMED THE PETITIONER THAT IF HE WAS INDEBTED, A LAWYER WOULD BE APPROVED TO REPRESENT

# STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Alleg. on Violation of EKE 52H, 62H  
(Amendment 142H Amending) S. 20 THE (Urgent)  
STATES CONSTITUTION.  
S. 20

2) Due to the Extrinsic Fraud,  
that occurred during the Cook County,  
Illinois, July Proceedings,  
"G. T. No: 599". held on: THE 20TH DAY  
of June, A.D. 1991. THE COURT NEVER  
WILL Fully REQUIRE PERSONAL  
JURISDICTION OVER THE DEFENDANT.

WHERE, A.S.A. PATRICK FIGHLY,  
by intentionally circumvented, the  
DEFENDANT'S CONSTITUTIONAL AND  
STATUTORY RIGHT TO BE PRESENT  
AT THE CRITICAL STAGES OF THE  
PRE-TRIAL PROCEEDINGS, WITH THE  
ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL FOR HIS DEFENSE.

WHERE, THE DEFENDANT WAS HELD  
in the County Jail, in Court Custody.  
In Violation of the (Urgent) STATES  
CONSTITUTION'S (20th AMENDMENT) 142H Amending.

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

3) During THE ARRAIGNMENT HEARING, HELD On: July 11, 1999. Judge Lon W. Shultz, (FATHER) TO ADVISE THE PETITIONER OF THE CHARGES AGAINST HIM, AND HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO COUNSEL.

In Violation of THE LAW, AND 142d AMENDMENT TO THE (U.S.) BILL OF RIGHTS CONSTITUTION.

THE ACTIONS OF JUDGE SHULTZ, DURING THE ARRAIGNMENT HEARING, WERE ALSO IN VIOLATION OF THE MAGISTRATE STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS OF (6925 ILLCS(5)113-1) PROCEDURE ON ARRAIGNMENT.

WHICH REQUIRES THE COURT TO MAKE A VERBAL RECORD OF THE ARRAIGNMENT HEARING. BUT, THE OFFICIAL COURT RECORD IS SILENT, IN REGARD TO THE PETITIONER BEING THE PRESSENER BY COUNSEL OR BEING INFORMED OF THE CHARGES DURING THE ARRAIGNMENT HEARING. SEE: THE AFFIDAVIT OF

# Summary of the Case

Court Reporter, Angela Pezzuoli  
(Exhibit #35) A-7...

For, ARE THERE ANY COURT RECORDS,  
THAT SHOW, THAT, THE PROSECUTOR,  
KNOWINGLY WAIVED HIS CONSTITUTIONAL  
RIGHTS TO COUNSEL DURING  
THE ARRANGEMENT HEARING.

1) THE ACTIONS OF JUDGE SCHAFFER, ON:  
July 11, 1997, WERE ALSO IN VIOLATION  
OF THE MANDATORY SEIZURE REQUIRE-  
MENTS OF (725 FCS 5/113-3(e)(6))  
COUNSEL AND EXPENSES;  
FEES AND EXPENSES.

WHERE, AN INTELLIGENT DEFENDANT,  
DOES NOT HAVE A SEIZURE RIGHT  
TO COUNSEL.

2) THE PROSECUTOR HAS RECEIVED THE  
INFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF TRIAL COUNSEL.  
WHERE, COURT APPOINTED COUNSEL (ASSISTANT  
PUBLIC DEFENDER, NICOLA CARREK-Woolfolk).

## SETTLEMENT OF THE CASE

REFUSED) TO REQUEST OR FILE A MOTION TO DISMISS THE INDICTMENT. BECAUSE OF THE MURKIN) A VIOLENCE, AND THE EXTRINSIC FLAW) THAT OCCURRED DURING THE GRAND JURY PROCEEDINGS. (Op. WOOD) SHE REQUESTED A FRYE HEARING. FRYE V. CEN. 261) SEEES, 293 F. 1013 (1). C. C. R. 1923).

IN ORDER TO EXPLAIN THE TWO DIFFERENCE STANDARD USED) BY THE STATE'S EXPERT WITNESS (ANGELA RIECK) FOR THE ANALYSIS) DNA ANALYSIS. BEFORE IT WAS PRESENTED TO THE TRIAL JURY (CORRECTED). SEE: EXHIBIT 1) (TRAIL TRANSCRIPTS 71-1 THRU 71-4) A-5

(2) THE DEFENDER HAS RECEIVED) THE INFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF TRIAL COUNSEL. WHERE, (ASSISTANT PUBLIC DEFENDER, DOROTHY A. KUEFER). REFUSED TO FILE DEFENDER'S MOTION TO DISMISS THE INDICTMENT. BECAUSE OF THE MURKIN) A VIOLENCE. OR THE MOTION

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

FOR A FRYE HEARING (i.d.). (SEE: EXHIBIT  
D-K #1 AND #2) A-6

WHERE THERE IS NO FRYE HEARING: "a. 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."

"b. THERE WILL BE NO FRYE HEARING ON YOUR CASE.  
THE TECHNIQUES USED IN YOUR CASE HAVE BEEN THE  
SUBJECT OF A FRYE HEARING IN THE PAST AND  
THAT HEARING HAS BEEN MET. THE COURT  
REQUIRES ONLY ONE HEARING - NOT A  
HEARING IN EACH CASE."

# Reasons For Granting THE PETITION

- 1) THE PETITIONER WAS ARRESTED AND FORMALLY CHARGED WITH THE MURKED 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, SCA  
# 4014 (p. failed) TO GIVE THE PETITIONER,  
NOTICE OF HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS  
UNDER MIRANDA V. ARIZONA 384 U.S.  
436, 86 S.Ct. 1602 (1966). Violation  
OF THE 4TH AND 5TH AMENDMENT PRINCIPLES OF  
THE U.S. CONSTITUTION. (SEE: EXHIBIT "A"  
(ORDER OF COMMISSIONER AND SENTENCE  
TO ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS)  
A-3).

THE PETITIONER'S CONVICTION (APPEAL DENIED).  
BECAUSE, HE WAS INTERROGATED WITHOUT  
THE PROPER MIRANDA WARNINGS. AT THE  
TIME, THE PETITIONER, WAIVED HIS RIGHTS  
TO COUNSEL.

THE EFFECTS OF VARIOUS CULTIVARS ON THE CELLULOSE ESTERIFICATION

During the 1970s and 1980s, the United Nations and World Bank promoted structural adjustment (SAC) as a way to reduce poverty and improve living standards. SAC involved cutting government spending on healthcare and education, privatizing state-owned enterprises, and allowing foreign companies to own land. These policies often led to increased unemployment, lower wages, and weaker unions. In some countries, SAC led to deep poverty and social inequality.

# Letterboxd 2018: The Year in Review

# REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

BY THIS JUDICIAL CIRCUMSTANCES THE PETITIONER'S  
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY RIGHTS TO  
BE PRESENT AT THE CRIMINAL STAGES  
OF THE TRIAL PROCEEDINGS, WITH  
THE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL FOR HIS DEFENSE.

During, the Cook County, Illinois, (Grant)  
Jury Proceedings "GJ no: 599". (Held)  
On: THE 20TH DAY OF JUNE, A.D. 1997.  
Exhibit #19 "G-J-H" (Grant) Jury  
TRANSCRIPTS (GJ no: 599) A-2.

In Violation of THE 14TH AMENDMENT  
AMENDMENT 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 ILCS 5/912-4(b)) DUTIES OF  
(Grant) Jury AND STAGE'S ATTORNEY.

1) During the ARR AIGMENT HEARING,  
Held On: July 11, 1997. Judge Hon  
W. Shultz, Failed to ADVISE THE  
PETITIONER OF THE CHARGES AGAINST

THE THEORETICAL FOUNDATION OF THE ELEMENTS OF THE MARKET EQUILIBRIUM

High Altitude 20 Gauge

# Letters from the Quatrefoil

# REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

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

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

5) THE ACTIONS OF JUDGE SHULTZ, On:  
July 11, 1991. WERE, ALSO IN VIOLATION  
OF THE MANDATORY STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS  
OF (MCS 54113-3(a)(b)). WHERE,  
AN INMATE DEFENDANT, DOES  
POSSESS A STATUTORY RIGHT TO  
COUNSEL.

6) Clerk Cook County, Illinois, Circuit  
Judge Timothy C. Evans, HAS NOT ADVISED,

# Letters for General Use

# 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, @ 162a.

Review of the erroneous actions of the Cook County, Illinois, judicial authorities is not only important in this petitioner's case (97-CR-19161-01). But, also for other similarly situated detainees and the general public at large. HERE, THERE ARE OTHERS WHO WERE DETAINED THEIR MIRANDA WARNINGS, DURING CHICAGO POLICE DETENTION AND CUSTODY.

## A) WILBERZ JACKSON

1) In the case of: Mr. Wilberz Jackson, CASE NO. (98-CR-20288-01). THE DEFENDANT WAS ARRESTED AND FORWARDED (CHARGED) AND HELD IN CUSTODY FOR THE ALLEGED OFFENSE On: July 14, 1998 (07/14/98).

These cultural values (elements) are the basic of the culture.

Wise of using less: ! (EFFECTIVE USE OF)  
SEE: F2A, B2C, D1C. J# " (B2A2) July  
12th (2012) (LAW-SEE).

REF ID: MR. PAUL BELL 1485, 92nd Regt SCAFFS

~~SIZES: (LARGEST SIZE OF LEGS) MARKET  
THE ABOVE - (LARGEST) MARKET AT  
THE 2ND JAY OF JULY 1998.~~

THE COOKS' BEEF BONE (THE GIZARD) July of Cook College, July, 1998. (July 1998)

(S.E.E.: E2411B12 "U - J #1" (Q2) E2 of PCL operating "U" 227272, 06/05/08).

# Lessons for the Beginning Teacher

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE POSITION

During the Grand Jury Hearing, THE DEFENDANT, W.D. AMY ACCORDING TO HIS BEHALF, WERE IN ATTENDANCE DURING THE COOK-COURT (GRAND) JURY PROCEEDINGS. IN VIOLATION OF THE DEFENDANT'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO THE EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL, DURING A CRITICAL STAGE OF THE ADVERSARIAL TRIAL PROCESS.

A.S.A. Paul BERWILL DENIED THE DEFENDANT, WILBERTE JACKSON, HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO THE EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL, BY CONDUCTING THE GRAND JURY HEARING WITHOUT THE DEFENDANT OR HIS DEFENSE COUNSEL BEING PRESENT... DUE TO: THE DEFENDANT WAS HELD IN COURT CUSTODY, AT THE TIME OF THE GRAND JURY HEARING.

"THE 13TH AMENDMENT GUARANTEES THAT, IN ALL CIVILIAN PROSECUTIONS, THE ACCUSED SHALL ENJOY THE RIGHT \*\*\* TO HAVE THE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL FOR HIS DEFENSE.

# REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

INCLUDING DURING THE PRE-TRAIL. (b)(5)(E)(I)  
SEAKES V. GOVERNMENT, 469 U.S. 180, 104  
S. Ct. 2292.

IF THE ACCUSED IS DEPRIVED OF COUNSEL  
AT ANY OF THESE CRITICAL STAGES, HE  
IS ENTITLED TO RELIEF WITHOUT  
SHOWING THAT HE WAS PREJUDICED  
HEREBY; THE DEPRIVATION OF COUNSEL  
IS (SIMPSON) PER SE REVERSIBLE  
ERROR. (b)(5)(E)(I) SEAKES V. CROWN, 466  
U.S. 648, 104 S. Ct. 2039.

3) THE CIRCUIT COURT'S (CERTIFIED) STATEMENT  
OF CONVICTION AND POSITION (EXHIBIT W-J#3).  
SHOWS THAT THE CIRCUIT COURT CHARGES THAT  
THE "PUBLIC DEFENDER APPPOINTED" ON:  
08/20/98... BUT, THE COOK-COURT  
(GRAN) JURY TRANSCRIPTS (COVER-SHARE),  
SHOWS THAT THE GRAN JURY HEARING  
WAS HELD ON: "THE 27TH DAY OF JULY, A.D.  
1998." (SEE: EXHIBIT W-J#2).

THEFORE, THE COURT'S OWN OFFICIAL

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

RECORDS REVEALS THAT FEEZ, ZHAZ, WILBERTE JACKSON, CASE NO. (98-CR-20288-01), HAD NOT RECEIVED THE REQUIRED MIRANDA WARNINGS. FOR NOT HAVING COPIES FOR HIS DEFENSE, DURING THE TRIAL PROCEEDINGS. LIKE THIS PETITIONER IN THIS CASE NO. (97-CR-17161-01).

### B) Tommy Thomas

1) IN THE CASE OF: MR. TOMMY THOMAS, CASE NO. (95-CR-3144-01). HE WAS ARRESTED AND FORMALLY CHARGED AND HELD IN CUSTODY. ON: OCTOBER 23, 1995 (23/OCT/95). SEE: EXHIBIT "1-141" (CITY OF CHICAGO POLICE DEPARTMENT OF POLICE, IDENTIFICATION SECTION).

MR. THOMAS, AND NOT RECEIVED THE REQUIRED MIRANDA WARNINGS DURING HIS TRIAL. LIKE THIS PETITIONER IN HIS CASE NO. (97-CR-17161-01).

# REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

~~THE OFFICIAL RECORDS BEFORE THE GRAN.~~  
Jury of Cook County, December, 1995 (G.J. # 1002)

SHEETS: TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY TAKEN  
IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER ON  
THE 15<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1995.

PRESIDE: M.R. JAY RABINOVITZ, ASSISTANT  
SHEET'S ATTORNEY

REPORTED BY: DONNA J. O'CONNOR (CERTIFIED)  
SKOLEK, RABINOVITZ & CERKIN, LTD.  
084-003549

## LIST OF WITNESSES:

DEFENDANT HIGGINS SEE: EXHIBIT "T-1#2"  
(GRAN) JURY TRANSCRIPTS COVER-SHEETS).

2) THE GRAN JURY TRANSCRIPTS (COVER-SHEETS) SHOWS THAT, ON: "THE 15<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1995." M.R. JAY RABINOVITZ, DEFENDED THE DEFENDANT, HIS RELIGION, TO CONSTITUTION. BY CONCLUDING THE GRAN JURY HEARING WITHIN THE DEFENDANT

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

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

THE (2nd AMENDMENT) GUARANTEES THE  
ACCUSED THE RIGHT TO COUNSEL. THIS APPLIES  
TO ALL CRITICAL STAGES OF THE PROSECUTION  
(INCLUDING PRE-TRIAL). (DYSKIN) STATED  
V. GOVERNMENT (2d)).

IF AN ACCUSED IS DEPRIVED OF COUNSEL,  
THE DEPRIVATION OF COUNSEL IS DEEMED  
PER SE REVERSIBLE ERROR. (DYSKIN)  
STATED V. CROWN (2d)).

3) THE CIRCUIT COURT'S "CERTIFIED" STATEMENT  
OF CONVICTION / "DISPOSITION" (EXHIBIT "T-1#3").  
SHOWS THAT THE CIRCUIT COURT CHAMPS THAT  
THE "PUBLIC DEFENDER APPOINTED" ON:  
11/22/95. BUT, THE GRAND JURY PROCEEDINGS  
WERE HELD ON: "THE 152 DAY OF NOVEMBER,  
1995." (SEE: EXHIBIT "T-1#2").

# REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

THEFORE, THE COURT'S OWN OFFICIAL RECORDS REVEAL THAT THE DEFENDANT, TOMMY THOMAS AND 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).

1) THE UNCONSCIOUSNESS OF THESE INDIVIDUAL ASSISTANT STATE'S ATTORNEYS. THIS ERRORS IN THEIR UNFAIR CUSTODY POLICY AND PRACTICE.

IN VIOLATION OF THE 62d AMENDMENT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, AS MADE OBLIGATORY UPON THE STATES BY THE 14th AMENDMENT OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION.  
BRADY V. WALTER WRIGHT 342 U.S. 335, @ 342, 83 S.C.E. 792, @ 795.

THE COMPLAINT OF THIS LIAISON PHIGE IS NOT OF THE COMMISSION OF MERELY ERROR. BUT, OF A WRONG SO

# REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

FUNDAMENTALLY, THAT IT MAKES THE BROADLY FAIR PROCEEDINGS IN EACH OF THE AFORESAID DEFENDANT(S), THE PETITIONER AND OTHER SIMILARLY SITUATED DEFENDANT(S) CASE(S), A MERE PRESENCE, AND MAY RENDER, THEIR CONVICTIONS VOID.

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

## Conclusion

THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI SHOULD BE GRANTED.

Respectfully Submitted,  
John J. Wilcox  
Date: August 19th, 2018