

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

MATTHEW Young — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

VS.

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

OREGON SUPREME COURT
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

MATTHEW YOUNG
(Your Name)

82911 Beach Access Rd.
(Address)

Umatilla, OR 97882
(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1) IS it an important issue of Law and Fact For the Purpose of Review by this court, When the State of Oregon's highest court failed to uphold its own prior precedent case Law decision, concerning the proper mechanism For judicial review. of a lower courts opposing that higher court's case Law decision?

2) Is it a reviewable Fact of Law, in the interest of the Public, that, there openly exist a conspiracy in the state courts, to openly deny Petitioner - as a prisoner - Access to Court - Due process of Law - Equal Treatment, where the trial court issues a court order dismissing Petitioner's Complaint Finding it without merit, without reviewing the Evidence, without Holding in form of Hearing?

3) Is it a reversible error, for the Oregon court of Appeals to affirm without opinion, a nonenforceable court order, which it had previously gave the trial Leave to Fix, to make it a Judgment?

4) Is it reviewable issue, for the Oregon Supreme court to fail to reverse the court of appeals - where the court of appeals ruled in its order that the trial court order was erroneous - but Affirmed it without opinion?

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:

MATTHEW YOUNG, is Petitioner;

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, First Respondent

MARK NOOTH, Superintendent, Snake River Correctional Institution,
IS the Second Respondent;

JEFF PREMO, Superintendent, Oregon State Penitentiary; IS the
Third Respondent.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	
CONCLUSION.....	

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	ORDER Dismissing complaint without merit
APPENDIX B	ORDER WAIVING APPELATE COURT FEES
APPENDIX C	ORDER ON MOTION FOR SUMMARY DETERMINATION OF APPEALABILITY GIVING TRIAL LEAVE TO ENTER JUDGMENT
APPENDIX D	ORDER DENYING TO DISMISS AND MOTION TO STRIKE
APPENDIX E	APPELATE JUDGMENT and SUPPLEMENT JUDGMENT
APPENDIX F	ORDER GRANTING EXTENSION OF TIME
APPENDIX G	ORDER DENYING REVIEW

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
<u>Filarsky v. Delia, 566 U.S. 377, 132 S.Ct. 1657, 182 LEd 2d 662 (2012)</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>Rehber v. Paulk, 566 U.S. 356, 132 S.Ct. 1497, 182 LEd 2d 593 (2012)</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>Tower v. Glover, 467 U.S. 914, 920, 104 S.Ct. 2820, 81 LEd 2d 758 (1984)</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>Ziglar v. Abbasi, 582 U.S. —, 137 S.Ct. —, 198 LEd 2d 290 — U.S. — (2017)</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>Becerra v. Lane County Assessor, TC-MD 020486D Ore. Tax (2003)</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>Predle v. Dept., of Revenue, 331 Or 320, 14 P.3d 613 (2000)</u>	<u>2</u>

STATUTES AND RULES

<u>Oregon Administrative Rule 291-119-0005</u>	<u>2</u>
--	----------

OTHER

V

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 G to the petition and is

☒ reported at Oregon Supreme Court; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☒ is unpublished.

The opinion of the _____ court appears at Appendix E to the petition and is

☒ reported at Oregon Court of Appeals; 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 May 5th, 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

United States Constitution, Amendment 1
United States Constitution Amendment 5
United States Constitution Amendment 14
Title 42 U.S.C. § 1983
Title 42 U.S.C. § 1985
Title 42 U.S.C. § 1986
Title 20 U.S.C. § 1709
Title 28 U.S.C. § 1331
Title 28 U.S.C. § 1339
Title 28 U.S.C. § 1343 (2) (3)
Title 28 U.S.C. § 2201
Title 28 U.S.C. § 2202
Title 42 U.S.C. § 10801
Title 42 U.S.C. § 10803
Title 42 U.S.C. § 10851

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The Federal question raised is brought under the Monell doctrine, where the state courts, together with the states attorney Generals office, engage in a wide range of customs, policies, and Practice to deny the petitioner, his constitutional rights to Access to court; Equal Protection of the Law; and to Due Process, where the state court record will clearly establish that there does exist a disturbing pattern of acts and conduct that at first sight do appear to be conspiratorial, and must be corrected in the interest of Justice, and Public concern, where the trial court enters an erroneous court order on 5/16/2016, dismissing petitioner's civil complaint, with a Hundred-Plus pages of exhibits submitted and attached to the complaint, in support thereof--stating the complaint was without merit, without holding any form of Hearing or reviewing any of the Evidence. Appendix-A. The Oregon appellate court on 1/3/2017 made finding that the trial court order was erroneous, and gave the trial court leave to fix it. Appendix-C. The appellate court on 3/17/2017 ruled the trial court's refusal to fix the court order, perfected the appeal. Appendix-D. The Oregon appellate court on Sept., 1, 2017 grossly contradicted its own ruling, when it affirmed without opinion the erroneous court order, which in fact is not an

actual, legally Binding court Judgment. Appendix - E on 12-15-2017
the Oregon Supreme court, granted petitioner 45 days Extension
on time to file for a petition for review by January 29, 2018, and
cited the case filing Docket number as N007202. Appendix - F.
on April 5, 2018 at 4:27pm, chief Justice of the Oregon Supreme
Court, Thomas A. Balmer, signed an order denying review on case
Filing Docket number SO65483, again Appendix - F

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

This court has repeatedly directed the state courts of Oregon to stop with its collective partiality conspiracy to deny Oregon inmates access to court, and Equal protection of the Law, and Due process of Law. But Oregon state courts have openly chosen to refuse to comply with this court's precedent case Law Rulings, *Tower v. Glover*, 467 U.S. 914, 920, 104 S.Ct. 2820, 81 LEd2d 758 (1984); *Ziglar v. Abbasi*, 582 U.S. —, 137 S.Ct. —, 198 LEd2d 290 — U.S. —, (2017); *Rehber v. Paulk*, 566 U.S. 356, 132 S.Ct. 1497, 182 LEd 2d 593 (2012); *Filarsky v. Delia*, 566 U.S. 377, 132 S.Ct. 1657, 182 LEd2d 662 (2012), Precedent(s) not directly on point, but the subject matter of these Precedent cases do reflect the position of the reasons stated here. where the Oregon State courts hold to the practice of ignoring the principle application of the structured Judiciary of our country, where any case Law decision handed down by this court is the Law of the land...

It is of paramount importance to the interest of the Public, that Petitioner's Inventions be made accessible to the American Public, where Petitioner's Inventions will without doubt contribute positively to the quality of life, and will enhance the economics of the American economy, in the interest of both Justice and the Public, where 30 percent of profits will go to victim compensation, 15 percent will go to cost and care - to the Department of corrections, 50 percent to be put in an untouchable account for the inmate upon release, the remaining 5 percent for remittal exponents in prison itself, T.v., shoes, canteen etc., where the respondent, the Oregon Department of corrections, creates a rule of Law which is both, allowed by, and supported by state statutory law making its application a binding constitutional right, OAR, Oregon Administrative Rule 291-119-0005 by use of the word "shall". See *Predle v. Dept., of Revenue*, 331 Or 320, 14 P.3d 613 (2000); also See *Becerra v. Lane County Assessor*, TC-MD 020486D Ore., Tax 2003, LEXIS 58. See Joint Appendix-A1 to Joint Appendix-A7, that

Its officials, Agents, employees, and staff are compelled to a duty, to perform a service or assistance to an inmate, if requested to do so, to in part, put the inmate in contact with appropriate outside Businesses; Agencies that can assist the inmate with getting his/her ideas-inventions to the public. (Oregon Revised Statute) ORS 147.275; 179.040; 421.095; 423.020; 423.030; 423.075. Petitioner relied upon Title 20 USC § 1709; 28 USC § 1331, § 1339; § 1343 (2)(3); § 2201; § 2202 Title 42 USC § 1983; § 1985; § 1986; § 10801; § 10803; § 10851 in his original complaint.

CONCLUSION

Joint Appendix-A1 through A7 clearly establishes the importance of Public interest in getting access to petitioner's inventions.

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew Young

Date: June 27, 2018