

No.

PETITION FOR AN EXTRA-ORDINARY WRIT OF MANDAMUS
IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

BRANDON J. LEE - PETITIONER
(YOUR NAME)

VS.

SUPREME COURT OF NORTH CAROLINA - RESPONDENT

ON PETITION FOR AN EXTRA-ORDINARY WRIT OF MANDAMUS

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

PETITION FOR AN EXTRA-ORDINARY WRIT OF MANDAMUS

BRANDON J. LEE
(YOUR NAME)

WAKE COUNTY DETENTION CENTER P.O. BOX 2479, RALEIGH, NC 27602
(ADDRESS)

N/A

PHONE NUMBER

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. SHOULD THE STATE BE PERMITTED TO ISSUE TRUE BILL OF INDICTMENTS WHICH ARE IN FACT A FRAUDULENT MISREPRESENTATION OF THE CHARGING INSTRUMENT FOR ALL CRIMINAL MATTERS PERTAINING TO INDIGENT DEFENDANTS?

2. SHOULD THE STATE BE PERMITTED TO SYSTEMICALLY WAIVE PROBABLE CAUSE DETERMINATION HEARINGS WITHOUT VERBAL AND/OR WRITTEN CONSENT BY RELYING ON TRUE BILL OF INDICTMENTS THAT MEET THE CLEARLY ERRONEOUS STANDARD?

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 JUDGEMENT IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS PETITION IS AS FOLLOWS:

1. WAKE COUNTY JUSTICE CENTER 2. WAKE COUNTY JUSTICE CENTER

10TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

10TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

ATTN: SENIOR RESIDENT SUPERIOR

ATTN: JENNIFER KNOX, CLERK OF COURT

COURT JUDGE PAUL C. RIDGEWAY

P.O. BOX 351

P.O. BOX 351

RALEIGH, NC 27602

RALEIGH, NC 27602

3. WAKE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY OFFICE 4. ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE

ATTN: LORREN FREEMAN, D.A.

ATTN: JOSH STEIN, ATTORNEY GENERAL

P.O. BOX 31

P.O. BOX 629

RALEIGH, NC 27602

RALEIGH, NC 27602

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....	3-4
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	5-6-7
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....	8-9
CONCLUSION.....	10-11-12

INDEX TO THE APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - SUPREME COURT OF NORTH CAROLINA PETITION
FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS DATED OCTOBER 18, 2017.

APPENDIX B - SUPREME COURT OF NORTH CAROLINA ORDER
IN THE MATTER FOR THE PETITIONERS WRIT OF
MANDAMUS (No. 356P17) DATED MARCH 1, 2018.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

<u>CASES</u>	<u>[APP=APPENDIX]</u>	<u>PAGE NUMBER</u>
MCCLURE V. STATE V. CASANDRA, 6 N.C. APP 626, 170 SE 2d 575 (1969) [PG 5];		
STATE V. BATDORF, 293 N.C. 486, 238 SE 2d 497 (1977) [PG 5]; STATE V.		
DELLINGER, 308 NC 288 (1983) [PG 5]; STATE V. PIPPIN, 72 N.C. APP 387		
(1985) [PG 5]; STATE V. COX, 28 N.C. 440 (1986) [PG 5]; GIDEON V.		
WAINWRIGHT 372 U.S. 335 SUPRA (1963) [PG 6]; PRINTER V. TEXAS, 380 U.S.		
400 - SUPREME COURT (1965) [PG 6]; COLEMAN V. ALABAMA 399 U.S. 19. (1970)		
[PG 6]; GERSTEIN V. PUGH, 420 U.S. 103 (1975) [PG 6]; UNITED STATES V.		
GAGNON, 470 U.S. 522 (1985) [PG 6]; LILLY V. VIRGINIA 527 U.S. 116 119		
C.T., 1887 144 LE2d 2117 (1999) [PG 6]; CRAWFORD V. WASHINGTON, 541 U.S.		
36 (2004) [PG 6]; WINSTON V. PEARSON, 683 F 3d 489, 494-500 (4TH CIR		
2012) [PG 9, APP A PG 8]; STATE V. ROBERTS, 18 NC APP 388 (1973) [PG 8, APP A		
PG 4, 5 AND 8]; STATE V. TINDALL, 294 NC 689, 242, SE 2d 800 (1978) [PG 8, APP		
A PG 3 AND 8]; STATE V. GOLDMAN, 311 N.C. 338 (1984) [PG 8, APP A PG 3, 7		
AND 8]; STATE V. MCHONE, 348 N.C. 254 (1998) [PG 8, APP A PG 6 AND 8];		
ROBINSON V. HOWES 663 F 3d 819, 824-825 (6 CIR 2011) [PG 9, APP A PG 8];		
PARK TERRANCE, IN V. PHOENIX INDEMN CO., 243 NC 595, 915 SE 2d 554 (1956)		
[APP A PG 9]; BRICE V. ROBERTSON HOUSE MOVING, WRECK & SALVAGE CO., 249 NC		
74, 105 SE 2d 439 (1958) [APP A PG 9]; IN RE BROWN LEE, 301 NC 532, 272 SE 2d 86 (1981)		
[APP A PG 9]; IN RE T. HT. 366 NC 446, 454, 665 SE 2d 846 (2008) [APP A PG 10]; SUTTON		
V. FIGGAT, 280 NC 89, 93, 185 SE 2d 99, 97 (1971) [APP A PG 10]; HALL V. QUATERMAN		
534 F 3d 365-367-69 (5TH CIR 2008) [PG 9] APP A]		
STATUTES AND RULES: N.C. G.S. 7A-32(B) [APP A PG 1]; RULE 22 N.C. APP PROCED. RES [APP A PG 1];		
NC.G.S. 15A-954(A)(3) [APP A, PG 3, 4, AND 11]; N.C.G.S. 15A-954(A)(4) [APP A PG 2, 6 AND 11]; N.C.G.S. 15A-954(A)(5) [APP A		
PG 5 AND 11]; 28 U.S.C. § 1651(A) [PG 5]; 28 U.S.C. § 1257(A) [PG 2 AND 5]; 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1) [PG 2]		

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR AN EXTRA-ORDINARY WRIT OF MANDAMUS

PETITIONER RESPECTFULLY PRAYS THAT A EXTRA-ORDINARY WRIT OF MANDAMUS TO ISSUE A REVIEW OF THE JUDGEMENT 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

☒ FOR CASES FROM STATE COURTS

THE OPINION OF THE HIGHEST STATE COURT TO REVIEW THE MERITS APPEARS AT APPENDIX B 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 MARCH 1, 2018. A COPY OF THAT DECISION APPEARS AT APPENDIX B.

☒ NO PETITION FOR REHEARING WAS TIMELY FILED IN MY CASE.

☐ 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 THE TIME TO FILE THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS WAS GRANTED TO AND INCLUDING _____ (DATE) ON _____ (DATE) IN APPLICATION NO. _____ A _____.

(THE JURISDICTION OF THIS COURT IS INVOKED UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1257A)

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

U.S. CONSTITUTION: FOURTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO A 'PROBABLE CAUSE' DETERMINATION AS A PREREQUISITE TO EXTENDED RESTRAINT OF LIBERTY FOLLOWING ARREST; FIFTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO AN INDICTMENT BY A GRAND JURY WHEREBY 'NO PERSON SHALL BE HELD TO ANSWER FOR A CAPITAL OR OTHERWISE INFAMOUS CRIME UNLESS ON PRESENTMENT OR INDICTMENT OF A GRAND JURY'; SIXTH AMENDMENT 'RIGHT TO A SPEEDY AND PUBLIC TRIAL BY AN IMPARTIAL JURY'... 'BE CONFRONTED WITH THE WITNESSES AGAINST HIM'... 'AND TO HAVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL FOR HIS DEFENSE'; AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT WHEREBY 'NOR SHALL ANY STATE DEPRIVE ANY PERSON OF LIFE, LIBERTY OR PROPERTY, WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF LAW, NOR DENY TO ANY PERSON WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION EQUAL PROTECTIONS OF THE LAWS'

N.C. CONSTITUTION: ART I, SEC 18- 'COURT SHALL BE OPEN COURT'... 'JUSTICE SHALL BE ADMINISTERED WITHOUT DENIAL OR DELAY'; ART I, SEC 19- 'LAW OF THE LAND EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS'... 'NO PERSON SHALL BE DENIED EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS', ART I SEC 22- 'MODE OF PROSECUTION'... 'NO PERSON SHALL BE PUT TO ANSWER ANY CRIMINAL CHARGE BUT BY INDICTMENT, PRESENTMENT, OR IMPEACHMENT'; ART I, SEC 23 'RIGHT OF THE ACCUSED'... 'TO CONFRONT THE ACCUSERS AND WITNESSES WITH OTHER TESTIMONY, AND TO HAVE COUNSEL FOR DEFENSE'; ART I, SEC 36- 'OTHER RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE'... 'THE ENUMERATION OF RIGHTS IN THIS ARTICLE SHALL NOT BE CONSTRUED TO IMPAIR OR DENY OTHERS RETAINED BY THE PEOPLE'

STATUTORY PROVISIONS: N.C. GEN STAT 15A-954 A.) THE COURT ON MOTION OF THE DEFENDANT MUST DISMISS THE CHARGES STATED IN A CRIMINAL PLEADING IF IT DETERMINES THAT

N.C. GEN STAT 15A-954(A)(3) - THE DEFENDANT HAS BEEN DENIED A SPEEDY TRIAL AS REQUIRED BY THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE CONSTITUTION OF NORTH CAROLINA

N.C. GEN STAT 15A-954(A)(4) - THE DEFENDANTS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS HAVE BEEN FLAGRANTLY VIOLATED AND THERE IS SUCH IRREPARABLE PREJUDICE TO THE DEFENDANTS PREPARATION OF HIS CASE THAT THERE IS NO REMEDY BUT TO DISMISS PROSECUTION

N.C. GEN STAT 15A-954(A)(8) - THE COURT HAS NO JURISDICTION OVER THE OFFENSE CHARGED

N.C. GEN STAT 7A-32(B) - POWER OF THE SUPREME COURT TO ISSUE REMEDIAL WRITS, GENERAL POWER TO SUPERVISE AND CONTROL THE PROCEEDINGS OF LOWER COURTS OR ACT IN ABSENCE OF RULE OR STATUTE

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

NOW COMES THE PETITIONER, BRANDON J. LEE, AND COMPELS THIS MOST HIGH AND HONORABLE COURT TO GRANT THIS PETITION FOR AN EXTRA-ORDINARY WRIT OF MANDAMUS AUTHORIZED BY 28 U.S.C. § 1651(A) WITH JURISDICTION INVOKED UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1257(A). THE PETITIONER SUBMITTED IN A WRIT OF MANDAMUS PETITION TO THE SUPREME COURT OF NORTH CAROLINA ON OCTOBER 18, 2017, WHICH WAS FILED IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NORTH CAROLINA ON OCTOBER 23, 2017. THE PURPOSE OF THE SAID WRIT OF MANDAMUS WAS TO ORDER THE WAKE COUNTY 10TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT TRIAL COURT TO HEAR THE PETITIONERS MOTIONS FOR DISMISSAL WHICH CHALLENGE THE FLAGRANT SYSTEMIC DUE PROCESS AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT VIOLATIONS WITHIN ITS DISTRICT.

WHEREFORE, THE PETITIONERS FOURTH, FIFTH, SIXTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION AND UNDER ART I, SEC 18, 19, 22, 23 AND 36 OF THE N.C. CONSTITUTION HAVE BEEN FLAGRANTLY VIOLATED. THIS IS ACHIEVED THROUGH THE SYSTEMIC ISSUING OF TRUE BILL OF INDICTMENTS WHICH ARE IN FACT A FRAUDULENT MISREPRESENTATION OF THE CHARGING INSTRUMENT. THEREFORE, THE STATE HAS NO JURISDICTION OVER THE OFFENSE(S) CHARGED. MCCLURE V. STATE V. CASSANDRA, 6 N.C. APP 626, 170 SE 2d 575 (1969); STATE V. BATDORF, 293 N.C. 486, 238 SE 2d 497 (1977); STATE V. DELLINGER, 308 NC 288 (1983); STATE V. PIPPIN, 72 N.C. APP 387 (1985);

STATE V. COX, 28 N.C. 440 (1986). THEREBY, FLAGRANTLY VIOLATING THE PETITIONERS FIFTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO AN INDICTMENT OF A GRAND JURY.

THEREAFTER, THE WAKE COUNTY 10TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT SYSTEMICALLY WAIVE PROBABLE CAUSE DETERMINATION HEARINGS WITHOUT VERBAL AND/OR WRITTEN CONSENT BY RELYING ON THESE FALSE INSTRUMENTS THAT MEET THE CLEARLY ERRONEOUS STANDARD. THEREIN, ABSENT OF A LEGALLY CONSTITUTED GRAND JURY CONVENING OR PROBABLE CAUSE HEARING THE FOURTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO A PROBABLE CAUSE DETERMINATION AS A PREREQUISITE OF EXTENDED RESTRAINT OF LIBERTY FOLLOWING ARREST IS FLAGRANTLY VIOLATED.

THEREIN, SYSTEMICALLY VIOLATING THE PETITIONERS SIXTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO HAVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL FOR HIS DEFENSE; AND HIS SIXTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO BE CONFRONTED WITH THE WITNESSES AGAINST HIM WHICH THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT ALSO MAKES OBLIGATORY UPON THE STATE. GIDEON V. WAINWRIGHT 372 U.S. 335 SUPRA (1963); POINTER V. TEXAS, 380 US 400-SUPREME COURT (1965); COLEMAN V. ALABAMA 399 U.S. 1.9 (1970); GERSTEIN V. PUGH, 420 U.S. 103 (1975); UNITED STATES V. GAGNON, 470 U.S. 522 (1985); LILLY V. VIRGINIA 527 U.S. 116 119 CT. 1887 144 LED 2d 117 (1999); CRAWFORD V. WASHINGTON, 541 U.S. 36 (2004)

HEREIN, THE SUPREME COURT OF NORTH CAROLINA DISMISSED THE PETITIONERS WRIT OF MANDAMUS ON

MARCH 1, 2018 (No. 356P17). THE GROSSLY INADEQUATE CONSIDERATION OF THE WELL PLEADED COMPLAINT WAS MADE IN CONFERENCE WITH NO LEGAL BASIS IN CONCLUSION OF LAW. EXTRA-ORDINARY DILIGENCE IN THE EXHAUSTION OF STATE REMEDIES HAS BEEN ACHIEVED IN AN ATTEMPT TO EXPOSE THE SYSTEMIC MANIFEST CONSTITUTIONAL ERROR OF THIS FALSE INSTRUMENT THAT MEETS THE CLEARLY ERRONEOUS STANDARD.

WHEREFORE, THE PETITIONER IS PLEADING THIS MOST HONORABLE COURT TO EXERCISE ITS DISCRETIONARY POWERS TO RESCUE AND REMEDY THE PETITIONERS STATED GOAL IN THIS EXTRA-ORDINARY WRIT OF MANDAMUS AND SUCH OTHER FURTHER RELIEF AS APPEARS TO THIS MOST HONORABLE COURT TO BE JUST AND PROPER. ADEQUATE RELIEF CANNOT BE OBTAINED IN ANY OTHER FORM FROM ANY OTHER COURT. GRANTING THIS WRIT WILL BE IN AID OF THE COURTS APPELLATE JURISDICTION INVOKED UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1257(A) AND MOST CERTAINLY WARRANTS THE EXERCISE OF THE COURTS DISCRETIONARY POWERS.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

THE PETITIONER, BRANDON J. LEE, HAS HAD THE UNFORTUNATE OPPORTUNITY TO MEET MANY MEN DURING HIS 892 DAYS OF OPPRESSIVE PRETRIAL INCARCERATION THUS FAR IN THE WAKE COUNTY DETENTION CENTER WHO HE BELIEVES ARE TRULY INNOCENT, FALSELY ACCUSED, OR GROSSLY OVERCHARGED. WHEREAS, PROPER PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS WOULD REMEDY BY MEANS OF A LEGALLY CONSTITUTED GRAND JURY CONVENING OR A PROBABLE CAUSE DETERMINATION HEARING.

WHEREBY, THE EVIDENTIARY HEARINGS AND TRANSCRIPTS THAT ARE A RESULT OF GRANTING THIS PETITION WILL FURTHER ADDUCE THE STATES EFFORTS TO CONCEAL THE FLAGRANT MENDACITY AND FRAUDULENT MISREPRESENTATION OF THE CHARGING INSTRUMENT THAT MEETS THE CLEARLY ERRONEOUS STANDARD.

II. PETITIONER ARGUES THAT THE SAID TRIAL COURT OF WAKE COUNTY, NC HAS NOT HEARD ANY OF THE PETITIONERS PRELIMINARY MOTIONS FOR DISMISSAL. HOWEVER, THE PETITIONER IS ENTITLED TO AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING BECAUSE THE STATE HAS NOT PROVIDED A FULL AND FAIR HEARING REGARDING ALL CONTESTED ISSUES OF FACT IN THE PETITIONERS MOTIONS FOR DISMISSAL. STATE V. ROBERTS, 18 NC APP 388 (1973); STATE V. TINDALL, 294 NC 689, 242, SE: 2d 806 (1978); STATE V. GOLDMAN, 311 NC 338 (1984); STATE V. MCHONE

, 348 N.C. 254 (1998); ROBINSON V. HAWES 663 F.3d 819, 824-825 (6 Cir 2011)

II. PETITIONER ARGUES THAT HE CAN ASK A HIGHER COURT TO ISSUE A WRIT, OUTSIDE THE USUAL APPEAL PROCESS, TO RECTIFY A CERTAIN WRONG BY THE TRIAL COURT. HALL V. QUATERMAN 534 F.3d 365-367-6 (5TH CIR 2008); WINSTON V. PEARSON, 683 F.3d 489, 494-500 (4TH CIR 2012)

III. PETITIONER ARGUES THAT IF HE FEELS WRONGED BY THE ACTIONS OF THE TRIAL COURT HE MAY NEED TO TAKE A WRIT TO OBTAIN AN EARLY REVIEW BY A HIGHER COURT, AS IS WHEN A FINAL JUDGEMENT HAS NOT YET BEEN ENTERED IN THE TRIAL COURT, BUT THE PARTY SEEKING THE WRIT NEEDS RELIEF AT ONCE TO PREVENT INJUSTICE, UNNECESSARY EXPENSE AND UNDULY DELAYED RULING.

IV. PETITIONER ARGUES THAT THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES HAS GENERAL SUPERVISORY AUTHORITY OVER THE ORDERS, JUDGEMENTS, AND DECREES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF NORTH CAROLINA WITH JURISDICTION INVOKED UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1257(A), WHEREBY, THIS IS A PETITION FOR AN EXTRA-ORDINARY WRIT OF MANDAMUS WHICH IN A PROPER CASE, WHEN NECESSARY TO PROMOTE THE EXPEDITIOUS ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE, THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES WILL NOT HESITATE TO EXERCISE.

CONCLUSION

THE FLAGRANT MENDACITY FROM THE SYSTEMIC FRAUDULENT MISREPRESENTATION OF THE CHARGING INSTRUMENT AT THE HEART OF THESE DUE PROCESS AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT VIOLATIONS IS PERFECTLY ADDRESSED BY FORMER SECRETARY OF STATE REX W. TILLERSON'S WARNING AND REBUKE OF OUR NATIONS CURRENT LEADERSHIP. ON MAY 16, 2018 IN A COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS AT THE VIRGINIA MILITARY INSTITUTE IN LEXINGTON, VA HE STATED THAT "IF OUR LEADERS SEEK TO CONCEAL THE TRUTH, OR WE AS PEOPLE BECOME ACCEPTING OF ALTERNATIVE REALITIES THAT ARE NO LONGER GROUNDED IN FACTS, THEN WE AS AMERICAN CITIZENS ARE ON A PATHWAY TO RELINQUISHING OUR FREEDOM... IF WE DO NOT AS AMERICANS CONFRONT THE CRISIS OF ETHICS AND INTEGRITY IN OUR SOCIETY AND AMONG OUR LEADERS IN BOTH THE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR... THEN AMERICAN DEMOCRACY AS WE KNOW IT IS ENTERING ITS TWILIGHT YEARS."

WE ARE UNFORTUNATELY AT A POINT IN OUR GREAT NATIONS HISTORY WHERE LAWMAKERS ARE TREATING JUDGES LIKE POLITICAL PAWNS WHO ARE, OR SHOULD BE BEHOLDEN TO A PARTISAN PLATFORM OR PUBLIC PRESSURE THAN TO THE LAW. WE ARE AT A TIME WHERE STATE AND FEDERAL COURTS ARE UNDERMINED, MANIPULATED, AND UNDER DIRECT ATTACK BY THE LEGISLATIVE AND EXECUTIVE BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT. WHEREBY, THERE IS

AN ONGOING ALL OUT COVERT WAR AGAINST THE JUDICIAL BRANCHES SOVEREIGN POWERS. IT IS THIS ENCROACHMENT OF THE SEPARATION OF POWERS WHICH FOSTERS AN ENVIRONMENT FOR FLAGRANT SYSTEMIC VIOLATIONS OF DUE PROCESS AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.

IN QUOTING JUSTICE NEIL M. GORSUCH'S DISSENT IN THE CASE, OIL STATES ENERGY SERVICES V. GREEN'S ENERGY GROUP, No. 16-712 "SUPPORTERS SAY THIS IS A GOOD THING.... AND, NO DOUBT, DISPENSING WITH CONSTITUTIONALLY PRESCRIBED PROCEDURES IS OFTEN EXPEDIENT. WHETHER IT IS THE GUARENTEE OF A WARRANT BEFORE A SEARCH, A JURY TRIAL BEFORE A CONVICTION-OR, YES, A JUDICIAL HEARING BEFORE A PROPERTY INTEREST IS STRIPPED AWAY- THE CONSTITUTIONS CONSTRAINTS CAN SLOW THINGS DOWN." ONE MIGHT EASILY ADD A FOURTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO A PROBABLE CAUSE DETERMINATION AS A PREREQUISITE TO EXTENDED RESTRAINT OF LIBERTY FOLLOWING ARREST, FIFTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO AN INDICTMENT OF A GRAND JURY, SIXTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO A SPEEDY AND PUBLIC TRIAL BY AN IMPARTIAL JURY, TO BE CONFRONTED WITH THE WITNESSES AGAINST HIM, AND TO HAVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL FOR HIS DEFENSE TO JUSTICE GORSUCH'S EXAMPLES OF NONDEROGABLE AND INDEFEASTIBLE DUE PROCESS AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT PROTECTIONS THAT MUST NOT BE SACRIFICED FOR THE SAKE OF BEING EXPEDIENT.

HEREBY, IN HONORING THIS EXTRA-ORDINARY WRIT
OF MANDAMUS PETITION A CLEAR AND CONSISE
MESSAGE WILL BE COMMUNICATED THAT THIS WILL NO
LONGER BE TOLERATED. THE PETITIONER RESPECTFULLY
REMINDS THIS MOST HONORABLE COURT THAT YOU HAVE
PLEDGED BY OATH TO DEFEND THE CONSTITUTION.
FAILURE TO DO SO WOULD RESULT IN A FUNDAMENTAL
MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

BY: BRANDON LEE

SIGNATURE: BL

DATE: 05-29-2018

AFFIRMATION

AFFIRMATION IN SUPPORT OF THIS EXTRA-ORDINARY WRIT OF MANDAMUS PETITION IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES. THE UNDERSIGNED, PETITIONER BRANDON J. LEE, PURSUANT TO FED. R. EVID. 603 AND IN COMPLIANCE WITH 28 U.S.C. § 1746 HEREBY SOLEMNLY PLEDGE, SWEAR, DECLARE, OR AFFIRM THAT I AM THE PETITIONER IN THE HERE WITHIN ACTION, THAT THE DOCUMENTATION IS BEING SENT TO THE CLERK PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS SET FORTH IN 29.2 AND 30.1 OF THE RULES OF THE SUPREME COURT ON THIS DATE OF MAY 29, 2018. AS SUCH, THE DOCUMENTATION IS BEING FILED TIMELY IN COMPLIANCE WITH GUIDELINES SET FORTH IN 13.1 AND 13.3 OF THE RULES OF THE SUPREME COURT. I, THE PETITIONER BRANDON J. LEE, HAVE READ THE FOREGOING AND KNOW THE CONTENTS THEREOF, THAT THE SAME ARE BASED ON FACTS, KNOWLEDGE, AND BELIEF. AS SUCH UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY ALL MATTERS HERE WITHIN SHOULD BE RECEIVED AS FACT.

I DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT:

EXECUTED ON: MAY 29, 2018

BY: BRANDON J. LEE

SIGNATURE: B. J. Lee