

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

TADAREOUS L. JACKSON — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

LORIE DAVIS — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

5th CIRCUIT Court of Appeals

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

TADAREOUS L. JACKSON

(Your Name)

(Address)

(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- 1) When a State Trial Court neglects it's duty to make findings after controverted and unresloved issues have been shown, is it resonable when considering claims of ineffectiveness for a court to find that a lawyer was effective, without first developing all the facts (in the case at bar, a affidavit from the lawyer) ?

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

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B *Opinion of the United State District Court*

APPENDIX C *United State Court of Appeals Ruling*

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

JURISDICTION

For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was MARCH, 23, 2018.

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: MAY 10 2018, 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 _____. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix _____.

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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On June 9, the State Indicted Petitioner For Aggravated Robbery in cause Nos. FG9-53841-L and FG9-53842-L Docs 11-14 at 6. Petitioner Plead not guilty and received 60 year sentences, "two" Concurrently. Petitioner Direct Appeal was denied September 19, 2012, JACKSON v State Nos. 05-11-01116-CR; 05-11-01117-CR. Petitioner Then Filed An P.D.R. which was refused by the state highcourt, JACKSON, 2012 WL 4097192. PD-1473-12; PD-1474-12 Feb. 6, 2013. Petitioner Then Filed his state habeas corpus Feb. 12, 2014. (Docs. 12-15 at 5, 21, 12-18 at 6, 22.) The Applications were denied without written order. (Docs. 12-13, 12-16); see Ex parte JACKSON, WR-81,506-04; WR-81,506-05 (Tex. Crim. App. Dec. 17, 2014. On February 17, 2015 Petitioner appealed to the Federal Court, & case was set for findings by magistrate. On March 15th 2017 Petitioner was denied, and appeal to the 5th Circuit Court who also conceded with the lower court and denied the Petitioner C.O.A.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Throughout Petitioner Appeal Proceedings, State And Federal the Petitioner was Not Protected AS A U.S. Citizen, Due Process And Constitution Right's Were Violated And over-looked by lower Courts Simply to Secure A Conviction. When the Petitioner Filed his State Habeas Corpus, The Trial Court never made A Ruling or Recommendation, theres No Proof the Court even Read the Applications. According to the TEXAS C.C.A. It's the duty of the trial Court to make Findings, The Federal Court Found it self duty bound by the State Court's Findings and Ruling, quoting Petitioner didn't Show the C.C.A. WAS wrong for Rejecting His Claim, but once more the question is Presented, "When Considering Claims of Ineffectiveness, is it Reasonable For The Court to Find A Counsel EFFECTIVE without First developing All the FACTS. In this CASE The State, Admitted Controvected And unresolved Issues and Propose An ORDER to Recieve AN AFFIDAVIT From trial Lawyer, But throughout All the Proceeding No Court ordered the Lawyer to Come Forth, And that Alone hender this CASE.

Petitioner would like to point out the fact that it's very very unfair that prose defendants can't get lawyer to help them are have one appointed to argue these claims, but it's even more unfair when the Courts don't uphold their duty and protect us, we still have rights to due process and our Constitutional Rights, but due to the fact we make have not followed a rule in a proceeding that we could not understand, our chances at fairness is lost, The Bar in this case was held to high, this went wrong in the state court. **CONCLUSION**

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Andreast Jackson.

Date: 6-21-2018