


Petition For Rehearing

This issue on hand: Appointment of Counsel is submitted to be considered with my original petition for Rehearing postmarked November 8, 2018 and received November 16, 2018.

Together, these state other substantial grounds not previously presented. These documents, my petition for Rehearing on the issue on hand: Appointment of Counsel, and presented in good faith and not for delay.

I, Lawrence Thompson declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.
Executed in: December 12, 2018

Law Thompson
Lawrence Thompson
Appellant



Supreme Court of the United States
Office of the Clerk
Washington, DC 20543-0001

Lawrence Thompson
Reg# 444590816
Federal Detention Center
P.O. Box 13900
Seattle, WA 98198

Issue on hand:
Appointment of Counsel

RE: Thompson v. Copeland, et al.
No: 18-5584

Dear Jacob Levitan

I, Lawrence Thompson, Appellant, make the following supplemental requests:

1. Request that a Rehearing de novo will show that the panel of Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals Errored by using tainted Evidence from directly or indirectly obtained by illegal means to save Judgment for Copeland immunity liability.
2. Request that the court take Judicial notice under Federal Rule of Evidence 201 of an Abstract of Judgment from the 3.6 Suppression hearing reveals that the pull over was a pretextual stop in King County Superior Court.

3 The language of the gun was link to the;
(i) pretextual stop, but, the Supreme court has condemned pretextual arrests: an arrest may not be used as a pretext to search for evidence. *United States v. Lefkowitz*, 285 US 452, 467, 76 L.Ed. 877, 52 S.Ct. 420 (1932). And (ii) the fruit of the poisonous tree, illegally obtained evidence, the king county superior court suppressed all language of evidence, to put a stop to, put down or prohibit; to prevent (something) from being seen, heard, known, or discussed.

4. Under the courts "subjective intent" cases, this finding automatically brings the stop within the definition of "pretextual" see *Mota*, 982 F2d, at 1386 (stop is pretextual if the primary purpose of the arresting officers in making stop to search for evidence of a more serious crime.)

A) The pretextual stop doctrine is not meant to inhibit the use of evidence discovered serendipitously during legitimate traffic stops.

B) "[a] pretextual stop occurs when the police use an legal justification to make the stop in order to search a person or place, or to interrogate a person, for an unrelated serious crime for which they do not have the reasonable suspicion necessary to support a stop. *United States v. Cannon*, 29 F3d 472, 474 (9th Cir. 1994)

(quoting United States v. Guzman, 864 F2d 1512, 1515 (10th Cir 1988)).

5. Because the gun was the tool of fabricated evidence, after the relevant event in an attempt of the government to achieve or avoid liability.

In addition, the Attached labeled Exhibit - A, is a copy of the King County Superior Court order entered July 24, 2012.

Lawrence Thompson, Appellant
Law Thompson
12-12-2018

**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**