

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Michael A Lajennesse — PETITIONER Pro-Se
(Your Name)

vs.

Iowa Ct. of Appeals (IA) — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

Justice, McDonald: Court of Appeals, Iowa (Feb 21, 2018)
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Michael Alexander Lajennesse (#6346041)
(Your Name)

406 North High Street
(Address)

Anamusa, Iowa 52205-0010
(City, State, Zip Code)

(319) 462-3504
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

(1) Why didn't J. McDonald acknowledge both exhibit 17 and 18 in his Opinion? My Appellate Defender: Brenda J Bohr, specifically elaborated about how the Shower Curtain isn't wet, Coiled-up, or "doesn't appear" to have been used 3 (three) separate times to kill Megan/Ch. (victim).

(2) I thought it was prosecutorial Misconduct for prosecutors to "Co-Sign" their witnesses false testimony:

(a) There wasn't ever a plastic bag recovered for Strangling;

(b) There wasn't "Torturing" with showering down water, and "Hand-typed" by the prosecutor - in his Minutes of testimony;

(c) the shower curtain isn't fashioned with respects to ligature

(3) The Medical Records were not part of the Trial? I am Confused about why NOT? Sorry about its messy-ness!

State of Iowa, vs Hemm: Lexis 135 and 470 (2010)
blood on Shower curtain; ie, no forensics in my case...

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	5
CONCLUSION.....	6

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	<i>Included as provided. (Precedo)</i>
APPENDIX B	<i>Rehearing Denied as provided. (order)</i>
APPENDIX C	<i>Sentencing at District Ct. (order)</i>
APPENDIX D	<i>Copy of the Opinion, By: J. McDonald (Feb 21, 2018)</i>
APPENDIX E	<i>Min. Lajunen 7-20-2018</i>
APPENDIX F	<i>* added anew and served Thomas Miller ATTY Gen. for Iowa. *</i>

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

- (1) Gideon v. Wainwright, 372 US 335,
83 S. Ct. 792, 9 L.Ed. 2d 799, 93
ALR 2d 733 (1963)
- (2) U.S. v. Melton, Ct. App. 8th Cir.; LEXIS 16753 (2017)
"So long... prosecutors remarks... based off of the Evid. in
a case..."

STATUTES AND RULES

Fed. Rs. of Evid. (d)(1)(A) provides... Inconsistent state-
ments... (Referent Iowa Rs. of Evid. 5-801(a)(1)(A)). See also,

- (1) Iowa Code § 602.10113 deceit and collusion
(Exodus 22:9)

OTHER

See also: State v. Lejennesse, LEXIS 188, Feb. 21, 2018
FECD299756, Polk County, Iowa Feb 8th. 2017.

(TT. Vol. II, p. 32, Ln. 11-20; Ln. 20 - p. 33, Ln. 5)

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 Lajennesse, LEXIS 188: Feb. 21, 2018; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the _____ 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.

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

☒ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: April 18, 2018, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix B.

☐ 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

- (1) The Right to effective Counsel through the Gideon case "demands" that Criminal Defense ATTY'S know certain facts which surround "their" effectiveness. Such as: Notifying the Jury "Before-Hand" and not after the verdict in an Arrest of Judgment Motion; ie, Iowa Code § 602.10113 (The Jury are the fact-finders)
- (2) Title 18 U.S.C. § 1622. Subornation of Perjury; ie, allowing (victim) Megan to testify about this Shower Curtain and plastic bag even though Legally he knew its NOT true (exh. 17318), is totally wrong, Your Honor.
- (2.a) Fair Trial under Fifth Amendment and both Confrontation Clause of Sixth Amdm. (the Det. D. White 4994 (DMPD, Iowa) wasn't at trial and neither was anybody from the hospital.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Lajeunesse was tried by jury on Feb. 6, 7 and 8th of 2017. A Guilty verdict was unanimous then

(I) timely filed an Appeal

Subsequently, J. McDonald (Ct. of App.) affirmed my conviction while preserving my ineffective assist. of Counsel claims and denying my prosecutorial misconduct claim. Stating that I had not developed an efficient, logical argument.... First off, they wouldn't supply the transcripts (proof, if you want me to, provided) to file my Supplemental pro-se brief — so how could I?

I have taken action (PCR) back in the District Court and I have a hearing on the merits of my opinion from the Ct. of App. but, Your Honor, something is wrong here? Copy of the Shower Curtain provided, Sorry!

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

I feel like... Just because the prosecutor, Tom Miller's Son (the Attorney Gen. of the State of Iowa), Thomas H. Miller, AT#0005416, is like High Ranking, you know, here in Iowa; its not fair for him to break the Rules and take my life away for a Domestic Abuse Situation that he thinks is an attempted murder case, You Honor!

(1) I didn't know my Name; (2) I had urinated on myself during transport; (3) the medical records weren't part of trial; (4) prosecutor intentionally blurred exp. 17 during trial; (5) the plastic bag was never collected and he did reference this to the Jury several times during both opening & closing arguments (and my Attorney let the Jury Run-with-it); and (6) much much more - believe me?

I've read cases after cases to know that when you've got a serious, murderous injury - the medical records are part of Trial, Sir.

God bless.

I will pray, without ceasing, that you would find it in your heart to GRANT this petition because it involves Constitutionally over stepping the boundaries and procedures of the law in which many (many) folks fought for... Truth, Justice and Our Fathers WAY. Amen

CONCLUSION

prosecutors must play fair, Your Honor.

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: 5-31-2018 (b)