

No. 03K15004396

\_\_\_\_\_  
IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
\_\_\_\_\_

Carl Ross — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

vs.  
State of Maryland — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

Court of Appeals of Maryland - Robert C. Murphy Courts of Appeal Building  
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Carl Ross  
(Your Name)

30420 Revells Neck Rd  
(Address)

Westover MD 21890  
(City, State, Zip Code)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Phone Number)

### QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- Is the evidence insufficient to sustain <sup>defendants</sup> ~~appellants~~ convictions
- Should Baltimore County Circuit Court's violation of due process against <sup>defendant</sup> ~~appellant~~ have overturned case?
- Did court's decision of "No Bail" violate <sup>defendants</sup> ~~appellants~~ rights
- Was <sup>Is</sup> DNA evidence test reading negative enough to reverse <sup>defendants</sup> ~~appellants~~ convictions or prove innocence?

## 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	<i>Decision of State Court of Special Appeals</i>
APPENDIX B	<i>Decision of State Trial Court (missing for reasons listed on attached)</i>
APPENDIX C	
APPENDIX D	
APPENDIX E	
APPENDIX F	

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED**

**CASES**

**PAGE NUMBER**

**STATUTES AND RULES**

**OTHER**

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☐ is unpublished.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☐ is unpublished.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 P 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 \_\_\_\_\_ 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 March 23rd 2018.  
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix B.

☒ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: March 23rd 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**

*Amendments 5, 6, 8, 9*



## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

- Bench trial • Date 9.20.16
- Judge Keith R. Truffer
- Conviction: sexual child abuse, sex offense 2nd degree and related offenses
- Sentence: 20 years, 10 suspended concurrent for both listed convictions, remaining convictions merged. (3rd and 4th degree sex offense and 2nd degree assault.) Plus 5 years supervised probation • Date 2.16.2017
- Appeal affirmed by Woodward, C.J. Friedman, and Moylan, Charles E., Jr (Senior Judge, specially Assigned) on December 11, 2017
- Writ of certiorari filed 1.12.2018 - Denied March 23, 2018 "Not desirable or in public interest."
- Chief Judge: Mary Ellen Barbera, of Court of Appeals of Maryland.
- this writ of certiorari to supreme court follows

Carl Ross

"Attached"

7-28-18

(Eastern Correctional Institution)

I'm an inmate confined in ECI with no counsel.

The ruling made by trial Judge Keith Truffer is missing because on the same day of my sentencing (February 16th 2017),

(Of Baltimore County Department of Corrections)

correctional officer Morton (bald-black-light skinned-big eyes and lips) took them and sent me to a mental health tier where I faced inhumane treatment because I was in fear of being killed by other inmates based on what I heard about MR.D.C.C, until February 22nd when they sent me there claiming they can't find the <sup>ruling</sup> sentencing papers. correctional officer Morton is responsible because he took the court papers.

The psychologists are responsible for speaking my case out loud near other inmates, having me sent to a psych-tier for invalid reasons, putting me in an unwashed, urine-feces smelling, dirty, sticky-floored cell naked and with no bed mattress for 1-2 days, threatening to have me charged for complaining and prescribing me Prozac, trying to get me to take it without telling me what it is until my last day there, then getting angry with me for refusing.

Judge Keith Truffer denied my request of another copy to the court claiming "unable to discern a request for any cognizable relief, no action taken". Also was ignored by Jennifer B. Aist (Public Defender)

I also believe I should let know that due to excessive cancellation of ECI's (Eastern Correctional Institution's) Law Library and library, I can't find out anything of statutes, cases, etc.

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

- DNA credibility: Court says 1 year is too long to determine innocence. All sources from law libraries state otherwise, even internet. Something is definitely wrong here. Even criminal law books indicate much longer times like Nolo.
- Apparent false accusation by witness: If witness saw me ejaculate, victim and their mother would have been able to see same. Also, they would have been notified. Ejaculate does not disappear within a minute. It stands out, so it's not invisible or hard to see, regardless if it was cleaned or not, which witness says wasn't, ruining the lie. Court ignored this.
- Witness stated my penis was pointing straight up. My girlfriend, who is the only one who's seen it erect, knows that's false.
- According to the MD constitution amendments 5 (due process), 6 (right to a speedy & public trial) (obtaining witnesses in favor), 8 (Excessive bail not required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishment inflicted) and 9 (The enumeration in the constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people), all were violated, save for obtaining witnesses in favor possibly because I'm not sure if they counted as being in my favor even if their statements were.
- The term "prima facie", meaning in latin "on its face" meaning "presumption" sounds questionable for a reason to find me guilty when it contradicts the definition of finding someone guilty "Beyond a reasonable doubt". Another phrase I haven't even heard of until my incarceration. I was raised on the phrase "Innocent until proven guilty". But that was from court shows. Very misleading. Then there's the fact that I was found guilty because the court claims nothing was proven with concrete evidence.

### CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Carl Ross

Date: 6.29.2018