

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Washington, DC 20543-0001

Ronnie Junior Rodriguez — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

United States of America — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

The United States Eleventh Circuit of Appeals Court
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Ronnie Junior Rodriguez 16-156764
(Your Name)

1321 Nw 13 Street
(Address)

Miami, FL 33105
(City, State, Zip Code)

786-263-4110
(Phone Number)

Questions Presented For Review

How is it that a Federal Criminal case goes to a trial with out the key elements of its constitutional rules of law. A defendant is to be presumed innocent to proven guilty. If the defendant exercises his right to not answer any question with respect to the self-incrimination or entrapment law being or not being the issue to remain silent. The United State Attorney used a persons constitutional right as a form to move a jury to push guilty. All criminal cases wighter its State or Federal is formed by evidence. The Constitutional law of the United States of America is a manual to how the laws is to be profermed. The law is not a law with out equal rights. A defendants words against a victims or any law enforcement agent is weighted by mere word of mouth and credibility or physically proven evidence. When a defendant could stand infront of a jury pro se with evidence showing perjury and not given

the equal honorable justice is unlawful
Mere word of mouth does not make a criminal
case the evidence that could show physical
factors is the foundation of any case The
petitioner was fighting a case that was
based on hear say and when the declarant
was found in a conflicting purgriest state
The petitioner had to keep on his fighting
arguments Theres issues with the law when
a witness confesses to trying to rob the
defendant (see Miami-Dade County Florida state
court deposition Officer Jasterly Mitial page 16)
and the defendant still goes to jail. The defendant
was also denied the chance to show the jury
pictures of the witness holding the same gun
in question of being in possession of the
defendant when there is so much in favor
of a defendant arguing his case pro se The
matter where the defendant is in a federal
trial and the only proof against him is
mere word of mouth of law enforcement
witnesses A juror with active federal agency
employment is in fact unfavorable for any

defendant The United States Attorney showed forms of manipulation to prove a case that should have never went to trial. There was two C.S.I agents at the scene of the alleged crime. One agent was dusting for finger prints and collecting evidence and the other one was a photographer. The United States Attorney called as a expert witness the C.S.I agent photographer to testify at the petitioners trial. The C.S.I agent could not show no link between the defendant and the gun. With the C.S.I agent being just a photographer the testimony given was acted as a confusement and manipulation to the jury. And a key factor in the petitioners case was there was three Miami-Dade county police officers wearing three body cameras on each of those persons. But only one had video showing nothing of the allegation just there mere word of mouth of what happen after the fact. When the petitioner moved for a lawful acquital it was denied. The

petitioner is an uneducated individual
that represented his self pro se at his
Federal trial The Petitioner may have not
went to school to be a lawyer but when
the facts speak for its self the law should
be prevailed.

The question is based on facts
in which stands at Did the Petitioner
have a fair trial Was the petitioner in
fact really guilty Did the trial court error
in not granting the petitioner an
acquittal Was the jurors qualified to
stand as jurors When there employment
or record retains a conflict of interest
Where theres a question such as is this
juror in favor with the government Did
the juror work or help the government
prosecute an individual in any other crime
State of Federal as an informant or an
arresting agency Is it fair by law to
have petitioners case brought in front of
such a jury When there is no physical

evidence but mere word of mouth of law enforcement agents/officers Did the witnesses in fact commit perjury at the petitioners trial Did the court error in telling the jurors that they can not be found as a hung jury Was the government witnesses a manipulation to the some jurors knowledge of the law Should evidence of government key witness holding the said gun be allowed to be shown to the jury Did the petitioner receive key material and documents in his case to persent his defence.

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:

Barrist Lori Assistant Federal Public Defender
Caruso Michael Federal Public Defender
Ferrer Aimee Allegra Assistant Federal Public Defender
Ferrer Wilfredo A. Former United States Attorney
Garber Barry L. United States Magistrate Judge
Goodman Jonathan United States Magistrate Judge
Greenberg Benjamin G. Acting United States Attorney
Holt Julie Assistant Federal Public Defender
Langley Matthew John Assistant United States Attorney
Lehr Alison Whitney Assistant United States Attorney
Martinez Jose E. United States District Judge
Rodriguez Ronnie Jr. Defendant / Appellant / Petitioner
Simantov Andrea M. United States Magistrate Judge
Smachetti Emily M. Assistant United States Attorney
~~Stalton Johnathan Douglas United States Magistrate Judge~~
Turnoff William C. United States Magistrate Judge
United States of America Plaintiff Appellee Respondent

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A United States Courts of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit
decision was made May 24, 2018

APPENDIX B United States District Court Southern
District of Florida Miami-Division Opinion 4-7-17

APPENDIX C In United States Courts of Appeals for the
Eleventh Circuit Re-hearing 8-7-18

APPENDIX D U.S. District Court Southern District
of Florida Miami Division Indictment 9-29-16

APPENDIX E U.S. District Court Southern District of
Florida Miami Division Verdict Form 2-8-17

APPENDIX F U.S. District Court Southern District of Florida
Sentencing date April 10, 2017

Table of Authorities Cited

Please note the Miami-Dade County Jail is
witch the Petitioners is Is not providing the
proper legal assistance that prevents petitioners
from quoting the proper laws and Statutes but
with the Petitioners knowledge states that Petitioners
trial is a violation to the right of an accused
The law should be proven by shown facts not
mere word of mouth The Federal law on here
say, DNA Evidence, General Evidence, perjury and
due process in general is being over ruled The
laws are to be followed not just by a defendant but
by all Laws where made for equal justice for the
people I the petitioner Bonnie Jeanne Rodriguez
am too the people of this State By law if an
accused of a crime is charged with a crime Theres
rules to follow to prove that crime was really
committed In petitioners case laws have been broken
One person can't inforce law or trash law with out
following them first them self The law need to prevail

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 A to the petition and is

reported at N/A; 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 B to the petition and is

reported at N/A; 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 _____ to the petition and is

reported at N/A; or,
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished.

The opinion of the N/A court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

reported at N/A; 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 May 24, 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: 8/7/18, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix C.

An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including N/A (date) on N/A (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 N/A. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix .

A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: N/A, 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 N/A (date) on N/A (date) in Application No. A.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Please Note: The Petitioner is in a Miami-Dade County Florida jail for the same case as he is Petitioning and does not have access to a law library or the proper legal material except by putting his legal request on a Miami-Dade Corrections and Rehabilitation Department Legal Information Request Form that is not as personally accessing a law library which makes a limitation to the petitioner being able to quote the proper law Petitioner puts forward that his trial was based on mere hearsay The declarant at petitioners trial made statements in a State of Florida document under oath and under the penalty of perjury that made the facts of Petitioners case but made a defont statement at Petitioners trial which made perjury

Statement Of The Case

On February 19, 2016 the Defendant Bonnie Junior Rodriguez was at his self storage at Northwest 2nd Avenue and 79th Street running errands. Once he was done he went for a walk to visit a nearby friend at Northwest 4th Avenue and 77th Street. That is where the defendant got stopped by the Miami-Dade Police Department. When the Miami-Dade Police Department stopped the defendant he had no idea what was the reason for him being stopped. He assumed it was part of another harassment stop that he endure on a day to day basis. As the defendant having some common knowledge of the law. When he was stopped he told the police officer that under his amendment 4 he wishes to keep walking. That's when the officer drew his gun and ordered the defendant to the ground. The defendant was left on the ground for 2 or 3 minute before being asked any questions. In confusion the defendant did not answer any questions. The defendant did not give his name or any information to the Miami-Dade Police.

The defendant just asked for a lawyer and the officers supervisor. The defendant was denied all request and was treated and told he was going to go to jail for a Terry Stop. The defendant then once again told the officer he wanted to talk to the officers supervisor and a lawyer. When the defendant was booked to the Miami-Dade County Jail Turner Guilford knight Correctional Center he received an arrest Affidavit stating that he was being charged with being in possession of a 357 revolver that he never seen before. Along with statements saying an individual by the name of Angel Rodriguez claimed the defendant robbed him. When that individual was later pressed by officers he made admission of being the one that was planning to rob the defendant. The individual first claimed that the defendant robbed him for an amount of money the defendant didn't even have on him. The defendant asked the State and Federal Public Defenders to get receipts from his self storage. The defendant also ask for the stores video Surveillance that's on Northwest 5th Avenue and 79th Street. That was meant to have been the said place the defendant

and the individual Angel Rodriguez met To show who was at the store doing what the defendant asked to have employees questioned about ever seeing the defendant or the other individual at the store before The defendant was a frequent customer to that store These facts where said to be irrelavent to the defendants case by the Federal Public defender which was one of the main reason the defendant went pro se at his trial The defendant also had many friends in the area that could of came to court on his behalf if they didn't fear the legal system Body camera video would show many young people passing by looking as in a celebration do to the fact the following day was going to be the defendant birth day And was not sure to celebrate his birth day in that area the following day The defendant was a respected member of that community Although he did not live in the area he was constantly in that area of 4th Avenue and 77th Street Angel Rodriguez is not from that area of 4th Ave. and 77th St nor did he have reason to be in the area unless he was planing a burglary or Robbery.

Reasons For Granting The Writ

The Judgement of United States Southern District Court of Florida - Miami Division Should be reviewed because of it's error in its judgement against the petitioner In such case where the evidence is held against its value The Justice system was built on the foundation of justice. In a case such as the petitioners the constitutional value should be up held Therefore with good faith the petitioner moves the said honorable court to grant his petition in his favor for relief or a new fair trial

Conclusion

This honorable Court should
reverse and dismiss the petitioners
conviction or remand his case for
a new trial

Respectfully Submitted
By Liz Kelly

Bonnie Junior Rodriguez
160156764
Pre-trial Detention Center
1321 NW 13th Street
Miami, FL 33125