


18-7446

No. USA 11 No. 16-11866

ORIGINAL



IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Anthony Julian Hopkins — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

CHRISTOPHER GORDY — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE 11TH CIR.
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)




PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Anthony Julian Hopkins (#272562)
(Your Name)

379 Alabama Hwy. 239 N.
(Address)

Clayton, AL. 36016
(City, State, Zip Code)

(334) 775-3331
(Phone Number)



QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- I. IS THE UNITED STATES APPEALS COURT FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT IN ERROR, because it DENIED PETITIONERS C.O.A, WHEN PETITIONERS CLAIMS ARE JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES THAT CAN TAKE JURISDICTIONAL NOTICE AT ANY TIME, WHICH MEANS THAT PETITIONERS SENTENCES ARE ILLEGAL DUE TO THE JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES HAVING NO JURISDICTION TO RENDER THE CONVICTION AND IMPOSE THE SENTENCE?
- II. IS THE U.S. APPEALS COURT FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT IN ERROR, because it DENIED PETITIONERS C.O.A, WHEN PETITIONERS CLAIMS WAS NEVER INDEPENDENTLY AND JUDICIALLY REVIEWED BY ANY OF THE PREVIOUS APPEALS COURTS, DUE TO ADOPTING THE PRE-DRAFTED ORDER OF THE RESPONSE FROM THE LOWER COURTS, WHO'S CLAIMS SHOW A SERIOUS QUESTION OF U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL LAW?
- III. IS THE U.S. APPEALS COURT FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT IN ERROR, because it DENIED PETITIONERS C.O.A, WHEN PETITIONER WAS DENIED THE OPPORTUNITY TO RESPOND AND WAS CLEARLY DENIED AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING WHICH IS IN CONFLICT WITH U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL LAW?
- IV. IS THE U.S. APPEALS COURT FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT IN ERROR, because it DENIED PETITIONERS C.O.A, WHEN PETITIONER WAS DENIED HIS SIXTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO EFFECTIVE COUNSEL GUARANTEED BY THE CONSTITUTION OF THE U.S. LAW?
- V. IS THE U.S. APPEALS COURT FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT IN ERROR, because it DENIED PETITIONERS C.O.A, WHEN PETITIONER WAS DENIED HIS SIXTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL BY AN IMPARTIAL JURY GUARANTEED BY THE CONSTITUTION OF U.S. FEDERAL LAW?
- VI. IS THE U.S. APPEALS COURT FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT IN ERROR, because it DENIED PETITIONERS C.O.A, WHEN PETITIONER WAS DENIED HIS FOURTEENTH (14TH) AMENDMENT RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS AND ALSO TO EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION GUARANTEED BY THE CONSTITUTION OF THE U.S. FEDERAL LAW, DUE TO THE STATE OF ALABAMA'S CRIMINAL LAWS ARE CONSTRUCTED UPON ITS 1901 14TH

AMENDMENT STATE CONSTITUTION THAT EXCLUDES THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAW CLAUSE, WHICH IS IN DIRECT CONFLICT WITH U.S. FEDERAL CONSTITUTION AND UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCE OF PETITIONERS CLAIMS DO SHOW A CLEAR DENIAL OF EQUAL PROTECTION UNDER THE LAW?

VII. IS THE U.S. APPEALS COURT FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT IN ERROR, BECAUSE ITS RULINGS ARE CONTRARY TO LAW WHEN PETITIONERS MERITED CLAIMS ARE UNDISPUTED BY THE RECORD?

VIII. IS THE UNITED STATES APPEALS COURT FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT IN ERROR, BECAUSE THE ORDER AND THE FOLLOWING RULING BOTH CONTRADICT ONE ANOTHER AND ARE NOT BASED UPON SOUND JUDGEMENT ORDER? SEE (APPENDIX A) AND (APPENDIX B)

IX. IS THE U.S. APPEALS COURT FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT IN ERROR, BECAUSE IT DENIED PETITIONERS C.O.A, WHEN PETITIONER WAS DENIED HIS FOURTEENTH (14TH) AMENDMENT RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS AND ALSO EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION GUARANTEED BY THE CONSTITUTION OF THE U.S. LAW; DUE TO PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT BY THE MOBILE COUNTY TRIAL COURT?

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:

1. BIRD, ELLA L. - Asst. Dist. Attorney, Mobile County (TRIAL)
2. BIVINS, SONJA F. - U.S. Magistrate Judge, Southern Dist. of Alabama
3. DAVIDSON, GLENN - Trial Attorney
4. DEEN, JEFF - Trial Attorney
5. HARRELL, SIDNEY M. - Trial Attorney
6. JORDAN, AUDREY - Asst. Attorney General Counsel For Respondent
7. KRILOKOWSKI, JOHN - Pathologist DR. FOR THE STATE OF ALABAMA
8. LOCKETT, JOHN R. - Circuit Judge, Mobile County
9. MARSHALL, ADERO J. - Asst. Dist. Attorney, Mobile County (TRIAL)
10. PHILLIPS, JILL - Asst. Dist. Attorney, Mobile County (TRIAL)
11. PRYOR, JILL - U.S. Circuit Judge, Eleventh Circuit of U.S.
12. PRYOR, MARTIN - U.S. Circuit Judge, Eleventh Circuit of U.S.
13. RICH, ASHLEY M. - Dist. Attorney, Mobile County (TRIAL)
14. STEELE, WILLIAM. H - U.S. Chief Dist. Judge, Southern Dist. of Alabama

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4-12
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	13-21
CONCLUSION.....	22

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIR. C.O.A AND
MOTION TO PROCEED FORMA PAUPERIS IS DENIED 5/19/2017.

APPENDIX B THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIR. DENIED
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE NON. COURTS MAY 19, 2017
ORDER DENYING C.O.A ON 7/24/2017.

APPENDIX C THE STATE OF ALABAMA, DRAFTED AN ADVERSE ORDER OF DENIAL
ON 3/4/2013. (SEE DATE IN UPPER RIGHT CORNER ON APPENDIX C)

APPENDIX D THE CIRCUIT JUDGE OF MOBILE COUNTY ALABAMA, RENDERED HIS
ORDER OF DENIAL OF THE RULE 32 PETITION THE FOLLOWING DAY
ON MARCH 5, 2013. THE TRIAL COURT JUDGE ABUSED HIS
DISCRETION BY ADOPTING THE STATES DRAFTED AND ADVERSED
ORDER OF DENIAL. HE DID NOT MAKE AN INDEPENDENT JUDICIAL
REVIEW BASED ON THE MERIT OF PETITIONERS CLAIMS. HE
MADE A REVERSIBLE ERROR WHEN DENYING HOPKINS ADEQUATE
TIME TO REPLY AND HE DENIED HOPKINS AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING.

APPENDIX E THE ALABAMA COURT OF CRIM. APPEALS AFFIRMED THE MOBILE
COUNTY ALABAMA CIRCUIT COURT'S DECISION OF ORDER AND
DENIAL ON 12/13/2013.

APPENDIX F PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI FILED AND DOCKETED WITH
THE SUPREME COURT OF ALABAMA ON 3/25/2014.

THE SUPREME COURT OF ALABAMA DENIED HOPKINS
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI by ENTERING
A CERTIFICATE OF JUDGMENT ON 7/11/2014.

APPENDIX G: THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT
OF ALABAMA, SOUTHERN DIVISION DENIAL OF HOPKINS,
CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY AND FORMA PAUPERIS
by THE U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGES REPORT AND RECOM-
MENDATION ON 3/7/2016.

APPENDIX H: THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DIST. OF
ALABAMA, ORDER OF DENIAL AND JUDGMENT OF C.O.A
IS DENIED AND DISMISSED AS PREJUDICE AS TIME
BARRED by THE CHIEF U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE ON
3/24/2016.

APPENDIX I: THE U.S. DIST. COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DIST. OF ALABAMA,
SOUTHERN DIV. CHIEF U.S. DIST. JUDGE VACATED HIS
MARCH 24, 2016 ORDER OF DENIAL AND JUDGMENT
AND THEN RE-ADOPTED HIS PREVIOUS ORDER OF
DENIAL AND JUDGMENT ON 4/25/2016.

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/B 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 C/H/I 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 E 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 Mobile County Alabama Trial court appears at Appendix C/D 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 MAY 19, 2017.

[] 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: JULY 24, 2017, 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. § 1254(1).

[] For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was MARCH 25, 2014. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix F.

[✓] A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: JULY 11, 2014, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix F.

[] 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

Article IV: "THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE TO BE SECURE IN THEIR PERSONS, HOUSES, PAPERS, AND EFFECTS, AGAINST UNREASONABLE SEARCHES AND SEIZURES, SHALL NOT BE VIOLATED, AND NO WARRANTS SHALL ISSUE, BUT UPON PROBABLE CAUSE, SUPPORTED BY OATH OR AFFIRMATION, AND PARTICULARLY DESCRIBING THE PLACE TO BE SEARCHED, AND THE PERSONS OR THINGS TO BE SEIZED."

Article VI: "IN ALL CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS, THE ACCUSED SHALL ENJOY THE RIGHT TO A SPEEDY AND PUBLIC TRIAL, BY AN IMPARTIAL JURY OF THE STATE AND DISTRICT WHEREIN THE CRIME SHALL HAVE BEEN COMMITTED... AND TO HAVE THE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL FOR HIS DEFENSE."

Article VIII: "... NOR CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENTS INFLICTED "

Article XIV: "ALL PERSONS BORN OR NATURALIZED IN THE UNITED STATES, AND SUBJECT TO THE JURISDICTION THEREOF, ARE CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES AND OF THE STATE WHEREIN THEY RESIDE. NO STATE SHALL MAKE OR ENFORCE ANY LAW WHICH SHALL ABRIDGE THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES OF CITIZENS OF THE U.S.; NOR SHALL ANY STATE DEPRIVE ANY PERSON OF LIFE, LIBERTY, OR PROPERTY, WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF LAW; NOR DENY ANY PERSON WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS."

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

A. THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT VIOLATED PETITIONERS' HOPKINS' 14TH AMENDMENT:

1. THE JUDGMENT OF BOTH ORDERS FROM THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT IN APPENDIX (A) AND APPENDIX (B) ARE CONTRADICTIVE, BECAUSE THE FIRST ORDER STATE THAT PETITIONER FAILED TO MAKE A SUBSTANTIAL SHOWING OF THE DENIAL OF A CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT. THE SECOND ORDER STATE THAT PETITIONER HAS OFFERED NO NEW EVIDENCE OR ARGUMENTS OF MERIT TO WARRANT RELIEF. IT IS CLEARLY OBVIOUS THAT PETITIONERS CLAIMS THAT ARE RAISED ARE HIGHLY MERITED AND CAN BE PROVEN BY THE PRIVILEGE OF AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING. HOW CAN NEW EVIDENCE BE OFFERED WHEN NO EVIDENCE HAS BEEN OFFERED AT ALL. THEREFORE, THE HONORABLE COURTS FINAL DECISION IS INADVERTENTLY, NOT BASED UPON SOUND JUDGMENT ORDER AND IS IN CLEAR VIOLATION OF HOPKINS' DUE PROCESS AND EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE U.S. LAW.

B. THE TRIAL COURT WAS WITHOUT JURISDICTION TO RENDER JUDGMENT OR TO IMPOSE SENTENCE; DENIAL OF EFFECTIVE COUNSEL AND PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT:

1. THE TRIAL COURT OF MOBILE COUNTY ALABAMA, VIOLATED PETITIONERS 6TH, 14TH AND 8TH AMENDMENT RIGHT, BECAUSE WITHIN THE FACTS PRESENTED IN THE PETITIONERS 42 U.S.C § 1985 AND 42 U.S.C § 1986 CONSPIRACY CLAIM, THE PROSECUTOR AND OTHER STATE ACTORS DID ACT IN A CONSPIRACY TO UNLAWFULLY AND WRONGFULLY CONVICT THE PETITIONER OF MURDER, WITHOUT THE CORROBORATION OF ANY EVIDENCE, AND WITH THE INTENT OF THE LEAD PROSECUTOR CAMPAIGNING DURING THE PETITIONERS 2010 TRIAL WITHOUT BEING RECLOSED. THE LEAD PROSECUTOR OF THE PETITIONERS TRIAL, CAMPAIGNED FOR MOBILE COUNTY HEAD DISTRICT ATTORNEY SEAT, WHILE JURORS CANDIDLY ADMITTING TO HAVING THE LEAD PROSECUTORS CAMPAIGN SIGNS IN THEIR YARD AND OTHERS ADMITTING TO BEING ON THE PROSECUTORS CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE. THESE STATE ACTORS PREJUDICED HOPKINS, THROUGH THEIR BIAS AND PRESUMPTUOUS ACTIONS BEFORE AND DURING TRIAL. THEY ALSO USED THE MEDIA TO SHOW INFAMOUS DOCUMENTARIES ABOUT HOPKINS' CASE DURING HIS ENTIRE POST CONVICTION APPEALS PROCESS TO FURTHER PREJUDICE HIM IN CASE OF A NEW TRIAL. THE FACTS OF THIS CONSPIRACY CLAIM CAN BE CLEARLY PROVEN AND HAS SUBSTANTIALLY DEPRIVED THE PETITIONER OF HIS

Constitutional Right to A Fair Trial by AN IMPARTIAL JURY, A DEPRIVATION OF LIBERTY, A DENIAL OF DUE PROCESS AND EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAW. AND AS LONG AS THOSE DOCUMENTARY'S ARE BEING SHOWN WHILE THE PETITIONER IS IN PRISON AS WELL AS WHILE HIS TIME IS TOLLING ON APPEAL, IT IS CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT. (SEE CASE 1:14-CV-00528-WS-B Document 16 FOR CONSPIRACY CLAIM)

2. The Trial Court Violated Petitioners 6TH AND 14TH Amendment Right When the District Attorney AND Chief of Police told the News Media that Petitioner killed his wife the day after he was arrested without first conducting A complete investigation AND without allowing the Autopsy to be Finalized in order to MAKE A Full Factual Determination of the Nature AND the Cause of Death. AS A Result, the News Media became A Frenzy that projected different UNTRUE SCENARIOS of the case, which had A severe Prejudicial Effect upon the Public, who At Trial, Jurors clearly Admit to having Fixed Opinions of Petitioners guilt due to the News Media. Forty Five out of Fifty Jurors were Exposed to such News Publicity. Petitioners Trial Counsel did NOT Motion the Trial Court for A Change of Venue After hearing Jurors Admit to having Fixed Opinions of Petitioners guilt. This Fact shows that Hopkins, was Substantially Denied A Fair Trial by AN IMPARTIAL JURY OF THE STATE. It Also show A Substantial AND Procedural Denial of Effective Assistance of Counsel for his Defense. And it further show A Deprivation of Liberty without being provided Due Process AND Equal Protection of THE LAW.

3. The Trial Court Violated Petitioners 6TH AND 14TH Amendment Right AFTER the Lead Prosecutor used her Public Office to take Advantage of the Excessive Pretrial Publicity of Petitioners Case by Campaigning during the Petitioners 2010 Trial to become Head District Attorney of Mobile County. Petitioners Trial Counsel did NOT Motion the Trial Court for A Change of Venue After clearly hearing Jurors Admit to being on the Lead Prosecutors Campaign Committee AND After hearing Jurors Admit to Family Members having the Lead Prosecutors Campaign Signs in their yards. Neither did Trial Counsel Motion to have the Lead Prosecutor Reclused from the Case due to Prejudicial Circumstances. This Fact shows that Hopkins was

Substantially Denied A Fair Trial by An impartial Jury of the State. It Also Show A Substantial Denial of Effective Assistance of Counsel For his defense. And it Further Show A Deprivation of his Liberty without being Provided Substantial And Procedural Due Process As well As A Substantial Denial within its Jurisdiction The Equal Protection of THE U.S. LAWS.

4. The Trial Court Violated Petitioners 6th And 14th Amendment Right Due to The State of Alabama's, Murder indictment Under Alabama, Code of 1975 15-8-25, Does NOT State Facts Sufficient to Constitute the Offence of Murder. The Murder indictment Fail Under the Principles of Statutory And Constitutional Construction. It Lack the Nature And Cause of Death. It Also Lack Constitutional And Statutorial Jurisdiction. To be Acted Upon by the State of Alabama And it's Grand Jury. It Fail to Reflect "How" the Alleged Murder Occurred, "Why" it Occurred And "What" Actually Happened to Determine if Indeed A Murder had Occurred. The Alabama Constitution 1901 Article 1 § 6 Require that A Demand of the Nature And Cause of the Accusation be given. The State of Alabama, Failed to give the Manner of Notification in Which Hopkins was Constitutionally Entitled to in Order to be Properly Notified of the Specific Crime he Was to defend himself Against. Hopkins' Trial Counsel did NOT Motion the Court to Dismiss the indictment And Neither did he Challenge the Insufficiency of such Instrument which Failed Under the Principles of Statutory And Constitutional Construction. This Fact Shows that Hopkins was Substantially Denied And Procedurally Deprived of being Informed of the Nature And Cause of the Accusation. It Further Shows A Substantial Denial of Effective Assistance of Counsel For his defense. It Show A Deprivation of Liberty without Procedural Due Process of the Law; And it Also Show A Denial within it's Jurisdiction The Equal Protection of THE LAW.

5. The Trial Court Violated Petitioners 6th and 14th Amendment Right due to THE STATE of ALABAMA clearly Lacking the Evidence of MURDER before, during AND AFTER the Petitioners 2010 TRIAL. Which FACTUALLY PROVE HOPKINS is ACTUALLY INNOCENT. THE STATE Pathologist Autopsy did NOT show A DEATH caused by suicide, Accidental or Homicide. His Autopsy Result only Proved what he Reflected on THE FACE of the indictment that declare THE DEATH is by A "MANNER UNKNOWN" or "Undetermined". THE STATE of ALABAMA, clearly Admitted on THE Record to NOT Reviewing the Medical Record of his Subject before Concluding his Autopsy. This FACT shows that Hopkins, is Substantially deprived of being informed of the NATURE AND CAUSE OF THE MANNER of his WIFE's DEATH. It show A Substantial deprivation of Liberty without Procedural Due Process of Law; And it Substantially deprive AND deny Hopkins within it Jurisdiction THE Equal Protection of THE LAWS.

6. THE Trial Court Violated Petitioners 6th and 14th Amendment by the Lead Prosecutor Coercing her STATE Witness to Commit PERJURY At TRIAL. THE PROSECUTOR KNEW her STATE Testimony At TRIAL would be Premised upon A Lie. It is THE PROSECUTOR, who obtained THE Police Reports that reflected THE Words of her STATE Witness totally AND clearly denying what she CONTRARILY Admitted on the stand At TRIAL. THE STATE NOT ONLY committed PERJURY, but SUBORNATION of PERJURY on THE PART of THE LEAD PROSECUTOR. The PERJURED Testimony did bias THE JURY AS WELL AS deceived them, while Petitioners TRIAL Counsel fail to Motion THE TRIAL Court to STRIKE THE PERJURED Testimony AND have the Witness impeached From TRIAL. This FACT show A Substantial AND Procedural denial of A FAIR TRIAL by AN IMPARTIAL Jury of THE STATE. It show A Procedural denial of Effective Assistance of Counsel for Hopkins Defense. It further show that Hopkins was deprived of Liberty without Procedural Due Process OF

LAW; AND it SUBSTANTIALLY DENY HOPKINS WITHIN its JURISDICTION THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAW.

7. THE TRIAL COURT VIOLATED PETITIONERS 6TH AND 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT DUE TO PETITIONERS TRIAL COUNSEL FAIL TO OBJECT AND FILE A WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE STATES MOTION IN LIMINE REGARDING THE ALLEGE SEX VICTIM TESTING POSITIVE FOR CHLAMYDIA. HOPKINS, WAS BIASELY CONVICTED FOR SEX CRIMES AGAINST HIS ELDEST STEP DAUGHTER, AGE 21 AT TRIAL IN 2010. AT HOPKINS, ARREST ON JULY 28, 2008, SHE WAS 19 YEARS OF AGE WHEN THE STATE TESTED HOPKINS FOR CHLAMYDIA THE ELDEST STEP DAUGHTER ALLEGE SHE CONTRACTED FROM THE PETITIONER. HOPKINS TESTED NEGATIVE. AT TRIAL THE PROSECUTOR MOTIONED TO SUPPRESS THE EVIDENCE. THE MOTION WAS GRANTED. PETITIONERS TRIAL COUNSEL FAILED TO OBJECT TO THE STATES SUPPRESSION OF VITAL EVIDENCE, THAT WAS FAVORABLE TO THE DEFENSE OF THE PETITIONER WHICH WOULD HAVE DISCREDITED THE STATES MAIN WITNESS AND WOULD HAVE PROVEN HOPKINS' INNOCENCE ON ALL ALLEGED SEX CHARGES. THIS FACT SHOW A SUBSTANTIAL DENIAL OF EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL. IT ALSO SHOW A DEPRIVATION OF LIBERTY WITHOUT PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS OF LAW; AND IT SUBSTANTIALLY DENY HOPKINS, WITHIN its JURISDICTION THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAW.

8. THE TRIAL COURT VIOLATED PETITIONERS 6TH AND 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT DUE TO PETITIONERS TRIAL COUNSEL DID NOT OBJECT AND NEITHER DID HE MOTION THE COURT TO DISMISS THE CHARGES BASED ON VENUE ISSUES. THE LEAD PROSECUTOR ALSO MISLED THE JURY AND THE TRIAL COURT REGARDING "WHERE" AND "WHEN" THE SEXUAL OFFENCES OCCURRED. THE STATE PROSECUTOR TOLD THE TRIAL COURT THE ALLEGE SEXUAL OFFENCES HAPPENED IN MOBILE COUNTY AND THEY BEGAN AROUND THE YEAR 2000, UNTIL THE ALLEGE MURDER IN 2004 OF THE MOTHER. ON THE CONTRARY, THE ALLEGE SEX VICTIM TESTIFIED AT TRIAL THE SEX CRIMES OCCURRED IN JACKSON, ALABAMA IN 2001 AND IN THE STATE OF LOUISIANA IN 2003. THE LEAD PROSECUTOR MISLED THE TRIAL COURT TO BELIEVE SHE HAD JUDICIAL CONTROL OR VENUE ON ALL ALLEGE SEX CRIMES CHARGED IN THE MOBILE COUNTY INDICTMENTS. THIS FACT SHOWS A SUBSTANTIAL

DENIAL OF EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL. IT ALSO SHOW A DEPRIVATION OF LIBERTY WITHOUT PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS OF LAW; AND ALSO A SUBSTANTIAL DENIAL OF EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAW.

9. The Trial Court Violated Petitioners 6th AND 14th Amendment Right When Petitioners Trial Counsel Failed to Object to The States Prosecutorial Misconduct When she used 2008 COPY RIGHT PORNOGRAPHIC DVD'S AS EVIDENCE AT TRIAL IN 2010 TO DECEIVE AND MANIPULATE THE JURORS TO THINK THE DVD'S WERE THE SAME DVD'S USED IN THE YEAR OF 2001 2ND DEGREE SODOMY ALLEGATION MADE BY HOPKINS, 21 YEAR OLD STEP DAUGHTER AT TRIAL. IN THE YEAR OF 2001, VHS WAS BEING PREDOMINATELY USED NOT DVD'S. THIS FACT IS A SUBSTANTIAL DENIAL OF EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL. IT SHOW A DEPRIVATION OF LIBERTY WITHOUT DUE PROCESS AND IT SUBSTANTIALLY DENY HOPKINS WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAW.

10. The Trial Court Violated Petitioners 6th AND 14th Amendment Right Due to Petitioners Trial Counsel Did NOT MOTION THE TRIAL COURT TO SEQUESTER THE JURY FROM BEING FURTHER BIASED BY FAMILY, FRIENDS, AND EXCESSIVE NEWS MEDIA DURING THE TRIAL. THIS FACT SHOWS THAT HOPKINS WAS SUBSTANTIALLY DEPRIVED A FAIR TRIAL BY AN IMPARTIAL JURY OF THE STATE. IT DENIED PETITIONER EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL FOR HIS DEFENSE. IT IS A PROCEDURAL DEPRIVATION OF DUE PROCESS AND WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION A DENIAL OF EQUAL PROTECTION OF LAW.

11. The Trial Court Violated Petitioners 6th AND 14th Amendment Right When The Prosecutor Failed to PROVE THE MOTIVE OF THE ALLEGE MURDER. THIS FACT SHOWS A DEPRIVATION OF LIBERTY WITHOUT DUE PROCESS AND WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION A DENIAL OF EQUAL PROTECTION OF LAW.

12. The Trial Court Violated Petitioners 6th AND 14th Amendment Right When Trial Counsel Prejudiced his Defense by directing The Juror's Attention to AN AREA THAT HAD NO RELEVANCE TO

the Charges, Which Shows A Substantial Denial of Effective Assistance of Counsel. A DEPRIVATION OF LIBERTY WITHOUT DUE PROCESS, IT'S JURISDICTION THE DENIAL OF EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAW.

13. The Trial Court Violated Petitioners 6th And 14th Amendment Right When The Alleged SEX Charges Were All Accused to have taken place outside of Mobile County Jurisdiction in Another County And STATE. This Fact Show that Petitioner Was Denied Effective Assistance of Counsel. A DEPRIVATION OF LIBERTY WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF LAW AND IN IT JURISDICTION THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF LAW.

14. The Trial Court Violated Petitioners 4th And 6th Amendment Right When The Prosecutor obtained, opened, and used Hopking, outgoing Mail At Trial Without A Probable Cause Which had no Relevance to the case. This Fact Show that Hopking Was Substantially Denied the Right to Secure his PAPERS Due to UNREASONABLE SEARCH AND SEIZURE WITHOUT PROBABLE CAUSE THAT ACTUALLY PREJUDICED his CASE AT TRIAL. It Show A Denial of Due Process of LAW AND IN IT'S JURISDICTION THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF LAW WAS DENIED.

15. THE TRIAL COURT ABUSED IT'S DISCRETION IN DENIAL OF HOPKING, PETITION FOR RELIEF AND CONVICTION. THE TRIAL COURT DID NOT MAKE AN INDEPENDENT JUDICIAL REVIEW BASED ON THE MERIT OF THE ABOVE CLAIMS. THE TRIAL COURT ADOPTED THE STATES PRE-DRAFTED AND ADVERSE ORDER OF DENIAL. THE TRIAL COURT DID NOT HAVE JURISDICTION OVER THE ALLEGED CRIMINAL MATTERS AND MADE A REVERSIBLE ERROR WHEN DENYING HOPKING, ADEQUATE TIME TO REPLY TO THE STATES RESPONSE BECAUSE THE TRIAL COURT RENDERED his JUDGMENT AND ORDER THE FOLLOWING DAY AFTER THE RESPONSE OF THE STATE, ALONG WITH DENYING HOPKING AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING WHICH IS A SUBSTANTIAL DENIAL OF DUE PROCESS. AND IN IT'S JURISDICTION A DENIAL OF EQUAL PROTECTION OF LAW.

C. THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT VIOLATED PETITIONER'S
HOPKINS' 14TH AMENDMENT:

1. The U.S. District Court Violated the Petitioner's 14TH Amendment Right immediately AFTER THE Hon. U.S. Dist. Magistrate gave her Report And Recommendation, the THE Hon. U.S. Dist. Chief Judge did NOT ALLOW HOPKINS, the OPPORTUNITY to Refute or Respond before issuing his Order And Judgment. His Order And Judgment WAS ISSUED ON MARCH 24, 2016 WHICH WAS 18 DAYS before the Petitioner's due date on APRIL 11, 2016. The Facts OF HOPKINS Objection WAS NEVER Reviewed by Neither U.S. Dist. Magistrate or U.S. Dist. Chief Judge. THE U.S. Dist. Chief Judge did NOT give AN independent Judicial Review of The Facts due to Adopting the U.S. Magistrate's R AND R. This FACT IS A SUBSTANTIAL Showing OF The PETITIONER'S due PROCESS AND EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAW procedurally being Denied.
2. THE U.S. District Court Violated the Petitioner's 14TH Amendment When the U.S. Dist. Chief Judge VACATED his PREVIOUS Order And Judgment ON APRIL 25, 2016 AND ADOPTED THE U.S. Dist. Magistrate R AND R. He Denied HOPKINS Objection AS Time BARRED Without Reviewing And Addressing the EXPLANATION OF EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCE. THE Hon. Magistrate gave HOPKINS, the OPPORTUNITY to save his Petition FROM being Time BARRED by Allowing him to give AN EXPLANATION demonstrating CIRCUMSTANCES excusing his Failure to File within AEDPA's one year limitation. THE Hon. U.S. Dist. Chief Judge did NOT Review And Address the Petitioner's demonstration OF Facts REGARDING EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES. This FACT IS A SUBSTANTIAL Showing OF HOPKINS, being Denied PROCEDURAL due PROCESS AND THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS.
3. THE U.S. District Court Violated the Petitioner's 14TH Amendment

When THE U.S. Dist. Chief Judge Adopted THE U.S. Magistrate Recommendation And Report Without giving AN independent Judicial Review OF Hopkins' Actual Innocent Claim And Neither did he Review Hopkins' 42 U.S.C § 1985 And 42 U.S.C § 1986 Conspiracy Claim. He Also did NOT Review ANY OF THE OTHER Merited Claims that ARE Jurisdictional Issues And ARE NOT Time BARRED. THE U.S. Dist. Chief Judge Issued his ORDER And FINAL Judgment on MARCH 24, 2016, Which WAS 18 DAYS before Hopkins, Sue Date on APRIL 11, 2016. THE U.S. District Chief Judge did NOT Address the Merit OF Hopkins issues. This FACT IS A Substantial Showing OF Hopkins being Denied PROCEDURAL due PROCESS And Within it's Jurisdiction The Equal Protection OF THE LAW.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

DEAR HON. CLERK OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT,

My Name is Anthony J. Hopkins, I have been incarcerated in the State of Alabama, since July 28, 2008. I am Wrongfully Convicted and is absolutely innocent of the Charges of Rape 2nd, SEX Abuse 2nd Sodomy 2nd, Incest and Murder. IN Retrospect, I am the Preacher With the Family Singing gospel group, who had one of the Most Exploited and SENSATIONALIZED high PROFILE Case in the State of Alabama, in Relation to me allegedly Killing My Wife and Placing her in a Freezer.

Nevertheless, I have diligently Exhausted all of my Previous Post Convictions Remedies on Appeal, While the Facts of my Claims have been totally ignored and denied Without Review and Without a Consideration of an Evidentiary hearing. I have Followed the Rules of the Previous Courts on Appeal, but it appears that the injustice I am claiming done against me by the Alabama Authorities are Not Clearly being Understood by the Previous Appeals Courts. Therefore, I have Written this Formal letter to Clearly Convey THE COMPELLING REASONS of such injustice that has Procedurally and Substantially Violated My Constitutional Rights.

I am absolutely innocent and is Unlawfully detained, along with my Entire Appeals Process having been subjected to being biased, Compromised and Prejudiced by Documentary Producers of Major Media Net Works, televising Misleading information about my case throughout the Entire Appeals Process. Presently, as an indigent Prose with No Technical Skills of the Law, I have No other way to Appeal, except by the Truth Revealed in this letter. I Pray this Honorable Supreme Court Review this letter in its Entirety and Under Just Consideration Make a Decision. Not only based on the investigation of the Actual Facts, but also based upon the Fact that the Appeals Court Rulings are Contrary to Law due to the Claims are Undisputed by the Record. Please Take Judicial Notice:

On July 28, 2008, My Eldest 19 year old Step daughter told the Mobile County Authorities that on December 4, 2004, When she was

16 years of age, I was caught by her Mother sexually abusing her in the bathroom of the Resident. She told the Authorities that after this incident her Mother and I had an argument and her Mother was murdered and put in a freezer. (I have two step daughters, four biological daughters and two biological sons by my deceased wife. We were married 10 years).

Immediately after my arrest on July 28, 2008, the following days on July 29 and July 30, 2008, the Chief of Police and the Assistant District Attorney of my case told the News Media, I had killed my wife without first conducting a complete investigation and without allowing the autopsy to be finalized in order to make a full factual determination of the identity, the nature and the cause of death. I have the record of both news documents with the dates showing July 29 and July 30, 2008 and these documents show the names of both law authorities saying that I "killed" my wife without the autopsy report being finalized. I also have the record of the pathologist evidence report showing the date it was released on October 13, 2008. Both law authorities had a willful determination and a reckless disregard to biasly and presumptuously prosecute me as a "killer" without first establishing the true facts and without corroborating the case with at least another witness besides the states only witness, which was my eldest 19 year old step daughter. Clearly at this point, my case was compromised, misleading, biased, prejudiced and my constitutional rights were procedurally and substantially violated.

During this same time in 2008, my second eldest step daughter at age 17 was interviewed numerous of times by the Mobile County Authorities. I have the record of both police interviews in 2008 and 2009, where she consistently denied hearing arguments between me and her mother that would refer to sexual misconduct between me and her eldest sister that would lay a premise for her mother's death. The record also shows where the lead prosecutor of my case used my second eldest step daughter at trial in 2010, falsifying her testimony about hearing an argument between me and her mother and then she admitted to lying, which is clearly perjury and subornation of perjury, because the prosecutor used her at trial knowing my second eldest step daughter would testify contrary to the police reports. My trial counsel failed to motion the trial court to strike her testimony and to have her impeached from trial. He also failed to motion for an acquittal based on the state having no credible witness and for lacking sufficient evidence to corroborate the main witness testimony. Based on the above given facts validated by the states own records, I was substantially and procedurally denied my constitutional rights.

Also, in my Possession are the 2008 Child Advocacy Report and Police interviews of my six biological children, who clearly deny hearing any argument between me and their mother in relation to the allegation on the Police Affidavit, and they also deny any sexual inappropriate behavior against themselves or against their two eldest siblings or sisters by me. The ages of my biological children in the year of 2008 at the time of my arrest was ages 14, 13, 12 and 7 (daughters) 9 and 4 (sons). In the Child Advocacy Report, my second eldest 17 year old step daughter, and my other children, totally deny having any knowledge of me and their mother having an argument or hearing an argument about me sexually abusing my 16 year old eldest step daughter in our residential bathroom in 2004. They were also clueless to any knowledge about their mother being allegedly murdered and according to the report, neither one of them knew their mother was placed in a freezer. They knew nothing about their mother allegedly being murdered or placed in a freezer, until after I was arrested in 2008. According to the records, the state of Alabama, had no one in the family resident to corroborate the allegations told by my eldest 19 year old step daughter given on the evening of July 28, 2008 to the Mobile County Authorities.

The only reason I am charged with the 2nd degree sexual charges is because my eldest 19 year old step daughter told the state of Alabama that I sexually abused her at the age of 12 in the year of 2001 in Jackson, Alabama (Clark County) and in the state of Louisiana, when she was 14 years of age in 2003. Both allegations were outside of the jurisdiction of Mobile County. I have the records that testify to this fact and the record also shows where the lead prosecutor misled the jurors and the trial court regarding "where" and "when" the alleged sexual offenses supposedly had happened. She misled the trial court to believe she had jurisdiction on all the alleged sexual charges in the Mobile County indictments. My trial counsel did not object and neither did he motion the trial court to dismiss the sex charges based on venue issues. Clearly I was substantially denied my constitutional rights. Also, my trial counsel failed to object and file a oral or written response to the states motion in limine regarding my eldest 19 year old step daughter testing positive for chlamydia. Immediately after my arrest on July 28, 2008, the state had me tested for chlamydia, because my eldest step daughter told the authorities she had contracted it from me. I have the medical record that shows I tested negative and the record that shows where my trial

Counsel Failed to Object to the States Suppression of Vital Evidence, that was Favorable to my defense which would have discredited the State's Main Witness and would have Proven my Innocence on all allege SEXUAL Charges.

NEVERTHELESS, IF You investigate the Various News Sources in Relation to my Case during the time Period From July 29, 2008 through September of 2008 and possibly, until the Time of my Trial at April 7, 2010, You will most definitely Find Various News Sources saying that I hit my wife in the Head with a Hammer and put her in a Freezer. OTHER News Sources said I cut her body up in pieces and stored her body parts in the Freezer. Another News Source said I strangled her and put her in the Freezer. Some News Sources said the Preacher sexually abused his little girl, while other News Sources said I sexually abused all eight of my children.

My Case was highly Publicized with Excessive ERRONEOUS and Misinformed News Publicity, that had a Severe Prejudicial Effect on the Public in Mobile County, along with surrounding Counties and States. My Trial Counsel did NOT Motion the Court for a Change of Venue. My Case was a Complete Circus through the Media that made me guilty before and during Trial in 2010. I possess the Records where it show that Forty Eight out of Fifty Voir Dire Jurors admitted to being Exposed to such Media Publicity of the Case and the Record also show SEVERAL JURORS by Name, who clearly Confess to having Fixed Opinions of my guilt due to the News Coverage. Based on the above Facts and the Fact that my Trial Counsel did NOT Motion the Trial Court for a Change of Venue shows that I was Substantially denied a Fair Trial by the State of Alabama. It also show a denial of Effective assistance of Counsel and it further show a deprivation of my Liberty without being provided due Process and in it's Jurisdiction the Equal Protection of the Law.

Out of all of the Mis-informed Lies about my Wifes death the Scientific Analysis of the Autopsy Report Reveals the Contrary. I have Possession of the Autopsy Report and THE States Record that clearly show where the State Pathologist Scientific Analysis did NOT determine any injury to the body of my wife. No sharp force trauma or injury. Absolutely no trauma at all. There were no Fractures as in broken bones or Fractures of the body at all. There were no Lacerations. No Evidence of any

Ligature around the Neck, neither around the Wrist, or Feet, or anything of the body being bound at all. No Evidence of any drugs Found in the Spleen other than Natural Fermentation of Alcohol in the body. The Skull was intact and the scalp didn't show anything revealing in terms of any areas of Trauma. Thyroid Cartilage were intact and there were no absolute Evidence of Strangulation. Nothing that indicates Smothering. No indication of gum and Lip being torn, that would suggest any suffocation. No indications or Evidence of any gun shot wounds or any stab wound. The abdomen, the liver, the pancreas, and the adrenal glands, along with the kidneys was nothing determined. The legs and the rest of the bony skeletal structure did not have any fracture material. The uterus was enlarged due to the defect of the C-section surgery. This is the scientific Analysis of my wife's death and I have the Record as Evidence to prove it.

However, the State Pathologist Scientific Analysis, only Confirmed and revealed what the State of Alabama projected on the face of their Murder indictment that says, "Anthony Hopkins, did Cause the death of Arletha Hopkins, by a 'Manner Unknown' to the grand Jury." As further evidence to my absolute innocence, I possess this particular document. How can I be indicted for Homicide when the State of Alabama, clearly fail to provide the Nature and Cause of my wife's death? How can a defendant be indicted and convicted with Homicide and Undetermined? These are two separate components of death. How can the State of Alabama say that a defendant caused the death of a subject, that the scientific Analysis totally and clearly eliminate the components of Homicide, Accidental, and Suicide? If the Manner of death is "Unknown" then how can the State say that the defendant caused the death? Homicide means the killing of one person by another. The scientific Analysis of any Professional Pathologist will support as clear Evidence to any death when it is either Homicide, Suicide, Accidental or Natural causes. In this particular case, the scientific Analysis resulted with the component of "Undetermined", which means the death of a subject is not Resolute or not Conclusive. It also means that the Manner in which a person die is Unknown or clueless, and it further means the death of any subject have no absolute determination to the Nature and Cause of death. The question is "How" did my wife die and by what means did she die? Where is the scientific Evidence and Circumstantial Evidence to Murder or Homicide? Especially since I am wrongfully convicted and is unlawfully detained in the Primitive, under staffed, over crowded and violent Alabama

Prison System. The state of Alabama can not give a valid or conclusive answer to how my wife died and by what means she died. Especially if a Judge or a Lawyer with integrity and justice seek to know! The Record speaks Contrarily to the State of Alabama's unjust conviction and sentences of my case. And how can the Producers of NBC Universal and T.V. One be authorized to do documentaries on a continual basis showing that I killed my wife without a valid conclusion of her death? Who gave them the Authority and Consent? Who gave them the Authority to use my Name and identity without my Oral or written Consent? This is dirty, unjust, unfair, dehumanizing and degrading! Especially, while I am presently appealing my case for relief. My Trial Counsel fail to challenge the Murder indictment being that the State of Alabama failed to provide the nature and cause of my wife's death. HE also fail to Motion the Trial Court to dismiss the indictment being that I had nothing to defend myself against. THE above facts show that I was procedurally and substantially denied an effective assistance of Counsel and it show a substantial denial of my liberty without due process and in its jurisdiction the Equal Protection of Law.

According to the state's Record that is presently in my possession, the State Pathologist admitted that he did not review my wife's Medical Record before he concluded his Autopsy. The State Pathologist had no clue my wife was admitted into the Hospital due to going into Child labor of our eighth child. My wife had Major C-section surgery. Her blood sugar and Her blood pressure was high and it had to be consistently regulated from November 21, 2004 to November 27, 2004. My wife was given orders at discharge from the Hospital to take a pill by mouth called Glyburide instead of insulin. The State Pathologist had no clue that during his Autopsy, he was suppose to find her discharge medication in her spleen or pancreas. His scientific analysis clearly reveal my wife had no drugs at all found in her spleen or pancreas. The State Pathologist had no clue my wife died 13 days after child birth and 7 days after being released from the Hospital. THE State of Alabama actually failed to do a first hand investigation before determining the conclusion of my wife's death. Had the State Pathologist reviewed my wife's Medical Records, he would have known why he injected "UNKNOWN" on the Murder indictment and he would have known she died by the clear component of natural causes. The above fact show that I was substantially and procedurally denied of being informed of the nature and cause of my wife's death by the state of Alabama. It further show how I was procedurally and substantially denied my liberty without due process and in its jurisdiction the Equal Protection of the Law.

In spite of all of the Injustices Rendered in my Case From the Very Moment of my Arrest in 2008, unto the 2010 Trial and even through out my Post Conviction Appeals Process, a Conspiracy can be Proven based on a Political Underhand, that used my Case to generate the Result. The Lead Prosecutor of my Case, used her Official and Public Office For Personal gain as a State Prosecutor to Campaign during My 2010 Trial, without Reclusing herself or being Reclused. The lead Prosecutor of my Case Campaigned For the Head District Attorney Seat of Mobile County on the Expense of my Trial. My Case turned From a Criminal Trial to a Political Charade, that guaranteed a guilty Verdict without my Constitutional Rights being Regarded by Neither the Trial Judge or any of my Attorneys. What County Would Not Vote For a Prosecutor to become head District Attorney, When Sexual Abuse of a Child and the Murder of the Child's Mother is the Case that the lead Prosecutor is on while Campaigning For Such honorable Seat? It is Not only a Conflict of Interest, but it is a Reckless disregard to Judicial Ethics, and if Not, then at least to an alleged Criminal Defendant, who should have Remained innocent until Proven guilty.

The Trial Judge, THE Prosecution Team and my Trial attorneys were Clearly aware of this injustice and had the Power to prevent it. They Refused to intervene, because the Core Conspirator who is the lead Prosecutor Not only had Motives For Political Advancement on the Expense of Excessive bias News Publicity of my Case, but also For the Financial benefit of the Out Come to all of the State actors very involved. Could this be why the State Record show why the Honorable Trial Judge of my Case allowed such Prejudice in his Court Room after hearing the Jurors of my Voir Dire admit to having Campaign signs of the Lead Prosecutor and admitting to being on her Campaign Committee and also admitting to their Family Members having Campaign signs in their Yards Regarding the Lead Prosecutor? Could this be why the Record show why my Trial Counsel Refused to Motion For a Change of Venue after hearing Jurors admit to having Fixed Opinions of my guilt due to the Excessive News Publicity of the Media? Could this be why he Failed to Motion the Trial Court to have the lead Prosecutor Reclused due to her

Campaign and due to donors admitting their interest in her Campaign? Could this be why I was tried for murder when there were no Nature and cause of death determined? Could this be why I am convicted of 2nd degree sexual charges by the allegations of my 21 year old step daughter in 2010, who allege she was sexually abused in 2001, when she was 12 years of age, with no evidence, but her word and some 2008 copy righted Pornographic DVD's of Professional people used as state exhibits abducted from my house in 2008?

On March 19, 2012, I became Prose to my own case on Post Conviction Appeal immediately after Direct Appeals. I filed claims in Relation to the issues within this letter. On March 27, 2012, ABC Universal wrote me a letter asking if they can interview me to do a unbiased account of my case for their documentary. On September 5, 2013, T.V. One offered the exact same thing in their letter to me. I never talked to either of the Producers, but I told the Warden at Gibb Correctional Facility, I decline both offers, because I did NOT want to compromise and prejudice my Post Conviction Appeal. The Producers did derogatory and demented documentary's of my case entitled "Blood, Lies and Alibis" and "Guins and Secreces". It is obvious there is nothing unbiased about their intentions, but I have copies of both letters that says the contrary. They used my identity and name without my written and oral consent. This show that both Producers are Presumptuous, bias and have a reckless disregard to me declining their deceptive offer. This show that both Producers lied about doing a unbiased account of my case. It also show their intent was Malicious and it prove their efforts to compromise and prejudice my Post Conviction Appeal, because these bias documentary's have been nationally viewed through out my entire Post Conviction Appeal Process from 2013 until now. This is an extension to the conspiracy highly related to the aforementioned state actors of my case to basically do what the lead Prosecutor and Chief of Police did in the beginning of my case, which was stigmatize and brand me as a "Killer" without giving me a fair chance to prove my innocence and without

Receiving a Fair and impartial Trial by Jury. Except these Producers Jobs were to Further brand Me as a Confirmed Semented "Killer" to the Public Nationally through out my Entire Post Conviction Appeal, so that in case of a New Trial, the bias Public will automatically generate a bias Jury with Fixed Opinions of my guilt just like the Jurors at my 2010 Trial. There is no way both Producers could have gathered information and produce their documentary's about my case without Consent of the State actors of Alabama. Both Producers show a clear Connection, a direct agreement and a tacit agreement through their bias and presumptuous actions towards Me about the same Case, as did the State Actors of my Case under the Color of Law.

Therefore, the Producers and the State actors of my Case are all in agreement in their individual Commission of their bias and Presumptuous actions of a Conspiracy with the Lead Prosecutor being the Core Conspirator. The Participants in this Cause and action are Professional Appointees of the Law to serve and protect with signity and integrity in their public Official Capacities. The Rules, laws and Ethics in which they are governed in these Official Capacities are sufficient for a civilized Society. However, the Participants in this Cause and action abused their official Capacities to intentionally and Cognitively act under the Color of Law for one common goal and purpose to the denial and deprivation of my Constitutional Rights.

In Conclusion of the Light of the Facts Presented, My Prayer is that this Honorable Supreme Court of THE UNITED STATES, grant a decision to Review on a Writ of CERTIORARI, due to the Fact that ONE of my basic Points of Prejudice in the Proceeding is that Neither ONE of the Lower Courts Ruled on the Merits of my Claims Raised in this Cause and action Wherein I am NOT Time barred.

Futhermore, THE UNITED STATES Eleventh Circuit abused its discretion due to Failing to Review the Record on the Merit and Facts of the issues Raised in the Proceedings on the basis of the Evidence Submitted as PROOF, and also on the basis that the Facts Validated by the Record is not only Compelling Reasons as Revealed in this letter, but it clearly show that I am Procedurally and Substantially denied My Constitutional Rights, which is a clear Manifestation of Injustice.

In Light of the Level of Albert Pike's Discussion, Which I Also Sustain in this Cause, that the importance of "Provost And Judge" Explains: "Those Who ARE Invested With The Power of Judgment should Judge the Causes of All Persons UP Rightly And IMPARTIALLY, Without Any PERSONAL Consideration of the Power OF the Mighty, or the bribe of the Rich, or the Needs of the Poor... They Must HEAR PATIENTLY, Remember ACCURATELY And Weigh CAREFULLY THE Acts And ARGUMENTS OFFERED before THEM." SEE (MORAIS And Dogma Pg. 126)


WHEREFORE With Premises Considered: I, Anthony JUAN HOPKINS, Respectfully PRAY This Honorable Supreme Court of THE UNITED STATES, UPON THE COMPELLING REASONS ABOVE GRANT THIS PETITIONER REVIEW ON A WRIT OF CERTIORARI, because THE FACTS PRESENTED before This Honorable Court ARE TRUE AND DO INDICATE AND IMPOSE A CLEAR Question OF STATE AND FEDERAL LAW.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony JUAN HOPKINS



Date: JANUARY 1, 2019