

No. 18-7481

ORIGINAL

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

JAN 04 2019

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Petition for a writ of certiorari

Olando Ray Workman — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

Robert Perry
James P Walsh — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

UNITED STATES court of appeals fourth circuit

(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Olando Ray Workman

(Your Name)

990 wisacky HIGHWAY Lee County prison F4/1154

(Address)

Bishopville SC 29010

(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- (1) IS IT Lawfull for an officer of The Law and his Lawyer an officer of The Court To knowingly and willfully with corruptly intent deliberately file false documentation in The UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT That They know was false?
- (2) What constitutional Rights was violated by officer Robert J Perry and his lawyer James P Walsh when They file false documentation in The UNITED STATES DISTRICT?
- (3) after The District courts found out That The document was false why Didn't They Uphold Their Constitution Duties?
- (4) How do The SUPREME COURT of The UNITED Enforce The Constitution after They see some1 have violated The civil rights of a black man?

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 AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

NA

STATUTES AND RULES

NA

OTHER

NA

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 _____; 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☒ is unpublished.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 _____; 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☐ is unpublished.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 _____; 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 10/26/2018.

☐ 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: 11/27/2018, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix A.

☐ 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 _____.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix _____.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied 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. § 1257(a).

const. CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

"U.S.C.A. ^{const.} Amendment, 14, § 1 CONSTITUTION Equal Protection ~~██████~~ → 11
→ 1

"U.S.C.A. CONST. Amendment, 14 § 1 CONSTITUTION Due Process"

"U.S.C.A. CONST. Amendment, 14 - ARTICLE XIV, SECTION 1, SECTION 5."

"U.S.C.A. CONST. Amendment, 11 - Article IX"

"42 U.S.C.A § 1983 CIVIL RIGHTS legislation"

"Racial Discrimination"

"18 U.S.C.A former § 51 [NOW 18 U.S.C.A. ~~former~~ § 241]"

"U.S.C.A. CONST. Amendment, 4th § 1 violation"

"U.S.C.A CONST. Amendment 1st § 1 retaliation"

"willfully knowingly corruptly False Affidavit"

[conspiracy to fraud with corruptly malice the UNITED-
STATES Government Federal Courts Systems

"official misconduct Investigating corruption among STATE officials"

"ETHNIC Discrimination"

"Conspiracy To Effect racial Discrimination"

"Person acting under color of State law"

"STATE Racial Discrimination"

"SLANDER"

"ATTEMPT TO overthrow The Constitution of U.S.C.A with corruptly intent"

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Complainant brings This Complaint against Robert Perry and his lawyer James P Walsh who knowingly and willfully with corruptly filed a deliberately recklessly false Affidavit in The Federal Courts systems That They Know was false and misleading with corrupt intent by way of ~~retaliation~~ retaliating on me for filing a Civil Rights U.S.C.A § 1983 law suit on officer Robert Perry for going To my mail Box and open it up and reading and or going Trough my mail with out a search warrant violating my 4th amendment rights of The Constitution. The warrant or Affidavit That was false and misleading was Dismissed NO 2016A23302C9659. officer Robert Perry and James P Walsh Discrimination act was a corruptly Racial violation against me because I am black and They Think That it is ok To file knowingly deliberately recklessly with corruptly intent false Affidavit on a black man in The Federal Courts systems That They know To be false and misleading violating my constitution Federal Protected civil Rights and DISRespecting The Federal Courts like They are a bove The UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION and The SUPREME COURT LAW of The LAND U.S.C.A.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Should grant me This Petition for write of Certiorari cases involving construction of This clause must depend upon decisions of THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT AMEND 1ST WITH 4th, 5th with The 14th, and ARTICL XIV WITH ARTICLE IX The Concepts of equal protection of the Law and due process both stem from The American ideal of fairness and are not mutually exclusive nor are The concepts always interchangeable, in That equal protection of the Law, but is a more explicit safeguard of prohibited unfairness than due process of the Law, but a discrimination may nevertheless be so unjustifiable as to be violative of due process That the majority meaning The lower courts used The bear minima of Their Constitutional duties in The courts Judgment in cases with police officer and Their Lawyers knowingly and willfully with corruptly file false documentation in The Federal Courts System. Like our federal Constitution rights protect Them from violating clearly establish Amendments of The constitution in with witch The majority action in dismissing Cases involving officer misconduct goes against The SUPREME COURT Law of The land of Enforcing The Constitution of The UNITED STATES and The fact That The DISTRICT COURT in Greenville South Carolina and The fourth Circuit Court of Appeals have an "Conflicting Issue of the law at hand on my case" The SUPREME COURT has enunciated a Two part Test for determining whether a defendant has acted under color of state and local law³¹¹⁰ First The Claimed deprivation must be caused by The exercise of a right or Privilege created or imposed by The state or undertaken by a person for whom The state is responsible.³¹¹¹ second, The defendant must be fairly characterized as a state actor.³¹¹² The Court has provided at least Three examples of conduct That satisfies both Prongs of §1983 "under color of state law" requirement. The first exampl

is The misuse of power, possessed by virtue of state law and made possible only because The wrongdoer is clothed with authority of The State law. ^{3113g} Officer Robert J Perry "The second example is action by a defendant who "has acted Together with or has obtained significant aid from state officials," Though not an officer of The State ³¹¹⁴ "James P Walsh lawyer for Greenville County sheriff's office. The Third example is an action by a private person who is authorized to exercise state authority, Officer Robert J Perry and James P Walsh acted under color of state law when They knowingly and willfully with corruptly intent file false untruthfull documentation in a UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT and The courts knew They was false but did nothing to Enforce Their Constitutional duties out of being rebellion against The U.S. CoA rights of a black man The decision of The lower courts conflicts with important matters That The Supreme Court should use its Discretionary power To uphold Their Constitutional Duties To Justice ^{CONCLUSION} Their ruling on This case.

"relief" 18,000,000.00 from Robert J Perry
18,000,000.00 from James P Walsh

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Claudio Roy Workman

Date: 12/21/2018