

No. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Donald Isaiah

— PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

Julie Jones vs. See  
Dept Corrections

— RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO United States  
Supreme Court Washington DC 20543  
United States court of appeals 11th circuit Atlanta  
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE) Georgia

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Donald Isaiah

(Your Name)

10650 S.W. 46th Street

(Address)

Jasper Florida 32052

(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

Will this Supreme Court overrule State v Weeks  
166 So 2d 892, 895 (Fla) 1964 Could be retroactive?  
Common Day, "Matter" needs purging free from  
providence. A parallel years, flush the thought of  
Mandate, its really a distinction to life. Primary  
Charges first still in existence... needs freeing  
Prob also

## 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. (FIA) Supreme Court of State v Weeks  
166 So 2d 892, 895 1964 Id At 897 in  
Question

2. 11th circuit court of appeals Atlanta  
Georgia (judgment on primary)

3. Northern District court, United States  
Pensacola Florida

## 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	11th circuit court of appeals Atlanta Georgia
APPENDIX B	4th District court of appeals Southern District of Florida case # 2:15 CV 14266 ALR CM/ECF F/16
APPENDIX C	19th Judicial circuit Southern District of Florida case # 562009 CF 3036B CM/ ECF F/16
APPENDIX D	United States Northern District of Florida case # 3:18 CV 335 RVCJK
APPENDIX E	Showing exhibit of Extra-Not Ordinary case
APPENDIX F	

1. State v Weeks <sup>TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED</sup> 16(802d) 892, 895 (FIA) 1964 ~~Ed~~

CASES

2. Steed v Head 219 F3d 1298, 1300 11th Cir 2000. The burden of establishing entitlement resting with petitioner

3. Drew v Dept of Corrections 297 F3d 1278, 1286 11th Cir 2002 post conviction matter civil

4. Miller v Elvcockrell 587 US 322, 123 Sct 1029 (2003) Standard for COA.

5. Slack v McDaniel 529 US 473, 484 2002, reasonable Jurist would find the district court assessment of Constitutional claim debateable or wrong

6. Putnam v Head 268 F3d 4223, 1241 11th circuit 2001 If State court Applied a rule that contradicts United States Supreme Court

7. State ex rel Butterworth v Kenny 714 SO 2d 404, 408 (FIA) 1998 STATUTES AND RULES meaningful Assess

OTHER

# Table of Authorities

By the constitution petitioner of Florida Application in writ of CERTIORARI is in regards to a controlling case, CASE # 16650 20 892, 898 (FLA) 1964 State v Weeks. Admittedly there are those who seem to advocate a form of socialization, with a socialist system in favor to one to show cause, Show cause "2015" District court Docket # 2:15-cv-14266 RLK and to bring together the greatest masses good for the greatest number, A form of Democracy. In 2016 while everyone was being tested with populace (gov, institutions, organizations private and per person with stress test). Then in 2017 and 2018 A different Extra Not Ordinary Avenue for his or her right to speak one's mind in a country founded on the very principles. Also in light of the legal profession that would provide government supplied legal services from the to the tomb so when in question it's not what's in it in case petitioner's but operating in what manner with claims of issuance order. See case reference 2:15-cv-14266 RLK District court Docket #, Also in appeal # 18-10159B from 17th Cir. Its cannot rules to be put in Retrospect we, not retroactive. Fortunately up to this point such a process of socialization has not attracted general judicial endorsement! Until mandated otherwise we have the Supreme court in (FLA) have no intention of negating

existing precedents to the mind of a  
farsighted prudential graveyard. Id. at  
897. With conflicts and interests in case  
to a fundamental flaw in the system.  
Should be addressed in language and  
expressed in favor to this. Written in  
Bd'l to reopen case in 1 year's time  
frame, petitioner addressed the 11th Cir  
that showing Extra not Ordinary not  
Ordinary circumstances. Steed v. Head  
219 F.3d 298, 1300 11th Cir 2000. The  
Burden of establishing entitlement to  
this extra not Ordinary remedy rested  
with the Petitioner. In Pet. Drane case  
the burden of extra not Ordinary remedy  
rested with petitioner never seeking filing  
extra but just establishing prof. Then  
is Drew v. Dept of Corr 297 F.3d 1278  
1286 11th Cir 2002. As well as a postconvict  
matter 13 Civil, Petitioner against  
State of Florida. # 3:18-cv-335 RV-CJK.  
Both had to demonstrate just in light

#1 That he has been pursuing his rights diligen-  
tly #2 that some <sup>extra</sup> Ordinary circum-  
stance in Drew v Dept of corr 297 F  
3d 1278 1286 11th Cir 2002 case but  
in Petitioner Extra NOT Ordinary in case  
Now from the panel Petitioner was  
Seeking a favorable order authorizing  
the District court to consider a  
Second or successive petition for a  
writ of habeas corpus. Such  
Authorization may be granted only

NO merits  
Dismissed  
Court found  
that the  
plaintiff's  
claims were  
not within  
the jurisdiction  
of the court  
and dismissed  
the case.  
The court  
then issued  
a writ of habeas  
corpus  
to the  
defendant  
and ordered  
him to appear  
in court  
on a specific  
date.

if (A)(B)(D)(E) are met in the 11th Cir. The 11th Cir Dismissed from lack of jurisdiction issued mandate with the right to redress according to 11th Cir R 27.2 Dismissed Judgment on May 11th 2013 Now with Judgment in reiterating where Application relies on dates which for filing expected by state action in violation of the Constitution. The dates on which the constitutional right was initially recognized by the Supreme Court And (due to petitioner's) argues And term, the dates on which the factual predicate of the claims presented, where discovered through the exercise of due diligence. Prior Application raised claim wherein issues on which COA is sought point and fact. In the US Supreme Court decision in Miller v Elv Cockrell 537 US 322 123 SCt 1029 (2003) the court clarified the standard standards for issuance of COA But also in fact (given Slack) Id 123 SCt at 1034 citing Slack v Mc Daniel 529 US 473 484 (2000) Where a district court has rejected the constitutional claim on merits the showing required to satisfy 2253 (C) is straight forward the petitioner must demonstrate that reasonable Jurist would find the the district courts assessment of the constitutional claim debatable or wrong. Again Show cause District

Case # 2:15cv14266 RLR. In total petitioner insufficient First 3850 initial Motion that was dismissed due to extensive string of case law and in clear to the trial court lead to the District Court for appeal. And also due to fact that a Post conviction Motion is also a civil matter. petitioner clarified Isaiah didn't indicate why application relied on Newly Discovered at the higher court, reasons as such On a lower level of proceeding see Evans v. Davis 546 US 189, 197 (2006) In said hold it was held that only a timely appeal tolls A.E.D.P.A.'s 1 year limitation period for the time between the lower courts adverse decision and the filing of a notice of appeal in the higher courts. Where law establishes what is required in post conviction relief proceedings whether Capital or non Capital is that the defendant have meaningful access to the judicial process. State v. expel Butterworth v. Kenny 714 So.2d 404 408 (CITA 1998) In fact also where petitioner tried to show cause after a show cause was issued on a newly Discovered claim, but due to the penal system petitioner was denied time and again. In as much the District Court not setting out the judgement in a separate document so Mr. Isaiah had until Wed August 20th 2017 to file a notice of appeal.

Mailing privilege see Exhibit, One  
hereof, went to the other, who  
still in time line for 14 years A. E. A. P.'s  
temptation. (With Exhibit showing of  
information with doubt, Some favors  
and rule in Part to the Supreme  
Court decision in Miller v. Cockrell  
537 U.S. 322, 123 Sct 1029 (2003) where  
Sarah was legally insufficient for  
failing to be sufficient, clear and  
specific with fact of fraud (age  
causing Prejudice About Juror of  
reason) Id at 1039 Citing Baraboo  
v Estelle 463 U.S. 880 (1983)

Meaning Petitioner does not have to  
prove that district court was wrong  
because it was clear to see that  
the Petitioner was thought about otherwise  
From Show Cause from District court  
Due to Slack and Jurisdiction the  
Petitioner prays that the Supreme Court  
find the District court Assessment  
from this court of the Constitutional  
claims wrong years later. In Deltimathy  
as the Florida Supreme court has  
expressed but under Petitioner  
language term. It sought remedies  
From milestones to do away with  
sentence, Emergency rehear, 2nd  
Whatever the court deems for a  
Jursprudential graveyard without  
a mandate issuing order. Matter  
in dualist thinking matter regarded  
as opposite mind

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.  
*On Primary Charges but issue Writ relief Order for both  
matters primary and One in Question  
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 11th circuit court of Appeals  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 4th District court of Appeals  reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
[ ] is unpublished. Southern District of Florida  
CASE# 2:15-cv-14266 RJK

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

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix C to the petition and is 19th Judicial circuit case # 562009CF3036B  reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
[ ] is unpublished. CM/ECF P/ces

The opinion of the United States District court Northern District of Florida appears at Appendix D to the petition and is CASE# 3:18-cv-335-RVCJK  reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
[ ] is unpublished.

Appendix E

1.  
In showing Exhibits of Extra Not Ordinary  
CASE

**JURISDICTION**

**Case #18-10157-B**

For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was March 01, 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: May 11th 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 March 1, 2017  
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix A.

A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: By Drawing of United States Appeal Court Judgment, 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).

### CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Claim by the Constitution. Issues on Which C.A.T. Is  
Caught 11th circuit court of appeals. Jurists of  
reason could disagree with the District court  
resolution of Petitioners constitution claim or  
Jurist could conclude the issues presented are  
adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed  
further. During trial court stage Jury Selection  
several prospective Juror's voiced their concern's  
(R1: p144-55) Supreme Law in question also under  
Article VI the United States with Treaties  
explaining how prisoners should be treated not  
only on a domestic level but with other country's  
and agreeing to General principles so again will  
the Supreme Court overrule State v Weeks 166 So  
2d 892, 895 (1964) Id at 897 A postconviction movant  
does not have the same panoply of constitutional  
rights? Which are afforded to a defendant in a  
criminal prosecution right. But there's a distinction  
Supreme law in question. Holding that the petitioner  
right to show there's a fundamental flaw in a Soci  
alist system can be protected (State decision) but  
only to stand by that which is discovered from Petition  
ers term in knowledge. Defining the significance in  
Florida Supreme Court has expressed there  
exists a distinction between the organic entitle  
ment to counsel in direct criminal prosecutions  
from the claimed right of assistance in collateral  
proceedings. State v Weeks 166 So 2d 892, 895  
(FIA) 1964 Id at 897 Admittedly there are  
these who seem to advocate a form of socialization  
of the legal profession that would provide

government supplied legal services from the cradle to the  
grave. Fortunately up to this point such a process of Judicature  
has not attracted general Judicial endorsement. Until  
Mandate otherwise we have no intention of relegating  
existing precedents to the limbo of a Jurisprudential  
graveyard. So what weight is due to stare decisis when  
evaluating the distinction between Entitlement to living  
A constitutional right. So pursuant to law and Which  
He argues amongst the difference in hopes that the court  
not only rule to the rule in which its governed but to  
law and its term Violations of the United States  
Constitution, Black Letter law and common law. Open  
mind for the accumulated wisdom of Judges and courts  
respect for the Roman movement and Petitioners dreams.  
Not a power struggle Jurisdiction to Jurisdiction but  
in regards to futile respect to David Souter magistrate  
Suzan in in the 90's method of reading. Now with Po-rum  
Matter du bist spirit uncommon needs purging free  
from charge pronunciamce Wherefore free from Socialist  
thinking Supreme law in question Also under Article VI  
The United States with treaties explaining how prisoners  
Should be treated not only on a domestic level but  
with other countries and agreeing to General principles  
so again Will the Supreme Court overrule State  
v Weeks 166 So 2d 892, 895 (1964) Id at 897

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

No one's above the Law! But this is a legal case, when striking with indistinguishable facts... Therefore with Federalism 11th circuit appeal court gives Jurisdiction with Putnam v Head 268 F.3d 1223, 1241 11th circuit 2001 Also on a lower level with facts its clearly seen where the Judge issued a writ then now became inorganic. A faction working against my main body also causing faction conflict within a Organization respondent FIA Dept of Corrections therefore needs interventionism due to Good Causes Pardon repeat to make America Great, Clarification or release from further punishment of a crime

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Reason such as, when issuing verdict as well as judgement it was on petition to assert violations. Again such as Jurist of reason and Doubt at trial stage and also appeal levels when highest court applied (rule) of writ in District that contradicts the United States Supreme Court case law. Petitioners also applied law concerning postconviction matters being civil as well in Whishes that one of two couple graces be ruled on for relief liberty due to all human beings. knowing what the Framers intended so with this case I only imagine now for it to be inorganic this petition is not to have a lesser struggle but with humanity that where the petitioner receives relief although I contravene there's still the right to liberty sought through due diligence. Primary there's the discovery of downward departure codef. plea Now After the Show cause and traverse the question is not what's in him but operating and issuing judgement who? and what depriving matter is the distinction when try to see again <sup>standard</sup> remedies Enediate New trial for the circumstance by new. Termination of the case in light of terms what lies in the body (faction) so in favor to the stream line. Petitioner will not mislead with this case but in hopes of the Justice leauge knowing that Petitioners is prose with this misfortune (injury) this doesn't continue to be a case of exploitation but direct view the Genius of the Constitution rest not in any static meaning it might have had in a world that is dead and gone but in Acceptability of its Great Principles to cope with current problems and current needs.

William Brennan

## **CONCLUSION**

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Donald S. Sarokin

Date: July 27th 2018