

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

MICHAEL R. SPENGLER — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

L.A. SUPERIOR COURT, et al. — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

MICHAEL R. SPENGLER - #3984203
(Your Name)

T.F.C.F. 450 BAUCHET ST. - COUNTY JAIL
(Address)

LOS ANGELES, CA 90012 (pro-per)
(City, State, Zip Code)

N/A (PRISONER)
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

THE L.A. SUPERIOR COURT, D.A. OFFICE AND THE LOS ANGELES SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT INSIDE THE JAIL HAVE ADOPTED AND IMPLEMENTED A "WIDESPREAD" POLICY LABELED THE PERKINS OPERATION PURSUANT TO U.S. SUPREME COURT CERTIORARI ILLINOIS V. PERKINS 496 US 292 (1990) WHERE UNDER COVER AGENTS ARE PLACED INSIDE LIVING QUARTERS WITH THE INMATE TARGET: "PERKINS", WHERE MIRANDA WARNINGS ARE NOT REQUIRED AND THE AGENT TAPE RECORDS/DIRECTLY INTERROGATES "PERKINS/TARGET" ON CRIMES WHERE THE SIXTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO COUNSEL IS NOT ATTACHED. HOWEVER, THE LASD ARE USING MEXICAN MAFIA KNOWN SHOTCALLER INMATES, WHO ARE SENT INTO THE LIVING QUARTERS TO TELL THE TARGET: "PERKINS" THAT HE AND HIS FAMILY HAVE A GREENLIGHT AND HIT ON THEIR LIVES AND GO INTO ELABORATE DETAILS OF "MAFIA POLITICS" OF HOW AND WHY, AND THE TARGET'S ONLY RECOURSE IS TO PURCHASE AND/OR RECEIVE PROTECTION FROM HIM INCLUDING CONFESSING HIS CRIMES FOR CREDIBILITY PURPOSES. THERE ARE OTHER INSTANCES WHERE THEY POSE AS HITMEN AND ASSASSINS TO WITNESSES IN THE TARGETS SIXTH AMENDMENT ATTACHED CASE. THESE ARE QUESTIONS OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE AFFECTING MANY PEOPLE, AND IN NO WAY DO I SEEK TO CORRECT LOWER COURT ERRORS OR DECISIONS, BUT I SEEK TO REVIEW THIS ADOPTED AND PERHAPS MISAPPLIED CASE LAW POLICY AS IT CONTRADICTS CASES IN OTHER COURTS THAT THIS OPERATION IS A PRODUCT OF COERCION.

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) LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT
(L.A. SUPERIOR COURT)
210 W. TEMPLE ST. L.A. CA 90012
- 2) L.A. SUPERIOR DISTRICT ATTORNEY OFFICE
210 W. TEMPLE ST. LA CA 90012
- 3) L.A.S.D. LOS ANGELES SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT
211 W. TEMPLE STREET - L.A. CA 90012
- 4) ATTORNEY GENERAL
312 N. SPRING STREET - LA CA 90012
- 5) BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
500 W. Temple Street
L.A. CA 90012
(ADD ON, UPON NEW INFORMATION)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE : → 4-9, 310-14 (CASE LAW)	15
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....	16
CONCLUSION.....	

INDEX TO APPENDICES (AFTER conclusion)

APPENDIX A	DECISION OF THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT
	IMMEDIATE DENIAL AND 9 TH CIRCUIT
APPENDIX B	APPEAL AND DENIAL (5 PGS. TOTAL) AT THE END
	→ JAILHOUSE INFORMANT POLICIES
APPENDIX C	AND ACTIONS WITHIN THE JAIL/COURTS
APPENDIX D	
APPENDIX E	
APPENDIX F	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED
(CASE LAW USED)

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

- LIST OF CASES
APPLICABLE TO THIS
WRIT

- 3

- 6th Amendment
- IN RE WILSON 3 CAI 4th 945
- US V. LENTZ 419 F SUPP 2d 945
- PEOPLE V. CATILLI 1991, 227 CAI APP
- US V. ARNOLD 106 F 3d *
- US V. JOHNSON 196 F SUPP 2d 795
- MASSIAH V. U.S., MAINE V. MOUTON,
3rd/9th Cir. CIRCUMVENTION/INTERWOVEN,
- US V. HENRY
- All of which are 6th Amendment ~~ILLEGALITIES~~

10-11

STATUTES AND RULES 5th Amendment Questions!

- ~~II/ARIZONA~~ V. FULMANTER/
- MIRANDA V. ARIZONA — PG. 11-12
- ILLINOIS V. PERKINS,
- MILLER V. FENTON, SPANO V.
- NEW YORK, etc. — PG. 13
- MISC. AB359/4001.75 — PG. 13
- YANGER ABSTENTION — PG. 13
- CITY OF LONEBEACH — PG. 14-15
- 715 F 3d 750 — PG. 14
- § BUCKLEY V. FITZSIMMONS — PG. 14
- 509 US 259 /
- 20 F.3d 789

OTHER

Appendix A & B
AFTER CONCLUSION & LAST:
DECISIONS BY FEDERAL COURTS AND
JAILHOUSE INFORMANT POLICIES

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 #18-55213; 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 2:18-cv-00097-REK-JRP; 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 9.19.2018.

☒ 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: _____, 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 _____.
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).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

- 1) ILLINOIS V. PERKINS 496 U.S. 292 (1990)
- 2) MIRANDA V. ARIZONA 384 U.S. 436 (1966) (5th)
- 3) MASSIAH V. UNITED STATES 377 U.S. 201 (1964), U.S. CONSTITUTION SIXTH AMENDMENT AND DUE PROCESS, -
- 4) MAINE V. MOUTON 474 U.S. 159 (1985) AND UNITED STATES V. HENRY 447 U.S. 264 (1980);
- 5) MILLER V. FENTON, 474 U.S. 104, 109-110 (1985); SPANO V. NEW YORK 360 U.S. 315, 320-321 (1959)
- 6) • 302 ~ • 304 ILLINOIS V. PERKINS 496 U.S. 292 (1990) JUSTICE BRENNEN DISSENT, -
- 7) 3rd/9th/Federal FACTUALLY INTERWOVEN INEXTRICABLY INTERTWINED 6th AMENDMENT EXCEPTION, YOUNGER ABSTENTION EXCEPTIONS
- 8) ARIZONA V. FUJIMANTE 499 U.S. 279 (1991) (U.S. SUPREME COURT?)
- 9) IN RE WILSON 3 CAL. 4th 945, 952-953 113 CAL. RPT. 2d 269 838 P 2d 122/2; U.S. VS. LENTZ 419 F SUPP. 2d 794
- 10) ASSEMBLY BILL 359/PC 4001.1,
- 11) PEOPLE V. CAELLI (1991) 227 CAL. APP 3d 1434 [278 CAL. RPT. 452]
- 12) UNITED STATES V. ARNOLD 106 F.3d 37 AND U.S. V. JOHNSON 196 F. SUPP. 2d 795

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

TO THE HONORABLE JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT. COMES NOW, THE PETITIONER MICHAEL R. SPENGLER TO HAVE A FEDERAL / CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION ANSWERED ON BEHALF OF THE PUBLIC THAT IT AFFECTS. I SOUGHT REVIEW IN BOTH THE DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA AND 9TH CIRCUIT WHO DISMISSED IT ON THE "YOUNGER ABSTENTION" GROUNDS - THEREFORE IT WAS FRIVOLOUS. (SEE YOUNGER ABSTENTION DOCTRINE) I SOUGHT A WRIT OF MANDATE FOR THE FEDERAL COURTS TO REVIEW THE ILLINOIS V. PERKINS 496 U.S. 292 - CASE LAW IMPLEMENTED AS A POLICY BY THE L.A. SUPERIOR COURT AND D.A. OFFICES AND FUNDED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS + COURTS. YOUR HONORS, THE SHERIFFS + D.A.'S ARE MEETING WITH INMATES THAT ARE IN THE MEXICAN MAFIA, INSIDE THE JAIL GIVING THEM A TAPE RECORDER AND SENDING THEM AS THEIR 'PERKINS' AGENTS' INTO THE TARGET'S (PERKINS) LIVING QUARTERS. THESE "MAFIA SHOTCALLERS" THEN TELL THE TARGET (PERKINS) THAT HE HAS A MAFIA HIT ON HIS AND HIS FAMILIES LIFE TO COERCE THE INMATE TARGET TO "PURCHASE HIS PROTECTION" AND PROVIDE CREDIBILITY OF HIMSELF BY CONFESSING TO HIS CRIMES. THE TARGET IS USUALLY ONE WHERE HE IS SUSPECTED OF OTHER CRIMES WHERE SIXTH AMENDMENT IS NOT ATTACHED, AND THE SOLE ISSUE IN ILLINOIS V. PERKINS WAS "MIRANDA (VS. ARIZONA) WARNING" APPLICABILITY. THERE ARE OTHER INCIDENTS WHERE THEY POSE AS "HITMEN" / "ASSASSINS" TO "WITNESSES" ON COUNSEL ATTACHED CASES OR TO INQUIRE ABOUT SPECIFIC EVIDENCE IN THE ~~II~~ ATTACHED CASES, (BUT NOT NECESSARILY ABOUT THE CRIME ITSELF) THEREFORE "ADMISSIBLE" - YOUR HONORS - THESE ARE PRODUCTS OF COERCION AND ~~II~~ INFRINGEMENTS AND MUST BE RULED AS SUCH. THANK-YOU - IN MY CASE THE B.O.S. DA GAVE THE MAFIA / JHE \$20,000

#5

POST STATEMENT - 1

I SHALL USE AN EXAMPLE IN MY CASE: WHERE I AM INDICTED ON 1 MURDER CHARGE VICTIM MARCUS NIETO BY A JAILHOUSE INFORMANT BEING SENT IN TO MY LIVING QUARTERS WHO WAS A MAFIA SHOTCALLER. ALLEGEDLY: I WAS TOLD I HAD A HIT ON MY LIFE FROM THE MAFIA AND NEEDED TO CONFESS MY CRIMES (AND SEEK HIS PROTECTION) SO THAT I COULD PROVIDE CREDIBILITY OF MYSELF TO HIM. MY 6TH AMENDMENT WAS NOT ATTACHED ON THAT NIETO 187 BUT I WAS BEING SUSPECTED AND QUESTIONED BY POLICE FOR IT MANY TIMES.

FURTHERMORE, I AM ALSO ACCUSED OF ASKING OR HAVING HIM BE A HITMAN/ASSASSIN TO KILL A WITNESS ON MY VI ATTACHED OTHER 187 CHARGE IN WHICH I WAS PENDING TRIAL AND IN JAIL FOR 2 1/2 YEARS: VICTIM MICHAEL MEZA THAT MAY HAVE WITNESSED THE 187

statement

to

IN WHICH HE "AGREED TO DO"
AND IN ORDER TO DO THE HIT
HE NEEDED INFORMATION ABOUT
THE WITNESS, THE CRIME, AND
CREDIBILITY OF MYSELF ABOUT MY
VI AND NON VI ATTACHED CRIME,
OF BOTH MURDERS.

THESE TACTICS ARE 'OFFICIAL' TACTICS
UNDER THE PERKINS OP/POLICY -
BUT ARE CONFLICTING IN CASE LAW,
AND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
PAID THIS MAFIA INMATE \$20,000
DESPITE A.B. 359 AND IMPLEMENTED
AND VOTED TO ADOPT THIS POLICY.
ARIZONA V. FULMANTER IS CLEAR ON
COERCION, ILL. VS. PERKINS IS ONLY
A MIRANDA ISSUE & NON VI ATTACHMENT,
BUT IN RE WILSON AND OTHERS ARE
CLEAR ABOUT POSING AS "HIT MAN"
ON "MASSIAH" ATTACHED CASES REGARDLESS
IF INSTIGATED BY DEFENDANT OR THE
JAILHOUSE INFORMANT.

BUT THE L.A. COURTS/DA/LAST
RELY ON ILLINOIS V. PERKINS
• A.B. 359 FORBIDING MONEY OR DIRECT

(7)

Statement

BECAUSE IT IS A BINDING USSC DECISION AND IS CLEAR THAT JHIS (JAILHOUSE INFORMANTS) CAN TARGET AND ELICIT FROM PERKINS TARGETS: ME ON NON VI ATTACHED NON MIRANDA ELICITATIONS. HOWEVER, FILL-VS. PERKINS MENTIONS BUT DOES NOT FULLY ADDRESS ISSUES SUCH AS ASSEMBLY BILL 359 & 400.1b ARIZONA V. FULMANTO BUT ALSO IN RE WILSON / CATTELLI / ARNOLD / LENTZ ETC. - THAT ANYTIME A CELLMATE COMES FORWARD TO THE PROSECUTION TELLING THEM THAT THE DEFENDANT WANTS HIM TO FIND A HITMAN TO ELIMINATE A WITNESS ON HIS CASE AND THEY TRANSFORM INTO THE HITMAN, IT VIOLATES "MASSIAH / ~~VI~~ / MAULTON / HENRY BUT IT MY CASE AS WELL AS OTHERS, THE ISSUE IS THAT HE ALLEGEDLY WANTED ME TO CONFIRM MY CREDIBILITY TO HIM OF MY CRIMES SO THAT HE COULD "GET THAT DONE" THE HIT, AND REMOVE THE HIT, ETC.

FURTHERMORE, THE ISSUE OF RELIABILITY ALSO NEEDS TO

Statement

⑧

be addressed. THIS MAN & THESE INMATES ARE IN THE MAFIA AND PAID \$1,000'S OF DOLLARS, AND IN MY CASE \$20,000. He further Flunked his polygraph, AND received NUMEROUS IN CUSTODY ASSAULT WRITUPS / STABBINGS, GET OUT OF JAIL FREE CARD, AND MY VERSION IS THAT HE IS THE ONE WHO HAD SAID THE MAFIA HAD PLACED THE HIT ON THE WITNESS, NOT ME, ONLY THAT I MUST COMPLY AS PART OF THE DEAL, CONSISTANT WITH WITNESSES STATEMENTS, WHO WITNESSED HIM COERCING / ATTACKING ME & STEALING MY DISCOVERY, ETC.

REGARDLESS, THE ISSUE AT HAND here is the validity, veracity, reliability AND CONSTITUTIONAL SAFEGUARDS THAT MUST BE addressed AND ENFORCED.

THE ISSUE IS DUE PROCESS VOLUNTARINESS AND DECEPTIVE POLICE PRACTICES.

I AM NOT THE ONLY VICTIM. THIS AFFECTS THE PUBLIC AS A WHOLE. CAN PERKINS BE USED BY THE MAFIA TO ISSUE SHAM HITS, ETC. AS A WAY TO ELICIT...

Statement

BECAUSE JUSTICE BRENNEN IN *ILL. VS. PERKINS* DISENTED BECAUSE IN *PERKINS*, HE WAS TRICKED INTO CONFESSING TO A MURDER AS A WAY TO PROVIDE CREDIBILITY TO A SHAM ESCAPE PLOT. I AM NO DIFFERENT. *ARIZONA V. FULMANT* MUST BE INCORPORATED INTO *PERKINS* BUT LIKE I SAID, THIS ISSUE IS SEMI ALREADY DECIDED IN *ILL. V. PERKINS*. HOWEVER... IN *RE WILSON/ARNOLD/ETC.* SAYS IT IS A VI CIRCUMVENTION & ILLEGAL UNDER *MASSIAH/MOULTON* TO POSE AS AN ASSASIN/HITMAN, TO A WITNESS IN A SUSPECTS VI ATTACHED CASE. AND IN MY OPINION AND HINTED IN *ILL. VS. PERKINS*, DOES NOT COMPLY WITH DUE PROCESS IF THE POLICE TAKE STEPS PHAVE THE J.H.I. BE THE MAFIA HITMAN AND ELICIT INFORMATION ABOUT A SUSPECTS CRIMES AS A CREDIBILITY TEST SO THE SHAM HIT CAN BE DONE? ETC. ESPECIALLY WHEN THE J.H.I. INITIATES IT AND CLAIMS THE HIT WAS ALREADY PUT ON BY THE MAFIA AND I MUST COMPLY AND ASSIST THEM, ETC. AS PART OF REMOVING MY HIT, ETC.

CASE LAW: statement 10

- IN RE WILSON, 3 CAL 4TH 945, 952-953, 13 CAL RPT2D 20 269 838 P. 2d 1222

- U.S. V. LENTZ 419 F. Supp. 2d 794

- PEOPLE V. CARILLI (1991) 227 CAL. App 3d 1434 [278 CAL. RPT2D 452]

- UNITED STATES V. ARNOLD 106 F. 3d 37 AND U.S. V. JOHNSON 196 F. Supp 2d 794 - AND

DE A

"ANYTIME A DEFENDANT'S ROOM-MATE IN THE JAIL APPROACHES THE POLICE AND SAY DEFENDANT WANTS A HITMAN TO KILL A WITNESS ON HIS VI ATTACHED CASE, AND THE POLICE TRANSFORM THAT INMATE/AGENT INTO THE HITMAN, IT IS IN VIOLATION OF MASSIAH:

- MASSIAH V. UNITED STATES 377 U.S. 201 (1964); MAINE V. MOULTON 474 U.S. 159 (1983), U.S. V. HENRY 447 US 264 (1980)

BECAUSE IT CIRCUMVENTS ON DEFENDANTS RIGHT TO COUNSEL - MOULTON RECOGNIZES THIS AS INTERROGATION EVEN BY MERE PARTICIPATION

31
CASE LAW #2 ^{at 11/2}

- Furthermore, 3rd/9th Cir. / Federal courts recognize this as a FACTUALLY interwoven exception.
- SECOND, when a Jailhouse INFORMANT ASKS QUESTIONS REGARDING EVIDENCE IN MY VI attached 187 MEZA CASE SUCH AS THE GUN or cellular phone but NOT NECESSARILY of the MURDER, VI AMENDMENT IS STILL VIOLATED AND INTERWOVEN.

II COERCION

- 3rd- AS far as ARIZONA V. FULMINANTE, 499 US 279 (1991) A confession may not be obtained by any sort of threat, promise, fear, coercion, or implied, etc.
- AND OF course Miranda V. ARIZONA 384 U.S. 436 (1966) DOES NOT APPLY TO INFORMANTS but does FORBID COERCION & TRICKERY

Case law #3 12

Illinois v. Perkins 496 U.S. 292
(1990), 302~304 by Justice
Brennen Citing Miller v. Fenton
474 U.S. 104, 109-110, (1985)
Spano v. New York 360, US
315, 320-321 (1959)

Where Miranda does not need
to be given by informants
and informants can elicit on
non-attached cases, but must
comply with due process principles.

And the new AB359 & penal
codes have been implemented
forbidding monetary gifts,
and direct elicitation, but is turmoil
& in doubt over the Perkins op.
this law mentions but has yet
to address that this
court must decide -

There are 1,000's of us indicted
on bogus 187 & "hit charges"
by this sham policy - I am
not the only person
affected.

CASE LAW #13

IT IS WELL ESTABLISHED IN GOLDSTEIN THAT THE DA REPRESENTS THE COUNTY IN IMPLEMENTING JAILHOUSE INFORMANT POLICIES AND IS NOT ALWAYS IMMUNE: BUCKLEY V. FITZ SIMMONS -

BUT DESPITE AB359, THE BOS / BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ARE STILL PAYING THE MAFA MONEY. † IN MY CASE: \$20,000

#2 - Younger Abstention - I sought review by the U.S. District Court 9th Cir. who deemed it frivolous because they would not enjoin under Younger. My only recourse is to YOU. THIS QUESTION, I DON'T SEEK AN ENJOINMENT PER SE, BUT THESE ARE LEGIT CONSTITUTIONAL / FEDERAL QUESTIONS AFFECTING THE PUBLIC OF A POLICY IN PLACE AND ADOPTED † ADMISSIBLE BY THE COURTS CLAIMING "I WAIVED MY RIGHTS REGARDLESS OF TRICKERY OR COERCION BECAUSE I WAS TALKING TO THE MAFA" THESE ARE QUESTIONS OF FEDERALLY PROTECTED RIGHTS THAT CANNOT BE ELIMINATED

~~ST. JAMES~~
CASE LAW # 14

& Flagrantly/patently violative of
express constitutional provisions in
every clause, sentence, paragraph
& in whatever manner & AGAINST
whomever an effort might be to
apply it. State proceedings are not
adequate, because there is no forum
for constitutional claims. This is an
in place and adopted policy in
the state court. There is no hope of
a valid conviction with the use of
such policies & surely jeopardizes the
integrity of the system. I AM challenging
the constitutional validity of "State
Statutes?" AGAINST STATE OFFICIALS IN
a sense to MINE & others Federally
protected RIGHTS: The public. This
issue must be addressed, it is
widespread abuse and MISUSE
OF YOUR PERKINS CASE LAW.

And must be remedied -

Gods will Kingdom of Jesse

So mote it be -

MR E

Thankyou

I AM ONE OF thousands
indicted affected by this policy
& decisions, at the court.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

YOUR HONORS - THE ILLINOIS V. PERKINS 496 U.S. 292 WAS A MAJOR CASE AND CERTIORARI PRESENTED IN YOUR COURT AND DECIDED IN YOUR COURT WHICH SET FORTH THE POLICE JAILHOUSE/INFORMANT POLICIES AND OPERATIONS FOR THE ENTIRE COUNTRY IN WHICH LAW ENFORCEMENT AND JAILS USE TODAY AS: "THE PERKINS OPERATION" THE RESJUDICATA/COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL JURISDICTION HAS ALWAYS BEEN (DECIDED) IN YOUR COURT, IN WHICH POLICE CAN USE JAILHOUSE INFORMANTS TO ELICIT INCRIMINATING RESPONSES FROM A SUSPECT PERTAINING TO CRIMES WHERE THE 6TH AMENDMENT IS NOT ATTACHED AND NO MIRANDA WARNINGS ARE REQUIRED. I AGREE, BUT IN ILL. V. PERKINS, JUSTICE BRENNEN EXPRESSED A CONCERN OF COERCIVE TACTICS BECAUSE IN PERKINS THE AGENT TRICKED HIM INTO A SHAM ESCAPE PLOT (.302-304) VIOLATING DUE PROCESS. BUT IN ILL. VS. PERKINS, THE SOLE ISSUE WAS ONLY MIRANDA WARNINGS. I NEED THIS COURT TO GO BACK AND REVIEW ITS OWN CASE LAW TO REVIEW WHETHER OR NOT THE POLICE & DA, LA SUPERIOR, ETC. CAN USE ILL. V. PERKINS COERCIVE TECHNIQUES SUCH AS USING MAFIA INMATES TO PLACE A SHAM HIT ON SUSPECT'S WIFE OR POSE AS AND ASSASSIN/HITMAN TO A WITNESS IN THE SUSPECTS 6TH AMENDMENT CASE (ARIZONA V. FULMANT 499 U.S. 279 (1991) AND IN RE WILSON 3 CAL 4TH 945, PEOPLE V. CATELLI (1991) 227 CAL APP 3D 1434, U.S. V. ARNOLD 106 F. 3D 37, ETC. WHICH STATE PRODUCTS OF COERCION/FEAR OR TO POSE AS AN ASSASSIN TO A WITNESS VIOLATES THE VI, BECAUSE THIS IS WHAT THE LASD/CARTS ARE IMPLEMENTING AND ALLOWING, AND MY ONLY RECOURSE IS TO YOU. THIS AFFECTS MANY PEOPLE; AND IN ORDER TO ELIMINATE THE WITNESS & REMOVE THE HIT THE SUSPECT MUST PROVIDE CREDIBILITY OF HIMSELF BY CONFESSING HIS CRIMES.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

M. R. Spengler

Date: Nov. 22nd. 2018
SIGNED AND SENT.

(16)