


No. 18-7756



IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Eighth circuit of Appeals

Roscoe Chambers — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

Nicholas A Sarcone — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

Eighth circuit of Appeals

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Roscoe Chambers
(Your Name)

WSP Lewisburg (Prison)
(Address)

Lewisburg Pennsylvania 17837
(City, State, Zip Code)

NA
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

Whether Article III of the US Constitution
Invoke Federal Judges the power to Grant
Immunity to private citizens, ?

Whether the Sixth Amendment requires
effective assistance of Counsel ?

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:

Honorable Stephanie M. Rose Federal Judge
8th circuit southern District of Iowa
123 east walnut street Room 300
Des Moines Iowa 50309,

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	Appeals Court Opinion
APPENDIX B	District Court order
APPENDIX C	order granting and judgement at (A)
APPENDIX D	order denying rehearing.
APPENDIX E	
APPENDIX F	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

Sixth Amendment
United States vs Orleans 425 U.S. 807, 814 (1976)

STATUTES AND RULES

28 USC § 2675(b)(2) bring a claim for violation
of a federal statute that authorize suit against and
Individual

42 USC 1983

OTHER The United States is not responsible under
FTCA for negligent or wrongful acts or omissions
of private contractors

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☒ is unpublished.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☒ is unpublished.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 May 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: July 11, 2018, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix D.

☐ 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

42 USC 1983

6th Amendment

28 U.S.C. § 2679 (b)(1)

28 USC § 2671

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On December 20, 2017 There was a conflict of Interest In the Judicial Ruling; The honorable Stephanie M. Rose Improperly concluded because the government hired this assassin he was not obligated to perform his Constitutional Duties to protect Chambers substantial Rights,

The Sixth Amendment Clause; The law requires that a defendant receive an Attorney; It also requires that this Attorney be effective,

When an attorney files an appearance in court on a defendant's behalf he or she is pledging to protect the defendant's Constitutional rights,

Article III of the US Constitution does not give a Federal Judge the authority to grant Immunity to a private citizen,

A person is a Contractor and not a federal employee If the United States does not exercise physical day to day control over his/her activities. This is true even if the person receives money and guidance from the United States, *US vs Orleans* 425 US 807, 814 (1976) *Logue vs US* 412 US 521, 527-28 1973,

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

This court is respectively obligated and required to oversee the efficient Administration of Justice
Thigpen vs Smith 792 F. 2d 1207 7th Cir (1980)

The court need to answer this legal Question:
If a federal Judge can grant Immunity to a private citizen?

Is It well settled that federal law will decide whether an individual is an Employee or Independent Contractor? United states vs Orleans 425 US 807 (1976)?

Is A person not a federal employee If the United states does not exercise physical day to day control over his/her activities

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Roscoe Chambers

Date: September 10, 2018