


No. 18-8595

ORIGINAL



IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

The GREAT UNITED STATES OF America Ex rel in re
The 49 GREAT SOVEREIGN STATES; and:
Charles K. Wallace, Sr. — PETITIONER - Relator
(Your Name)

Warden Jerry Goodwin vs.
The Ex State of Louisiana in Secession and
La. Const 1974, et al — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

La Sup. Ct.; La. 1st Cir. Ct. of App.; 19th Jud. Dist Ct. La., A.C.R.P.
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Charles Kenneth Wallace, Sr.
(Your Name)

D.W.C.C., 670 Bell Hill Rd.
(Address)

HOMER, LA. 71040-2150
(City, State, Zip Code)

911
(Phone Number)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

DID THE LA. SUP. CT. deny certiorari as untimely, when under mailbox rule is timely filed?

IS IT THE SOLICITOR/ATTY. GENERAL'S DUTY TO PRESS THIS CAUSE OF ACTION TO PROTECT U.S. CITIZENS VESTED LIBERTY INTEREST SUBSTANTIVE rights, privileges and immunities, et seq?

HAS THE TRUE PROPER PERSON A.R.P. RESPONDENT CONCEDED the case by the total letter of the law failure to respond to the FIRST STEP as mandated?

IS THE LA. CONST. 1974 illegal as repugnant TO THE U.S. CONST. NOT HAVING BEEN TO DATE APPROVED BY CONGRESS OR THE LA. CONST. 1921?

IS PLAINTIFF-RELATOR'S substantive and religious rights to HOLY SMOKE CIGARETTES PROTECTED HEREBY THE U.S. CONST. ART IV Sect. 2 [1] and Amendments IX and XIV?

HAS RESPONDENTS VIOLATED RELATORS
OPT OUT RIGHT OF ESTOPPAL RELATED
TO THE MASTER-TOBACCO CLASS-ACTION-
SETTLEMENT by encroaching upon his
religious substantive right to "HOLY
SMOKE TALK" in celebration of the
first universally recognized "HOLY
SMOKE COMMUNIONS freedom of religious
expressions thousands of years old?

DOES THE U.S. CONST- SUPPORT/CONDONE
ANY STATES denial of peaceful "HOLY
SMOKE TALK SIGNAL" COMMUNION?

Respondents have never to date produced
into any records any mittimus to support
their allegation that the denial of
relators right to smoke is within
his sentence and does not equate
to involuntary servitude; does the total
failure deny the right to presumption
of innocence protected by Amend IV/XIV?

DOES THE RESPONDENT ACTIONS/INACTIONS
VIOLATE RELATORS UNENUMERATED RIGHT
OF CONSCIENCE?

Can the La. Leg. / La. Dept. of Public Safety and Corrections retroactively change a definite sentence by taking away the citizens right to ~~holly~~ smoke his cigarettes upon public property maintained by cigarette tax dollars?

IS THE SECESSION OF THE STATE OF LOUISIANA FINAL by its Failure to oppose, object to, or rebuttal the presumption fact of illegality of the LA Const. '74 by respondents as never consented to or approved by the U.S. Congress per mandate of U.S. Const. Art. IV Sect. 3, [1]?

Without any letter of the law definition of "HUMAN BEING" for purposes of any homicide statutes can any verdict rest on insufficiency of evidence?

DOS THE PROHIBITION AGAINST CITIZEN & SMOKING CIGARETTES ON PROPERTY PAID FOR AND MAINTAINED BY TOBACCO TAX DOLLARS resurrect Jim Crow separate but equal citizenship classes repugnant to Brown vs Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954) vs. Plessey v. Ferguson, 41 LED 256 (1894)

AS OPP #2 HAS NEVER BEEN POSTED
ON ANY POST IS IT TRUE DUE PROCESS
IN equal protection of the Law?

CAN ANY STATE CONSTITUTIONALLY TAKE
CITIZENS PEACE RELIGION PROTECTED
therein the U.S. Const. Amend. IX/XIV?

CAN THIS COURT ANSWER THE RIPE A.R.P.'s
D.W.C.C.-2015-0444 and D.W.C.C.-2019-0212 herein
APPENDIX-F WHICH PROPER PERSON RESPONDENT
DEFIANTLY REFUSES TO REBUT?

FURTHER INCLUSIVE THEREIN APPENDIX-F:

CAN THIS COURT ANSWER D.W.C.C.-2019-017,
WHICH LETTER OF THE LAW PROPER PERSON Respondent
Defiantly REFUSES TO RESPOND?

DOES THE arbitrary or/capricious actions or/
inactions of the A.R.P. PROPER PERSON RESPONDENT
demand interdiction with an independent
appointed Administrative LAW Judge Special
MASTER?

Does the arbitray-capricious acceptance or
rejection A.R.P. process evaluation demand
Special Master interdiction?

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:

La. Prison Enterprise

Master-Tobacco-Class-Action-Settlement

Price Waterhouse-Cooper, London England, UK

ALL KNOWN/UNKNOWN "Holy Smokers"

John Bell Edwards, Gov. La.

Jeff Landry, La. Atty. Gen.

James M. Leblanc, Secretary LDPS&C

Jerry Goodwin, Warden, DWCC

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

State of Louisiana

MR. JERRY Goodwin, Warden D.W.C.C./Regional

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW

JURISDICTION

CONSTITUTION AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

CONCLUSION

INDEX OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A : La. 1st Cir. Ct. App. (w/19th JDC opinion Appendix B-1
INCLUSIVE THEREIN)

APPENDIX B-2: La. 19th JDC Dist. Ct. Judgements

APPENDIX C: DENIAL OF La. Sup. Ct. (w/Filing timelines)

APPENDIX D: Rehearing Return

APPENDIX E: La. DPSIC, OPP #021 / SMOKING POLICY

APPENDIX F: La. D.P.SIC, OPP #001 / A.R.P. Policy / A.R.P.'s
DWCC-2015-0444, 2019-017, 2019-0212

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483

STATUTES AND RULES

Dept. P.S. & Correction Reg. No. B-05-005, HB 85 2002 La. (A.R.P.)

HB 85 2002 La

Act 815 2006 La

Dept. P.S. & Correction Reg. No. C-03-008 ~~11-11-11~~ (SMOKING)

L.S.A.-R.S. 14:30.1

L.S.A.-R.S. 14:2 et seq

OTHER

Constitution of Louisiana 1921

Const. La. 1974

DWCC-2015-0444, 2019-017, 2019-0212

U.S. Const. Art. IV sect. 3 [1], [2]; Art. VI [3]

U.S. Const. Amend. IX and XIV

VIII.

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 _____ 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 _____ 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 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 La. 19th Judicial District court appears at Appendix B-1/2 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 _____.

☐ 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 08 Jan. 2019.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix B.

☒ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date:
12 February 2019, 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. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

the U.S. Constitution.

the La. Const. Annot. 1921 and 1974

the La. Stat. Annot. R.S. 14 et seq.

UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS (U.N.)

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

PLAINTIFF-Relator has raised many matter of fact conclusive presumptions below which have never been rebutted, opposed or objected to by respondent's that by default support this cause of action.

The A.R.P. First Step Respondant has never to date responded by letter of the law in proper person wherefore has conceded this case by default.

The La. Leg. has unconstitutionally and illegally done an end around to total circumvent Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954); (Plessy vs. Ferguson, 41 L.B.D. 256, (1896) ressurecting separate but equal citizenship classes upon public property maintained by cigarette tax dollars denying U.S. Const. Art.

VI [3], Amend. IX & XIV vested liberty interest substantive rights to smoke cigarettes and exercise the original universal holy communion of a religion inviolate of U.N. Declaration of Human Rights, U.S. Const. Art IV, sect. 2 [1], Art. VI [3], Amend. I, IX, XIV, XIII sect. 1-2; U.D.H.R./U.N. Art. 4.

AN illegal STATE ACTOR HAS ENCROACHED with false documentation herein the FIRST STEP RESPONSE INVIOATE OF THE letter of the law Dept Reg. No. B-05-005, et seq; (this is not a PREA. which does/ would authorize a WARDENS designee).

the La. Const. 1921 has no provision(s) for any Const. Convention to repeal itself and form a NEW STATE Const. within itself inviolate of U.S. Const. Art. IV, sect. 3. [1] wherefore La. Const. 1974 is unconstitutionally illegal and with out Congressional consent approval.

The La. Dept. of Public Safety and Corrections does not posses a court order mittimus for plaintiff-relator custody no has ever attempted to enter any mittimus into this record to substantiate any cause to disprove his matter of fact cruel and unusual punishment involuntary servitude sentence enhancement.

the failure of the respondents to rebut, object or deny the illegallity of the alleged La. Const. '74 is no doubt conclusively a deafening silence.

Plaintiff relator timely filed his petitions below by MALBOX Rule no doubt.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Relator believes this Court has original and exclusive jurisdiction over this case.

the STATE COURT OF last Resort has decided an important federal question by by vagueness and ambiguity in a way that conflicts with the decision of another state court of last resort or of a U.S. Court of App.; and has by a state court an important question of Fed. law that has not been, but should be settled by this Court; and has decided an important Fed. question in a way that conflicts with relevant decisions of this court; and contrary to this Courts appellate jurisdiction.

A decision related to the illegal state Const., and failure of the A.R.P. First STEP proper person response is in aid of the Courts appellate jurisdiction; by default of and unlawful state actor.

PLAINTIFF - RELATOR OFFERED ONE FINAL Good Faith notice to original A.R.P. PROPER PERSON TO ARP-DWCC-2015-0444 therein ARP-DWCC-2019-0212 which was defiantly REJECTED in relation to Relators present conditions of confinement, grievance, challenges to rules, regulation policies or STATUTES(sic) etc. reflected herein "Appendix F".

The gist of this case is that plaintiff-relator has timely filed below, and the true respondents have never filed at all by due process of letter of the law.

There is no legal definition of "Human being" FOR PURPOSE OF ANY HOMICIDE STATUTES IN AMERICA, creating evidence ~~in~~ insufficiency.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles William Sre

Date: MARCH 18, 2019