

JUN 21 2018

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 18-8614IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATESWashington, D.C. 20543-0001Leonard Dwayne Hill — PETITIONER
(Your Name) *Pro se*vs.
United States of America — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

Appendix A COA *U.S. District court* "On Petition for a writ of
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE) *Certiorari to*

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Leonard Dwayne Hill
(Your Name)U.S.P Beaumont P.O. Box 26030
(Address)Beaumont, TX 77720-6030
(City, State, Zip Code)409-727-6129
(Phone Number)**ORIGINAL**

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

23 Year Long "Circuit Split" is making 92(g)(1) unconstitutional
to (my case)

The 23 Live Rounds of Ammunition was manufactured An Asssembled In
The (Samestate) ^(I) defendant was Arrested At

The Supreme court Set up the "Minimal nexus test" to find defendant's
who Violated the Interstate Commerce element of the offence. If you
Look to (my case), the "minimal nexus test" is "not proven" see
Scarborough V. Unitedstates 431 U.S. 563, 575 (1977)

"Circuit split"

8th Circuit is still Holding to the fact's in mosby. 60 F.3d 454/8th Cir 1995
But "NO A.T.f Specailist OR Ammunition Specailist" Never
testified to the fact's In mosby based on Interstate
Commerce. 2nd circuit Also 5th circuit distinguished the
mosby case, to it's fact's. With the 6th Circuit Agreeing with the
5th circuit chamber's case.

If I WAS In Any other "Circuit Court" with this
Case, would their even be federal Jurisdiction over
my Case.

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 CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	5-6-7
CONCLUSION.....	7-8

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

Unitedstates v. Mosby 60 f.3d 454 (8 th CIR 1995) ^{cota}	4-6
Unitedstates v. Travisano 724 f.3d 341 (2d CIR 1983) ^{cota}	5
Unitedstates v. Chambers 408 f.3d at 241 (5 th CIR April 2005) ^{cota}	5-6
Unitedstates v. Hill 835 f.3d 796 (8 th CIR 2016) ^{cota}	5
Stirone v. Unitedstate 361 U.S. 212, 217-18 (1960)	5
Unitedstates v. Bishop Lexis 10700 No. 175319 April 24, 2018 ^{dis. update}	4-6
Unitedstates Garcia Lexis 13943 No. 17-10890 MAY 24, 2018	6-7
Unitedstates v. Walker 734 f.3d 451 (6 th CIR 2013)	6-7

STATUTES AND RULES

18 U.S.C § 922(g)(1)
18 U.S.C § 921(17)(A)

OTHER

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 Lexis 9079 NO. 17-3508 April 11 2018; 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 A to the petition and is

reported at Mosby (08-74454) Lexis 16904 July 13 1995; 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 ~~April 29, 2016~~, March 8, 2016

- 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: April 11, 2016, 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).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

18 U.S.C § 922(g)(1) is Unconstitutional to my case)

Interstate commerce WAS not proven In my case.

The "minimal nexus test" the Supreme Court set up WAS not
Proven In "my case"

In The 8th circuit 921(7)(A) definition of Ammunition
Has no meaning to the Statute.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

I, Leonard Dwayne Hill was Indicted by the Unitedstates district of Minnesota for Violating 922(g)(1). Possession of Ammunition. In my Indictment it says, That is: 23 Live Rounds of federal Brand 9Millimeter Luger Ammunition. At trial I was found guilty of something different then what the "grand Jury" Indicted me on.

The government went so fare to prove the Interstate Commerce Element of the offence, they Broke my Ammunition down to its part's An determined that the "gun powder" inside the Live rounds was made In Florida. But the full Rounds itself was manufactured An Assembled In minnesota the (Samestate) Were the defendant ⁽¹⁾ WAS Arrested At. Also the remaining part's was Manufactured An Assembled In minnesota.

The government should have Never broke the Live rounds down to its part's because they could not prove interstate commerce with the "full rounds itself." Instead they make 922(g)(1) unconstitutional to me, because what the grand Jury Indicted me on Never Cross "Any" State Lines. 23 Live rounds of federal Brand 9Millimeter Luger Ammunition, Were I was Arrested at, In minnesota.

The 8th circuit do not respect the "minimal nexus test" the Supreme Court Set up in Scarborough v. Unitedstates 431 U.S. 563, 575 (1977) Instead they use the Unitedstates v. Mosby 60 F.3d 454 (8th Cir 1995) Case for their "minimal nexus test" to Interstate commerce the 5th and 2nd circuit Has Distinguished this mosby case, Also myself I have found out that No A.T.F specialist or Ammunition Specialist never testified to the facts In "mosby." like other cases dealing with firearms An Ammunition Manufacture datea Base.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

It has been over 20 year's since the 2nd circuit Had Direct conflict with the 8th circuit In Unitedstates v. Travisano 724 f.3d 341 (2d Cir 1983) An the mosby case. In travisano it Holds that a Shotgun manufactured An Assmbled In The (Samestate) were A defendant was Arrested at. Did Not Affect Interstate Commerce. even the parts of the Shotgun Broken down was made from Some were else. Interstate commerce was not Proven In travisano. The 2nd circuit have distinguished the 8th circuit Case In mosby 60 f.3d 454 (8th Cir 1995) mosby Held that Ammunition Assmbled from component's, All of which had traveled In Interstate commerce, was "In commerce" for purposes of 18 U.S.C. § 922(g), even though the Ammunition itself had been Assmbled Intrastate. The 5th CIRCUIT of Appeals has Also distinguished this mosby case to its fact's In Unitedstates v. Chambers 408 f.3d 241 (5th Cir 2005) this chamber's case is Identical to my case, An In chamber's his Conviction was overturned. 5th circuit Also Distinguished Mosby to the fact's In the mosby opinion to Suspect that the Indictment was other then Wholly general, OR that it ever Alleged any Particular fact's respecting the "In or Affecting Commerce" element of the offence, OR that it ever alleged Anything respecting Completed rounds. Mosby Is hence Inapposite as it addresses the Situation Spoken to In the Italicized portion of the following passeg from Stirone Viz: When one most rest on that charge and not Another, even though it be Assumed that under an Indictment drawn In general terms a conviction must rest upon a Showing that Commerce of one kind OR Another had been burdened.

* Very Important Distinguished case that needs to be Addressed

The District Court was Always Confused about the "mosby case"

because it was the first possession of Ammunition Case dealing with Interstate commerce. The District Court granted the defendant's motion for Judgement of Acquittal based on a narrow Interpretation of § 921(a)(17)(A)'s definition of Ammunition. In mosby the government State's that All 4 components was manufactured Some were else but was Assembled In Minnesota. In Mosby were is the Physical Evidence to SAY Mosby Ammunition was even Assembled in Minnesota? If you Look to "Any" Possession of firearms or Ammunition Case that deal's with Interstate commerce. There's always a "A.T.F" Agent or Ammunition or firearm Specialist. That will testify about the manufacture Location. In Mosby There is "No testimony" from "No A.T.F Agent or Ammunition Specialist" like My Case an others' So were did the Physical Evidence come from In the fact's of Mosby? Was mosby Ammunition found in a box of Ammunition that had a stamp on their saying "made in Minnesota"? because If that is so, If they take 2 Rounds for examination like the Ammunition Specialist did in my Case they will determine that mosby Ammunition was not made in Minnesota, because the government SAY In mosby that (All 4 component's is made somewhere out-of-state) an If the Specialist Look to the Cartridge Casing An type. In the stamp for the Manufacture, the results will be that (Mosby Ammunition is not Assembled or Manufactured in Minnesota Because (All 4 component's is made from Some were else.))
(No A.T.F Specialist or Ammunition Specialist Never testified In his case.)

To Sum up my full Argument I would use a passage out of Unitedstate v. Walker, 734 f.3d 451 (6th circuit 2013) Even though the government stated In Walker that the government made 2 mistakes In chamber that compelled reversal.

but IT was in "good faith" to reversal of Chambers Indictment. first, The Indictment "made" no mention of Cartridge Cases, primers, bullets or powder" and "Alleged" one, and only one, factual Basis" for ^{and} Interstate Nexus finding: The Completed rounds of Ammunition. Chambers, 408 F.3d at 241. second the government "presented no Evidence" at trial that the rounds had traveled in Interstate commerce, focusing instead on the connection of certain components of the rounds to Interstate commerce. The combined effect of these two ERRORS was that "The government... proved an Essential Element of the offence... on the basis of a set of facts different from the particular facts Alleged in the Indictment in respect to the Element, which led the fifth circuit to conclude that the government constructively Amended the Indictment.

With these facts If you look to these 2 ~~new~~ cases An Apply their Argument with mine you can see how this 23 year long circuit split makes 922(g)(1) unconstitutional to "my case only" because Interstate commerce was (never proven) See United States v. Garcia Lexis 13943 No 17-10890 May 24, 2018 Also, United States v. Bishop Lexis 10760 No. 17-5319 April 24, 2018 update cases

I wish that the Supreme Court Grants my Writ of Certiorari, An ~~fix~~ this 20 year long circuit split that Holding my Conviction to the 8th circuit. If the Supreme Court see that the minimal need was not given in my case I hope to get relief that I'm needed for this wrongfully conviction.

I wish the Supreme Court will overturn my conviction based on your Law of the Lands. Thank you

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Leonard R. Hill

Date: Sept 10th, 2018