18-8709

ORIGINAL

NO.

Supreme Court of the United State

Emmanuel Adeyinka

Vs.

Harris County, State of Texas, B. Sanderson

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Emmanuel Adeyinka

10811 Richmond Ave 18

Houston Tx , 77042

713-514-6288

Signature:

Questions Presented for Review

1. Can the United States identify any of nine elements of common and law fraud in this case?
2. Is there a pattern or practice is there discriminatory activities and procedures.
3. In the united state district court for the southern district of Texas Houston division memorandum opinion and order Heck v.Humphrey , 512 .U.S. 477, 486-87 (1994).

☐ **Is there a conspiracy against rights in these cases? Or a statute of**
☐ **frauds remedy**

Have these officers acted under color of law or violated Emmanuel Fourteenth Amendment right, or meeting the qualifications of failure to train and lead litigation?

List of part

Emmanuel Adeyinka	*Plaintiff*
Harris County Jail	*Defendants*
State Of Texas	*Defendants*
B.Sanderson	*Defendants*

Appendix to the petition for a writ of certiorari

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Commonwealth Edison Co. v. Montana, 453U.S. 609 **(1981)**

California v. ARC America Corp., 490 U.S. 93 **(1989)**

Crosby v. National Foreign Trade Council, 530U.S. 363 **(2000)**

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

OPINION BELOW

The opinion of the united state district court for the southern district of Texas Houston division memorandum opinion and appear in Appendix A Civil Action No. H-18-1616

District Judge: The Honorable Keith P. Ellison

JURISDICTION

The opinion of the united state district court for the southern district of Texas Houston division memorandum opinion was issue May 18 , 2018 , outlined in Heck v. Humphery , 512 U.S. 477 (1994) In Appendix A , The united state district court for the southern district of Texas Houston division , Order and denied was issue May 30,2018 Appendix B , The united state district court for the southern district of Texas Houston division , Order and denied was issue August 20, 2018 Appendix C , The United State Court of Appeals For The Fifth Circuit , Dismissed for failed to timely pay the docketing fee. Of July 11, 2018, The United State Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit Dismissed for failed to timely pay the docketing fee. Of October 24, 2018

Constitutional Provision

U.S. Const. Amend. VI: In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defense.

U.S. Const. Amend. XIV, sec. 1: All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Amendment IV **U.S. Const. Amend. IV The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.**

U.S. Const Article 1 section 6 No Preference of commerce or revenue to the port of one state over those of another: nor Shall vessels bound to, or from, one state, be obliged to enter, clear, or pay duties in another

U.S. Const Article 1 section 10 1 and 2 No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation; grant Letters of Marque andReprisal; coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts; pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law, or Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts, or grant any Title of Nobility.

No State shall, without the Consent of the Congress, lay any Imposts or Duties on Imports or Exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing it's inspection Laws: and the net Produce of all Duties and Imposts, laid by any State on Imports or Exports, shall be for the Use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such Laws shall be subject to the Revision and Controulof the Congress.

U.S. Const. Article 3 section 2 The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury; and such trial shall be held in the state where the said crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any state, the trial shall be at such place or places as the Congress may by law have directed.

U.S. Const. Article 4 section 2 -3, Section 3 Section 2 3: No person held to service or labour in one state , under the law thereof , escaping into another ,shall ,in consequence of any law or regulation therein , be discharge from service or labour ,but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labour may be due.

Section 3 1: New states may be admitted by the congress into this union; but no new state shall be formed or Erected within the jurisdiction of any other state; nor any state be formed by the junction of two or more states , or parts of states, without the consent of the legislatures of the states concerned as well as well as of the congress.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On May 18, 2018 the United States district court for the southern District of Texas Houston Division.The honorable judge Keith P. Ellison respondent very quick and in remedies and with in And showing a pattern in practices and premeditated judgment, the proceeds of the Emmanuel Adeyinka , See in brown v. united states 356 U.S.148 (1958) the decision to exhaust the remedies .Of the state bring an unreasonable decision to appeal before or after the final judgment blacklist; black law book, master v. Lee, 39 Neb.574 N.W.;(Mattison v. Railway Co., 2 Ohio N.p.279) , Not because of the quick decision of judge but notices it show sign of fifth amendment violation. And been the some decision making and unjust attitude the state and defendant have made in other associate case criminal case as well as this lawsuit. Heck v.Humphrey, 512 U.S. 477 (1994) one of elements in Heck v.Humphrey, 512 U.S. 477 (1994) that sue challenge his and convictions, one because his Choices to appeal to the elements of the concern of the institution or division. 5.Which challenge the Equal right and bring more civil elements, See in Barron v.City of Baltimore (1833)) also (Bolling v.Sharp, 1954. However, this attitude faded in Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company v.City of Chicago (1897), 6. Due process has been interpreted to include thing such as the right to work See in Lochner v. New York (1905) the promise of legality and fair procedure form the clause Magna Carta of ordinary processes procedures of law legal systems, and the due process clause also promises before depriving a citizen of life, liberty or property, government must follow fair procedure. Case relation to Heck v. Humphrey , See In the Wallace V. City of Chicago (05-1240) was well the conflicts See in Albright v.Oliver. Recovery available to him the courts recognize the common law matter of a wrongful arrest may only cause the harm of unlawful detention from arrest. same as in Emmanuel Adeyinka case the accrue of time trying to overture the case in heck. Litigants and principle establish in the courts in Wallace V. City of Chicago (05-1240) of the common law equal footing of the statutory of law. Also see in Connick v. Thompson case of failure –To- Train liability Brady v.Maryland. Emmanuel Adeyinka was denied effective assistance of counsel during a critical stage of his defense as he was essentially unrepresented. Emmanuel Adeyinka has appeal do to See in Strickland v. Washington, 466 .U.S. 668(1994) (rule 3.850 Ineffective assistance of counsel, effective assistance and that had effective assistance been offer, the outcome may have been different. Failure to convey a plea offer

failure to investigate exculpatory witnesses or evidence, failure to preserve the right to appeal , advise you and gave incorrect information ,Gifford William R Emmanuel Adeyinka court appointed lawyer said to Emmanuel Adeyinka him was really was look to get him for trespassing. Emmanuel Adeyinka never sign any paper for Page Janik to be his lawyer and told he didn't want her as his lawyer Page Janik forces a probation Violation do to not having a job , When Emmanuel Had a job . But it questions abandoned - pleadings article 2 of the constitution of the state of Texas and in power Article 3 of constitution of the state of Texas and question the supremacy cause of the Fifth Amendment which question the Economic stabilization or a civil conspiracy, Martin A.Schwartz and In the Civil Right Act of 1871 the federal statute number 42 U.S.C section 1983 that allow people to Sue the government for civil rights violation. It applies when someone acting "under color of" state- Level or local law has deprived a person of rights created and the state in agreement by the U.S. Statutes. Constitution or federal, proven within their predisposition practices induces. See in Sorrells v.United States, 287 U.S. 435,451 states remedies of the public Enforcements department and federal services roots of analysis within and condition conspiracy of imprisonment the service to Slave or enslave treats unlawful Imprisonment, See, e.g. . Schenck v. Pro Choice Network, 519 U.S. 357 (1997) abuse of process But for the defendant's action, the prosecution would not have Proceeded calls for exhaust the remedies protection of freedom act 2012 and a civil remedy. The law recognizes tort a civil wrong and allow injured parties to recover for their losses it is also important to note that a law cannot punish a person simply for their status. A "crime" is any act or omission in violation of a law prohibiting it, or omitted in violation of a law ordering it. The government cannot prosecute an individual for conduct that was not declared criminal at the time the individual acted. The constitution explicitly forbids in Article 1, Sections 9 and 10 retroactively applicable criminal law-ex post facto laws. As the Supreme Court explained See. In Robinson v.California, 370 U.S.660 (1962) any statute that Criminalizes the status of a person inflicts a cruel and unusual punishment in violation of the eight a And fourteenth Amendment, example, a state could not punish an individual for "being homeless," Which would be a status offense, but could punish a homeless individual for trespassing or loitering,

REASON FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Which involves some conduct? In Robinson v.California, 370 U.S.660 (1962) 3/4/2004 cases# 1223447001010-2 In Harris County Record Emmanuel Adeyinka was homeless Man was arrested by the status offense trespassing. In Robinson v.California, 370 U.S.660 (1962) 4/27/2004 case #098579501010-3 of Harris County Record Emmanuel Adeyinka, arrested status offense in violation of See .In Article 1, Sections 9 and 10 , the litigation is unconstitutional and this constitutes a due process violation.On the date 08/24/2000 at 3620 Woodchase Dr apt 99 HoustonTx 77042 Emmanuel Adeyinka was Illegal Arrested and false imprison of under the Case#101765901010-2 Harris County Record

arrested for trespassing See.In Robinson v.California, 370 U.S.660 (1962) 3/23/2012 Case # 181697501010-2 of Harris County record Emmanuel Adeyinka arrested for status offense, trespassing The cruel and unusual punishment as discussed In Ingraham v. wright,430 U.S. 651 (1977). This standard was refined in whitley v. Alber, 475 U.S. 312 (1986) public service Werlinger , Daniel Joseph JR.and Lisle John beat Emmanuel Adeyinka , Emmanuel in his car using his computer , Now call town suite hotel but then call sun suit hotel using the internet were when Werlinger Daniel Joseph JR pull him out of his car beat and assault Emmanuel Adeyinka for calling his mother to pick up his car. Emmanuel Adeyinka wrote the mayor Annise Danette Parker about this incident in e-mail complaining about the nine traffic ticket he receives in a month time. In line 36,-39 on the retaliation, Emmanuel Adeyinka was fought and beating by a gang he was move twice both fought and beating by gangs. Fround that a prison's eighth amendment was violated See in Hope v.Pelzer, 536 U.S. 730 (2002) In Hudson v.McMillian, 503 U.S. 1 (1992) the court held that prison's eighth amendement right could be violated if malicious force was used against him, even in the prisoner did not experience significant pain.,

See. In Robinson v.California, 370 U.S.660 (1962) Harris County Record an and of the date 06/17/2012 Case # 183425101010-2 Of Harris County Record at a public park Emmanuel Adeyinka using the rest room of the park service's false allegation of Nickson kekeeocha listed as the Property owner Emmanuel was illegal arrested and false imprison and at 3100 w.Sam Houston pkwy. S Houston, Tx 77042, in violation of See .In Article 1, Sections 9 and 10, the litigation is unconstitutional and this constitutes a due process violation. on 6/27/2013 under case# 190429301010-2 under Harris County Record Emmanuel Adeyinka was using the computer at Houston Community College located 1300 Holman St, Houston ,TX 77004 security guard at Houston community College approach Emmanuel Adeyinka with allegations of sexual harassment Emmanuel told the guard he was just using the computer to run the camera back the guard asking Emmanuel for his ID Emmanuel show it to him then the guard ask Emmanuel to put his hand around his back , (See).In Aguilar v. Texas, 378 U.S. 108 so Emmanuel Adeyinka Run , they run Emmanuel down and arrest him . the guard didn't or the witness didn't identify him as the one how sexual harassment somebody , but they book Emmanuel Adeyinka for Evading arrested .see. In illinois v. Gates, 462 U.S. 213 (1983) See. In United States v. Matlock, 415 U.S. 164 also see in terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S. 1(1968) See. In O'connor v. Ortega,480 U.S.709(1987).in see the text of 18 U.S.C section 2520 didn't have a Tex Code Crim.Proc.1405, .(1964) Section 14(a) of the act is codified at 15 U.S.C. section 78(n)(a).as implement by the Sec, it prohibits false or misleading proxy statement . Under the circumstance the court to be alert to provide such remedies as are necessary to make effective the congressional purpose 377.US.426, 433(1964). Violation of is fourth amendment Crime if he or she Acts in a way that fulfills every element of offense. The status establishing the Offense also Establishes element of offense. In general, every crime involves three elements: first the act or Act or Conduct (" Actus Reus "); secord,the individual's mental state at the time of the act("mens rea") the Government has the burden of proof to establish every element of a crime beyond a Reasonable Doubt; and third, the Individual's conduct must be the cause of the crime. The act Omission that Comprise the Physical by statute. See,e.g. Schad v.Arizona ,501 U.S.624 (1991) 2/08/2016 under case # 207345901010 Harris County Record Emmanuel Adeyinka was Illegal Arrested and false imprison by Hampton and Inger Marie and a false accused by Chu ,pp Emmanuel prove he live in the area from is ID But Hampton said Emmanuel had a traffic ticket , See. In Robinson v.California, 370 U.S.660 (1962) the litigation is unconstitutional and this constitutes a due process violation. ("The law recognizes tort a civil wrong and allow injured parties to recover for their losses it is also Also important to note that a law cannot punish a person simply for their status") B.Sanderson intentioned and intentionally. See. In Robinson v.California, 370 U.S.660 (1962)

9/5/2016 Emmanuel Adeyinka was charge with retaliation; for the words to a officer word the officer said Emmanuel Adeyinka said I kill you, there was no evidence, of Emmanuel Adeyinka said these words or phrase to , appropriate way explain his action would be verb abuse , Emmanuel Adeyinka is not afflicted within or contracted or legal employee of Texas department of justice's so claim under charge is misrepresented or pursue judgment under a Mental state of mind; which Emmanuel Adeyinka"(real said he sue") ,Which in other hands the action doesn't meeting the express of the words that was reported. Emmanuel Adeyinka See. In Beazell v.Ohio, 269 U.S.167 (1925) in J.I case co v. borak . B.Sanderson didn't have a probable cause, Emmanuel Adeyinka was arrested by OTTO and Roy Allen

because of the some traffic ticket Hampton arrested him in earlier case #207345901010 of Harris County Record for , ("even if giving that Emmanuel Adeyinka said I kill you"); .see. In illinois v. Gates, 462 U.S. 213 (1983) See. In United States v. Matlock, 415 U.S. 164 also see in terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S. 1(1968) See. In O'connor v. Ortega,480 U.S.709(1987).in see the text of 18 U.S.C section 2520 didn't have a Tex Code Crim.Proc.1405, During the course of incarceration on an of case# 1522647 of Harris County Record at 10811 Richmond Ave 18 Houston Tx 77042 false allegation was brought up again Emmanuel Adeyinka ,by public force service B.Sanderson of the public force Emmanuel Adeyinka was arrested by OTTO and Roy Allen because of the some traffic ticket Hampton arrested him in earlier case for , who is B.sanderson there was no one by the name of B.Sanderson at Emmanuel Adeyinka houses also conspiracy to assault , Emmanuel Adeyinka was fought and Beat in jail . Emmanuel Adeyinka is appeal these case # 1522647 First Court of appeal 01-18-00312-CR Because of insufficient counseling and because his Miranda rights was not reado him See in Howes v. Fields (10-680) the supreme court has established that prisoners are in custody and must be advised of their Miranda . the night of his arrest Emmanuel Adeyinka four amendment right was violated he was at his house B.Sanderson cause for being on his property was not because he did something wrong, Constitution of United States Of America 1789 (rev.1992)The right of the people to be secure in their person,house papers and effects unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated , and no Warrants shall issue ,but upon probable cause ,support by Oath or affirmation and particularly describing the place to be search, and the person or thing to be seized. These questions was over look in court. She did have a search warrant for his arrests, B.Sanderson ask Emmanuel Adeyinka questions about a burglary in progress in the neighborhood, then late said Emmanuel Adeyinka had a traffic ticket , and she forgot about the burglary in progress, she ask for his ID , Then then later, charge him with retaliation on account. Emmanuel Adeyinka counsel Bill R. Gifford never taught to use is witnesses his mother or offer Emmanuel to go to trail, also there were other witnesses, that could have been asset to the case , a young lady outside at the pool that B.Sanderson question also, and a young man that confronted Emmanuel Adeyinka about a burglary, In front of the officer Emmanuel Adeyinka relies he doesn't know anything about the burglary, Emmanuel Adeyinka , Been living in these neighborhood for nine year. Would this information been consider in trail or before the DEA? The foregoing test was set forth in .Strickland v. Washington (1984) Deficient performance by counsel Resulting prejudice, in that but for the deficient performance ,the result of the proceeding would have differed Emmanuel Adeyinka pulling in a motion of discovery and a motion for a new court appointed lawyer, but the court over look the motions. Evidence show that his Miranda right wasn't readied to Emmanuel Adeyinka not till court : , See In Miranda v. Arizona (1966) ,warning to an individual in their custody they may interrogate that person and act upon the knowledge gained, but may not use that person's statement as evidence against him or her in criminal trial. B.Sanderson states she was only taking Emmanuel Adeyinka in for a traffic ticket. and that he has been to jail before in February ,Wish means B.Sanderson knew Emmanuel Adeyinka already service time , for those ticket t ,were is the evidence of the thing B .Sanderson said , Emmanuel Adeyinka did, why would a cop come out on a business night just then to take someone in on a ticket. When Emmanuel Adeyinka was under

custody. in the report it never said Emmanuel Adeyinka resisting arrest or running or anything in these nature ? They never had any evidence of this nature; Emmanuel Adeyinka counsel Bill R. Gifford never brought hand is evidence before the courts or the witnesses or even tried to get a relief for the DEA or judge , 22 of may 2017 Emmanuel Adeyinka refuse and firer Janik Page, Page process without Emmanuel Adeyinka consent , Emmanuel Adeyinka stated his not responsible for her action or processing in court . The courts revoke his probation do to not having a job wish Emmanuel Adeyinka ask Janik page not to proceed, Emmanuel Adeyinka do have evidence of a job for dates wishes the probation officers said Emamnuel Adeyinka didn't have one banks statement also tax claims. Texas department of criminal justice parole division threatening deprive the rights of Emmanuel and threaten is freedom inside and outside of being incarceration Emmanuel adeyinka fourteenth amendment rights was violated by having the states contrite their laws pass the giving time frame of the state policy of the statute limititation . by question about event of and claims of events that taking place outside of the giving policy limit ation of these state and as well as the state were the event took place. Supremacy clause See. In United State v.kemp & Associates,et al See . In bell Atlantic Corp . v. Twombly ,550 U.S.554 (2007)section 901.462 of the public accountancy act the justice department has also sued state licensing board. See In United State v. Texas state board of pub . accountancy , 464 f.supp.400(w.d.tex 1978), modified , 592 f.d.919(5th cir.1979),for example ,the court held that the state accounting broad was subject to the antitrust laws when it promulgation a rule prohibiting accountant from making competitive bids for professional services . The board's enabling Statute did not express a policy concerning competition that would permit such a rule. Promulgation of the rule,Therefore, constituted an agreement among competition that unreasonably restrained trade, and thus violated The antitrust law. Competitors in the market for health care service have also sued licensing and regulatory boards on antitrust ground. false allegation of his probation officer , she told the court appoint attury that Emmanuel didn't have a job and Emmanuel adeyinka at the time. Emmanuel Adeyinka petition for a writ of habeas Corpus Under 28 U.S.C under the causes for appeal 01-18-00321-CR. Which is in violation of Fourth Amendment, Public Law Pub.L? 107-56, the litigation is unconstitutional and this constitutes a due process violation. Also see in New York V. Harris

(1964) Section 14(a) of the act is codified at 15 U.S.C. section 78(n)(a).as implement by the Sec, it prohibits false or misleading proxy statement . Under the circumstance the court to be clert to provide such remedies as are necessary to make effective the congressional purpose 377.US.426, 433(1964).) This Case is in the appeal process 01-18-00321-CR of The First Appeal Courts, , also, See In Union et al v.Mukasey et al

In violation of False claim Act (31 USC Section 3729-3733

(Conspires to defraud the government by getting a false or fraudulent claim paid or approved by the government; or knowingly makes, (B) 2 acts in deliberate ignorance of the truth or falsity of the information. Emmanuel Adeyinka has two CLASS B misdemeanor penal code 21.08 See. In Edgar v. MITE Corp., 457 U.S. 624 (1982), not two conviction but two counts of 21.08 from the state of Philadelphia, PA in 2008, 28 U.S. Section 1447 he was focus to register with Texas sex offender registration program. See **Brady v. Maryland**, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), Violation of Rule 65(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and **jurisdiction policy Chapter 62 code of criminal procedure is not a requirement of Emmanuel Adeyinka post case of** ***retaliation that bring these matters at hand See In***

Sullivan *v.* United States, 990 A.2d 477 (D.C. 2010)

EXCEPTIONS (D.C. OFFICIAL CODE SEC. 22-4016(B))

The following do not constitute registration offenses:

1. Any sexual offense between consenting adults or an attempt, conspiracy or solicitation to commit such an offense, except for offenses to which consent is not a defense as provided in Section 218 of the Anti-Sexual Abuse Act of 1994 (D.C. Official Code § 22-3017).

2. Any misdemeanor offense that involved a person's sexual touching or attempted or solicited sexual touching of an undercover law enforcement officer where the person believed that the officer was an adult.

3. Any misdemeanor offense committed against an adult, except where the offender agrees in a plea agreement to be subject to sex offender registration requirements.

See In Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803), because of his parole. He is not requiring to registering in the state of Philadelphia, Pa because of the level and nature of his crime, in Texas in other hands said he do. See. In Pennsylvania v. Nelson, 350 U.S. 497 (1956) Also See, In Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U.S. 1 (1958), On May 29th of 2018 he when to register. C. Aquilera the officer that registers and set the appointment at the location at 8300 mykawa RD Houston, TX 77048 Houston police department. Emmanuel Adeyinka spoke the officer C. Aquilera she show him some paper work with the wrong information, Emmanuel Adeyinka told C. Aquilera that's incorrect information. United States ex rel.Steury v. Cardinal Health,Inc., 625f.3d 262,267(5th Cir.2010); C. Aquilera said checking with Philadelphia, Pa "Courts", Martin v. Hunter's Lessee, 14 U.S. 304 (1816), also See. In In Ware v. Hylton, 3 U.S. (3 Dall.) 199 (1796), also see in **Brady v. Maryland**, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), also See In *Miranda v. Arizona (1966) Because her record showed sexual assault, Emmanuel Adeyinka told her these is the wrong procedure ,He not suppose to take part in sex offender registration program Emmanuel Adeyinka not a part of ; ("Megan's law ");See.In Cohens v. Virginia, 19 U.S. 264 (1821), See.In Ableman v. Booth, 62 U.S. 506 (1859) Emmanuel Adeyinka real doesn't have to register to began with , they begin to argue a couple of the officer and C. Aquilera ask Emmanuel Adeyinka to step outside , till she get her paper works , Emmanuel Adeyinka waited about an hour , C. Aquilera said she received and email, ("31 USC Section 3729-3733") from the courts with the information. (Conspires to defraud the government by getting a false or fraudulent claim paid or approved by the government; or knowingly makes, I attach a copy of the information she said she register. She registers the wrong information intentionally. (B) 2 acts in deliberate ignorance of the truth or falsity of the information. Also. See. In Union et al v.Mukasey et al –Document 39.Decision) the litigation is unconstitutional and this constitutes a due process violation."(C.Aquilera and the department of public safety didn't follow protocol misrepresentation) See* **Brady v. Maryland**, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), *Decision undue influence and coercion See. In Johnson v. Buttress HCA 41, (1936) "By not Contacting priority of federal authority, Megan's law the federal authority, "Note":; The Case Parole and Department of Public safety was trying to register was out of their jurisdiction and not under the federal law. See. In Martin v. Hunter's Lessee, 14 U.S. 304 (1816), also See. In In Ware v. Hylton, 3 U.S. (3 Dall.) 199 (1796), the United States Supreme Court for the first time applied the Supremacy Clause to strike down a state statute. Virginia had passed a statute during the Revolutionary War allowing the state to confiscate debt payments by Virginia citizens to British creditors.*

The Supreme Court found that this Virginia statute was inconsistent with the Treaty of Paris with Britain, which protected the rights of British creditors. Relying on the Supremacy Clause, the Supreme Court held that the treaty superseded Virginia's statute, and that it was the duty of the courts to declare Virginia's statute "null and void".and Cohens v. Virginia, 19 U.S. 264 (1821), See.In Ableman v. Booth, 62 U.S. 506 (1859) the Fugitive Slave Act or to order the release of federal prisoners held for violation of that Act. The Supreme Court reasoned that because the Supremacy Clause established federal law as the law of the land, the Wisconsin courts could not nullify the judgments of a federal court. The Supreme Court held that under Article III of the Constitution, the federal courts have the final jurisdiction in all cases involving the Constitution and laws of the United States, and that the states therefore cannot interfere with federal court judgments. Obligations of Parole broad decision impose on Private law Emmanuel Adeyinka and his Parole officer Decision been undue influences and coercion See. In Johnson v. Buttress HCA 41, (1936) 56.CLR 133 misrepresentation, the litigation is unconstitutional and this constitutes a due process violation. Section 21.08 of the Texas Penal Code , Amendment by Pub.L.112-81 see 541(f) of Pub.L.122-81 See in Connick v. Thompson , Emmanuel have been force to participate in sex offender treatment class as well register for as a sex offender , under a state law in Philadelphia class B misdemeanor , See In Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803), the Supreme Court held that Congress cannot pass laws that are contrary to the Constitution, and it is the role of the Judicial system to interpret what the Constitution permits. Citing the Supremacy Clause, the Court found Section 13 of the Judiciary Act of 1789 to be unconstitutional to the extent it purported to enlarge the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court beyond that permitted by the Constitution. Also See. In Pennsylvania v. Nelson, 350 U.S. 497 (1956) the Supreme Court struck down the Pennsylvania Sedition Act, which made advocating the forceful overthrow of the federal government a crime under Pennsylvania state law. The Supreme Court held that when federal interest in an area of law is sufficiently dominant, federal law must be assumed to preclude enforcement of state laws on the same subject; and a state law is not to be declared a help when state law goes farther than Congress has seen fit to go. Also See In Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U.S. 1 (1958), the Supreme Court rejected attempts by Arkansasto nullify the Court's school desegregation decision, Brown v. Board of Education. The state of Arkansas, acting on a theory of states' rights, had adopted several statutes designed to nullify the desegregation ruling. The Supreme Court relied on the. Supremacy Clause to hold that the federal law controlled and could not be nullified by state statutes or officials. Also See. In Edgar v. MITE Corp., 457 U.S. 624 (1982), the Supreme Court

ruled: "A state statute is void to the extent that it actually conflicts with a valid Federal statute". In effect, this means that a State law will be found to violate the Supremacy Clause when either of the following two conditions (or both) exist:[8] Compliance with both the Federal and State laws is impossible "State law stands as an obstacle to the accomplishment and execution of the full purposes and objectives of Congress"In 1920, the Supreme Court applied the Supremacy Clause to international treaties, holding in the case of Missouri v. Holland, 252 U.S. 416, that the Federal government's ability to make treaties is supreme over any state concerns that such treaties might abrogate states' rights arising under the Tenth Amendment. The Supreme Court has also held that only specific, "unmistakable" acts of Congress may be held to trigger the Supremacy Clause. Montana had imposed a 30 percent tax on most sub-bituminous coal mined there. The Commonwealth Edison Company and other utility companies argued, in part, that the Montana tax "frustrated" the broad goals of the federal energy policy. However, in the case of Commonwealth Edison Co. v. Montana, 453U.S. 609 (1981), the Supreme Court disagreed. Any appeal to claims about "national policy", the Court said, were insufficient to overturn a state law under the Supremacy Clause unless "the nature of the regulated subject matter permits no other conclusion, or that the Congress has unmistakably so ordained".[9] However, in the case of California v. ARC America Corp., 490 U.S. 93 (1989), the Supreme Court held that if Congress expressly intended to act in an area, this would trigger the enforcement of the Supremacy Clause, and hence nullify the state action. The Supreme Court further found in Crosby v. National Foreign Trade Council, 530U.S. 363 (2000), that even when a state law is not in direct conflict with a federal law, the state law could still be found unconstitutional under the Supremacy Clause if the "state law is an obstacle to the accomplishment and execution of Congress's full purposes and objectives".[10] Congress need not expressly assert any preemption over state laws either, because Congress may implicitly assume this preemption under the Constitution.[11]

The government cannot prosecute an individual for conduct that was not declared criminal at the time the individual acted. The constitution explicitly forbids in Article 1, Sections 9 and 10 retroactively applicable criminal law-ex

post facto laws. As the Supreme Court explained See. In Robinson v.California, 370 U.S.660 (1962) also see Brandy v. Maryland 373 U.S. 83, see in Wallace v. City of Chicago (05-1240) any statute that Criminalizes the status of a person inflicts a cruel and unusual punishment in violation of the eight a And fourteenth Amendment, example, a state could not punish an individual for "being homeless," Which would be a status offense, but could punish a homeless individual for trespassing or loitering, Which involves some conduct?

Section 242 of Title 18 makes it a crime for a person acting under color of any law to willfully deprive a person of a right or privilege protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States. For the purpose of Section 242, acts under "color of law" include acts not only done by federal, state, or local officials within the their lawful authority, but also acts done beyond the bounds of that official's lawful authority, if the acts are done while the official is purporting to or pretending to act in the performance of his/her official duties. Persons acting under color of law within the meaning of this statute include police officers, prisons guards and other law enforcement officials, as well as judges, care providers in public health facilities, and others who are acting as public officials. It is not necessary that the crime be motivated by animus toward the race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status or national origin of the victim. The offense is punishable by a range of imprisonment up to a life term, or the death penalty, depending upon the circumstances of the crime, and the resulting injury, if any.

Title 18, U.S.C., Section 241 - Conspiracy against Rights

This statute makes it unlawful for two or more persons to conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any person of any state, territory or district in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him/her by the Constitution or the laws of the United States, (or because of his/her having exercised the same).

It further makes it unlawful for two or more persons to go in disguise on the highway or on the premises of another with the intent to prevent or hinder his/her free exercise or enjoyment of any rights so secured.

Punishment varies from a fine or imprisonment of up to ten years, or both; and if death results, or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for any term of years, or for life, or may be sentenced to death.

TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242

Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, ... shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if bodily injury results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include the use, attempted use, or threatened use of a dangerous weapon, explosives, or fire, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include kidnaping or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death.

Civil Rights Laws and Police Misconduct

A statute known as Section 1983 is the primary civil rights law victims of police misconduct rely upon. This law was originally passed as part of the Civil Rights Act of 1871, which was intended to curb oppressive conduct by government and private individuals participating in vigilante groups, such as the Ku Klux Klan. It is now called Section 1983 because that is where the law has been published, within Title 42 of the United States Code. Section 1983 makes it unlawful for anyone acting under the authority of state law to deprive another person of his or her rights under the Constitution or federal law. The most common claims brought against police officers are: see in Wallace v. City of Chicago (05-1240)

False arrest (or false imprisonment)

Malicious prosecution

Unreasonable/excessive force

- In Robinson v.California, 370 U.S.660 (1962) also see Brandy v. Maryland 373 U.S. 83, see in Wallace v. City of Chicago (05-1240) 4/27/2004 case #098579501010-3 of Harris County Record Emmanuel Adeyinka, arrested on status offense On the date 08/24/2000 at 3620 Woodchase Dr apt 99 HoustonTx 77042 Emmanuel Adeyinka was Illegal Arrested and false imprison of under the Case#101765901010-2 Harris County Record . Arrested for trespassing See.In Robinson v.California, 370 U.S.660 (1962) also see Brandy v. Maryland 373 U.S. 83, 3/23/2012 Case # 181697501010-2 of Harris County record Emmanuel Adeyinka arrested for status offense, trespassing The cruel and unusual punishment USE UNREASONABLE FORCE Scott v. metropolitan police commissioner (1975) AC 910, by Werlinger , Daniel Joseph JR.and Lisle John beat Emmanuel Adeyinka , Emmanuel was in his car using his computer , at Now call town suite hotel but then call sun suit hotel Emmanuel was using the internet or Wi-Fi were when Werlinger Daniel Joseph JR pull up on Emmanuel pull him out his car , they said they receive a call that some was trespassing they pull he out of his car beat and assault Emmanuel Adeyinka for calling his mother to pick up his car Because they wanted to tow it , They real didn't have probable cause because nobody warning him that couldn't be on that property and why would they it a hotel people come and go and he was park in his vehicle . Emmanuel Adeyinka wrote the mayor Annise Danette Parker about this incident in e-mail complaining about the nine traffic ticket he receives in a month time.

1. See. In Robinson v.California, 370 U.S.660 (1962) see in Wallace v. City of Chicago (05-1240) also see Brandy v. Maryland 373 U.S. 83, Harris County Record an and of the date 06/17/2012 Case # 183425101010-2 Of Harris County Record at a public park Emmanuel Adeyinka using the rest room of the park service's false allegation of Nickson kekeeocha listed as the Property owner Emmanuel was illegal arrested and false imprison and at 3100 w.Sam Houston pkwy. S Houston, Tx 77042, on 6/27/2013 under case# 190429301010-2 under Harris County Record Emmanuel Adeyinka was using the computer at Houston Community College located 1300 Holman St, Houston ,TX 77004 security guard at Houston community College approach Emmanuel Adeyinka with allegations of sexual harassment Emmanuel told the guard he was just using the computer to run the camera back the guard asking Emmanuel for his ID Emmanuel show it to him then the guard ask Emmanuel to put his hand around his back , so Emmanuel Adeyinka Run , they run Emmanuel down and arrest him . the guard didn't or the witness didn't identify him as the one how sexual harassment somebody but they book I'm for Evading arrested on .see. In Illinois v. Gates, 462 U.S. 213 (1983) See. In United States v. Matlock, 415 U.S. 164 also see in terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S. 1(1968) See. In O'Connor v. Ortega,480 U.S.709(1987).in see the text of 18 U.S.C section 2520 didn't have a Tex Code Crim.Proc.1405, .(1964) Section 14(a) of the act is codified at 15 U.S.C. section 78(n)(a).as implement by the Sec, it prohibits false or misleading proxy statement . Under the circumstance the court to be alert to provide such remedies as are necessary to make effective the congressional purpose 377.US.426, 433(1964).

Crime if he or she Acts in a way that fulfills every element of offense. The status establishing the Offense also establishes element of offense. In general,

every crime involves three elements: first the act or Act or Conduct (" Actus Reus "); secord,the individual's mental state at the time of the act("mens rea") the Government has the burden of proof to establish every element of a crime beyond a Reasonable Doubt; and third, the Individual's conduct must be the cause of the crime. The act omission that Comprise the Physical by statute.

See,e.g. Schad v.Arizona ,501 U.S.624 (1991) 2/08/2016 under case # 207345901010 Harris County Record Emmanuel Adeyinka was Illegal Arrested and false imprison by Hampton and Inger Marie and a false accused by Chu ,pp Emmanuel prove he live in the area from is ID card But Hampton said Emmanuel had a traffic ticket and that rise they arrested Emmanuel Adeyinka , See. In Robinson v.California, 370 U.S.660 (1962) see in Wallace v. City of Chicago (05-1240) also see Brandy v. Maryland 373 U.S. 83,

("The law recognizes tort a civil wrong and allow injured parties to recover for their losses it is also Also important to note that a law cannot punish a person simply for their status")

B.Sanderson intentioned and intentionally. See. In Robinson v.California, 370 U.S.660 (1962) see in Wallace v. City of Chicago (05-1240) also see in Brandy v. Maryland 373 U.S. 83, 9/5/2016 Emmanuel Adeyinka was charge with retaliation; for the words to a officer word the officer said Emmanuel Adeyinka , said I kill you, there was no evidence, and he said these words or phrase to the officer but a mental state of mind,; which Emmanuel Adeyinka real said he sue , Emmanuel had a full conversion with B.sanderson why

would the conversion turn violet . Which in other hands the action doesn't meeting the express of the words that was reported. Emmanuel Adeyinka See. In Beazell v.Ohio, 269 U.S.167 (1925) in J.I case co v. borak . B.Sanderson didn't have a probable cause, Emmanuel Adeyinka was arrested by OTTO and Roy Allen because of the some traffic ticket Hampton arrested him in earlier case #207345901010 of Harris County Record for , ("even if giving that Emmanuel Adeyinka said I kill you"); .see. In Illinois v. Gates, 462 U.S. 213 (1983) See. In United States v. Matlock, 415 U.S. 164 also see in terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S. 1(1968) See. In O'Connor v. Ortega,480 U.S.709(1987).in see the text of 18 U.S.C section 2520 didn't have a Tex Code Crim.Proc.1405, During the course of incarceration on an of case# 1522647 of Harris County Record at 10811 Richmond Ave 18 Houston Tx 77042 false allegation was brought up again Emmanuel Adeyinka ,by public force service B.Sanderson of the public force Emmanuel Adeyinka was arrested by OTTO and Roy Allen because of the some traffic ticket Hampton arrested him in earlier case for , who is B.sanderson there was no one by the name of B.Sanderson at Emmanuel Adeyinka houses also conspiracy to assault , Emmanuel Adeyinka he was fought and Beat in jail

Malicious Prosecution

A malicious prosecution claim asserts that the officer wrongly deprived the victim of the **Fourteenth Amendment** right to liberty. To win this type of claim, the victim must show four things: And a Due Process clause

The defendant police officer commenced a criminal proceeding.

The proceeding ended in the victim's favor (that is, no conviction).

There was no probable cause.

The proceeding was brought with malice toward the victim.

False Arrest

See in Wallace v. City of Chicago (05-1240)

The claim that is most often asserted against police is false arrest. Persons bringing this claim assert that police violated their Fourth Amendment right against unreasonable seizure. If the officer had **probable cause** to believe the individual had committed a crime, the arrest is reasonable and the Fourth Amendment has not been violated. Police can arrest without a warrant for a felony or misdemeanor committed in their presence. (Some states also allow warrantless arrests for misdemeanor domestic assaults not committed in the officer's presence.)

Even if the information the officer relied upon later turns out to be false, the officer is not liable if he believed it was accurate at the time of the arrest. To prevail on a false arrest claim, the victim must show that the arresting officer lacked probable cause, that is, facts sufficient to cause a reasonable person to believe that a crime had been committed.

In Robinson v.California, 370 U.S.660 (1962) also see Brandy v. Maryland 373 U.S. 83, see in Wallace v. City of Chicago (05-1240) 4/27/2004 case #098579501010-3 of Harris County Record Emmanuel Adeyinka, arrested on status offense On the date 08/24/2000 at 3620 Woodchase Dr apt 99 HoustonTx 77042 Emmanuel Adeyinka was Illegal Arrested and false imprison of under the Case#101765901010-2 Harris County Record . Arrested for trespassing the officer ask Emmanuel Adeyinka he said he did there was no probable cause, **see in Wallace v. City of Chicago (05-1240)** See in ***Brady v. Maryland***, 373 U.S. 83 (1963),

See.In Robinson v.California, 370 U.S.660 (1962) see in Wallace v. City of Chicago (05-1240) 3/23/2012 Case # 181697501010-2 of Harris County record Emmanuel Adeyinka arrested for status offense, trespassing The cruel and unusual punishment USE UNREASONABLE FORCE See in Scott v. metropolitan police commissioner (1975) AC 910, by Werlinger , Daniel Joseph JR.and Lisle John beat Emmanuel Adeyinka , Emmanuel was in his car using his computer , at Now call town suite hotel but then call sun suit hotel Emmanuel was using the internet or Wi-Fi were when Werlinger Daniel Joseph JR pull up on Emmanuel pull him out his car , they said they receive a call that some was trespassing they pull he out of his car beat and assault Emmanuel Adeyinka for calling his mother to pick up his car Because they wanted to tow it , They real didn't have probable cause because nobody warning him

that couldn't be on that property and why would they it a hotel people come and go and he was park in his vehicle no probable cause, see in Wallace v. City of Chicago (05-1240) . Emmanuel Adeyinka wrote the mayor AnnaDanette Parker about this incident in e-mail complaining about the nine traffic ticket he receives in a month time.
See. In Robinson v.California, 370 U.S.660 (1962) *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), \ Harris County Record an and of the date 06/17/2012 Case # 183425101010-2 Of Harris County Record at a public park Emmanuel Adeyinka using the rest room of the park service's false allegation of Nickson kekeeocha listed as the Property owner Emmanuel was illegal arrested and false imprison and at 3100 w.Sam Houston pkwy. S Houston, Tx 77042, Record Emmanuel Been use the Quillian center service since he was 14 year old.a pubic park these was a hate crime no probable cause. See in Wallace v. City of Chicago (05-1240)

on 6/27/2013 under case# 190429301010-2 under Harris County see in Wallace v. City of Chicago (05-1240) Emmanuel Adeyinka was using the computer at Houston Community College located 1300 Holman St, Houston ,TX 77004 security guard at Houston community College approach Emmanuel Adeyinka with allegations of sexual harassment Emmanuel told the guard he was just using the computer to run the camera back the guard asking Emmanuel for his ID Emmanuel show it to him then the guard ask Emmanuel to put his hand around his back , so Emmanuel Adeyinka Run , they run Emmanuel down and arrest him . the guard didn't or the witness didn't identify him as the one how sexual harassment somebody but they book I'm for Evading arrested on .see. In Illinois v. Gates, 462 U.S. 213 (1983) See. In United States v. Matlock, 415 U.S. 164 also see in terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S. 1(1968) See. In O'Connor v. Ortega,480 U.S.709(1987).in see the text of 18 U.S.C section 2520 didn't have a Tex Code Crim.Proc.1405, .(1964) Section 14(a) of the act is codified at 15 U.S.C. section 78(n)(a).as implement by the Sec, it prohibits false or misleading proxy statement . See,e.g. Schad v.Arizona ,501 U.S.624 (1991) 2/08/2016 under case # 207345901010 Harris County Record Emmanuel Adeyinka was Illegal Arrested and false imprison by Hampton and Inger Marie and a false accused by Chu ,pp Emmanuel prove he live in the area from is ID But Hampton said Emmanuel had a traffic ticket , See. In Robinson v.California, 370 U.S.660 (1962) *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), see in Wallace v. City of Chicago (05-1240) ("The law recognizes tort a civil wrong and allow injured parties to recover for their losses it is also Also important to note that a law cannot punish a person simply for their status") B.Sanderson intentioned and intentionally. See. In Robinson v.California,

370 U.S.660 (1962) ***Brady v. Maryland***, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), **see in Wallace v. City of Chicago (05-1240) 9/5/2016 Emmanuel Adeyinka was charge with retaliation; verb abuse to a officer they said Emmanuel Adeyinka said I kill you, there was no evidence, of these verb abuse or these words or phrase or a Mental state of mind,; which Emmanuel Adeyinka real said he sue, Which in other hands the action doesn't meeting the express of the words that was reported. Emmanuel Adeyinka See. In Beazell v.Ohio, 269 U.S.167 (1925) in J.I case co v. borak . B.Sanderson didn't have a probable cause, to arrest Emmanuel Adeyinka , OTTO and Roy Allen because of the some traffic ticket Hampton arrested him in earlier case #207345901010 of Harris County Record for , ("even if giving that Emmanuel Adeyinka said I kill you"); .see. In Illinois v. Gates, 462 U.S. 213 (1983) See. In United States v. Matlock, 415 U.S. 164 also see in terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S. 1(1968) See. In O'Connor v. Ortega,480 U.S.709(1987).in see the text of 18 U.S.C section 2520 didn't have a Tex Code Crim.Proc.1405, During the course of incarceration on an of case# 1522647 of Harris County Record at 10811 Richmond Ave 18 Houston Tx 77042 false allegation was brought up again Emmanuel Adeyinka ,by public force service B.Sanderson of the public force Emmanuel Adeyinka was arrested by OTTO and Roy Allen because of the some traffic ticket Hampton arrested him in earlier case for they didn't have** probable cause **see in Wallace v. City of Chicago (05-1240) ,See in** ***Brady v. Maryland***, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), **Emmanuel Adeyinka he was fought and Beat in jail See**

Excessive Force

Excessive force claims receive the most publicity, perhaps because the results of excessive force seem the most outrageous, involving serious physical injury or death. Whether the officer's use of force was reasonable depends on the surrounding facts and circumstances. The officer's intentions or motivations

are not controlling. If the amount of force was reasonable, it doesn't matter that the officer's intentions were bad. But the reverse is also true: if the officer had good intentions, but used unreasonable force, the excessive force claim will not be dismissed.

See in Scott v. metropolitan police commissioner (1975) AC 910,

. Arrested for trespassing See. In Robinson v.California, 370 U.S.660 See in Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), **(1962) 3/23/2012 Case # 181697501010-2 of Harris County record Emmanuel Adeyinka arrested for status offense, trespassing The cruel and unusual punishment USE UNREASONABLE FORCE by See in Scott v. metropolitan police commissioner (1975) AC 910, Werlinger , Daniel Joseph JR.and Lisle John beat Emmanuel Adeyinka , Emmanuel was in his car using his computer , at Now call town suite hotel but then call sun suit hotel Emmanuel was using the internet or Wi-Fi were when Werlinger Daniel Joseph JR pull up on Emmanuel pull him out his car , they said they receive a call that some was trespassing they pull he out of his car beat and assault Emmanuel Adeyinka for calling his mother to pick up his car Because they wanted to tow it , They real didn't have probable cause because nobody warning him that couldn't be on that property and why would they it a hotel people come and go and he was park in his vehicle . Emmanuel Adeyinka** wrote **the mayor Anna Danette Parker about this incident in e-mail complaining about the nine traffic ticket he receives in a month time.**

Failure to Train and lead litigation

Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963),

A municipality may be liable for a tort committed by an employee if the city could have prevented the injury through training.

"The inadequacy of police training may serve as the basis for 1983 liability only where the failure to train in a relevant respect amounts to deliberate indifference to the constitutional rights of persons with whom the police come into contact... Only where a failure to train reflects a "deliberate" or "conscious" choice by the municipality can the failure be properly thought of as an actionable city 'policy.'

Moreover, the identified deficiency in the training program must be closely related to the ultimate injury. Thus, respondent must still prove that the deficiency in training actually caused the police officers' indifference to her medical needs. To adopt lesser standards of fault and causation would open municipalities to unprecedented liability under 1983; would result in de facto respondent superior liability...; would engage federal courts in an endless exercise of second-guessing municipal employee-training programs, a task that they are ill suited to undertake; and would implicate serious questions of federalism."

Element One :

Traffic tickets Emmanuel Adeyinka Receive 4 to 9 tickets in one

Month in 2012 so much he wrote the mayor about these tickets because He fills he was not being stop or pick on for no rise. So in one Way or another Emmanuel Adeyinka Show concern because he wrote his mayor, so he wanted these traffic tickets Taking care of in one matter or another.

2/08/2016 under case # 207345901010 Harris County Record Emmanuel Adeyinka was Arrested and by Hampton and Inger Marie accused by Chu ,pp Emmanuel prove he live in the area from is ID But Hampton said Emmanuel had a traffic ticket , *and why he still processed to take Emmanuel Adeyinka to jail that night For the "Traffic Ticket" and still book him for trespassing. Emmanuel receives a charge for trespassing.*

9/5/2016 Emmanuel Adeyinka was charge with retaliation; That night when these officer was questing Emmanuel Adeyinka OTTO and Roy Allen they Said they run his ID and he had a the some one traffic ticket Hampton arrested Emmanuel Adeyinka How know it was the some one Because one of the officer ask Emmanuel Adeyinka if he been to jail before Emmanuel Adeyinka said no , The black lady officer said yes you have you when to jail in February Emmanuel Adeyinka relpy , When you charge with a misdemeanor or felony and a traffic ticket is the objective or subject or the reason you be containing it sould be expunged out of the system immediaptely after server time or during the process of convition. Even after Emmanuel Adeyinka was release for the case# 1522647 of Harris County Record on probation . Emmanuel Adeyinka still had to call and tell harris county to expunged the traffic ticket , Emmanuel Adeyinka told them he just been release for jail , but he can renew is drive license till the remove the ticket out of the system , Would these have prevented officer Hampton and OTTO and Roy Allen and B. Sanderson , from taking Emmanuel Adeyinka to jail giving that reason for arresting him and stop a coviction of a misdemeanor and felony .

Element two:

On the date 08/24/2000 at 3620 Woodchase Dr HoustonTx 77042 Emmanuel Adeyinka was Arrested and false imprison of under the Case#101765901010-2 Harris County Record arrested for trespassing. He live and stay in apartment number 99. Thought his case was Dismiss, there was an illegal search and seizure that night. Nor did the officer have probable cause and the officer voilated Emmanuel Adeyinka 4 fourth amendment rights , these case was dismiss but emmanuel spend a night in jail , that was the first trespassing conviction bring up againts Emmanuel Adeyinka . but a start of a pattening of accusation of a property violation and a 4 fourth amendment violation and and Section 1983 violation , unlawful for anyone acting under the authority of state law to deprive another person of his or her rights under the Constitution or federal law. By a False arrest. 9/5/2016 case# 1522647 of Harris County Record Emmanuel Adeyinka Show the officer his ID card And the officer spoke with Emmanuel Adeyinka mother to clarify he live in the neighborhood. Both nights he proof he wasn't the casuse of any trouble an had no probable cause to bother him.

Element tree:

On date 3/23/2012 Case # 181697501010-2 of Harris County record Emmanuel Adeyinka arrested for status offense, trespassing The cruel and unusual punishment USE UNREASONABLE FORCE by Werlinger , Daniel Joseph JR.and Lisle John beat Emmanuel Adeyinka , Emmanuel was in his car using his computer , at Now call town suite hotel but then call sun suit hotel Emmanuel was using the internet or Wi-Fi were when Werlinger and Daniel Joseph JR pull up in their in police cruiser on Emmanuel they ask Emmanuel Adeyinka what was he doing there , Emmanuel Adeyinka what he was doing there . He told use his computer he just pull over to use his computer he be moving he was just making a quick stop. they ask Emmaunel Adeyinka to get out of his car , Emmanuel Adeyinka why I haven't don't anything wrong , Emmanuel Adeyinka get out his car . they ask him to pull his hands beheld his back , Emmanuel Adeyinka still asking why , and that he haven't done anything wrong ,the tell that someone call and said someone was trespassing , Emmanuel Adeyinka said it couldn't been me I told what I was doing here I just pull over for a quick stop to use his computer . They search his car without permission . Emmanuel Adeyinka Ask them what going on , they rely that they are taking he in for trespassing , at these time they have Emmanuel Adeyinka in the custody in the back of the police cruiser , Emmanuel Adeyinka had his phone in his hand he bring to my a phone , his intention to call his mother to pull up his car , so they wouldn't tow it , they then began to punch and strike and beat Emmanuel Adeyinka '{ ("Note") that

CONCLUSION

There have been patterns of remedy and acts of similar violation explain are listed in the above statement. There has been proof of element and evidence in other related cases evening bring these case to exhibit in other related lawsuits Emmanuel Adeyinka is address These elements of violation, the courts cannot replace or restore a career or cover the emotion damages and condition that families go through or the spiritual foundation and standards forced to live under by the litigation developments of economical decision of legislators and peers place on the public. But you can show that there is a righteous line of judgment and a raft of the United States justice system that justify that duty of justice but doesn't show favor to unconstitutional or undeveloped acts that are unconstitutional. The Equal and fair chances of the constitution as in what Magna Carta have to offer to

the constitution Equal voting rights, and not to be Litigated by the legislator. Human have civil Rights and if there are violated they are faced with persecution no matter who you are or how much money you have, America is free from any discrimination.

they had Emmanuel Adeyinka in custody in the back of police cruiser in handcuff already)}' that night they didn't have probable cause or did they have a rise to use Force to get Emmanuel Adeyinka cooperate with them or did Emmanuel show any sign to resist arrest , Emmanuel Adeyinka Ask and told the officer before he try make the phone , that he like to make a phone call because he didn't want his car tow , and that he stay down that street he like his mother to pick up his car.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted under rule 11 or 10

28 U.S. Code § 2101 **28 U.S. Code § 1253**

Respectfully submitted,

EmmanuelAdeyinka

10811 Richmond Ave 18
Houston Tx 77042
713-514-6288
emmanueladeyinkalaw@gmail.com
Signature:

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on the following date: 9/5/18 (date), I provided a copy of: ☒ this brief ☐ the excerpt of record to:

☐ the opposing party ☐ the opposing party's attorney

☐ ☐ ☐ *(other)*

by: ☒ First class mail or ☐ Hand delivery

Signature: _____

SIGNATURE

Respectfully submitted on 9/5/18 (date)

Your signature: _____

☑ Appellant ☐ Appellee

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

You must give the opposing party (or their attorney if represented) a copy of this brief and any excerpt of record you file. Fill out the Certificate of Service at the bottom completely. Reminder: You also have to file an excerpt of record, including all important documents from the first court of appeals Court record. Make sure to file the number of copies of your brief and excerpt of record stated in the brief notice.