

No. 18-8907

ORIGINAL

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

MAR 21 2019

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

SAMUEL H. WILLIAMS — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

VS.

U.S. SUPREME COURT — RESPONDENT(S)
EXTRAORDINARY WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS
ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF ~~ORIGINAL~~ TO

EIGHTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS MISSOURI
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)
EXTRAORDINARY WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS
PETITION FOR WRIT OF ~~ORIGINAL~~

SAMUEL H. WILLIAMS
(Your Name)

ERDCC 2727 HIGHWAY
(Address)

BONNETERRE MO 63628
(City, State, Zip Code)

378-576-5516
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

VIOLATION OF THE FIRST CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

VIOLATION OF THE SIX CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

VIOLATION OF THE EIGHTH CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

VIOLATION OF THE 14TH AMENDMENTS

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:

EIGHTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MO,

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT
SOUTHERN DIVISION SPRINGFIELD MO,

MISSOURI SUPREME COURT CHIEF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL
MISSOURI COMMISSION DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL FOR
JUDGES,

MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS EASTERN AND WESTERN
DISTRICT,

GREENE COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT,

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	EIGHTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS ST. LOUIS MO	PAGES 1-2
APPENDIX B	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN AND WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI SOUTHERN DIVISION	PAGES 3-8
APPENDIX C	MISSOURI SUPREME COURT CHIEF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL	PAGES 9-13
APPENDIX D	MISSOURI COMMISSION DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL, FOR JUDGES	PAGES 14-16
APPENDIX E	MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS EASTERN AND WESTERN DISTRICT SOUTHERN DIVISION,	PAGES 17-21
APPENDIX F	GREENE COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT,	PAGES 22-27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
HAINS V. KARNER 404 U.S. 519, 522;	
BRADY V. MARYLAND 373 U.S. 83, 10 LE D 2B 215 83	
SCT 1194 1963 TO 493 652;	
301 F.2D 262, 267 AN 234 F SUPP 201, 203,	
425 P.2D 974, 978, SEE GENERALLY MODLE PANAL CODE 224 SEE	
ALSO DECEIT,	
5 U.S.C. § 556 (D) § 557, 706	
OWNEV, CITY OF INDEPENDENCE, 100 SCT 1398;	
MAINE V. THIBOUTOT, 100 S. C. T. 2502;	
HAFER V. MELO 502 U.S. 21	
TITLE 42 U.S.C. 1983 AND FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS ACT EXCEPTION	
FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTS AND 18 U.S.C. 241/242	
STATUTES AND RULES	
SECTION 18 (A) OF THE MISSOURI CONSTITUTION THE RIGHTS	
OF A CASE D;	
SECTION 18 (B) OF THE MISSOURI CONSTITUTION STATES THAT	
IT IS NECESSARY IN A FELONY CASE TO TAKE DEPOSITION	
9-1-11-18 RULES	
ARTICLE SIX CLAUSE TWO	
CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT XIV	
AMENDMENT BY PUB. L. 96-170 APPLICABLE WITH RESPECT ANY	
DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS, PRIVILEGES, OR IMMUNITIES SECURED	
BY THE CONSTITUTION AND LAWS OCCURRING AFTER DEC. 29, 1979	
SEE 30F PUB. L 96-170, SET OUT AS A NOTE UNDER SECTION 1343 OF	
TITLE 28, JUDICIARY AND JUDICIAL PROCEDURE,	
OTHER	
SECTION 2241 POWER TO GRANT WRIT	
TITLE 28- JUDICIARY AND JUDICIAL PROCEDURE	
PART VI PARTICULAR PROCEEDINGS	
CHAPTER 853 HABEAS CORPUS;	

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR WRIT OF ~~CERTIORARI~~
EXTRAORDINARY HABEAS CORPUS

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 EIGHTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS; 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 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MO; 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 C to the petition and is

☐ reported at MISSOURI SUPREME COURT; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the _____ court appears at Appendix D.E.F to the petition and is

☒ reported at OTHER COURTS; 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 N/A.

☐ 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: N/A, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix N/A.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including N/A (date) on N/A (date) in Application No. N/A A N/A.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

ARTICLE SIX CLAUSE TWO

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was N/A.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix N/A.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: N/A, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix N/A.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including N/A (date) on N/A (date) in Application No. N/A A N/A.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

ARTICLE SIX CLAUSE TWO

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

28 U.S.C. 1983

28 U.S.C. 2254

28 U.S.C. 2241

28 U.S.C. 2242

ARTICLE SIX CLAUSE TWO

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT XIV

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT 13TH

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT 8TH

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT 6TH

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT 4TH

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT FIRST

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1966,

CIVIL RIGHTS OF 1971 CAR - 42 U.S. CODE 21, 1981, -
1983, 1988,

42 U.S.C. CHAPTER 21 CIVIL RIGHT

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

PETITIONER FILE THIS PETITION SEEKING THE COURT APPELLATE JURISDICTION THE EXTRAORDINARY) EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES THAT WARRANT THE EXERCISE OF THE COURT'S DISCRETIONARY) POWERS BECAUSE ADEQUATE RELIEF CANNOT BE OBTAINED IN ANY OTHER FORM OF FROM ANY OTHER COURT,

AUTHORIZED BY ARTICLE SIX CLAUSE TWO

PETITIONER WAS ARRESTED IN AUGUST OF 2007, BY THE SPRINGFIELD CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT STATE OF MISSOURI, THE CHARGES WAS FIRMVOLDUS AND MALICIOUS THE CASES WAS TURN OVER TO THE GREENE COUNTY PROSECUTING ATTORNEYS SYSTEM FOR PROSECUTING THE CASES WENT TO JUDGE BROWN THE COURT APPOINTED COURT APPOINTED PUBLIC DEFENDER) HATLEY TO REPRESENT PETITIONER ON ALL OF THE CASES I PETITIONER COULD NOT COMMUNICATED WITH COURT APPOINTED PUBLIC DEFENDER HATLEY PETITIONER TERMINATED ATTORNEY CLIENT RELATIONSHIP WITH HATLEY PETITIONER GIVE NOTICE TO THE COURT TO JUDGE BROWN ORALLY AND IN WRITTING MOTION FORM THAT COURT APPOINTED PUBLIC DEFENDER HATLEY WAS TERMINATED, HATLEY REFUSE TO BE-

TERMINATED BY PETITIONER HATLEY WENT AND
CONSPIRED WITH JUDGE BROWN AND THE GREENE
COUNTY PROSECUTING ATTORNEYS SYSTEM TO
HAVE PETITIONER DENIED OF HIS GUARANTEE
BY THE CONSTITUTION THE RIGHTS TO TERMIN-
ATE) ATTORNEY CLINT RELATIONSHIP JUDGE
BROWN THEN CONSPIRED WITH THE GREENE
COUNTY PROSECUTION SYSTEM WITH THE COLLA-
BORATION) OF HATLEY TO SET A FARBETTA HEA-
RING) AND THE PRELIMINARY HEARING ON THE
SAME DAY AT THE SAME TIME ONE RIGHT AFTER
THE OTHER JUDGE BROWN HAD ALSO CONSPIRED TO
DENIED TO PETITIONER THE GUARANTEE BY THE
CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AME-
RICA) EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS, JUDGE
BROWN FIRST STATEMENT WAS THAT THE REASON
WHY HE DENIED TO PETITIONER HIS GUARANTEE
BY THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE CONSTIT-
UTIONAL) LAWS WAS THAT PETITIONER DID
NOT DO IT IN A INTELLIGENT MANNER THEN
JUDGE BROWN CHANGE HIS STATEMENT THIS
TIME JUDGE BROWN STATEMENT WAS PETITIONER
PRATEAL RECORD AS NOT INTELLIGENT THEN
JUDGE BROWN DISQUALIFIES HIM SELF THEM
JUDGE BROWN TURN AROUND AND RECUSE HIM
SELF

JUDGE BROWN CONSPIRED WITH JUDGE MOUNTJOY
COURT APPOINTED PUBLIC DEFENDER HATLEY LUTKE
AND THE PROSECUTION SYSTEM FOR JUDGE MOUNT-
JOY) TO TAKE THE FELONY CASES FOR FORMAL READING
OF FELONY INFORMATION THIS WAS AFTER THE FARR-
ETTA) AND THE PERIMINARY HEARING JUDGE BROWN
HAD ALSO CONSPIRED WITH JUDGE MOUNTJOY PUBLIC
DEFENDER AND LUTKE AND THE GREENE COUNTY
PROSECUTION SYSEEM TO HAVE COURT APPOINTED
PUBLIC DEFENDER LUTKE TO COME TO COURT IN
HATLE PLACE AND WAIVE THE FORMAL READING
AND MAKE A PLEAD OF NOT GUILTY FOR HATLEY
AND JUDGE BROWN BECAUSE PETITIONER
TERMINATED ATTORNEY CLIENT RELATIONSHIP
WITH HATLEY AND THE COURT REFUSE TO GIVE
PETITIONER EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE CON-
STITUTIONAL LAWS BY DEPRIVING PETITIONER
THE RIGHTS TO TERMINATED HATLEY I PETIT-
ITIONER) DID NOT EVER PLED ANYTHING AT
ALL THE COURTS WOULD NOT LET PETITIONER
SPEAK ON HIS OWN BEHALE PETITIONER PLEAD
WOULD BE SELF DEFANCE I WAS BEING ATTACK
IN SIDE THE HOUSE WHERE I PETITIONER LIVE

WHEN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF GREENE COUNTY
APPOINTED A COURT PUBLIC DEFENDER TO
REPRESENT A DEFENDANT THE COURT TAKE AWAY
ALL OF YOUR CONSTITUTE ^{ONAL} ~~AND~~ RIGHTS
PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES

AFTER JUDGE MOUNTJOY HELD THE FORMAL READING OF FELONY INFORMATION JUDGE MOUNTJOY THEN SET A FARRETTA HEARING THIS WAS MONTHS AFTER THE FIRST FARRETTA AND PRELIMINARY HEARING WAS CONDUCTED JUDGE MOUNTJOY THIS TIME THE COURT LET PETITIONER SPEAK ON HIS OWN BEHALF PETITIONER INFORMED JUDGE MOUNTJOY OF THE FORMAL COMPLAINTS WITH THE COMMISSION ON RETIREMENT REMOVAL AND DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL FOR JUDGES THE MISSOURI SUPREME COURT CHIEF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL THE AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION AND FEDERAL LAW SUITS CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLAINTS HABEAS CORPUS FOR VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS OF THE LAWS UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTS OF DUE PROCESS OF THE LAWS WHEN PETITIONER GIVE NOTICE THE COURT JUDGE MOUNTJOY THAT LEGAL ACTION'S WAS ON JUDGE BROWN JUDGE MOUNTJOY JUDGE HOLDEN COURT APPOINTED PUBLIC DEFENDER HATLEY MIKE LUTKE J. WATKINS AND THE GREENE COUNTY PROSECUTION SYSTEM PETITIONER HAD 12 PROSECUTING ATTORNEYS WORKING COMMITTING ALL KIND OF PERJURY FRAUD DECEIT AND MANY OTHER UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND UNETHICAL ACTS OF DUE PROCESS OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL LAWS,

AFTER JUDGE MOUNTJOY RECUSE HIMSELF THE CASES
WENT TO JUDGE HOLDEN FOR TRIAL JUDGE HOLDEN
CONSPIRED WITH JUDGE MOUNTJOY JUDGE DROWN
THE COURT APPOINTED PUBLIC DEFENDER SYSTEM
AND THE GREENE COUNTY PROSECUTING ATTORNEYS
SYSTEM FIRST TO DENIED ALL OF PETITIONER'S
AND MOTIONS THAT THE COURTS REFUSE TO REJECT
AND HERE FOR TWO PLUS YEARS EVEN THE ORAL MOT-
ION) FOR A CHANGE OF JUDGE AND A CHANGE OF
VENUE BECAUSE OF ALL OF THE FORMAL COMPLI-
MENTS) AND CIVIL ACTIONS EVEN ON JUDGE
HOLDEN HIMSELF THE COURTS TOLD PETITIONER
THAT IF PETITIONER WANTED TO HAVE REPRESENTATION) PETITIONER HAD TO WORK WITH
HATLEY AND NO ONE ELSE I PETITIONER REFUSE
TO WORK WITH COURT APPOINTED PUBLIC DEFEND-
ER) HATLEY AND LUTKE AND J. WATKINS WAS
WORKING WITH THE PROSECUTION AND
COURT SYSTEM COMMITTING ALL KIND
OF UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTS OF DUE PRO-
CESS) OF THE CONSTITUTION THIS IS WHY
PETITIONER TERMINATE ATTORNEY CLIENT
RELATIONSHIP EVEN AFTER ALL OF THE PERJURY
FRAUD AND DECEIT HATLEY STILL REFUSE TO BE FIRED

THE CASE WENT TO JUDGE HOLDEN FOR TRIAL FIRST
JUDGE HOLDEN SET A FARRETTA HEARING TO DESMI-
SS) HATLEY WHEN THEY CALL PETITIONER IN TO
THE COURT ROOM FOR THE FARRETTA HEARING
JUDGE HOLDEN HAD CONSPIRED WITH HATLEY SO
AND THE PROSECUTION SYSTEM FOR HATLEY TO STEP
OUT OF THE COURT ROOM IN ORDER TO STOP PETI-
TIONER) FROM CONFRONTING HATLEY IN OPEN
COURT ABOUT ALL OF THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL
ACTS OF DUE PROCESS OF THE LAWS THAT HATLEY
AND OTHERS FROM THE PUBLIC DEFENDER SYSTEM
AIDING THE COURTS AND THE PROSECUTION
SYSTEM IN COMMITTING ON PETITIONER BECAUSE
OF ALL OF THE LAW SUITS AND FORMAL COMPLAINTS
ON GREENE COUNTY JUDICIAL OFFICIAL FOR
UNCONSTITUTION AND UNETHICAL ACTS OF
DUE PROCESS OF THE LAWS AND ASKING TO
BE FREED FROM LAWFUL UNETHICAL UNCON-
STITUTIONAL AND VENICTIVELY INCAR-
CERATION) AND PAY PETITIONER MONEY
DAMAGES OF SEVEN MAYION SEVEN HUNDRY
AND FIETY THOUSANT DOLLERS.

THE COURTS FINELLY GIVE PETITIONER HIS RIGHTS
TO SPEAK PRO SE ON HIS OWN BEHALE THAT THE
COURTS DEPRIVED PETITIONER OF FOR TWO PLUS
YEARS WITH THE COURT SYSTEM THE PROSECUTION
SYSTEM AND THE PUBLIC DEFENDER SYSTEM
COMMITTING ALL KIND OF ACTS OF PERJUR FRAUD
AND DECEIT ON THE COURTS RECORD

JUDGE HOLDEN STARTED CONDUCTING THE TRIAL PETITIONER WAS TOLD THAT IF PETITIONER TRIED TO BRINE UP ANYTHING ABOUT THE SOCALL VICTIM CRIMINAL HISTRY PETITIONER WOULD BE BARED OUT OF THE COURT ROOM AND COURT APPOINTED PUBLIC DEFENDER HATLEY WOULD BE REPRESENTING PETITIONER WITH OUT PETITIONER) BEING IN THE COURT ROOM JUST LIKE ALL OF THE OTHER TIMES AFTER PETITIONER TERMINATED ATTORNEY CLINT RELATIONSHIP WITH HATLEY THE COURTS WOULD SET A HEARING) BUT WOULD NOT LET PETITIONER COME INTO THE COURT ROOM THE JAIL OFFICIAL) WOULD BRING PETITIONER DOWN TO THE COURTS HOLDING CELLS BUT NOT IN TO THE COURT ROOM IT SELF.

JUDGE HOLDEN THEN CALL IN THE JURY GROUP FOR TO PICK 12 OF THE JURY MUMBER FOR TRIAL THE COURT CALL IN 45 PEOPLE THE SIX JURY MUMBER THAT I PETITIONER PICK WAS NOT USED JUDGE HOLDEN AND THE PROSECUTION SYSTEM PICK ALL 12 OF THE JURY MUMBER WHEN PETITIONER OBJECT ABOUT JUDGE HOLDEN) AND THE PROSECUTION SYSTEM PICKING ALL OF THE JURY JUDGE HOLDEN TOLD PETITIONER WELL I GUST THAT WE WILL HAVE A MISTRIAL THAT IS WHAT JUDGE HOLDEN ANSWER WAS TO PETITIONER

AFTER THE JURY WAS PICK JUST BEFORE THE TRIAL
SOME OF THE ALL RACES JURY MEMBER SAID TO
PETITIONER NIGGER YOU OR GUILTY PETITIONER
GIVE NOTICE OF THIS TO THE COURT TO JUDGE
HOLDEN THAT IS JUDGE HOLDEN SAID THAT HE
DID NOT HEAR THAT BUT HE WILL KEEP AN EYE
OUT FOR THAT THEN THE TRIAL STARTED FIRST
THE COURT CALL TO THE WITNESS STAND TO
TESTFIDE WAS THE VICTIM WITNESS HE GOT
ON THE WITNESS STAND AND TESTFIDE THAT
NOTHING IN THE POLICE PROBABLE CAUSE
STATEMENT OR IN THE POLICE REPORTS WAS
ANYTHING THAT HE SAID TO THE POLICE OR TO
THE PROSECUTION SYSTEM, THE SO CALL VICTIM
WITNESS TESTFIDE THAT HE DID NOT MAKE ANY
STATEMENTS AT ALL TO THE POLICE OR TO THE
PROSECUTION SYSTEM THE STATE CALL THE NEXT
WITNESS ONE OF THE POLICE OFFICER THAT HELP
WRIGHT THOSE FALSE POLICE REPORTS THE POLICE
OFFICER GOT ON THE WITNESSES STAND AND
LIED ABOUT THE FALSE POLICE REPORT WHEN
THE WITNESS GOT OFF THE WITNESS JUDGE HOL-
DEN) MADE A STATEMENT TO THE JURY THAT
IMPLICATED THAT PART OF THE POLICE JOB
DESCRIPTION IS TO LIE THEN JUDGE HOLDEN
WENT ON TO SAY TO THE JURY THAT HE KEEP
REMBER THAT HE HEARD PETITIONER SAY THAT HE
DID IT I PETITIONER DID NOT EVER SAY THE
INCIDENT DID NOT HAPPEN THE COURTS WOULD
NOT LET ME SPEAK SELF DEFENCE IS MY PLEAD

JUDGE HOLDEN MADE SEVERAL UNETHICAL AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL STATEMENTS TO THE ALL RACES JURY THAT THE COURT AND THE PROSECUTION SYSTEM PICK FOR THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL TRIAL OUT OF RACES VINDICTIVE HATE THE COURT JUDGE HOLDEN AIDED AND COLLABORATED WITH THE PROSECUTION COMMITTING ALL KIND OF ACTS OF DECEPTION THROUGH OUT THE COURSE OF THE TRIAL THE STATE REFUSE AND THE COURTS REFUSE TO CALL IN THE DOCTOR THAT THE POLICE STATE'S THAT DID ALL KIND OF SURGERY ON THE SO CALL VICTIM MY ATTACKER THE MEDICAL REPORTS SAY THAT PETITIONER ATTACKER THE SO CALL VICTIM HAD BEEN STAB IN THE CHEST AND THE LEFT WRISK LONG BEFOR HE ATTACKED PETITIONER AND END UP WITH A LACERATION SOME WHERE ON THE LEFT ARM THE POLICE REPORTS STATE'S THAT THE ONE LACERATION WAS IN THREE DIFFERENT PLACE ON THE LEFT ARM; PETITIONER GIVE NOTICE OF APPEAL TO JUDGE HOLDEN THE SAME DAY THAT THE RACES JURY OFFICIALLY THIS TIME SAID THAT PETITIONER IS GUILTY JUDGE HOLDEN THE COURTS REFUSE TO TAKE AND DOCKET PETITIONER NOTICE OF APPEAL THE COURTS AND THE STATE REFUSE TO GIVE TO PETITIONER THE TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS EVEN NOW THE COURT WILL NOT GIVE PETITIONER THE TRIAL TRANSCRIPT;

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

PETITIONER IS ASKING THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NATION TO USE ITS APPELLATE JURISDICTION) BECAUSE OF THE EXTRAORDINARY EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES THAT WARRANT THE EXERCISE OF THE COURT'S DISCRETIONARY POWERS BECAUSE ADEQUATE RELIEF CANNOT BE OBTAINED IN ANY OTHER FORM OR FROM ANY OTHER COURT

AUTHORIZED BY ARTICLE SIX CLAUSE TWO

PETITIONER FILE HIS FIRST CASE IN FEDERAL COURT IN FEBRUARY OF 2008, SEEKING RELIEF FROM FALSE ARREST AND WRONGFUL INCARCERATION) BECAUSE PETITIONER TERMINATED ATTORNEY) CLIENT RELATIONSHIP WITH COURT APPOINTED) PUBLIC DEFENDER CHRISTOPHER HATLEY HATLEY REFUSE TO BE FIRED BY PETITIONER HATLEY ALSO REFUSE TO GIVE ALL OF THE DISCOVERY) TO PETITIONER ONLY PART WHICH WILL NOT HELP ME IN THE DEFENSE OF MY CAUSE OF CRIMINAL ACTION) THE FEDERAL COURT TOLD PETITIONER THAT COURT APPOINTED PUBLIC DEFENDER) DO NOT WORK UNDER THE COLOR OF LAW, PETITIONER THEN FILE AN UGHTER LAW SUIT AN HABEAS CORPUS TO GATHER ON COURT APPOINTED

PUBLIC DEFENDER HATLEY AND JUDGE BROWN FOR
COMMITTING UNETHICAL AND UNCONSTITUTION-
AL) ACTS OF DUEPROCESS OF THE LAWS PETITIONER
HAVE FILE MANY LAW SUITES AND HABEAS CORP-
US) ON GREENE COUNTY STATE OF MISSOURI
JUDICIAL OFFICIAL FOR ALL KINDS OF UNCON-
STITUTIONAL) ACTS OF DUEPROCESS OF THE LAWS
EVEN 'DENIEING PETITIONER OF HIS PRIVILEGES
AND IMMUNITIES THE FEDERAL COURTS ISSUE
SUMMONS ON SOME OF THE RESPONDENT'S BUT
PETITIONER DID NOT EVER HAVE HIS DAY IN
THE COURT ROOM THIS WAS IN APRIL OF 2008,
AGAIN IN FEBRUARY OF 2009 THE COURT ISSUE
AN ORDER TELLING RESPONTENT'S TO SHOW
CAUSE WHY THE RELIEF SOUGH SHOULD NOT BE
GRANTED COURT RULE 9.1-18, PROCESSING AND
REVIEWING HABEAS CORPUS PETITIONS FILED
PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. 2241 ET SEQ, THOES
FILED BY STATE PRISONERS PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C.
2254, OR BY FEDERAL PRISONERS PURSUANT TO
28 U.S.C. 2255, AND CIVIL SUITES FILED BY
STATE PRISONER UNDER 42 U.S.C. 1983 WITH
AUTHORITY TO REQUIRE RESPONSES, ISSUE ORDERS
TO SHOW CAUSE AND SUCH OTHER ORDERS AS ARE
NECESSARY TO DEVELOP A COMPLETE RECORD INC-
LUDING THE CONDUCT OF EVIDENTIARY HEAR-
ING) AND THE PREPARATION OF A REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION TO THE DISTRICT JUDGE AS
TO APPROPRIATE DISPOSITION OF THE PETITION OR
CLAIM)

AGAIN IN FEBRUARY OF 2014 THE COURT ISSUE
AN ORDER TELLING RESPONDENTS TO SHOW CAUSE
(SE) WHY THE RELIEF BEING SOUGHT NOT BE
GRANTED THE COURTS FAIL TO GIVE TO
PETITIONER ANY OPPORTUNITY TO PROVE
ANYTHING NO EVIDENTIARY HEARING HEARD,
THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE PROVIDES
(DES) THAT ALL MEN ARE CREATED EQUAL AND
THAT MEN CREATED GOVERNMENT TO SECURE
THE RIGHTS OF MEN PURSUANT TO THE UNANIMOUS
DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE JULY 1776
B.A.R. TERRORISTS AND GOVERNMENT AGENTS OF
FIDERS AND OPPORTUNITY TO OFFER SUPPORTING
EVIDENCE, ACCORDINGLY ALTHOUGH WE INTIMATE
(ATE) NO VIEW ON THE MERITS OF PETITIONER
ALLEGATIONS WE CONCLUDE THAT HE IS ENTITLED
(TTLED) TO AN OPPORTUNITY TO OFFER PROOF
HANES V. KERNER, 404 US 519 522,
CONSTRUCTIVE [LEGAL] FRAUD COMPRISES ALL ACTS
OMISSIONS AND CONCEALMENT INVOLVING
BREACH OF EQUITABLE OR LEGAL DUTY TRUST
OR CONFIDENCE AND RESULTING IN DAMAGE
TO ANOTHER, 38 CAL RPTER 148, 151, IF NO SCIENTER
REQUIRED THUS THE PARTY WHO MAKE THE
MISREPRESENTATION NEED NOT KNOW THAT
IT IS FALSE, SEE 437 SW.2D 20, 28,

PETITIONER HAVE BEEN DENIED DUE PROCESS OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL LAWS AND EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS BY GREENE COUNTY CIRCUIT COURTS STATE OF MISSOURI, AND THE FEDERAL UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI AND THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS STATE OF MISSOURI ALSO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT DENIED PETITIONER DUE PROCESS OF THE LAWS EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL LAWS

THE CORNERSTONE TO DUE PROCESS IS NOTICE AND OPPORTUNITY ABSENT PROPER NOTICE AN ACCUSED MAY BE ABSOLUTELY DEPRIVED OF THE OPPORTUNITY TO DEFEND LIES FRAUDS DECEITS SHYSTER SHENANIGANS AND OTHER TREACHERY FAIL AS TO PROPER NOTICE, ONCE DUE PROCESS IS DENIED ALL JURISDICTION CEASES AS PER YOUR VERY OWN U.S.C. 556 (D), 557 706. JUDGES HAVE NO IMMUNITY, AS OWNE V. CITY OF INDEPENDENCE, 100 S.C.T. 1398; MAINE V. THIBOUTOT 100 S.C.T. 2502; AND HAFER V. MELO, 502 U.S. JUDGES ARE DEEMED TO KNOW THE LAW AND SWORN TO UPHOLD THE LAW, JUDGES CANNOT CLAIM TO ACT IN GOOD FAITH IN WILLFUL DEPRIVATION OF LAW THEY CERTAINLY CANNOT PLEAD IGNORANCE OF THE LAW EVEN THE CITIZEN CANNOT PLEAD IGNORANCE OF THE LAW, IT IS INDICIOUS FOR A LEARNED JUDGE TO PLEAD IGNORANCE OF THE LAW THEREFORE -

THERE IS NO JUDICIAL IMMUNITY IN MATTERS OF
RIGHT SECURED BY THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNIT-
ED) STATES OF AMERICA, SEE TITLE 42 U.S.C. 1983 AND
FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS ACT EXCEPTION FOR UNCON-
STITUTIONAL ACTS, AS WELL AS 18 U.S.C. 241/242

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

AMENDMENT XIV EQUAL PROTECTION

ALL PERSONS BORN OR NATURALIZED IN THE UNITED
STATES, AND SUBJECT TO THE JURISDICTION THERE
OF ARE CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES AND OF THE
STATE WHEREIN THEY RESIDE, NO STATE SHALL MAKE
OR ENFORCE ANY LAW WHICH SHALL ABRIDGE^C 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.

PETITIONER PRAY THAT SUPREME COURT OF THE NATION WILL GRANT THAT
RELIEF PETITIONER HAVE SEEKING FOR OVER 11 YEARS NOW THE RELIEF BEING IS
FREE PETITIONER FROM UNLAWFUL UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VINDICTIVE
IMPRISONMENT AND PAY MONEY DAMAGES OF SEVEN MATION SEVEN HUNDRY
AND FIFTY THOUSANT DOLLERS

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

SAMUEL H. Williams

Date: MARCH 11- 2019

**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**