

No.

18-9038

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ORIGINAL

SCOTT PETERS AN PROSE ATTORNEY - PETITIONER

V.S.

People of the State of ILLINOIS - Respondent(s)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

ILLINOIS Supreme Court

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED

SCOTT PETERS AN PROSE ATTORNEY

NO. M52851

MSU-X-A26

P.O. Box 1000

MENARD, ILLINOIS 62259

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

MAR 11 2019

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- ① PETITIONER QUESTIONS THE TRIAL COURT'S RULING CONCERNING POSSIBLE PREJUDICE OF PRISONER'S STATUS AS A "QUALIFIED INDIVIDUAL" AND HIS RIGHTS TO USE HANDICAP ASSISTIVE DEVICES FOR MOBILITY.
- ② PETITIONER QUESTIONS THE TRIAL COURT'S DECISION TO BRING PETITIONER INTO COURT ROOM PLACE HIM IN A CHAIR AND NOT ALLOW HIS DEMEANOR TO BE OBSERVED BY THE TRIER OF FACT.
- ③ PETITIONER QUESTIONS THE TRIAL COURT'S ALLOWING WOUNDED OFFICER TO REMAIN IN COURTROOM IN WHEELCHAIR, WHERE OFFICER COULD STAND UP AND DID, HOWEVER PETITIONER COULD NOT STAND UP AND PRESS NOTED OFFICER STOOD UP BUT PETITIONER DID NOT THUMBING HIS NOSE AT THE COURT, OFFICERS AND JURY, CREATING BIAS AND PREJUDICE TOWARD PETITIONER.
- ④ PETITIONER QUESTIONS AND ASSERTS THAT HIS ADA, HANDICAP ISSUES SHOW HE NAKED ASSERTIONS BY THE TRIAL COURT AND STATE, ARE VOID OF FACT OR ARE THEY AS ASSESSED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS VERY REAL HANDICAPS, AS NO REBUTAL OR EMPEACHING EXPERT WITNESSES WERE PRESENTED ON HIS BEHALF AND DID THIS REMOVAL OF HIS ISSUES FROM SITE OF THE FACT FINDER PREJUDICE HIM FROM SHOWING HIS VULNERABLE POSITION AND FEAR FOR HIS LIFE DUE TO THAT REASON AND VULNERABILITY TO ARMED INCUSSIONS.
- ⑤ PETITIONER QUESTIONS THAT HIS DEFENSE COUNSEL WOULDNT PERSUE CONTRARY TO HIS WISHES HIS PLEAS OF SELF DEFENSE AND ACTUAL INNOCENCE AT THE ONSET, INSTEAD THEY PERSUED AN INSANITY DEFENSE AND FAILED, ONLY THEN THEY TOOK UP PETITIONERS SELF DEFENSE PLEADING WITHOUT PREPERATION OR EXPERT WITNESSES NEEDED TO ENFORCE A TECHNICAL NARRATIVE OF THE EVENTS ADVERSARILY TO THE STATE EDITORIAL. PETITIONER QUESTIONS IF THIS PREJUDICED AND BIASED HIM VIOLATED HIS DUE PROCESS RIGHTS, AND BY PLEADING HERE INSANITY DEFENSE BASICALLY PLEADED HIM GUILTY AGAINST HIS WISHES, OR GUILT BY INSANITY.
- ⑥ PETITIONER QUESTIONS THE VALIDITY OF THE APPELLATE COURT'S OPINIONS DELIVERED BY JUSTICE SCHOSTOK AS INHERENTLY WITHOUT TRUTH AND WHETHER THE COURT CAN MAKE NAKED ASSERTIONS WITHOUT LOOKING AT THE TRUTH OF A MATTER. CLEARLY THE JUDGE AND COURT DID NOT READ ANY OF THE TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS OR EVIDENCE BEFORE PROVIDING ITS OPINION, PETITIONER QUESTIONS WHETHER THESE STATEMENTS AS MADE CONSTITUTE JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT BY BEING BLATANTLY WITHOUT FACT.
- ⑦ PETITIONER QUESTIONS WHETHER A TRIAL COURT JUDGE CAN OUTRIGHT PRESENT FALSEHOOD ON THE RECORD IN RELATION TOO PETITIONER'S CONCERNS ABOUT THE PSYCHOLOGICAL EVALUATIONS HE COURT USED AND THERE PERSONELL.

QUESTIONS) PRESENTED

PAGE TWO

- ⑧ PETITIONER QUESTIONS WHETHER ACCUSATIONS OF "CONSISTANTLY FAKING OR EXAGGERATING HIS AILMENTS," AS THE STATEMENT IN ITSELF IS INCULPATORY TO THE MAKER IN THAT IT STATES THE PETITIONER HAS AILMENTS. MOREOVER, HE CANNOT BE ACCUSED OF SOMETHING A CREDIBLE GOVERNMENT AGENCY STATES HE HAS OR CAN HE? AND CAN IT BE USED AS SLANDER TO IMPED ITS ACCESS TO THE FINDER OF FACT.
- ⑨ PETITIONER QUESTIONS WHETHER APPELLATE DEFENSE COUNSEL IN PETITIONER'S NAME AS DEFENDANT CREATE A SPECULATIVE NARRATIVE ABOUT TECHNICAL ISSUES WITH NO FORMAL TECHNICAL TRAINING IN THE FIELD OBVIOUSLY WITHOUT READING THE TRANSCRIPTS OF THE STATES NARRATIVE OF HOW IT ALLEGEDLY TOOK PLACE. FURTHER, QUESTIONING THE MATERIAL FACT OF WHAT LEFT FIELD, THE ASSERTION CAME FROM. WHEN A REAL EXPERT COULD HAVE DISSOLVED THE ACCUSATIONS AS VOID OF TECHNICAL FACTS. (SEE PARA 38 APPELLATE OPINIONS), AND MERELY CONCLUSORY BY BOTH PARTIES.
- ⑩ PETITIONER QUESTIONS WHETHER PREJUDICE, BIAS, MISCONDUCT AND VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS RIGHTS OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION BY THESE QUESTIONS AND ALL THE QUESTIONS PREVIOUS TO THESE, PUT FORWARD BY HIM IN THIS PETITION OTHER PREVIOUS PETITIONS, COMPLAINTS AND APPEALS AND INCORPORATES THEM ALL AS QUESTIONS TO THIS HONORABLE COURT TO DECIDE.
- ⑪ PETITIONER QUESTIONS WHETHER PREJUDICE, BIAS AND MISCONDUCT AS A RESULT OF IMPAIRMENT AND FUNCTION DUE TO A DOCUMENTED MEDICAL ISSUE OR DISABILITY CAN BE USED TO DISCREDIT HIM WHEN THOSE MEDICAL ISSUES ARE DOCUMENTED AS EXISTING AND VERY REAL.
- ⑫ PETITIONER QUESTIONS WHETHER DISCRIMINATION OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITY BECAUSE OF SOCIAL ECONOMIC DEPRIVATION AND MEANS CAN BE USED TO WITHOLD, POSSIBLE, INCULPATORY, EXCULPATORY OR IMPEACHING EVIDENCE OR TO FILE A PLEADING OR PERSUE AN ARGUMENT THAT MAY POSSIBLY SLOW VOID JUDGMENT AND ACTUAL INNOCENCE.

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	7
JURISDICTION	8
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	9
STATEMENT OF CASE	10
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	11
CONCLUSION	12

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A-1 — Decision of State Trial Court Twenty-Second Judicial Circuit — CASE NO. 14 CF 939

APPENDIX B-1 — Decision of State of Illinois Court of Appeals Second District — CASE NO. 15 0650

APPENDIX C — Decision of State of Illinois Supreme Court Denying Review — CASE NO. 123475

APPENDIX D — Decision of State of Illinois Supreme Court Denying Rehearing — CASE NO. 123475

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

- CONSTITUTIONAL -

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
JONES VS. City of Chicago	856 F.2d 985 (1988)
CRIVENS VS. ROTH	172 F.3d 991, 999 (1999)
DAVIS VS. Washington	547 U.S. 813, 126 S.Ct. 2266 (2006)
FRANKS VS. Delaware	98 S.Ct. 2674 (1978)
Giglio VS. United States	92 S.Ct. 763
UNITED STATES VS. CHRONIC	104 S.Ct. 2039
Griffen VS. Illinois	76 S.Ct. 585
Kyles VS. Whitley	115 S.Ct. 1555 (1995)
FN RE WINSKAP	397 U.S. 358 (1970)
Mulhoney VS. Wilbur	421 U.S. 684 (1975) 95 S.Ct. 1881
CRAWFORD VS Washington	124 S.Ct. 1354
Kimmelman V. Morrison	106 S.Ct. 2574 (1986)
Evitts VS. Lucey	105 S.Ct. 830
BRADY VS MARYLAND	83 S.Ct. 1194
STATUTES AND RULES	
ADA 42 USC 12101-12131 SECTION 504 F	
ADA 42 USC 12102(1) Paragraph (3)	
ADA 42 USC 12102(4)(A)(B)(C)(D)(E)(I)(II)(III)(IV)	
ADA AMENDMENTS re: major life activities (A)(B)	
ADA	28 CFR part 35, 103
ADA	28 CFR SUBPART A GENERAL Part 35

OTHER

NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT STANDARDS, C.A.L.E.A.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

☐ For cases from federal courts:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

☒ For cases from state courts:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix B-1 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 _____.

☐ No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

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

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

☒ For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was 9/24/2018.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix C.

☒ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: 12/24/2018, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix D.

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

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

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT I
UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT IV
UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT V
UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT VI
UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT VII
UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT VIII
UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT XIV
UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION ARTICLE VI
AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT 42 USC 12101-12131
AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT 42 USC SECTION 504
AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT 42 USC 12102(4)(A)(B)(C)(D)(E)(i)(ii)(iii)(iv).
AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT ADA AMENDMENTS ACT MAJOR LIFE ACTIVITIES (A)(B)
COURT RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT (JUDGES)
AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT 35.101, 42 USC 12131
AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT 28 CFR part 35
AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT SUBPART A GENERAL PART 35
AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT 28 CFR part 35, 103.41(B)
AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION Rules of Professional Conduct
M. NEWELL, LAW OF MALICIOUS PROSECUTION, FALSE IMPRISONMENT AND ABUSE OF LEGAL PROCESS,
(PAGE 57, 1892)
NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT STANDARDS, C.A.L.E.A.,
ILLINOIS CONSTITUTION OF 1970 ARTICLE I, II.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

ON 16 OCTOBER 2014, Mc Henry County SHERIFFS MOVED UPON PETITIONERS HOME AND OCCUPANTS. THEIR FIRST ASSERTED TESTIMONY WAS THEY ANNOUNCED THEMSELVES AS HAVING OFFICIAL BUSINESS, NEVER ENTERED THE HOME OR ATTEMPTED TOO, AND PETITIONER OPENLY AMBUSHED THEM WITHOUT REASON. PETITIONER ALLEGES UNKNOWN INTRUDERS BRANDISHING FIREARMS GAINED ENTRY TO HIS HOME PROVOKING A FEAR FOR HIS LIFE AND THE LIVES OF OCCUPANTS, PETITIONER UNDER MENTAL DURESS AND IN SELF DEFENSE OF UNKNOWN INTRUDERS BRANDISHING FIREARMS FEARING FOR HIS LIFE ATTEMPTED TO REPEL INTRUDERS FROM THE DOORWAY. PETITIONER SUCCESSFUL IN THE EJECTION, MOVED TO INVESTIGATE WHERE AN UNKNOWN INTRUDER WHO STANDING IMMEDIATELY UNDER PETITIONERS SURVEILLANCE CAMERA, STILL FAILING TO IDENTIFY THEMSELVES POINTING A FIREARM AT PETITIONER AND UNDER EXTREME MENTAL DURESS AND IN FEAR FOR HIS LIFE REPELLED THAT ATTEMPT ON HIS LIFE. THE UNKNOWN INTRUDER WAS HIT BUT SOUNDED FEMALE UPON FALLING TO THE GROUND. UPON FURTHER INVESTIGATION PETITIONER IN THE DARKNESS, 100'S OF FEET DOWN THE BLOCK UNDER THE TREES HE COULD SEE THE REFLECTIVE LIGHTS OF THE POLICE CARS, KNEW IT WAS A TERRIBLE MISTAKE BUT UNDER MENTAL INCAPACITATION FROM THE CIRCUMSTANCES HE HAD JUST BEEN THROUGH AND PETITIONERS KNOWLEDGE OF THE RASH OF POLICE SHOOTINGS BY FACT OF ABUSIVE NATIONAL ENFORCEMENT NARRATIVES REMOVED HIMSELF FROM THE AREA AGAIN FEARING FOR HIS LIFE IN AN ATTEMPT TO SECURE RUSH HOUR EXPOSURE WHERE LAW ENFORCEMENT WOULD NOT RISK RETALIATION OR HE COULD SECURE TRANSPORTATION FROM A FRIEND TO PROTECTION OF THE VETERANS ADMINISTRATION. PETITIONER WAS ARRESTED DURING RUSH HOUR WITHOUT INCIDENT. PETITIONER COOPERATED WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT BUT THEY BECAME MORE AND MORE FRICTIONAL, LAW ENFORCEMENT TWISTED THE INTERVIEW TO THEIR NARRATIVE AND ARRESTED PETITIONER. AFTER FOUR DAYS OF BADGERING AND FRICTIONAL INTERVIEWS OF PETITIONERS WIFE AND 12 YEAR OLD DAUGHTER. POLICE THROUGH THE STATE 88 HOURS LATER FORMALLY CHARGED PETITIONER HOWEVER NEVER READS THE CHARGES. BUT BOND GOES FROM 1 TO 7 MILLION. THE NARRATIVE NOW BY LAW ENFORCEMENT WAS THEY WERE NOW IN POSSESSION OF A 911 RECORDING BY AN ARMY ALUMNI OF PETITIONERS LIVING IN DETROIT MICHIGAN THE ALLEGED CONTEXT, THAT HE WAS TOLD BY PETITIONERS WIFE THAT HE SHOULD CALL LAW ENFORCEMENT BECAUSE SHE WAS BEING KILLED BY PETITIONER.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

HOWEVER, NO CALLER, NO WITNESS, WITNESS TESTIMONY OR 911 RECORDING WAS EVER PRODUCED AT TRIAL. • SIGNIFICANTLY, PETITIONERS WIFE WHO WAS SCHEDULED AS A WITNESS, SUPERANNED AND FORCED TO COURT FOR FOUR DAYS WITH PETITIONERS 13 YEAR OLD DAUGHTER WERE BOTH RELEASED THE FIRST DAY OF TRIAL. MOREOVER, NO TESTIMONY BY PETITIONERS WIFE OF ANY KIND WAS EVER INTRODUCED IN ANY FORM. EVEN MORE SIGNIFICANT IS THAT NO EVIDENCE WAS EVER INTRODUCED SHOWING PETITIONER EVER THREATENED TOUCHED, HAD ANY MARK UPON HER, ASKED TO SEE OR SEEN ANY EMERGENCY MEDICAL TECHNICIAN, DOCTOR, WENT TO ANY HOSPITAL OR WAS ABUSED IN ANY SHAPE, FORM OR MANNER. NOR WAS PETITIONERS DAUGHTER. PETITIONER UPON MAKING HIS SELF DEFENSE STATEMENT ASKED FOR A PUBLIC DEFENDER BECAUSE HE KNEW HE COULD NOT AFFORD A REAL ATTORNEY. WHEN GIVEN A PUBLIC DEFENDER, HE DID NOT ADVERSARILY PROTECT PETITIONER, BUT APPEARED TO BE HELPING THE STATE. AFTER PETITIONER TOLD HIM NUMEROUS TIMES IT WAS FEAR FOR HIS LIFE FROM UNKNOWN PERSONS, HE (PUBLIC DEFENDER) ASKED FOR INSANITY, IN DOING SO PLEADED PETITIONER GUILTY WITHOUT INVESTIGATION INTO WHETHER PETITIONER WAS ACTUALLY INSANE, OR IF DURESS AND EMOTIONAL INSTABILITY WAS THE CAUSE OF A TEMPORARY INSANITY BY FEAR FOR YOUR LIFE, AS NOW IN THERE SECOND INDICTMENT, THE NARRATIVE CHANGES AGAIN WITH REGARD TO ENTERING PETITIONERS HOME, NOW "AS THEY ENTERED THE RESIDENCE", AND FURTHER SCIENTIFICALLY IMPOSSIBLE ACTIONS WERE ADDED THAT WERE ALLEGED TO PREVIOUSLY HAPPEN

Statement of CASE:

State here as briefly as possible the facts of your case. Describe how each defendant is involved, including names, dates, and places. Do not give any legal arguments or cite any cases or statutes. If you intend to allege a number of related claims, number and set forth each claim in a separate paragraph. (Use as much space as you need. Attach extra sheets if necessary.)

WHILE THE INCIDENT Progressed, Now Alleged AFTER SIX MONTHS ONE OF THE
Deputies WAS Allegedly SHOT THROUGH THE FRONT DOOR GLASS POINT BLANK IN
THE CHEST, AS WELL THE AMOUNT OF SHOTS FIRED AND WHERE NOW CHANGES
HOWEVER, Testimony Previously Does not Reflect these changes. Petitioner
WAS ALLOWED NO EXPERTS AND ASKED COUNSEL Repeatedly FOR EXPERTS TO
IMPEACH witness testimony AS NOT POSSIBLE. PETITIONER ATTEMPTED
TO REMOVE COUNSEL AND COMPLAIN MANY TIMES. PETITIONER WARNED
COUNSEL ABOUT ALLOWING Petitioner TO REMAIN IN CUSTODY OF THE
SAME POLICE INVOLVED IN THE LOSS AND RETALIATION BUT WAS
IGNORED, Petitioner ALSO WARNED COUNSEL OF THE PROBLEM WITH
AVENUE THAT WAS SO COLLUSIVE, AGAIN PETITIONERS ISSUES
IGNORED. PLAINTIFFS OBSTRUCTED AND SUPPRESSED EVIDENCE, I.E. 911 CALL
ALLEGED, SURVEILLANCE VIDEO BELONGING TO PETITIONERS, ALLEGED WITNESSES
PETITIONERS ARMY ALUMNI, Petitioner's wife AND EXPERT WITNESS BY BALLISTICS,
PETITIONERS COUNSEL AS WELL DID NOT ADVOCATE FOR PETITIONER AT ANY
TIME, AND ALLOWED PETITIONER TO BE THREATENED AT SENTENCING BY
POLICE WITNESSES, FAILED TO PRESERVE ANY ISSUES FROM SENTENCING
OR ANYTHING AT ALL DURING SENTENCING. THE ENTIRE PROCEEDINGS WERE A SHAM.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

IF THE AIM OF THE LAW IS NOT TO APPREHEND CRIMINALS BUT TO PENALIZE ADVOCACY, IT LIKEWISE MUST FALL. SINCE THAT TIME OF ALEXANDER HAMMILLON WROTE CONCERNING HIS OATHS, THE BILL OF RIGHTS WAS ADOPTED AND MUCH LATER CAME THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT AS A RESULT OF THE LATTER A BROAD RANGE OF LIBERTIES WAS NEWLY GUARANTEED TO THE CITIZEN AGAINST STATE ACTION. BY THAT REQUIREMENT THE STATE REFRAIN FROM DECEPTION AND INTIMIDATION, THAT REQUIREMENT [OF DUE PROCESS], IN SAFEGUARDING THE LIBERTY OF CITIZEN AGAINST DEPRIVATION THROUGH ACTION OF THE STATE EMBODIES THE FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTIONS OF JUSTICE WHICH LIE AT THE BASE OF OUR CIVIL AND POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS. [CITATIONS OMITTED] IT IS A REQUIREMENT THAT CANNOT BE DEEMED TO BE SATISFIED BY MERE NOTICE AND HEARING IF A STATE HAS CONTRIVED CONVICTION THROUGH THE PRETENSE OF A TRIAL WHICH IN TRUTH IS BUT USED AS A MEANS OF DEPRIVING A DEFENDANT LIBERTY THROUGH A DELIBERATE DECEPTION OF COURTS AND JURYS BY THE PRESENTATION OF TESTIMONY KNOWN TO BE PERJURED, SUCH A CONTRIVANCE BY A STATE TO PROCURE THE CONVICTION AND IMPRISONMENT OF A DEFENDANT IS AS INCONSISTANT WITH THE RUDIMENTARY DEMANDS OF JUSTICE AS IS OBTAINING OF A LIKE RESULT BY INTIMIDATION AND THE ACTION OF PROSECUTING OFFICERS ON BEHALF OF THE STATE, LIKE THAT OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS IN THE EXECUTION OF ITS LAWS CONSTITUTES ACTION WITHIN THE PURVIEW OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT AND THE BILL OF RIGHTS. SIGNIFICANTLY THE LARGER REASON THIS CASE BELONGS BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT IS THERE ARE AMONGST ALL THE OTHER WRONGS IN THIS CASE

REASONS FOR GRANTING PETITION

A QUESTION OF WHETHER UNDER THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT IN A CRIMINAL PROCEEDING THE STATE CAN SUPPRESS THE DEFENDANTS DEMEANOR BEFORE THE TRIER OF FACT. ENABLING THE TRIER OF FACT TO UNDERSTAND BETTER THE DEFENDANTS STATE OF MIND AT THE TIME THE INCIDENT TOOK PLACE. INSTEAD OF SEEING THE DEFENDANT AS REVOLTING.

CONCLUSION

IN CONCLUSION THE STATE THROUGH ITS OFFICERS OF McHENRY COUNTY, ILLINOIS HAVE DEPRIVED PETITIONERS RIGHTS THROUGH MANY AVENUES OF REPROACH. IT STARTED WHEN PETITIONERS HOME WAS ASSAULTED AND ENDED IN A SENTENCING WHERE EACH AND EVERY RIGHT OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION OF PETITIONER WAS ASSAULTED. A CONSTITUTION THAT NO LONGER EXISTS AND PETITIONER TOOK AN OATH TO PROTECT THAT FAILED HIM. AND IF THIS HONORABLE COURT WILL JUST LOOK AT THIS CASE NOT JUST "LOOK OVER" BUT LOOK IN-DEPTH AT WHAT IS PROVIDED AND QUESTION IT AS THERE WILL BE QUESTIONS IT WILL SEE THE DEBAUCHERY AND THE MIS CARRIAGE OF JUSTICE THAT TOOK PLACE AND FOR THAT REASON: THE JUDGEMENT IS VOID AND THE PETITIONER CLAIMS ACTUAL INNOCENCE AND THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS SHOULD BE GRANTED.

Respectfully Submitted,

Scott Peters

SCOTT PETERS AN PROSE ATTORNEY

DATE: 5th MARCH 2019