

NO. 18-9476

ORIGINAL

OCTOBER TERM, 2019
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ANTHONY K. ANDERSON, Petitioner


V.

BRAIN SANDOVAL, et al.,

NEVADA DISTRICT ATTORNEY

ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR STATE OF
NEVADA,

Respondents



ON PETITION FOR EXTRAORDINARY APPLICATION FOR
WRIT OF Habeas CORPUS. TO THE 8th District
COURTS FOR CLARK COUNTY NEVADA:

PETITIONER SEEKING EXTRAORDINARY Habeas Relief NOW
SHOWS THAT EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES WARRANT
THE EXERCISE OF THE COURTS DISCRETIONARY POWERS
THAT ADEQUATE RELIEF CANNOT BE OBTAINED IN ANY
OTHER FORM OR FROM ANY OTHER COURT CONCERNING
A NORMAL Habeas CORPUS PROCEEDING. PETITIONER HAS
EXHAUSTED AVAILABLE STATE REMEDIES AND NOW COMES
WITHIN PROVISIONS OF 28. U.S.C. § 2254 (b)
EXTERMINAL CIRCUMSTANCE WARRANT THIS COURTS DISCRETIONARY
POWERS

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

PRO-SE
Anthony K. Anderson

ON PETITION FOR 8th DISTRICT COURTS CLARK COUNTY NEVADA

Southern Desert C.T.A.

5-24-19

Indian Springs NV
89070

* QUESTIONS PRESENTED *

#1 WHETHER, THE 8th DISTRICT COURTS FOR CLACK COUNTY NEVADA UNFAIRLY PRECLUDED, PRO-SE "LITIGANT" ANTHONY K. ANDERSON #1082999, AN EQUAL AND FAIR RULING WITHOUT THE APPLICATION OF IMPLIED JUDICIAL BIAS, AND AN ECONOMICAL AND FINANCIAL INTEREST CONCERNING 8th DISTRICT COURTS UNCONSTITUTIONAL "SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION"?

#2 How can 8th DISTRICT COURTS ADD LACHES AND TIME BARS, PROCEDURAL BARS TO A CIVIL IN NATURE ACTION CONCERNING "ACTUAL INNOCENTS" AS A RESULT OF 8th DISTRICT COURTS UNCONSTITUTIONAL "SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION"?

#3 How did 8th DISTRICT COURTS PRO-CLUDE, A. ANDERSON FROM HEBEAS PROCEEDURES WITH-OUT ADDRESSING THE MERITS OF A SUPREME COURT ORDER OF REVERSE AND REMAND #76313, WITH THE 8th DISTRICT COURTS. NOT HAVING AN OPPOSITION OF THE MERITS FOR 3 YEARS AND HAVING FULL KNOWLEDGE THAT ANDERSON PRESENT FACTS TO THE COURTS THAT ARE BEING PROCLUDED, EQUAL PROTECTION OF LAWS, FACTS THAT SENATE BILL #182 CHAPTER 304 WAS AND IS AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACT. WITH ANY AND ALL PROCEEDS FROM THIS ACT BEING NULL AND VOID! STATE OF NEV. PROCLUDES TO ADDRESS ANY MERITS BELOW WHY?

MERITS

STATE OF NEV SUPREME COURT ACTS OF DUAL SERVICE
IN VIOLATION OF NEV CONST: 3 § 1 NEV. CONST: 6 § 11 IN VIOLATION
OF U.S. CONSTITUTION 5th AMENDMENT 8th AMENDMENT 9th AMENDMENT
14th AMENDMENT

LIST OF PARTIES

[] All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

X 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:

The EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA.

- #1 BRIGIN SANDOVAL; AND FORMER GOVERNORS.
- #2 LT. GOVERNOR MARK HUTHLESSON. STATE OF NEVADA.
- #3 STEVEN WOLFSON. CLARK COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY
- #4 ADAM LEALT; ATTORNEY GENERAL STATE OF NEVADA

The LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

- | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| #5 PATRICIA "PAT" SPEATHMAN | #26 JOHN HAMBRICK |
| #6 MOISES "MO" DENIS | #27 NELSON AKAUJO JR. |
| #7 TUCK SEGEBLOM | #28 RICHARD MCARTHUR |
| #8 KELVIN ATKINSON | #29 BRITNEY MILLER |
| #9 JOYCE WOODHOUSE | #30 WILLIAM MC CURDY II |
| #10 NICOLE CANNIZZARO | #31 DINA NEAL |
| #11 DAVID PARKS | #32 JASON FRIERSON |
| #12 PATRICK FARLEY | #33 STEVE YARGER |
| #13 BECKY HARRIS | #34 CHRIS BROOKS |
| #14 LYANNA D. CANCELA | #35 OLIVIA DIAZ |
| #15 AARON D. FORD | #36 JAMES O'KENEHILL |
| #16 JOSEPH "JOE" PHADY MD. | #37 PAUL ANDERSON |
| #17 JULIA RATTI | #38 TYRONE THOMPSON |
| #18 DON GUSTAVSON | #39 RICHARD A. CARRILLO |
| #19 HEID S. GANSERT | #40 CHRIS EDWARD |
| #20 BEN KIECKHEFER | #41 ELLEN SPIEGEL |
| #21 JAMES A. SEITZMEYER | #42 OZZIE FURLO |
| #22 GOTT T. HAMMOND | #43 KEITH PACKARD |
| #23 PETE GOICOCHEA | #44 MELISSA A. WOODBURY |
| #24 MICHAEL ROBERSON | #45 AMBER JOINER |
| #25 MARK A. MANUENDO | #46 JILL TOLLES |
| | #47 LISA KRANSNER |
| | #48 TERESA BENITZ THOMPSON |
| | #49 EDGAR FLORES |
| | #50 LESLEY ELISABETH COHEN |
| | #51 MICHAEL SPRINKLE |
| | #52 RICHARD "SKIP" DAUG |
| | #53 IKA HENSEN |

list of parties # 2

- #54 JOHN ELLISON
- #55 Bill Bray AXELROD SHANNON
- #56 JUSTIN WATKINS JONES OSCARSON
- #57 JIM MARCHANT
- #58 ROBIN L. TITUS
- #59 JIM WHEELER
- #60 AL KRAUER
- #61 SANDRA JAUREGUI
- #62 IREN BUSTAMANTE ADAMS

NEV. JUDGES FOR SUPREME COURT

- #63 RON ZAKAGUIRRE
- #64 JAMES W. HARDESTY
- #65 MICHAEL L. DOUGLAS
- #66 MICHAEL A. CHERRY
- #67 MARK GIBBSON
- #68 KRISTINA PICKERING
- #69 STEPHEN MICHAEL GIBBONS
- #70 GEROY L. TAO, ABBE, SILVER

AND Past Judges JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

AND Past Legislatures

- #71 MERRILL J. #72 CATHER C. J. #73 BOOTH J.
- 8th District Court for Clark County
- JUDGES DISTRICT OF NEV JUDGES

- #74 CHARLES THOMPSON
- #75 DONALD HOSLEY
- #76 KATHLEEN E. CALABRESE
- #77 MARK B. BAILUS
- #78 RICHARD F. SCOTT
- #79 STATE OF NEVADA EX RE. Real Parties IN INTEREST JOHN AND JANE DOE'S
- 1 - 100

The Judicial Department of THE STATE OF NEVADA

JUDGES, Civil in Nature

JUDGES, Criminal in Nature

JUSTICES, Magistrates

Court Clerks

STAFF ATTORNEYS

STATE AND FEDERAL

Paralegals

Public DEFENDERS STATE

Public DEFENDER FEDERAL

OFFICERS OF THE NEV COURTS

Paid AND ASSIGNED ATTORNEYS STATE OF NEVADA

Supreme Court Judges

AND STAFF ET. AL.

Appeals Court OF NEVADA et al

US District Court

District of NEVADA

- #81 Judge: JENNIFER A. DORSEY
- #82 Judge: ANDREW P. GOODIN

NEVADA SECRETARY OF STATE ET. AL.

NEVADA [LCB]

Legislative Council Bureau

Is also an illegally created Private Corporation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
Jurisdiction	1
Constitutional And Statutory Provisions Involved	1
STATEMENT OF CASE	2
OPENING BRIEF EXTRA ORDINARY WRIT OF Habeas corpus	3
Reason For Granting The writ	24
Conclusion	28
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE	29
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	30

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	NEVADA COURT OF Appeals Ruling # 75313
APPENDIX B	District Trial Court Decision 4-10-2019
APPENDIX C	Original writ of Habeas corpus Filed 1-26-2017
APPENDIX D	WRIT OF Mandamus
APPENDIX E	9 th Circuit Judicial Notice Newly Discovered Evidence CONCERNING "legal Actual INNOCENTS", with Full copy of APPENDIX C
APPENDIX F	WRIT OF QUO-WARRANTO
APPENDIX G	Rule 60(b) Filed AFTER REVERSE AND Remand # 75313 8 th District Court wont Honor Supreme Courts Reverse AND Remand For PROCEEDING SEE: APPENDIX G-A TRU GH

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES SEE: TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
File too large for space provided

PAGE NUMBER
(iv) ATRU I

STATUTES AND RULES

SEE. STATUTES AND RULES FOUND WITH
APPENDIX FILES TOO LARGE TO PLACE
IN SPACE PROVIDED

OTHER

SEE INDEX APPENDIX SUMMARY
EXCERPTS OF RECORDS VOLUMES
I, II, III, IV, V
Pages 1 thru 9

Petition For EXTRAORDINARY WRIT OF Habeas CORPUS

SUPREME COURT OF THE
UNITED STATES

* * *

ANTHONY K. ANDERSON
V
Plaintiff

STATE OF NEVADA et al.

Real Party of Interest

FORMER GOV: BRIAN SANDOVAL et al

LT GOV: MARK HUTCHINSON

Clark County District Attorney

State of NEV

ATTORNEY GEN OFFICE
et al

Respondents

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
CITED

IV ATRU I

Petition For writ of Habeas CORPUS

- FROM #1 8th District Courts: JUDICIAL BIAS AND PRE-JUDICED
#2 NEVADA SUPREME COURTS: FRAUD, DUAL SERVICE
#3 US DISTRICT COURTS: WANTON MIS CONDUCT
#4 9th Circuit Negative MIS-PRISION
#5 INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL

Table of Authorities

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

U.S. SUPREME CT KIPPO V. BAKER (Kippo IV)
580 U.S. —, 137 S. Ct 905 (2017)

United States of America v. Dezekki Cortez 697
F.2d 1305 (1988) Lexis 11818 NO 88 CR 159 (SWK)

U.S. ACT OF CONGRESS SENTENCING COMMISSION
28 U.S.C. § 991 (a)

United States v. Cortez Supra

9th circuit

Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.
v. Barrett 246 F.2d 846 (9th Cir 1957)

England v. Doyle, 281 F.2d 304, 310 (9th Cir 1960)

U.S. District Courts

DENT v. West Virginia 129 U.S. 114 123 (1889)

Daniel v. Williams 474 U.S. 327 337 (1986)

State EXXEL MOON v. State Bd of EXAMINERS

104 Idaho 640 648 662 P.2d 221, 229
(Idaho 1983)

Table of Authorities

U.S. Dist Courts

Norton v. Shelby County 118 U.S. 425 442 (1886)

State v. Silver 9 NEV. 227

School Dist v. Hill 113 U.S. 135. 28 1 ed 954 5
S.C.T. 371)

Boyd v. United States 116 US 616. 635 (1886)

First National Bank of Boston v. Bellotti; 435 U.S.
765 786 (1978)

Peugh v. United States, 569 US ____ - 133 sct
2012. 186 Led 2D 84. (2013)

Tribe of Florida v. Florida 517 US. 44. 116 sct
1114 (US. Fla (1996)

Pennsylvania v. Union Gas Co 491 U.S. 1. 24 109 sct.
2273 2286, 105 Led (1989)

Counselman v. Hitchcock, 142 U.S. 547 12 sct
195 (1892)

COOPER v. AARON 358 US 1. 18 78 sct 1401
1409-1410 3 Led. 2d (1958)

Baker v. Carr 369 U.S. 186 215, 82 sct
691 709, 2 Led 663 (1962)

U.S. v. Tweel. 550 F.2d 297 299 (1977)

U.S. v. Prudden. 424 F2d 1021, 1032 (1970)

Faretta v. California 422 U.S. 806 (1975)

U.S. v. Throckmorton 98 US 61 (1878)

NUDD v. BUCKAUS 91 U.S. 426 (1875)

Boycer v. Grundy 3 U.S. (Pet) 210 (1830)

MERRITT v. Walsh 104 U.S. 694, 702. (1881)

Table of Authorities

U.S. District Courts

United States ex rel Toll v. Quarles, 350 U.S. 11, 17 (1955)

Tolay Bros, Inc v. Filardo 336 U.S. 281 (1949)

Palmoke v. United States 411 U.S. 389 (1973)

Lane v. Wilson 301 U.S. 268 275, 59 S. Ct 872 876
83 L. ed 1281 (1939)

Harmon v. Torseenias 380 U.S. at 540-541, 85 S. Ct
at 1185

U.S. Term Limits, Inc v. Thornton 514 U.S. 779 829 115
S. Ct 184 (1995)

Davidson v. Cannon 474 U.S. 344, 348 (1986)

Cooper v. Aaron 385 U.S. 178 S. Ct 1401 (1958)

U.S. v. Will 449 U.S. 200 216, 101 S. Ct 471, 66 L. ed
2d 392 406 (1980)

Cohens v. Virginia 19 U.S. (6 Wheat.) 264, 404,
5 L. ed 257 (1821)

NEVADA Supreme Courts

Bible v. Malone 68 NEV 32 231 p2d 599

(1951) . Snow v. State 105 NEV 521, 523 779 p2d 96 97 (1989)

Meagher v. Strongy County 5 NEV. 244, 250 XXX

p. XXX (1869)

State v. Tufley 20 NEV 427 428, 29 22 p105
XXX (1890)

State v. Lake 8 NEV 276 285, 21 Cal. Jur 1013
p. 172 (1873)

Drury 19 NEV at 390 12 p. at 835

Table of Authorities

NEVADA SUPREME COURTS

NEVADA MINING ASS. V. EKODES 117 NEV 531 538, 26

93d 953 757 (2001)

Del Papa V. BOARD OF Regents 114 NEV 388, 392

956 92d 770 773-74 (1998)

Porch V. PATHERSON 39 NEV 251, 268, 156 9439 445
(1916)

State V. ROGER 10 NEV 250 255 265 (1875)

Porch 39 NEV. at 268 156 P at

COYMAN ON ETHICS V. HARDY 125 NEV 285 et
Seq 212 93d 1098 et Seq NEV (2009)

Galloway V. TRUESDELL 83 NEV 13 et Seq 422
P 2d 237 et Seq (NEV (1967))

KING V. THE BOARD OF REGENTS 65 NEV 535, 556,
200 P 2d 221 232 (1948)

White Head V. NEV COMH ON JUD DISC 110 NEV
874, 917, 887, P 2d, 913, 940, (1985)

Levingston V. Washoe County By AND THROUGH SHERIFF
OF Washoe County 112 NEV 477, 482, 916 P 2d 163
166 NEV (1996)

State ex rel STEVENSON V. TUFFY 20 NEV 427 428-29
(1890)

BARRIOS - LOMEL: 114 NEV at 780, 961 P 2d. at
751

Mathews V. MURRAY 70 NEV 116 120-21 258 P 2d
982 983-84 (1953)

State ex rel KENDAL V. COLE 38 NEV 215 219, 148 P.
551 552 (1915)

Table of Authorities

NEVADA Supreme Courts

State ex rel Stevenson, 20 NEV at 428 29;

Lake, 8 NEV. at 285;

Crump v. Warden 113 NEV 293, 934 P.2d 247 (1997)

McCague v. Warden 112 NEV 159, 912 P.2d 255 (1996)

Hathaway v. State, 119 NEV 248, 252, 71 P3d 503 506 - (2006)

Drury v. Hallock, 19 NEV 384. —. 12 P 832 (1887)

State v. Bunker Ass'n 23 Kan 499;

White Head; 110 NEV at 917 878. P2d at 940

Dunn v. Board of Commissioners 21 NEV 235 29 P 974 (1829)

State v. Silver 9 NEV. 227

Yeager v. Weaver 64 Pa 425

State v Gibson 30 NEV 353, 96 P 1057 (1908)

Sup ct

State v Payne 53 NEV 193 295 P770 (1931)

Keane v. Berry 168 NE 10;

Meagher 5 NEV at 246

Cardwell v. Glenn 18 NEV 34. (1883)

Murphy v. Murphy 103 NEV 185, 734 P.2d 738 (1987)

Villalon v. Bowen 70 NEV 456 469 273 P.3d 409 (1954)

Monville v. Monville, 79 NEV 487 387 P.2d 661 (1963)

Table of Authorities

NEVADA Supreme Courts

Barnette v. Reno Air 114 NEV 41 447 (19 NEV 1998)

Patrick Olson v State of Nevada # C012-279291 (P. 6)

McNeil v. State 132 Adv Opn 54 (7-28-2016)

Dogget v. State, 91 NEV 786, p2d 1066 1068 (1975)

Bell v. Frist Judicial Dist Ct 28 NEV. 280

81 p (1905)

Chase v. Rogers 10 NEV. 250 (1875)

NEVADA Highway Patrol Assoc v. NEVADA DMVPS 107

NEV 547 815 p2d 508 (1991)

Wright v. Cradlebough 3 NEV 341 (1867 cited)

Passing v. Reno Stock Brokerage Co. 30 NEV

342 349 96 pac - 1054 (1908)

State v. Fouquette 67 NEV 505 514 221 p2d

404 (1950)

Vigoreman v State 96 NEV 592 614 p2d 532 (1980)

Cosio v State, 106 NEV 327 793 p2d 836 (1990)

Halverson v. Secretary of State 124. NEV

484, 487, 186 p3d at 896 (2008)

State ex rel Chase v. Rogers 10 NEV 250 (1875)

State v. Hays 15 NEV 27 (1880)

State ex rel Wilson v. State 24 NEV 308 53 p 497 (1898)

NEVADA Court of Appeals

Willing v. State NEV Appeals Court

68953 (3-16-2016)

Table of Authorities

NEVADA OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GEN. STATE OF NEVADA -
2004-03 A/G OPINION NO 2004-03
March 1, 2004 "SEPERATION OF POWERS"

Attorney GEN OPINION 85 (7-25-1951)

Application OF FR. HEDEIRGS FOR WRIT OF Habeas
CORPUS 57 NEV 301, 306, 64 P2d 346. (1937)

SW. Courts - - - - -

Lynch V. Murphy 24 SW 774

N.W. Courts - - - - -

City of Plattsouth V. Murphy 105 N.W. 293

N.E. Courts - - - - -

Copeland V. Town of Sheridan : 51 NE. 474

N.W. Court - - - - -

Burlington & MRC CO V Sanders CO 9 NEB 507
4 N.W. 240

N.Y. Courts - - - - -

Wisner V Mayor of Monroe 25 La ANN 598

People V. Briggs 50 NY 553

Davis V. State Supra People V Hill 35 NY
449

N.M. Courts - - - - -

State V. Fernandez 40 N.M. 288. 58 P2d (193

607 CJS OFFICERS 2 P27; 42 AM JUR 881 Public
OFFICER, 3) MECHAN ON Public OFFICERS
IV 16

Table of Authorities

OHIO Courts

Lapolla v. Davis Ohio Com Pl 1948, 89 NE 2d 706, 708

General v. Jennings 57 Ohio St 415 49 NE 404 63 AH St Rep 723

State Exrel Barney v. Hawkins 79 Mount 506, 257 p. 411 (1927)

Cal. Courts

Winchester v. Huby 122 Cal. 522 55 P 393

Recessier 190 BR. 396 (1995)

Winchester v. Howard 136 Cal. 432 439. 64

P. 692 69 P 77. 89 AH St Rep 153

Toth v. Quarles 350 U.S. 11. 17 (1955)

NY Courts

Rockway Pacific Corporation v. Statesbury 255 F. 345 (D.C. NY (1917))

Idaho Courts

Heed v. Arnell 791 P 2d 410 117 Idaho 660 (1990)

Kan Courts

Harris v. Hannahan 387 P2d 771 192 Kan 183 (1963)

G.A. Courts

Joiner v. State 15 SE 2d 8 233 G.A

ARK Courts

Ferkil v. Keel 151 SW 289 276 105 ARK 380 (1912)

Table of authorities

Chiles v Monroe 25 1a ANN 598

Stone v Brown 54 Tex 330

State v. Persinger, 76 Mo 346

White Head, 110 NEV at 917 878 P2d at 940

NEVADA Rules of Civil Procedure

Rule 60(b), Throckmorton Supra.

" NEVADA LAWS

Chapter 304 S.B-182.

FORWARD Statute Revision Commission.

NEVADA legislative Counsel Bureau.

Staff Directions 1945-2013 Regular
legislative session.

NEV. SENATE Assembly Rule # 7 [# 1 TRU # 7].

SENATE Bill # 1, SENATE Bill # 2, SENATE Bill # 3.

SENATE Bill # 109 Chapter 385. SECTION (# 2 # 3 # 4).

SECTION # 1, SECTION # 188, SECTION # 218.

ENACTING Clause.

legislative Counsel's pre-Face.

SCOPE AND EFFECTS OF NEVADA REVISED Statutes.

Public Records Secretary of State.

statute, Twenty-Fifth Session of legislature.

ASSEMBLY History 1969 at 218-288.

COMMITTEE ON Finance Chapter 248.

EXECUTIVE Department CERTIFICATE OF

election "Brain Sandoval" GOVERNOR OF NEVADA

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR WRIT OF EXTRAORDINARY
APPLICATION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.
8th District Courts for Clark County

OPINIONS BELOW

☒ For cases from federal courts:

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

- ☒ reported at 17-70203 Counsel ordered to address Senate Bill #182 But failed to do so in Brief 19; 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 E to the petition and is

- ☒ reported at 2:16-cv-02215-APG-pg 17-15265, 17-70203 (Dec 1 2017); or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☒ is unpublished.

☐ For cases from state courts:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

- ☒ reported at #75313 9-11-2018; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the STATE Trial Court court appears at Appendix B to the petition and is

- ☒ reported at A-17-750603-w 8th District Court; 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 3-1-2019 PENDING CERTIORARI #17-70203 CRIMINAL MATTERS
COUNSEL NEVER ADDRESSED UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF SB 182 AS ORDERED 12-1-17

☐ 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).

CASE #17-70203 ; 17-15265 ARE UNDER CERTIORARI REVIEW
THIS IS A NEW ORIGINAL ACTION

☒ For cases from state courts:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was 4-10-2019.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix B. A-17-750603-W

☒ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: 4-22-2019, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix JURISDICTION 01

☒ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including 4-22-2019 (date) on APRIL 15 2019 (date) in Application No. A-17-750603-W
4831114

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

~~*Jurisdiction*~~

THE STATE OF NEVADA'S COURT OF APPEALS FOR STATE OF NEV.

FILED A PUBLISHED ORDER OF REVERSAL AND REMAND. SUPREME COURT #75313 DISTRICT COURT # A-17-750603-W REMANDING.

WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS FILED 2-6-2017. BACK TO 8th DISTRICT COURTS FOR PROCEEDING CONSISTENT WITH ORDER ON SEPT 11, 2018

ON 10-9-18 SUPREME COURT ISSUED WRIT #75313

ON 9-13-2017 ANDERSON FILES APPEAL # 74102 DISTRICT COURT # A-17-750603-W WRIT #75313 ISSUED MARCH 5, 2018. DISTRICT COURT, DEFECTS SUPREME COURT VACATED. APPEAL 8th DISTRICT COURT SETS RECONSIDERATION AND SETS STATUS CHECK

2-21-2018 ANDERSON FILES NOTICE OF PROCEDURES IN PSEUDONYM FOR PROTECTION OF ALL PARTIES BOTH HIM-SELF AND STATE OF NEV. (ANDERSON) REQUEST ALL HEARING GO UNPUBLISHED AND ALL FINDINGS UNDISCLOSED

4-15-2013 ANDERSON FILES WITH 8th DISTRICT COURTS CLARK COUNTY NEVADA'S "LACK OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION" DUE TO INVALID LAWS

10-10-2013 DEMAND NOTICE 8th DISTRICT COURTS DEFICIENCY NON COMPLIANCE WITH NEV. CONST. ART XVII 2 § 20 OFFICIAL BONDS

3-28-2016 PETITION FOR SPECIAL WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS WITH EXTRAORDINARY RELIEF / EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES ORIGINAL COMMON LAW WRIT

9-16-2016 NEV SUPREME COURT AFFIRMS IN EX PARTE

* Jurisdiction *

FILED

APR 22 2019

CLERK OF COURT

IN The 8th Judicial District Court OF
The STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR The
County OF Clark

ANTHONY K. ANDERSON
Plaintiff

CASE No: A-17-750603-2W
Dept No: 03B

v.

STATE OF NEVADA
WARDEN JO. GENTRY et al.
Real Party OF Interest
FORMER GOVERNOR BRUCE SANDOVAL
EXECUTIVE Branch OF Gov. et al.
LEGISLATIVE Branch OF Gov. et al.
JUDICIAL Branch OF Gov. et al.
Defendants

* NOTICE OF Motion *

* NOTICE OF EQUITY Jurisdiction
* MANIFEST ERROR

A-17-750603-W
NOTM
Notice of Motion
4831113



RECEIVED

APR 22 2019

CLERK OF THE COURT

NOW COMES Plaintiff ANTHONY K. ANDERSON #1082999
IN PRO-SE and request. The 8th District Court's
Take NOTICE That Two week EXTENSION OF TIME
IS NEEDED AS SHOULD ALL RECORDS REFLECT THAT
WOULD ALLOW Plaintiff TIME TO PREPARE AND FILE
A COMMON LAW "WRIT OF CERTIORARI" TO
THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT. THIS EQUITY JURISDICTION
IN COMMON LAW'S JUDICIAL SYSTEM GIVES THE POWER
TO HEAR CERTAIN (CIVIL ACTIONS) ACCORDING TO
COMMON LAW PRO-CEDURE OF THE COURT OF CHANCERY
RESOLVE ACCORDING TO EQUITABLE RULES OF
JURISDICTION

intended to show that.

MANIFEST ERROR Has Disregarded The Controlling law on The Credible EVIDENCE IN The Record Which Manifested Constitutional ERROR. Has Been INTRODUCED TO Case # A-17-750603-2W

This Court is made aware that The "High Court" of The U.S.A. now Has Equity Jurisdiction. U.S.U By An AVERMENT That Relief is UNAVAILABLE OUT-SIDE OF Equitable Channels. Dated 4-15-2019

THIS DUE TO The Following INADEQUATE Relief
MANIFEST ERROR!

GROUND #1 Supreme Court of State of NEV. REVERSE AND REMAND FOR PROCEEDINGS [SC#75313 Civil IN NATURE DC # A-17-750603-2W - Clark County's D/A OFFICE Deputy District Attorney JOHN NIMAN REFUSED TO ANSWER writ 750603-2W on THE MERITS. with The 8th Dist Courts allowing AND stating - "Plaintiff" NEVER Addressed unconstitutional creation of SB-182 DURING Direct appeal which By AND Through Due Diligence Did Plaintiff become aware of This unconstitutional Act.

The 8th District Courts Also Fail To acknowledge established ^{NEV.} Supreme Court Case law Found in Snow V- STATE, 105 NEV. 521, 523 779 p.2d

96, 97. (1989)

* Jurisdiction 1-E *

FILED

APR 22 2019

CLERK OF COURT

MR. Anthony Anderson, 1082999
Petitioner/In Propria Persona
Post Office Box 208, SDCC
Indian Springs, Nevada 89070-0208

IN THE 8th JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF Clark

MR. Anthony K. Anderson,
Plaintiff,

vs.

State of Nevada,
Defendant.

CASE No. A-17-750603-W
DEPT. No. File 03B

DESIGNATION OF RECORD ON CERTIORARI

TO: Office of The Clerk of The Supreme Court of The
United States of America
1 First Street N.E.
Washington D.C.
20543

The above-named Plaintiff hereby designates the entire record of the above-entitled case, to include all the papers, documents, pleadings, and transcripts thereof, as and for the Record on Certiorari

DATED this 15th day of April, 2019.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED BY:
Anthony K. Anderson
Anthony K. Anderson # 1082999
Plaintiff/In Propria Persona

RECEIVED
APR 22 2019
CLERK OF THE COURT

Jurisdiction 1-E

A-17-750603-W
FILE
Filing
4831114



CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS

The Requirement for Filing an Extraordinary Writ of Habeas Corpus with Exceptional Circumstances which Warrant the Exercise of the U.S. Supreme Court's Exercise of Discretionary Powers.

Unadjudicated claims are statutory and are as follows:

(b)(1) A claim presented in a second or successive Habeas Corpus Application under Section 2254 that was presented in a prior Application shall be dismissed

(2) A claim presented in a second or successive Habeas Corpus Application under Section 2254 that was not presented in a prior Application shall be dismissed unless

(A) The Applicant shows that the claim relies on a rule that is new a new rule of constitutional law made retroactive to cases on collateral review by Supreme Court that was previously unavailable; OR

(B)(i) The factual predicate for the claim could not have been discovered previously through the exercise of due diligence; AND

* Constitutional AND Statutory Provisions *

(ii) THE FACTS UNDERLYING THE CLAIM IF PROVEN AND VIEWED IN LIGHT OF THE EVIDENCE AS A WHOLE, WOULD BE SUFFICIENT TO ESTABLISH BY CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE THAT BUT FOR CONSTITUTIONAL ERROR, NO REASONABLE FACTFINDER WOULD HAVE FOUND THE APPLICANT GUILTY OF THE UNDERLYING OFFENCE

(3)(A) BEFORE A SECOND OR SUCCESSIVE APPLICATION PERMITTED BY THIS SECTION IS FILED IN THE DISTRICT COURT, THE APPLICANT SHALL MOVE IN THE APPROPRIATE COURT OF APPEALS FOR AN ORDER AUTHORIZING THE DISTRICT COURT TO CONSIDER THE APPLICATION

(B) A MOTION IN THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR AN ORDER AUTHORIZING THE DISTRICT COURT TO CONSIDER A SECOND OR SUCCESSIVE APPLICATION SHALL BE DETERMINED BY A THREE-JUDGE PANEL OF THE COURT OF APPEALS

(C) THE COURT OF APPEALS MAY AUTHORIZE THE FILING OF A SECOND OR SUCCESSIVE APPLICATION ONLY IF IT DETERMINES THAT THE APPLICATION MAKES A PRIMA FACIE SHOWING THAT THE APPLICATION SATISFIES THE REQUIREMENTS OF THIS SUBSECTION

28 U.S.C. § 2244 (b) (2018)

* Constitution AND Statutory Provisions *

This petition implicates Title 28 U.S.C. § 2254, which states

The Supreme Court ---- shall entertain an Application for writ of Habeas Corpus - IN BEHALF OF a PERSON IN custody pursuant to the Judgment of a State Court only on the Ground THAT He is in custody IN violation OF THE Constitution OR laws OR TREATIES OF THE "UNITED STATES"

The statute's Exhaustion Provisions reads:

(b) (1) An Application for writ of Habeas Corpus ON BEHALF OF a PERSON IN custody pursuant to THE JUDGMENT OF State Court shall NOT BE GRANTED unless it appears that

(A) THE Applicant HAS EXHAUSTED THE Remedies Available IN THE Courts OF THE STATE; OR

(B) (i) THERE is an ABSENCE OF Available STATE Connective Process; OR

(i) (i) CIRCUMSTANCES EXIST THAT RENDER SUCH PROCESS INEFFECTIVE TO protect THE rights OF THE Applicant

* Constitutional AND Statutory Provisions *

(2) an application FOR writ OF Habeas Corpus May BE Denied ON The MERITS, NOT WITHSTANDING The FAILURE OF The Applicant TO EXHAUST The Remedies Available IN Courts OF The State

(3) A state shall not BE Deemed To Have WAIVED The EXHAUSTION Requirements OR BE ESTOPPED FROM Reliance UPON The Requirements UNLESS The State, Through Counsel, EXPRESSLY WAIVES The Requirement

THE Standards AND Requirements FOR Acquiring Relief FROM a State COURT

CONVICTION IN FEDERAL COURT IS SET FORTH IN: 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d):

AN Application FOR writ OF Habeas Corpus ON BEHALF OF a PERSON IN Custody PURSUANT TO The Judgment OF a State COURT Shall NOT BE granted WITH RESPECT TO any Claim THAT WAS Adjudicated ON The MERITS IN State COURT PROCEEDINGS UNLESS The Adjudication OF The Claim

Resulted IN a Decision THAT WAS contrary TO, OR INVOLVED an UNREASONABLE Application OF, Clearly established FEDERAL laws. AS DETERMINED BY The Supreme COURT OF The UNITED STATES;

OK

* Constitutional And Statutory Provisions *

Resulted in a decision that was based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented.
IN STATE COURT PROCEEDING.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW CANNOT CREATE AN OFFICE. THERE CAN BE NO OFFICE TO FILL: THAT AN OFFICE ATTEMPTED TO BE CREATED. BY AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW HAS NO LEGAL EXISTENCE, IS WITHOUT ANY VALIDITY. AND THAT ANY PERSON ATTEMPTING TO FILL SUCH A PRETEND OFFICE, WHETHER BY APPOINTMENT OR OTHERWISE IS A USURPER, WHOSE ACTS WOULD BE ABSOLUTELY (NULL AND VOID) AND COULD BE QUESTIONED BY ANY PRIVATE SUITOR IN ANY KIND OF ACTION OR PROCEEDING. IT WOULD BE A MISNOMER OF TERMS TO CALL A PERSON AN "OFFICER" WHO HOLDS NO OFFICE. A PUBLIC OFFICE CANNOT EXIST WITHOUT AUTHORITY OF LAW AN OFFICE CANNOT BE CREATED BY AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACT. FOR SUCH AN ACT IS NO LAW IF IT CONFERS NO RIGHTS IMPOSES NO DUTIES, AFFORDS NO CONTEMPLATION AND IS TO BE REGARDED AS NEVER HAVING BEEN "POSSESSED OF ANY LEGAL POWER OR EFFECT" AND IS ALWAYS TO BE TREATED AS THOUGH IT NEVER EXISTED.

How The Records Reflect The Creation of Senate Bill 182 WAS DONE IN VIOLATION OF NEV CONST: ARTICLE # 3 AND 1
NEV CONST: ARTICLE 6 AND 11 - AND ANY LAWS OR STATUTES DERIVED FROM THAT UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACT ARE NULL AND VOID UNDER ANY COLOR OF LAW

NOTE
U.S. FEDERAL CASE OF THE SAME NATURE

U.S. v DEZERRE LORTEZ 697 F Supp 1305 1988 US Dist Court
lexis 11818 NO 88 CK 159 (SWK) FINDING

THE U.S.S.G. WAS CONSISTANT WITH THE ACT THE COURTS DECLARED THE ACT UNCONSTITUTIONAL BECAUSE IT REQUIRED ARTICLE III JUDGES TO ENGAGE IN SUBSTANTIVE EXECUTIVE OR LEGISLATIVE ROLE YETTER AS MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

THUS THE ACT VIOLATED THE

SEPERATION OF POWERS DOCTRINE
UNDERSTANDING AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACT CANNOT CREATE AN OFFICE OR ANY LAWS TO ENFORCE.

* STATEMENTS OF THE CASE *

IN THIS, THE VIOLATIONS OF NEV. CONSTITUTION ART. 3 § 1 VIOLATIONS OF NEV. CONSTITUTION ART 6 § 11, 6 § 12, ALONG WITH IMPLIED JUDICIAL BIAS AND PRE-JUDICED ARE TOO HIGH TO BE CONSTITUTIONAL TOLERABLE. 8th DISTRICT COURTS REFUSED TO ORDER NEV.

DISTRICT ATTORNEYS OFFICE TO RESPOND TO THE MERITS OF THE EVIDENCE; THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL CREATION OF SENATE BILL #182 CHAPTER 304, WHICH ALSO VIOLATES.

U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS 9th AMENDMENT, RIGHT RETAINED BY THE PEOPLE 5th AMENDMENT DUE PROCESS OF LAW, 14th AMENDMENT EQUAL PROTECTION OF LAW 8th AMENDMENT CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT.

THE ABOVE MENTIONED VIOLATIONS WERE BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE 8th DISTRICT COURTS FOR CLARK COUNTY ON FEB 6, 2017 "THROUGH WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS" # A-17-750603-W. SEE APPENDIX C. ORIGINAL WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS WHICH IS AND WAS CIVIL IN NATURE 8th DISTRICT COURT RESPONDS 1 year 1/2 later RECLASSING WRIT # 750603-W AS A CRIMINAL CHALLENGE. PLACING CRIMINAL # C-268406 AS CONTROLLING # SEE EXHIBIT # 1

APPEARED # 74102 SUPREME COURT. SEE EXHIBIT # 2 RESPONSE TO, WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS ONLY IN CRIMINAL PLATFORM # C-268406 WITH THE STATES USE OF LATCHES, TIME BARS, PROCEDURAL BARS, NEVER ADDRESSING THE MERITS OF ANDERSON'S CLAIMS. 8th DISTRICT COURTS DENIED TO APPLY CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS FOUND IN (B)(i)(ii) (B i) THE FATAL PREDICATE FOR THE CLAIM COULD NOT HAVE BEEN DISCOVERED PREVIOUSLY THROUGH THE EXERCISE OF DUE DILIGENCE.

* STATEMENTS OF THE CASE *

ON (6-22-2018) a "Writ of Mandamus" was Filed ALSO ON
Said Violations of Constitutional Laws, State AND Federal Constitutions
SEE EXHIBIT #3 8th District Courts Attempt, At "Re-Naming", THE
"Writ of Mandamus" INTO a "Writ of Habeas Corpus"
SEE EXHIBIT #3A. ALSO SEE APPENDIX D: HARD COPY Stamp Filed
"Writ of Mandamus" AS Stated Above SEE EXHIBIT #3C
Stated By The Courts THEIRS NO legal Authority To Support
"Writ of Mandamus" Defendants Petition HAS NO MERIT
SEE EXHIBIT #4 AND #5

SEE EXHIBIT #7: SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA #75436
District Court # A-760603-W Filed in proper Person Petition
FOR "Writ of QUO-WARRANTO" (March 27, 2018) SEE:
HARD COPY Stamp Filed Writ of "QUO-WARRANTO"
APPENDIX F

SEE Court of Appeals #75436: By What legal Authority, IS
SENATE BILL #182 a Constitutional Act? SUPREME COURT OF NEV.
REFUSE TO EXERCISE ORIGINAL JURISDICTION: FOUND IN
EXHIBIT #8 (May 22 2018)

SEE EXHIBIT #9 U.S. District Court Judge: JENNIFER DOWNEY
REFUSED TO EXERCISE JURISDICTION OF "Writ of QUO-WARRANTO"
Filed (1-15-2014) U.S. District Court # 2:15-cv-02504-JAD-pal
Stating IN HER ORDER: THIS ISSUE IS BETWEEN CITIZEN
AND STATE "Writ Denied" JURISDICTIONAL DEFECTS

* Statements OF The Case *

On (July 9, 2018) # A-17-750603-W / C-268406 / Motion FOR Relief FROM Judgment EXHibit #10

SEE EXHibit #11 (March 13, 2018) Petition FOR WRIT OF Habeas CORPUS SENT TO MASTER CALENDAR TO Re-designate as a CRIMINAL petition Removing Civil # 750603-W AND placing CRIMINAL # C-268406 IN ORDER To Add Laches Procedural Bars, Time Bar, NEVER Addressing Merits of claim

August 13, 2018 Time Bar

Sept 7, 2017 Involuntary Dismissal

Appendix A: Appeals Court REVERSE AND Remand # 75313

Filed (Sept 11, 2018) Returning in REVERSAL The unconstitutional creation of Senate Bill # 182 Chapter 304; To 8th District Courts UNDER Civil Case # "A-17-750603-W" which THIS case # is YEARS AFTER Plaintiffs Direct appeal. But The 8th District Courts state These Issues should have been addressed on Direct Appeal

SEE Appendix E. 9th Circuit Court of Appeals. #1 stating The court SENT a copy OF "WRIT OF Habeas CORPUS" # A-17-750603-W To Counsel To Be Appended with 9th Circuit Case # 17-70203/17-15265 (OCT 26, 2017) SEE: Full EXHibit #18

CORRESPONDENCE TO: Chief Judge FOR The 9th Circuit Alex KOZINSKI, CONCERNING IN-EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF Counsel AS well AS Newly Discovered EVIDENCE Directing "legal Actual INOCENTS" CONCERNING UNConstitutional Subject Matter Jurisdiction

* Statements of The Case *

ON (SEPT 25 2018) JUDICIAL NOTICE FILED #A-17-750603-W
EXHIBIT #20

ON (SEPT 25, 2018) "Civil Writ of Mandamus" Filed with
Claims of Violations To NEV. Constitution ART # 6/11, 6/12
3/1, 5/7, 5/20, 6/6(1)

APPENDIX G: Plaintiff Files Rule 60(b) EXHIBIT #24:
Filed (NOV. 19. 2018) JUDICIAL ERROR AND DEFECTS CONCERNING
8th District Courts Refusal To Honor Reverse AND Remand #75313
AS well AS ERROR in Honorable Judge Delaney's FINDING
of Facts AND Conclusion of law (May of 2018) 8th District Court
Don't Have (Subject Matter Jurisdiction) To Rule #A-17-750603-W/
C-268406/ are under jurisdiction of Supreme Court until
Reverse AND Remand (Sept 11 2018) 8th Dist Courts Ruling is
Null AND Void. 8th District Courts Refuse any correction

Dec 26 2018 Supreme Court Motion To Compel Found in
EXHIBIT # 24 APPENDIX G

APPENDIX G, EXHIBIT #24 B, APPENDIX G EXHIBIT #24 C
NEV Supreme Court won't motion / ORDER 8th District Courts
Compelling: Honorable Judge Mark J. Baileys To Follow
Supreme Court Orders: ANDERSON Files Constitutional
Claims Against The State of NEV, Attorney GEN, FORMER GOV
BRAD SANDOZ.

* Statements of The Case *

ON (Jan 7, 2019) "Petition For Criminal Writ of Habeas Corpus"

ON (Feb 4, 2019) Motions For Sanctions

ON (Feb 5, 2019) SEE EXHIBIT # 24-G "Court states (2) Types of Habeas Petitions" DEFENDANTS CHALLENGE TO CONSTITUTIONALITY OF SENATE BILL # 182 IS TO BE ADDRESSED ON THE HEARING 3-21-19 THE STATE ONLY ADDRESSED, TIME BARS, LATCHES, PROCEDURAL BARS: AND NEVER ADDRESS THE MERITS OF PLAINTIFFS CLAIMS.

ON (2-20-2019) COURT ORDERS MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE (SEE EXHIBIT # 24-J) (SEE EXHIBIT # 24-K) #1 Habeas # 750603-W #2 Habeas # 785909-W #3 CIVIL ACTION # A-17-761357-C

APPENDIX G (March 21, 2019) states response on page #3 PETITIONER CLAIM IS WAIVED FOR FAILURE TO RAISE IT ON DIRECT APPEAL SEE: EXHIBIT # 24

APPENDIX B DECISION OF STATE TRAIL COURT
APRIL 10 2019 Writ of Habeas Corpus

ON (4-15-13) EX PARTE MOTION TO DISMISS, CHARGES # C-268406
lack of "SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION" INVALID LAWS

ON (8-9-2013) Appeal To Federal Courts

#1 CHALLENGING UNCONSTITUTIONAL "SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION"
INVALID LAWS AND NO ENACTING CLAUSE ON THE FACE
OF CHANGING DOCUMENTS

ON (10-10-2013) Demand Notice of DEFICIENCY TO WIT
Alleged NON COMPLIANCE WITH ARTICLE XVII NEV.
Constitution 2/20 IN VIOLATION OF REQUIRED OFFICIAL
BONDS

* Statements of The Case *

ON (3-28-2016) Petitioner, Petitions 8th District Court
For a Special Writ of Habeas Corpus with Extraordinary
Circumstances That Require Extraordinary Relief, That
Require an Evidence Hearing Original Writ Common AND
Constitutional State AND Federal laws

ON (3-30-2016) ORDER Petition For writ of Habeas Corpus

ON (6-6-2016) Petition For writ of Habeas Corpus Regarding
Constitutional Violations NEV. Const Art 3/1 Art 6/1 Regarding
Official Bonding And No Enacting clause ON FACE of Charging
Documents

ON (2-6-17) Petition For writ of Habeas Corpus

Original writ with Provisions Found IN

Bible V. Heloan #A-17-750603-W Civil IN Nature

Between Citizen AND Executive Branches of NEVADA GOVERNMENT

ON (5-4-2018) Civil writ of Habeas Corpus #A-17-750603-W

Re-Designated as a Criminal challenge To Plaintiff

J.O.C UNDER CASE # C-268406

The Above mentioned statements of writ #A-17-750603-W
"where All"! Brought To The Attention of The
8th District Courts, NEVADA Supreme Courts, NEV. Court of Appeals
US District Court District of NEVADA, 9th Circuit Court of Appeals
All in Civil AND Criminal Terms of Extraordinary writ
#1 Habeas Corpus #2 Mandamus #3 Quo Warranto
#4 State Appeals #5 Federal Appeals. AND All other Courts
Have Failed To Address Constitutional AND Statutory Provision
NEVER Addressing The Merits of Plaintiff's Claims

* Statements of The Case *

IN (B)(i) The Factual predicate for the claims could not have been discovered previously through the EXERCISE OF DUE DILIGENCE AND.

(ii) The Facts underlying the claim IF PROVEN AND VIEWED IN light of the EVIDENCE by clear AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE as would be SUFFICIENT to establish By clear AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE, That But FOR Constitutional errors NO reasonable factfinder would have found the Applicant guilty of the underlying OFFENCE

(B)(i) THERE IS AN ABSENCE OF Available State corrective PROCESS; OR

(ii) CIRCUMSTANCES EXIST THAT RENDER SUCH PROCESS INEFFECTIVE TO PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF THE APPLICANT:

OPENING BRIEF

THIS MATTER NOW BEFORE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT. REQUESTING
ISSUANCE BY THE COURT. AN EXTRAORDINARY WRIT AUTHORIZED
BY 28 U.S.C. § 1651 (a) IS NOT A MATTER OF RIGHT, BUT
OF COURT'S DISCRETION. SPARINGLY EXERCISED.

PETITIONER IS SEEKING A EXTRAORDINARY
"WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS" IN COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS
OF 28 USC §§ 2241 AND 2242 IN PARTICULAR WITH PROVISIONS
IN THE LAST PARAGRAPH OF 2242 STATEMENTS OF THE REASONS
FOR NOT GRANTING APPLICATION TO THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE
DISTRICT WHERE THE APPLICATION IS HELD PETITIONER
ANDERSON SEEK RELIEF FROM STATE COURT JUDGMENT
BY AND THROUGH, THIS PETITION FOR "EXTRAORDINARY
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS" WHICH WILL SET OUT SPECIFICALLY
HOW AND WHERE THE PETITIONER HAS EXHAUSTED AVAILABLE
REMEDIES IN STATE COURTS, OTHER-WISE COMES WITHIN
PROVISIONS OF 28 USC § 2254 (b) WHICH EXCEPTIONAL
CIRCUMSTANCES WARRANT THE EXERCISE OF THE
U.S. SUPREME COURT'S DISCRETIONARY POWERS. WHEN
ADEQUATE RELIEF CANNOT BE OBTAINED IN ANY OTHER
FORUM ^{IN} ANY OTHER COURT.

"Primarily" 8th DISTRICT COURTS FOR CLACK COUNTY;
SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA; APPEALS COURT OF NEV; U.S. DISTRICT
COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA; AND 9th CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS.
REFUSE TO GRANT DUE PROCESS OF LAW, NOR WILL THE ABOVE
MENTION COURTS ADDRESS PLAINTIFF CLAIMS CONCERNING DUAL
SERVICE VIOLATIONS OF NEV CONST 3/1 NEV CONST 6/11. THESE
CLAIMS ARE REFUSED TO BE ADDRESSED ON THE MERITS
ANDERSONS ARGUMENT SHOWS GOOD CAUSE AND JUDICIAL BIAS
AND PRE-JUDGED WITH EXERCISED PROCEDURAL BARS

ANDERSON ALSO BRINGS TO THE ATTENTION OF
THE "SUPREME COURTS" CLAIMS OF ALLEGED INEFFECTIVE
ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL; DURING ARRAIGNMENT, INVESTIGATIONS
OF CRIMINAL CHARGES, EVIDENCE HEARING, STATUS CHECKS
NEGOTIATIONS, SENTENCING, DIRECT APPEAL, FEDERAL "WRIT OF HABEAS
CORPUS #17-70203", WITH FACTS THAT ATTORNEYS ARE OFFICERS
OF THE COURT ACTING UNDER THE COLOR OF LAW.

AND ARE PRESUMED TO KNOW THE LAWS IN WHICH
THEY INTERACT AND THE LAWS THAT GOVERN THEIR FAITHFUL
DUTIES TO THEIR OFFICE.

OATH OF OFFICE

I, NEVADA ATTORNEY do solemnly swear (AFFIRM) THAT I
WILL SUPPORT, PROTECT AND DEFEND THE CONSTITUTION AND GOVERNMENT
OF THE UNITED STATES, AND THE CONSTITUTION AND GOVERNMENT OF THE
STATE OF NEVADA, AGAINST ALL ENEMIES, WHETHER DOMESTIC OR
FOREIGN AND THAT I WILL BEAR TRUE FAITH, ALLEGIANCE AND
LOYALTY TO THE SAME, ANY ORDINANCE, RESOLUTION OR LAW
OF ANY STATE NOTWITHSTANDING AND THAT I WILL WELL
AND FAITHFULLY PERFORM ALL MY DUTIES OF OFFICE
ON WHICH I AM ABOUT TO ENTER; SO HELP ME GOD
IF AN AFFIRMATION UNDER PERJURY AND PERJURY OF PERJURY

How can any Federal or State Attorney uphold
THE ABOVE MENTIONED OR FULLY DEFEND THE U.S. CONSTITUTION
OR THE NEVADA CONSTITUTION FROM ALL ENEMIES BOTH
"DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN", WHEN THEY ARE NOT AWARE OF
OR WON'T EXPOSE "DOMESTIC ENEMIES" IN THE JUDICIAL
BRANCH OF NEVADA'S GOVERNMENT THAT HAVE COMMITTED
TREASON TO THESE PERNICIOUS DOCTRINES,

PETITIONER is entitled to Extraordinary Relief
OF U.S. Supreme Court IN FORM OF Habeas Corpus
Due To Statutory Mandates. THE INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE
OF Formal Counsel, PROVIDE GOOD CAUSE AND THE
IN-EFFECTIVE claim it SELF must NOT it SELF BE
PROCEDURALLY BARRED. SEE Hathaway v. State 119 NEV.
248 252, 71 P.3d 503, 506 (2003). ANDERSON HERE
ADDRESSES THE ISSUES RELATED TO IN-EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE
OF COUNSEL. TO EXCUSE all other Defaulted Claims.
All Claims maintain MERITS, AND NEVADA Courts
WONT Address These claims ON THE MERITS, NOR
will any Agency's OF NEVADA Attorneys Properly
BRING FORTH THE SAID UNCONSTITUTIONAL CREATION
OF Senate Bill-182 Chapter 304.

Plaintiff now Request Discretionary Review OF JUDGMENT
ENTERED ON April 10, 2019, By 8th District Courts.
Review OF 8th Districts Courts Bias AND Pre-judiced Actions
Review OF 9th Circuit ORDER Dec 1 2017
Review OF Supreme Courts Refusal To accept Jurisdiction
OF Quo-warrant March 27, 2018
Review writ OF Mandays 6-22-2018
Review U.S District Court District OF NEV. "ERROR'S Bias
IN Nature" stated this is Between citizen AND state!
Plaintiff Request Equity Judgment in Both State Court OF
First Instance AND in all Appellate Courts with The Supreme Court
Ruling ON AND Giving Final opinion ON All portions
OF Courts charge Vacating all ERRORS CONCERNING
The unconstitutional Creation OF S-B-182 By NEV. state

which 8th Dist Courts Refuse ON 4-10-2019
IN [*MANIFESTED ERROR*]

GROUND #1 There is no opposition to ANDERSONS
Claim That Senate Bill #182 was an unconstitutional
act FROM THE VERY START IN VIOLATION OF NEV. CONST
3/1 : (NEV. CONST 6/11. NEV. CONST 6/12 WHICH
8th DISTRICT COURTS ORDERED A RESPONSE FROM
Deputy D/A JOHN NIMAN ON 2-5-19. AS TO HOW DID
THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF S-B-182 EFFECTED
"ANDERSON" AND HIS PRISON SENTENCE D/A'S OFFICE
REFUSED TO RESPOND TO THE MERITS WITH NO
OPPOSITION TO ANDERSONS WRIT #750603-W. THEREFORE
THE COURTS MUST TAKE EVERY WORD IN
CASE #750603-W AS "TRUE" - BUT INSTEAD
MANIFESTED ERROR WAS THE VEHICLE USED
TO DELIVER THE COURTS RULE. THAT PLAINTIFF
NEVER ADDRESSED THESE ISSUES ON "DIRECT APPEAL"
IN WHICH COUNSEL ON DIRECT APPEAL REFUSED
TO ADDRESS THESE FACTS COUNSEL (JULIAN GROEGANG^{ESQ})
MANIFESTED CONSTITUTIONAL
ERROR

GROUND #2 WITH-OUT AN OPPOSITION THE 8th
DISTRICT COURTS MUST NOW TAKE EVERY SINGLE WORD
AS TRUE BUT THE 8th DIST COURT IS AGAINST
PLAINTIFF AND NOT ACTING AS A REFEREE; BUT AS
A PROSECUTOR. AND THE COURT ATTEMPTS TO FIND
ANY AND EVERY EXCUSE THAT WOULD AVOID

upholding The Plaintiff's 9th Amendment
Rights Given in The U.S. Const

[*The Rights of The People Can-Not Be]
[Infringed Upon *]

The 8th Dist Courts fail to up-Hold Both The
U.S. Const As well As The NEV. Const:

Manifest Error

Grand #3 with The 8th Dist Courts stating on
The face of The Record That The ORDER Verbally
stated IN OPEN COURT ON 2-5-19 WAS INCORRECT
-AND THAT, The Court HINS were INCORRECT

Plaintiff Request ON (MAR 27 2019) a
Full Complete Copy OF AUDIO & VIDEO,
AND TRANSCRIPTS FOR The Following Dates

Open Court 2-5-2019 Time 9:00 AM

IN CHAMBERS 2-20-2019 Time 3:00 AM

Open Court 3-21-2019 Time 9:00 AM

These Transcripts were Requested For ONE
They WAS a Verbal Order Not Followed #2

The Court HINS Reflected above mentioned #3

The Clerk of The Court Louisa Gracien Heard
AND Recorded This Verbal ORDER #4 AS D.D. ANDERSON
Heard; This Verbal ORDER By Judge Richard T. Scott.
IN which Honorable Judge Richard T. Scott, Signed
and ORDERED ON (2-20-2019) a Consolidation
OF Case # A-17-750603-W, A-17-761357-C, A-18-785909-W
with new Court Clerk, Louisa Gracien

which Judge Richard T Scott states in
opposition to the records reflection; The
Court states this [consolidation] NEVER existed

SEE ANDERSON V. STATE OF NEVADA D.O.C.

SC CASE # 78061 D.C CASE # A-17-761357-C

Court HINS FOR "February 20, 2019"

Motion To Consolidate (Granted)

SEE ANDERSON V. WARDEN Jerry Howell / Offender Management
Division State of NEV et al

Case # A-18-785909-W

Court HINS FOR "February 20, 2019"

Motion To Consolidate Granted

SEE ANDERSON V JO GENTRY

Case # A-17-750603-W

Court HINS FOR "February 20, 2019"

Motion To Consolidate # A-17-750603-W A-17-761357-C
A-18-785909-W Granted

This Oral Statement on 3-21-2019 By Judge:
Richard T Scott, was NUN: EXCUSABLE ERROR
By The 8th Dist Courts; which Manifested
Constitutional ERROR AN ERROR By a Trial Court
That Has an Identifiably Negative Impact
ON The Hearing To such a Degree That
Constitutional Rights of The Party are Now
COMPROMISED "Manifest ERROR AN ERROR"

That's plain AND ~~INDISPUTABLE~~ AND AMOUNTS TO
a complete DISREGARD OF THE (Controlling law!)
ON THE CREDIBLE EVIDENCE UPON THE FACE OF RECORD
Manifest error

Ground #4: Deputy DA John Nixas states clearly
ON THE FACE OF THE RECORD IN OPEN COURT: 3-21-19

The reason of NO OPPOSITION was Plaintiff USE
OF THE WRONG WRIT Referring TO (Writ of Habeas corpus
750603-20) #1 But also with-out knowledge of
Plaintiff's History of THIS writ #2 IN DISREGARD
TO SC REVERSE AND REMAND AND TOTALLY IN
OPPOSITION OF well established CASE LAW BY NEV. SUP COURT
Found IN Shaw V. State 105 NEV. 521, 523, 779
p2d. 96.97 (1989) : ALSO IN DISREGARD TO FOOT
THE RECORD ALSO REFLECTS

Plaintiff ANDERSON HAS FILED

- #1 writ of COHIN NORBIS
- #2 writ of Mandamus
- #3 writ of Quo-warranto : FEDERAL
- #4 writ of Quo-warranto : STATE
- #5 writs OF Habeas Corpus

All with-out any legal procedure

That's IN OPPOSITION TO THE MERITS OF THE
UNCONSTITUTIONAL CREATION OF SB-182 AND
HOW DID THIS UNCONSTITUTIONAL BILL EFFECT
Plaintiff IMPRISONMENT / AND OR PLEA DEAL /
Sentence -

which Plaintiff Requested a Sealed
Copy of Transcripts as well ^{AS} AUDIO & VIDEO
For Proceedings 2-5-19 2-20-19 3-21-19
_{open court} _{Chambers} _{open court}

Court Clerk Louisa Garcia Case # A17-152003-W
And as of 4-15-2019 8th Dist Court Refuses
Plaintiff These Said Documents

* Equity Jurisdiction *

There-for Plaintiff ANDERSON Now enters
Motion For Equity Jurisdiction to:
Supreme Court of the UNITED States
For a COMMON law writ of CERTIORARI
With The state of NEVADA Having Full Knowledge
of Fraud, Stealth Fraud Treason to The
U.S. Const.; Treason to The NEV Const.
UNConstitutional Executions, False Imprisonment
Human Trafficking By Way of Mass
INCARCERATION Through The effects
of Dual SERVICE; Separation of Powers
Violations which resulted in The UNConstitutional
Creation of SB-182 which This Illegal
Act By The Judicial Branch of NEVADAS
Government has Effected, THOUSANDS OF NEVADENS
Not excluding THOUSAND UPON THOUSANDS
OF Citizens of The U.S.A And 8th
Dist Courts Refuse Any Remedy!

OPINION "The writ of Habeas Corpus is available to allow the presentation of questions of law which cannot otherwise be reviewed, or that are so important as to render ordinary procedure inadequate and justify extraordinary remedy." SEE also

Director of Prison v. Knott 98 NEV. 84, 85 690 P.2d 1318, 1319 (1982) State Ex Rel Orsborn v. Fogliani, 82 NEV. 300, 417 P.2d 148 (1966)

SNOW does not delineate "post conviction petition for writ of Habeas Corpus", yet Habeas Corpus! This

reasoning is very sound, as the Court expressed: to allow the presentation of questions of law presented in this writ, would could not otherwise be introduced without reviewing SNOW, 105 NEV 523, 779 P.2d at 97. ^{Printings}

CONCERNS OF The "Facial unconstitutionality of Senate Bill #182 Committee on Finance Chapter 304, Statutes of NEVADA 1951 [APPROVED March 22, 1951] S-B #182

But, 8th District courts as well as Deputy District Attorney John Niman, OVER look these matters and interject manifest ERROR with responds to case A-17-750603-2 in the forms of

Procedure Bars, Time Bars, Laches, which the 8th Dist Court allows IN ERROR!

Facts there ARE (NO!) Time Bars

Procedure Bars or laches when addressing "subject matter jurisdiction" That's AN - opening grounds for *Legal Actual Innocents*, One

process and equal protection of law must move forward with a FULL-DISCOVERY, showing

THAT THE WEIGHT OF THE EVIDENCE AS WELL AS, THE
PERPONDERENCE; THAT CANNOT BE OVER-LOOKED

* SENATE BILL # 182 CHAPTER 304 *

IS FACIALLY UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND, ALL, ACTS DERIVED FROM
THIS PERPONDERENCE INCLUDING ALL THE EFFECTS NOTED

FROM THIS UNCONSTITUTIONAL CREATION ARE "NULL AND VOID", THIS ALSO
VOIDS THE 8th DIST COURTS OF NEV. ORIGINAL #1 SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION

#2 EFFECT UNCONSTITUTIONAL CHANGING DOCUMENTS, #3 MAINLY ANY AND ALL
SENTENCING, #4 SENTENCING GUIDELINES #5 CHARGES #6 PUNISHMENT

#7 PRISON TERMS #8 PROBATION, #9 PRESIDENTIAL CONFINEMENT, #10 RESTITUTION

#11 OR COMMUNITY SERVICE, DERIVED FROM THE CREATION OF SB-182

NOT EXCLUDING THE N.R.S SYSTEM WHICH ARE A RESULT OF AN
UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACT OF LEGISLATORS /DUAL SERVICE AND ARE NULL & VOID

ACTS OF GOVERNMENT, THAT CANNOT LEGALLY BE ENFORCED OR USED

AS ANY FORM OF ENFORCEABLE LAWS. MEANING THE ORIGINAL SAID JURISDICTION
OF THE DETAINING POLICE OFFICER, THE ORIGINAL ARREST REPORT OR

INFORMATION USING LAWS DERIVED FROM SB-182 ARE AND WHEN

ALL VOID NOW THE ONLY LEGAL ACTIONS BY U.S. SUPREME COURT, CONCERNING
8th DISTRICT COURTS UNCONSTITUTIONAL USE OF INVALID LAWS, IS REVERSE AND

VACATE BY SUMMARY JURISDICTION THE HIGH COURTS AUTHORITY TO ISSUE
A JUDGMENT OR ORDER SUCH AS A FINDING WITHOUT NECESSITY
OF TRIAL OR OTHER PROCEED WHICH ARE THE GEOGRAPHIC BOUNDARIES
OR CONSTITUTIONAL STATUTORY LIMITS THAT ARE LEFT WITHIN

LEGAL AUTHORITY OR U.S. SUPREME COURTS MAY USE
EQUITY PRACTICE OF EQUITABLE CHANNELS OF THE U.S SUPREME
COURTS COMMON LAW WRIT OF CERTIORARE FOR THE 8th DISTRICT
COURTS IN THIS ACTION BETWEEN A CITIZEN AND A

ENTIRE STATE, STATE OF NEVADA AND THEIR
EXECUTIVE STAFF

Plaintiff Also makes Supreme Court aware of
"LATENT Equitable" Subject Matter Jurisdiction, Violations
which Plaintiff presents Claims OR Violations of "Civil Rights"
Known only By The Parties For AND Against whom
it exist OR That Has BEEN CONCEALED FROM Public
OR ones whom are interested in Constitutional
Violations of "Subject Matter Jurisdiction"

INTERESTED parties are The AMERICAN Public,
The CITIZEN OF The State OF NEVADA, The Tourist
That visit The State OF NEVADA, AND The Entire Country!

With The State OF NEVADA Violating The NEGATIVE MISPRISION
Clause AND The wrongful Concealment OF The UNCONSTITUTIONAL
Citation OF S-B-182. That's Some-Thing. That Should
Have BEEN, OR Should Be Revealed To The Public

MISPRISION OF TREASON, By 8th District courts,
NEV. Supreme Court, NEVADA Court of Appeals, U.S. District Court
9th Circuit Court of Appeals. Facts That Concealment OR
NON DISCLOSURE OF SOME-ONE ELSE'S TREASON TO The
Constitution. Single Senate Bill # 182 chapter 304. IS a
MISDEMEANOR AND The EFFECTS OF FRAUD, Steath FRAUD
SURROUND This UNCONSTITUTIONAL Act. which violates, The
Equal protection Analysis. Also The Fundamental Rights such
as The 9th Amendment, Now UNDER STRICT SCRUTINY
The State must ESTABLISH That it Has a Compelling Interest
That Justifies a Necessitate For The Above Mentioned
Due process or law violations TO uphold an
UNCONSTITUTIONAL law IN QUESTION S-B 182 which

Chapter #304 Violates The U.S.A. Fundamental Rights
This MISNOMER Handred Down AND created By The
States Criminal Justice System, ~~Three~~ Supreme Court
Justices #1 HERRIL J #2 EATHER CJ #3 Badt.J , the
ONLY correction of this action can be By EMERGENCY
legislative hearing, with an Amendment which can
relate Back To The Date of The Original

"Dual SERVICE" Violation OF NEV Const: 3 § 1
NEV Const 2 § 11 , 6 § 12 5 § 20 ,
Federal R. Civil P. 15 (c) (3)

Petition For: "Common Law Writ of Certiorari"
To The 8th DISTRICT Courts For Clark County NEV.

Petitioner, now demonstrates, that exceptional circumstances warrant the exercise of the courts discretionary powers, and that adequate relief cannot be obtained in any other court, pertaining to the entire judicial system in the (STATE OF NEVADA) *et al.*

Petitioner, **Anthony K. Anderson**, in Pro-Se makes his petition known in the "Supreme Court", of the United States, requesting issuance of an extraordinary "Writ of Common Law Certiorari", authorized by U.S.C 1651 (a) concerning judicial bias and prejudice found in The State of Nevada's entire judicial system with the State of Nevada's Judicial Branch of Government. Having interest in the "Economical Anatomical" Welfare of the State.

#1 As with judicial bias found in Luciaetta Marie Ivery V. The Eight Judicial District Court of The State of Nevada, real party of interest Philip Dennis Ivery Jr. 129 Nevada 154 299 p3d 354 2013 No 59297 March 28, 2013 Judicial Bias exist when the court has an Economic Interest in the **Subject Matter Jurisdiction** is controversy with Implied Bias.

#2 United States Supreme Court: Found in United States Supreme Court:
ORDER OF CERT **Rippo V. Baker** (Rippo IV) 580 vs. . 137
Supreme Court 905 (2017) Judicial bias to high to be constitutionally
Tolerabl Id @. . 137 Supreme Court at 906-07 Merit is found if
allegations are true counsel provided ineffectiveness as with (**Anderson
V. Williams #17-70203**)

Counsel provided ineffectiveness by not investigating Anderson's claims
of unconstitutional creation of S-B-182 received by 9th Circuit Court
(October 26 2017) filed in the 9th circuit court December 1 2017: See
Appendix E Exhibit #18. Counsel provided ineffectiveness by not
investigating Anderson's claims due diligence and never presenting
Anderson's claims to the courts, to provided true and factual good
cause with supporting "Actual Innocence" under the said constitutional
claims that would provide good cause to excuse any procedural default.

Anderson brings issues to the attention of the below listed. #1 Courts,
#2 Court personnel, #3 Court clerks, #4 Staff attorneys, #5 Public
defenders, #6 Private attorneys, 8th District Court for Clark County,
Supreme Court of Nevada, Appeals Court State of Nevada, US District
Court, 9th Circuit Court of Appeals, All above mentioned courts overlook
Constitutional violations of US Constitution, 1st amendment, 5th
amendment, 14th amendment, 9th amendment, and 8th amendment.

Violations of NEVADA Constitution

Article # 3 AND 1

Article # 6 AND 11

Article # 1 AND 23

Article # 4 AND 17

Article # 6 AND 12

Article # 6 AND 23

Article # 5 AND 20

Article # 6 AND 35

Article # 4 AND 4

Article # 17 AND 2 { 20

Article # 1 { 8 [5]

Violations of N.C.J.C Rule 2.11 (A) # 1 AND # 2

THESE Bias Pre-JUDGED Acts By NEVADAS JUDICIAL Branch of ~~Grate~~ ^{Hall} ARE DONE - IN TOTAL DISREGARD TO THE COLOR OF CONSTITUTIONAL LAW FOUND IN ARTICLE III SECTION #2 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION "CONTROVERSY BETWEEN A CITIZEN AND A STATE" [ANDERSON is a CITIZEN OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, AND BORN ON AMERICAN SOIL! WHICH IN "ARTICLE VI OF US CONSTITUTION THE LANGUAGE IS BOLD AND CLEAR, JUDGES IN EVERY STATE SHALL BE BOUND THERE BY ANYTHING IN THE US CONSTITUTION OR LAWS OF ANY STATE TO THE CONTRARY NOT WITHSTANDING "ARTICLE IV" PUBLIC ACTS AND RECORDS

"Bias" is ALSO FOUND AGAINST THE COLOR OF LAW, WHICH ANDERSON, ALSO PRESENT FACTS WHICH ARE SUPPORTED BY OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GEN OF NEV. WHOM ALSO FIND SEPARATION OF POWERS VIOLATION CONCERNING DUAL SERVICE SEE: OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GEN. STATE OF NEV 2004-03 2004-NEV ALG lexis 4 OPINION NO 2004-03 (MARCH 1 2004) HONORABLE DEAN HALLER JUDGE SECRETARY OF STATE / STATE OF NEV. FACTS PRESENTED BY PLAINTIFF [BRAIN SANDOVAL ATTORNEY GEN] WHOM MR SANDOVAL'S OPINION AS THE ATTORNEY GEN. FOR STATE OF NEV. CONTRADICTS: MR SANDOVAL'S ACTIONS AS: GOVERNOR FOR STATE OF NEV. CONCERNING UNCONSTITUTIONAL CREATION OF SB 182 ^{THESE} CREATIONS THAT VIOLATE NEV CONST ART 3 { 1 SEPARATION OF POWER ACTS CREATING

LOSSES TO THE AMERICAN PUBLIC: IMPOSSIBLE TO CATALOGUE

THE FACTS OF IMPLIED JUDICIAL BIAS AND PRE-JUDICED, PRESENTED AND SUPPORTED BY THE FACE OF THE RECORD. HERE EVEN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEV. HAS DEPRIVED ANDERSON OF STATE AND FEDERAL PROTECTED CONSTITUTIONAL, LAWS / RIGHTS - ANDERSON PRESENTS THIS BIAS, TO THE QUESTION.

By What Constitutional Authority is Senate Bill #182 A CONSTITUTIONAL ACT?

ANDERSON CLAIMS THE FULL JUDICIAL, BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT IN THE STATE OF NEV. COVERS THIS VIOLATION OF ART 3, 1 WITH IMPLIED BIAS AND PRE-JUDICED, THIS ACT WAS CREATED TO PROTECT NEVADA'S JUDICIAL BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT'S INTEREST IN THE ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL INTEREST IN THE WELFARE OF THE STATE

IN NEVADA A JUDGE HAS A GENERAL DUTY TO SIT UNLESS A JUDICIAL CANNON, STATUTE OR RULE REQUIRED ANY JUDGES DISQUALIFICATION, NEV REV STAT 1.230 PROHIBITS A JUDGE FROM PRESIDING OVER ANY MATTER WHEN ACTUAL OR IMPLIED BIAS EXIST ON PART OF THE JUDGE. THE RELEVANT PROVISIONS OF NEV. CODE JUDICIAL CONDUCT CANN 2.11. (A) SEE EXHIBIT 2.11(A). "NEVADA'S" GREATEST ECONOMIC INTEREST IN STATE WELFARE ARE THE MILLIONS OF OFFICES CREATED BY THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL CREATION OF SB#182 THAT MUST BE PROTECTED AT ALL COSTS EVEN BY AND THROUGH UNCONSTITUTIONALLY EXERCISING AMERICANS. UNDERSTANDING THE DEATH WARRANTS ARE NULL AND VOID UNDER NEV. EXISTING LAWS OFF SPRINGS OF CHAPTER 304.

WRIT # A-17-70603-22 EXPOSES THE GREATEST SECRET EVER KEPT

PROSECUTION, NEGLIGENCE, FRAUD, STEALTH FRAUD, CONSPIRACIES
ENGAGED IN BY OUR JUDICIAL BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT USING
UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTS TO SUCCURE UNCONSTITUTIONAL LOSS OF LIBERTY
LOSSES OF THIS MAGNITUDE ARE IMPOSSIBLE TO CATALOGUE. INDEED
THE JUDICIAL BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT IN THE STATE OF NEVADA
DOES IN FACT HOLD A GREAT FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC
INTEREST. IN THE STATE OF NEVADA'S JUSTICE SYSTEM WITH
NEV. PRISON SYSTEM BEING A MAJOR PART OF THE SILVER STATE'S
ECONOMY #1 WITH-OUT MASS INCARCERATION THE STATES
ECONOMY WOULD ALL BUT COLLAPSE FACT SMITHS BONDING
VISA AND MASTERCARD HOLD SHARES IN THIS SYSTEM.
THEIR INVESTORS MUST BE PAID BY AND THROUGH IMPLIED BIDS
AT THE EXPENSE OF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC. MASS INCARCERATION.

THE STATE OF NEV. IS RESPONSIBLE FOR COUNTLESS UNCONSTITUTIONAL, EXECUTIONS
CAUSING THE LOSS OF LOVE AND AFFECTION FROM FAMILY AND FRIENDS
WITH FALSE IMPRISONMENT LEADING TO MENTAL AND PHYSICAL DAMAGES, WHICH ALSO
PREVENT AMERICANS WITH SUPPORTED FACTS OF CONSTITUTIONAL "ABUSE"
SINCE THE CREATION OF S-B #182 WITH EACH AND EVERY JUDGE, JUSTICE
MAGISTRATE OF NEV. HOLDING AN ECONOMIC INTEREST IN THE STATE'S ECONOMY
SEE NRS FOR JUDICIAL RETIREMENT FOUNDED 1A.160, 1A.120
NRS 1A.520, 31A.150 1A.230, 240 1A.050
SEE APPENDIX B EXHIBITS #25 A.B.C.D.

ANDERSON IS AWARE OF THE DAMAGE THIS WOULD CAUSE IF
TRUTH BE EXPOSED AND TOLD. ANDERSON SO FILES A MOTION
FOR MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF PSEUDONYM IN SUPPORT
OF PROTECTIVE ORDER ON 2-21-2018 FOR HIMSELF
AND THE STATES PROTECTION

Nevada State Government

Page # 20

Page # 20

FRONT # 20
BACK # 21

Voters of Nevada

Judicial Branch

Executive Branch

Legislative Branch

Elective Officers

Attorney General
(See Note 1)

Secretary of State
(See Note 2)

Governor
(See Note 3)

Lieutenant Governor
(Const. 5.17)

Controller
(Const. 5.19)

Treasurer
(Const. 5.19)

Senate
(Const. 4.1)

Assembly
(Const. 4.1)

State Board of Pardons
Commissioners
(NRS 213.010)

State Board of
Examiners
(Const. 5.21)

Board of State
Prison Commissioners
(See Note 4)

*Agencies
Headed
by Elective
Boards*

Nevada System of
Higher Education
(See Note 5)

State Board of
Education
(See Note 6)

Committees of
the Legislature
(See Note 7)

Legislative Counsel Bureau
(See Note 8)

Executive/Legislative
Committees
(See Note 9)

*Agencies Headed by
Directors Appointed
by the Governor*

Department of
Administration
(See Note 10)

State Department of
Agriculture
(See Note 11)

Department of
Business and Industry
(See Note 12)

Office of the State
Climatologist
(NRS 396.595)

State Department of
Conservation and Natural
Resources
(See Note 13)

Department of
Cultural Affairs
(See Note 14)

Department of Employment,
Training and Rehabilitation
(See Note 15)

Department of Health and
Human Services
(See Note 16)

Department of
Information Technology
(See Note 17)

Office of the Military
(See Note 18)

Department of
Motor Vehicles
(See Note 19)

Department of
Personnel
(See Note 20)

Department of
Public Safety
(See Note 21)

Office of
Veterans' Services
(See Note 22)

Department of Wildlife
(NRS 501.331)

*Agencies Headed by Boards
or Commissions Appointed
by the Governor.*

Colorado River
Commission
of Nevada
(NRS 538.051)

Commission on
Economic Development
(See Note 23)

State Gaming
Control Board
(NRS 463.030)

Commission on
Mineral Resources
(See Note 24)

Commission on
Postsecondary
Education
(NRS 394.383)

Board of the Public
Employees' Benefits
Program
(NRS 287.041)

Public Employees'
Retirement Board
(See Note 25)

Public Utilities
Commission of Nevada
(See Note 26)

Nevada
Tax Commission
(See Note 27)

Commission on Tourism
(See Note 28)

Board of Directors
(for the Department of
Transportation)
(See Note 29)

*Independent Boards,
Commissions, or
Councils*

State Board of Finance
(NRS 355.010)

Nevada
Gaming Commission
(NRS 463.022)

State Board of Health
(See Note 30)

Nevada
Indian Commission
(See Note 31)

Nevada Tahoe Regional
Planning Agency
(See Note 32)

Board of Wildlife
Commissioners
(NRS 501.167)

Professional and
Occupational Licensing
Boards
(See Note 33)

Other Boards,
Commissions, and
Councils
(See Note 34)

Page 20
FRONT

Page 20
BACK

The State of NEVADAS

Judicial Branch of Government are, all aware

#1 NEVADA State Courts #2 NEVADA Federal Courts

#3 NEV. Supreme Court #4 NEVADA Appellate Courts

#6 Judges #6 Justices #7 Magistrates #8 Staff Attorneys
#9 Court clerks / State / Federal #10 Federal Judges

#11 Federal Magistrates #12 all officers of NEV courts

#13 Public Defenders #14 Court Appointed Attorney State of NEV

#15 Paid Attorneys State of NEV

But all above Refuse any-one challenges The unconstitution
creation of S-B #182 any-opposition concerning The merits of claim

"The Entire Judicial Branch of Government" For The State
of NEVADA Have Secured an Economical Interest in The
unconstitutional Creation of #182 Chapter 304 Introducing
The NIS System To NEVADA law Removing Corporal laws

IN Violation of The Separation of Powers Act Article 3, §1
NEV Const. Article, §11, §12 The NEV. Courts use
of "Implied Judicial Bias" is The Front line Defense

To Any-one. Challenging The Separation of Powers Violation
Which would Automatically Remove "Subject Matter Jurisdiction"

For 8th District Courts understanding NEV Const §11 For Bids

Any Acts of Dual Service ORDERING Retor active


Back To (1951) any act of This Nature is null and void

And To Be Treated as Thaw it NEVER existed

But with 8th District Courts Treason To Their OAT

of Office HAVING a Financial And Economic Interest

IN State Government Equal Protection of laws No longer
Exist. With ANDERSON EXPOSING wrongfull



ACTS COMMITTED BY THE "PRIOR" SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA."

"JUSTICES #1 Earthen J. #2 Badt CJ. #3 Merrill J; ARE THE
ROOT OF THE CONTROVERSY AT HAND. WITH VIOLATIONS OF NEVADA
CONSTITUTION ARTICLE #3 | 1 ARTICLE 6 | 11; THE SUPREME
COURT WON'T DISQUALIFY THEMSELVES NOR RESPECT THE
PUBLIC TRUST. THE U.S. DISTRICT COURTS OF NEV. HAS COMPROMISED
THAT COURTS INTEGRITY, 8th DISTRICT COURT TOTALLY OVER-BOKE
THE VIOLATIONS AND ADD LATCHES AND TIME BARS.

COURT OF APPEALS FOR STATE OF NEVADA WON'T ACCEPT ORIGINAL
JURISDICTION SUPREME COURT FOR STATE OF NEV. TRANSFERS
ALL SUBJECT MATTER CONCERNING THE CREATION OF SB-182.

9th CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS ARE AWAKE OF THE "BIAS" CONTROVERSY
AND WON'T SUGGEST AN "EMERGENCY LEGISLATIVE APPEAL/HEARING"
IN REGARDS TO THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL CREATION OF SB-182. ALL

THIS TO AVOID AN ECONOMIC BREAK DOWN AT THE EXPENSE OF THE
CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES. FACTS ALL NEVADA JUDGES HAVE
AN ECONOMIC AND OR FINANCIAL INTEREST IN "NOT" EXPOSING

THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL CREATION OF SB 182 SEE: FINANCIAL INTEREST

#1 Pay CUTS. #2 lost of 401-K #3 BONUS lost. #4 conviction

rate decline with more challenges to the NRS system #5 pay scale

changes #6 Retirement lost #7 less Guilty pleas #8 MISS REVERSALS

AND VACATED SENTENCES #9 The State of NEV. OWING MASSIVE

AMOUNTS OF FINANCES DUE TO UNCONSTITUTIONAL CONVICTIONS STEAMING

FROM CREATION OF SB 182 #10 lost of Family Consortium FOR


WRONGFUL IMPRISONMENT DEPRIVING WIVES OF THEIR HUSBANDS FOR

YEARS. THE lost of AFFECTION AND SEXUAL ENJOYMENT OF

ONE'S SPOUSE, THESE LOSSES WERE PROXIMATELY

CAUSED BY THE STATE OF NEVADAS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

CREATION OF SB-182 LEADING TO



REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

This is The Case of The "Hebers" litigant, whom is too industrious. Normally Due Diligence is a positive attribute for prisoner litigants under 28 U.S.C. 2254 setting for diligence requirements establishing equitable tolling. However Anderson is in "DANGER" because.

He is too diligent. Therefore, this Honorable Court should grant! EXTRAORDINARY WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS.

IN ORDER TO VACATE THE 8th DISTRICTS COURTS PROPOSED ORDER AND CLARIFY THAT BY AND THROUGH DUE DILIGENCE WITH GOOD CAUSE. PETITIONER DEVELOPED FURTHER FACTUAL INFORMATION AGAINST STATE OF NEVADA'S EXECUTIVE, LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIAL BRANCHS OF GOVERNMENT.

CONCERNING DUAL SERVICE IN VIOLATIONS OF NEV CONSTITUTION ARTICLE 3/1 ARTICLE 6/11, 6/12

5/20. IN VIOLATION OF U.S. CONSTITUTION'S 9th AMENDMENT 5th AMENDMENT 14th AMENDMENT 8th AMENDMENT: THESE VIOLATIONS

TO ALL BRANCHS OF STATE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENTS,

WHICH COMMITTED BY THREE NEVADA SUPREME COURT JUSTICES #1 HILTON B. BADT #2 EDGAR BATES #3 CHARLES MERRILL

IN VIOLATION OF UNITED STATES, DUAL SERVICE PERVENTION

IN VIOLATION NEV CONST 6/11 3/1. SEE CHAPTER 304


SENATE BILL #182 STATUTE REVISION COMMISSION THIS

ENTIRE ACT FROM START UNTIL TODAY IS AND WAS AN

UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACT EFFECTING ANDERSON AND

THOUSANDS OF THOUSAND AMERICAN CITIZENS

SEE: FACTUAL HARD COPIES FOUND IN ORIGINAL WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS 750603-20 APPENDIX C, EXHIBIT 1 TRU 16



Reasons For Granting The Petition

FOUND IN ORIGINAL WRIT OF Habeas corpus #A-17-750603-W WITH THE 8th DISTRICT COURTS REVIEWING THE FACTS OF

ANDERSONS CLAIMS FOUND IN HIS ORIGINAL HABEAS PETITION, THE COURTS FOR 8th DISTRICT COUNTY OF CLARK.

SHOULD HAVE ADHERED TO "A TRADITION OF EQUITY SOUGHT TO 'BELIEVE' HARDSHIPS WHICH FROM TIME TO TIME ORIGINSE FROM A HARD AND FAST ADHERENCE' TO MORE ABSOLUTE LEGAL RULES, WHICH IF STRICTLY APPLIED THREATEN THE "EVILS OF ARCHaic RIGIDITY"

Holland V Florida 560 US 631, 650 (2010) (quoting)

Hazel - Atlas glass Co V. Hartford Empire CO. 322 US 238, 248 (1944)

DISAPPROVED OF ON OTHER GROUNDS BY: STANDARDS oil CO.

OF CAL V. UNITED STATES 429 U.S. 17, 18 AND N.2. (1976)

ANDUE HARDSHIP IS PRESENT HERE IN #750603-W, BY

CALLOUSLY SABOTAGING ANDERSONS ABILITY TO HAVE,

HIS CLAIMS HEARD ON FACTUAL MERITS. BECAUSE

OF ANDERSON ELECTION TO "INVESTIGATE AND FILE

CLAIMS AGAINST "NEVADAS STATE" executive, legislative,

JUDICIAL BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT ANDERSONS PETITION

FACES IMPLIEO JUDICAL BIAS AND PRE-JUDICED

CONCERNING NEVADAS UNCONSTITUTIONAL, PRESS INVEIGATION

OF AMERICANS, UNCONSTITUTIONAL EXICUTIONS AS A RESULT

OF NULL AND VOID DEAFT WRITINGS, RESULTING

FROM "EVILS OF ARCHaic RIGIDITY" as a result

OF 1 UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACT OF JUDICAL BRANCH

OF GOVERNMENT IN THE STATE OF NEV. FOR CLARK COUNTY

Reasons For Granting The Petition

DECENCY, SECURITY AND LIBERTY ALIKE DEMAND THAT GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS SHALL BE SUBJECTED TO THE SAME RULES OF CONDUCT THAT ARE COMPAED TO THE CITIZENS. IN A GOVERNMENT OF LAWS, EXISTENCE

OF THE GOVERNMENT WILL BE IMPERILLED IF IT FAILS TO OBSERVE THE LAWS SCRUPULOUSLY. OUR GOVERNMENT IS THE POTENT THE OMNIPOTENT TEACHER FOR GOOD OR FOR ILL. IT TEACHES THE WHOLE PEOPLE BY ITS EXAMPLES. --- CRIME IS CONTAGIOUS. IF THE

GOVERNMENT BECOMES A LAW BREAKER, IT BRINGS CONTEMPT FOR LAW; IT INVITES (EVERY)MAN TO BECOME

A LAW UNTO HIM-SELF, IT INVITES ANARCHY TO DECLARE THAT, THE GOVERNMENT MAY COMMIT CRIMES IN ORDER TO GAIN AND SECURE UNCONSTITUTIONAL CONVICTIONS OF PRIVATE AMERICAN CITIZENS.


THAT IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL LAWS THE ENDS JUSTIFIES THE MEANS AND TO

DECLARE THAT GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS HAVE COMMITTED CRIMES AGAINST BOTH THE N.Y. STATE GOVERNMENT CONSTITUTION AND THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION. FACTS OF

THIS TREASON WOULD BRING A TERRIBLE CONTRIBUTION AGAINST THOSE PERNICIOUS DOCTRINES, THE

HIGH COURTS MUST GRANT THIS EXTRAORDINARY WRIT DUE TO IMPRISONED BIAS BY 8th DISTRICT COURTS AND REMAND GIVING FINAL ORDER AND

OPINION UNDER DISCRETIONARY REVIEW



"SPECIFIED EXACT RELIEF BEING SOUGHT"

DISCRETIONARY REVIEW OF 8TH DISTRICT COURTS
PROPOSED JUDGMENT APRIL 10 2019, WITH AN
REVERSAL, REGRAND AND VACATE WITH THE HIGH COURTS
HANDING DOWN FINAL OPINION REVIEW AND RULING
ON UNCONSTITUTIONAL CREATION OF SENATE BILL #182 CHAPTER 2304
ON IMPLIED BIAS, FRAUD, STEALTH BRAND, ECONOMIC AND
ANATOMICAL INTRUSION IN WOLFINE OF STATE OF NEVADA
ON CONVENTION VIOLATIONS JUDICIAL BIAS UNCONSTITUTIONAL INCARCERATION
MASS INCARCERATION UNCONSTITUTIONAL EXISTING UNCONSTITUTIONAL DEATH WARRANTS
VIOLATION OF U.S. CONSTITUTION: 5TH AMENDMENT 8TH AMENDMENT
9TH AMENDMENT 14TH AMENDMENT - NEVADA CONSTITUTION 31.1 NEV. COURT. 6/11
NEV. CONSTITUTION 5/20 NEV. COURT 14/1 AND OR 12 ARTICLE #178/5
WITH 8TH DISTRICT COURTS REFUSING TO ANSWER THE HEARINGS
OF #A-17-75403-20

APPOINTMENT OF FEDERAL COUNSEL WITH NO ALLEGIANCE
TO THE STATE OF NEVADA

Anthony K. Anderson
Anthony K. Anderson

5-24-19 #1082999

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Mr. Anthony K. Anderson #1082999

Date: ~~April 26~~ 2017

May 24, 2019

34
Page 27

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I, the undersigned, acknowledge that I have read the foregoing and that the information contained therein is true and correct to my own knowledge and belief.

Further, I state that I have not directly or indirectly paid or caused to be paid to any inmate, agent of an inmate, or family member of any inmate a sum of money, favors or anything else for assistance in the preparation of this document or any other document in connection with this action.

Further, I acknowledge that if any of the information included in this motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is false or misleading, I understand that sanctions may be imposed against me. Those sanctions may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- (1) dismissal of my case with prejudice;
- (2) imposition of monetary sanctions;
- (3) the Nevada Department of Prisons may bring disciplinary proceedings for a violation of MJ-48 of the Code of Penal Discipline, which can include all sanctions authorized under the Code including the loss of good time credits and punitive confinement; and
- (4) perjury charges.

Further, I hereby authorize the United States SUPREME COURT, or its representative, to investigate my financial status, and authorize any individual, corporation, or governmental entity to release any such information to the said Court or its representative.

Further, I acknowledge and consent that a portion of any recovery, as directed by the court, shall be paid to the clerk for reimbursement of all fees and costs incurred by me as a result of being granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

Dated this 26th day of April, 2019.

Anthony K. Anderson
(Signature of Applicant)

I understand that a false statement or answer to any question in this declaration will subject me to penalties of perjury. I DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY UNDER THE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT. See 28 U.S.C. § 1746 and 18 U.S.C. § 1621.

Signed at Southern Desert CTN
(Location)

Anthony K. Anderson
(Signature)

April 26th 2019
(Date)

1082999
(Inmate Prison Number)

May 24 2019

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Anthony K. Anderson, hereby certify that I am the
Petitioner in this matter and I am representing myself *in propria persona*.

On this 26th day of April, 2019, I served copies of
the Petition for Common-law writ of
CERTIORARI 5-24-19
in Case No. T.B.A, and placed said document(s) in the United States

Mail, first-class postage prepaid, addressed as follows:

Clerk of the
Supreme Court of
The United States
1 First Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20543

DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY

The undersigned declares under penalty of perjury that he is the Petitioner in the
above-entitled action, and he has read this Certificate of Service and the information
contained therein is true and correct.

Executed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746 and 18 U.S.C. § 1621 at
Southern Desert Correctional Center on this 26th day of
April, 2019.

May 24 2019

Anthony K. Anderson
Anthony K. Anderson NDOC No. 108299

Petitioner - In Propria Persona

4-26-2019

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100