

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

LEVAR BROWN — PETITIONER

VS.

CALIFORNIA, ET AL — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

LEVAR BROWN

BOX 32510

STOCKTON, CA 93260

(SUSPIR/AY9660)

QUESTION (PRESENTED)

DID THE SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE IN THE EVENT OF AN EXCLUSION OF THE APPEALER RIGHT TO DISCOVERY FURTHER AND PROMOTE A CONSPIRACY; WHICH INTURN VIOLATED PETITIONER'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO PRESENT A DEFENSE AND TO A FAIR TRIAL?

18 U.S.C. 242; 42 U.S.C.S § 1986

LIST OF PARTIES

(x) 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 PROCEEDINGS IN THE COURT WHOSE JUDGMENT IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS PETITION IS AS FOLLOWS:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	XE
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	XF
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	XG
REASON FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	XH
CONCLUSION	Xi

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: DENIED 8-18-2014	
APPENDIX B: DENIED 7-22-2014	
APPENDIX C: REJECT/LOST 9-11-2014	
APPENDIX D: DENYING REHEARING 8-6-2018	
APPENDIX E: REJECTED AS MOOT 6-19-2018	
APPENDIX F: DENIED MAR 13 2019	

**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001**

May 14, 2019

Levar Brown
CDC #AY9660
PO Box 1050
Los Angeles, CA 93960

RE: Brown v. California
CASC No. S251178

Dear Mr. Brown:

The above-entitled petition for writ of certiorari was originally postmarked March 19, 2019 and received again on May 14, 2019. The papers are returned for the following reason(s):

No motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, signed by the petitioner or by counsel, is attached. Rules 33.2 and 39. The motion must be signed.


No notarized affidavit or declaration of indigency is attached. Rule 39. You may use the enclosed form.

Please correct and resubmit as soon as possible. Unless the petition is submitted to this Office in corrected form within 60 days of the date of this letter, the petition will not be filed. Rule 14.5.

A copy of the corrected petition must be served on opposing counsel.

When making the required corrections to a petition, no change to the substance of the petition may be made.

Sincerely,
Scott S. Harris, Clerk
By:


Susan Frimpong
(202) 479-3039

Enclosures

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

KAORI YAMATAYA V. (FISHER) [...] [23 S.Ct 611; 47 L.Ed 721]	X G
PEOPLE V. TRIM (1870) 39 CAL 75; 1870 CAL LEXIS 12	X H
PEOPLE V. BISHOP (1963) CAL APP 4TH DIST) 220 CAL APP 2d	X H
FARRAKHAN V. GREGGIRE (9TH CIR 2010) 623 F.3d 990	X i

STATUTES AND RULES

18 U.S.C 242	Z1
42 U.S.C.S § 1986	Z1
FEDERALIST // 10; 78; & 48	X F
"(AEDPA) [...] (APRIL 24, 1996)	X F
18 U.S.C 1913	X i
PROP # 9	X i

OTHER

<u>PLATINUM</u> (PT-78)	X i
-------------------------	-----

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

PETITIONER RESPECTFULLY PRAYS THAT A WRIT OF
OF CERTIORARI ISSUE TO REVIEW THE JUDGMENT
BELOW.

OPINIONS BELOW

(X) 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 E TO THE PETITION AND IS

(X) REPORTED AT _____; OR,
() HAS BEEN DESIGNATED FOR PUBLICATION BUT IS NOT YET
REPORTED; OR,
() IS ~~BE~~ UNPUBLISHED.

(X) FOR CASES FROM STATE COURTS:

THE OPINION OF THE HIGHEST STATE COURT TO
REVIEW THE MERITS APPEARS AT APPENDIX F TO THE PETITION AND IS

(X) REPORTED AT _____; OR,
() HAS BEEN DESIGNATED FOR PUBLICATION BUT IS NOT YET REPORTED; OR,
() IS UNPUBLISHED.

THE OPINION OF THE CALIFORNIA LOWER APPEALS
AT APPENDIX A TO THE PETITION AND IS

(X) 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 INVOLVED 28 U.S.C. 1254(1)

☒ FOR CASES FROM STATE COURTS:

THE DATE ON WHICH THE HIGHEST STATE COURT DECIDED MY CASE WAS 8-6-2018. A COPY OF THAT DECISION APPEARS A APPENDIX D

☐ A TIMELY PETITION FOR REHEARING WAS THEREAFTER DENIED ON THE FOLLOWING DATE: , AND A COPY OF THE ORDER DENYING REHEARING APPEARS AT APPENDIX

☐ AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE THE PETITION FOR CERTIORARI WAS GRANTED TO AND INCLUDING (DATE) ON (DATE) IN APPLICATION NO. A

THE JURISDICTION OF THIS COURT IS INVOLVED UNDER 28 U.S.C. 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

" ANTI-TERRORISM AND EFFECTIVE DEATH
PENALTY ACT OF 1996 (AEDPA), Pub. L. NO.
104-208, 110 STAT. 279 (APRIL 24, 1996) "

FEDERALIST~10, 78; &, 48

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

ON OR ABOUT JULY 8TH 2014
IN "MICHAEL ABZUG" COURT: "L.A.S.C.", THE
PETITIONER WAS DENIED DISCOVERY;
THE PETITIONER FILED A "GRIEVANCE"
42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a) THROUGH A
WRIT OF MANDATE; HENCE IT WAS DENIED
BY THE COURT; HOWEVER, THE PETITIONER
REFILED WITH THE SECOND APPEALS;
THENCEFORTH, IT WAS ALSO DENIED.

THUS, THE PETITIONER THEN AGAIN
FILES A HABEAS CORPUS WHICH WAS
THEN "LOST IN THE MAILING SYSTEM
PERCE-FOR-K; 18 U.S.C. 241.

THEN AFTER, AFTER THE ABOVE
EFFECTS, PETITIONER FILED A FEDERAL
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS WITH U.S. DIST-
RICT, BUT, IT'S REJECTED AS MOOT
AND HELD WITH THE COURT AS A
"FAP"...

KAGAWA YAMATAYA V. FISHER (THE JAPANESE IMMIGRANT CASE)
(1901) 189 U.S. 86 (23 S. CT. 611; 47 L. ED 721)


REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

CERTIORARI SHOULD BE BROUGHT BEFORE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT AND IS APPROPRIATE IN THIS CASE TO SETTLE AN IMPORTANT QUESTION OF LAW. (U.S. SUPREME COURT RULES, RULES 11-16)

PEOPLE V. TRIM (1870) 39 CAL 75, 1870 CAL LEXIS 12

PEOPLE V. BISHOP (1903), CAL APP 4TH DIST) 220 CAL APP 2d 148,

MENTAL BEN



"18 U.S.C 1913; FARNAKHAN V. GREGG (9TH CIR 2010) 623 F.3d 990. Prop # 9; "MUZZLING
CONCLUSION

THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS
SHOULD BE GRANTED.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

S 8:15/

DATE: 8/8/2018