

ALBERT J. HAMILTON
AU2583 D-19-169 Low.
P.O. BOX #4000
Vernonville TN 35696
Date: May 1, 2019

18A1183

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

WASHINGTON D.C. 20543-0001

ALBERT J. HAMILTON
Appellant

vs.

UNASCO STATE PRISON et al;
Appellees.

CASE NO: 15-000661-AWE-SAB
NO: 17-16770

CORRECTION MADE SO
[APPELLANT] CAN FILE WRIT
OF CERTIORARI WITH THE
COURT.

NOTICE: Appellant received a US. Letter about the above
Case No. a few days ago. (EX)(B).

All lower court opinions have been attach like the court
had stated in Rule 13.5

The Appellant was requesting for an extension because the Appelles - Attorney Ken witness for the State of California had filed a "false declaration" in the United States District Court Eastern District of California and Senior District Judge "overlooked" the evidence. Also The United State Court of Appeal for The Ninth Circuit Judges had also "overlooked" the evidence. See the Supreme Court of The United States Federal-Civil Rule 60(b)(6)(3). The COPY is attached for Proof. EX(C).

The following U.S. Lower Court OPINIONS Pursuant to Fed. Rule 13.5 are the following. (1) A. COPY of the COER Lead mail log List. EX(D)

(2) A COPY of The United States Court of Appeals 9th Cir. Order on Case No. 17-16770 D.C. No. 1:15-cv-00661-AWE-SAB the 9th Cir. "overlooked" the Facts of the "false declaration" but stamp - "Case dismissed" See EX(D), (Date): 9-14-17.

(3). A copy of The United States Court of Appeals 9th Cir

Order on Case No. 17-16770 D.C. No. 1:15-cv-00661-RWT-SAB the 9th Cir "overlooked" the facts, of the "false core declaration" but stance "case dismissed" see EX(02). Date: 10.17.17.

(4) A copy of The United States Court of Appeals 9th Cir Order on Case No. 17-16770 D.C. No. 1:15-cv-00661-RWT-SAB the 9th Cir "overlooked" the facts, of the "false core declaration"

EX(03). Date: 11.28.17.

(5). A copy of The United States Court of Appeals 9th Cir. Motion to Dismiss. "Court overlooked" the facts, of the "false core declaration" EX(04). Date: 12.12.17.

(6). A copy of The United States Court of Appeals 9th Cir. Order on Case No. 17-16770 D.C. No. 1:15-cv-00661-RWT-SAB the 9th Cir "overlooked" the facts, of the "false core declaration" but stance "case dismissed" Court overlooked" the facts, of the "false core declaration" EX(01). Date: 3.26.18.

1.18.19.

(10). A copy of The United States Court of Appeals 9th Cir. Memorandum on Case No. 17-16770 D.C. No. 1:15-cv-00661-AWI-SAB the 9th Cir. "overlooked" the facts, of the "false core declaration" stated Rule 41(a) (see LEXIS) but:

Date: 8.21.18.

(9). A copy of The United States Court of Appeals 9th Cir. Memorandum on Case No. 17-16770 D.C. No. 1:15-cv-00661-AWI-SAB the 9th Cir. "overlooked" the facts, of the "false core declaration" but stated denied " (see LEXIS)

(8) A copy of The United States Court of Appeals 9th Cir. Order on Case No. 17-16770 D.C. No. 1:15-cv-00661-AWI-SAB the 9th Cir. "overlooked" the facts, of the "false core declaration" but "stated denied as moot" (see LEXIS). Date: 7.25.18

(7). A copy of The United States Court of Appeals 9th Cir. Order on Case No. 17-16770 D.C. No. 1:15-cv-00661-AWI-SAB the 9th Cir. "overlooked" the facts, of the false core declaration but stated "Case dismissed" (see LEXIS). Date: 6.19.18

(11) A COPY of The United States Court of Appeals 9th Cir. Order on Case No. 17-16770 D.C. No. 1:15-cv-00661-AWL-SAB the 9th Cir. "overlooked," the facts of the, "false 2022 declaration" stated all other pending requests are denied SZZ (EX E5) Date: 1.10.19.

STATEMENT ABOUT JURISDICTIONS

(12) The District Court entered judgment on 6.28.17 (Court Docket #94). "overlooked" the facts, of the false 2022 declaration on 6.27.17 SZZ EX LF).

(13) The District Court findings and recommendations on (ELF No. 71 72) but still "overlooked" the facts, of the false 2022 declaration on 5.1.17 SZZ (EX F1).

(14) The District Court order Denying Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration for The 6.28.17 on Doc. Nos 93 95) but still "overlooked" the facts, of the false 2022 declaration on 9.27.17 SZZ EX LF2)

(15). The District Court Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment on 4.30.15 and still the court overlooked the facts of the "false LOR declaration" and refused to follow law under Pen. Code §§ 118. See EXF3. Request for this U.S. Court to look down on the facts of Pen. Code §§ 118 and order this case back to District Court Eastern District of California.

ARGUMENT OVER THE JURISDICTION

According to The Black Law Dictionary the word Comity reads the following: The informal and voluntary recognition by courts of one jurisdiction of the laws and judicial decisions of another. That, this U.S. Courts now decision.

Clerical ERROR. it reads the following: A mistake was made with filing the "false LOR declaration". The case evidence was not handled in the right way. The court did not keep the court's records right. Request all clerical errors be corrected and case process in how courts.

conclusion

if the morally degraded people are not punished and the the morally pure people are not rewarded (both end in the dust alike). It would mean that there is no "justice" in the U.S. courts where human nature and common sense demands that a Judge should do "justice".

Hamilton only request this court of law do "justice" and hereby order the lower courts to review the "false zero declaration case evidence".

I declare under Penalty of Perjury under the laws of the state of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date: May 1, 2019.

Alfred A. Hamilton