

Supreme Court of United States
Washington D.C.

NO.: 19-5226

9th Cir. Case

NO.: 18-15926

D.C. NO. 2:17-cv-02582-DLR--ESW

Arizona Department
of Public Safety, et al

Supreme Court of United
States Washington

October 31 2019


Patrick Caldwell

v

Arizona Department
of Public Safety, and
B. Houchens, Highway
Patrol Officer

Petition for Rehearing

October 31 2019



Pursuant to Washington D.C.
Supreme Court Rule 44.1 Petition for
Rehearing of the Court decision on
October 7, 2019.

²
I Patrick Demon Caldwell, will be addressing the Supreme Court of Washgiton D.C. the 2nd time, and I will like to say thank you for allowing me to file a rehearing which is a 2nd opportunity for me. I would like to state that everything in my Petition for writ Critira was sufficient. I believe I stated a bit too much on my Petition that was irrelevant at the time of Petiting, and I ask that the Courts Please except my rehearing which is the Correction of my Petition of writ Critira which I should have stated nothing but the Consitutions and rule of law, and my Proven facts, and evidence to Perswade the Court to approve my Petition. 21

Here as followed will be my Rehearing Approching the **COURT OF WASHGITON D.C.** with my Correct Petition for Writ Critira Stating my Rule of Law, Consitution, fact and evidence. I would ask the Court Please have **SYMPATHIE** on me due to my error's Rushing because of time farne and toldly forgot to applying basic fundamentals into my Petition of writ Critira so it can be granted. Sorry.

And federal District Courts of Arizona
has failed to Review the records for
this Case dismissing this Case for failure
to State A Claim. However the State
Judge ignored one of the main rules which
was not reviewing the Case records
Nor recognizing the lower Courts decision
on this Case NO# PF2017124338001

Due to Jones v Barnes I Patrick Caldwell
is entitled to section (1983) I was
A victim of liberty and Property Case
NO# PF2017124338001 I was Violated
of my 4th Amendment Search & Seized
VIN# 1G6DC67A760128791
TOW# T10786817146002

In the 4th Amendment Context
Independent review is necessary
if appellate Court are to maintain
Control and Clarify, the legal Principals
Case law - States Common law
Jurisidictions, is the Set of decisions
of Adjudicatory tribunails, (Stare decisis)
A legal Principal that judges are
Obligated to respect the Precedents
established by Prior decisions. Interpreting
Statutes

And applying Precedent which record how and why Prior Cases been decided,

Rule of law 4 Principles

- Accountability
- Just law - Protect fundamental rights including the security of Persons, and Contracts, Property, human rights

• Open Government

3.1 Request of information hold by A Government Agency.

3.2 Assesses the effectiveness of Civic Participation mechanisms - including the Protection of freedom of opinion and the right to Petition.

3.3 People Can bring Specific Complaints to the Government. Access to Information. Integrity the fight against Corruption the Euthyna. held officials to a standard of "Straightness."

- Appealing to the Circuit Court which was The 9th Circuit Court of Appeals NO. # 18-15926 Which also denied this Case without Propable Cause Stating that the District Court of Arizona Rule upholds. Also 9th Circuit stated when receiving this Case


This Case was Closed which was false statment that the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals stated. The District Court of Arizona and The 9th Circuit Court of Appeals has Misconduct by Corrupting the Court System by Illegally tampering with documents recognizing allowing Unconstitutional right to be violated. 18 U.S.C Title 242 Refers to an apperance of legal Power to act, and may operate in violation of law. Recognizing to Records of this Case but did not uphold the rule of law Ignoring on 6-13-2017 the Muncipal Court of Downtown Justice Center Arizona Case Record[#] PF2017124338001 and also Ignoring the retrial case that the State of Arizona retrialed. Which took the Original Case[#] PF2017124338001 and made a false case[#] TR2017124338 and on 3-13-2018 the state of Arizona held A Seeretly Arrangment Hearing breaking and violating the 5th Amendment Consitution by Double jeopardy at Encanto Court of Arizona Case[#] TR2018-113113 Conveccting me and Issuesing Out An Warrant for my arrest.

5th Amendment - The Right to life, liberty and Property. You can not be tried for the Same crime more than Once. On 2-25-2015 Case # M-0741-4927682 I was convicted Prior for no Drivers license. And no signal. The 9th Circuit Court of Appeals, and District Court of Arizona have wrongfully dismissed my Case and ignored the Constitutional rights, The rule of law breaking the Judicial Code of conduct, Rule 2.3 and 3.6. Also federal District Court of Arizona Granted My Proceeding In forma Pauperis with Good faith on May 4 2018 Document 9 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915 (a)(3) well on May 30 2018 9th Circuit Court of Appeals Stated that they review District Court **DOCKET** Stating that District Court of Arizona is not taken in good faith and revoked, Which was false also 9th Circuit Stated that they receive this Case Close, and that this was a Close Case, dismissing my Case Unfairly Without reviewing the importance of this Case nor filed Documents on records which Shows that the Court Violated the Judicial Code of conduct rule 2.3 and 3.6.

Must Conduct a review of the entire record. Regardless if the A Pro se brief has been filed, Griffin v Illinois 351 U.S 12 18-19 (1956) All of the states now provide some method of appeal from Criminal convictions, recognizing the importance of appellate review to a correct adjudication of guilt. Jones v Barnes 463 U.S 745, 756 (1983) There are few, If any situations in our system of justice in which a single judge is given unreviewable discretion over matter concerning a persons liberty of property. Base on the lower Court Municipal Court Arizona # PF 2017124338001 has findings that the State of Arizona Highway Patrol officer B. Houchens has lack evidence and could not support his allegations against me and therefore I was deprive and violated of my rights without A Porpable Cause. Therefore Highway Patrol officer B. Houchens and the State of Arizona Has broken Consitutional Rights.

1 (3) The docket shall reflect that the Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3)
2 and Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure 24(a)(3)(A), has considered whether an appeal
3 of this decision would be taken in good faith and finds Plaintiff may appeal in forma
4 pauperis.

5 Dated this 4th day of May, 2018.

6
7
8
9 
10 Douglas L. Rayes
11 United States District Judge
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Presented in good faith and not for
delay.

Patrick D. Caldwell

My Petition for rehearing was Postmarked
Oct. 31, 2019 was signed By J. Corps 12:00pm
on Nov. 1, 2019 Priority Mail Express
tracking number EJ 059 140 365 US
on Nov. 17, 2019 I got my letter from D.C.
Clerk. I have the other tracking number
if you need it.

Patrick D. Caldwell

My Petition for rehearing will be mail out
Dec 2, 2019

will be there by the
Dec. 3 2019

Certified Mail

Patrick D. Caldwell

I also would like to say that the Documents
that I have received on Nov. 17, 2019
Does not match up with other Documents
I received from Washington, D.C.
for inmate.

Patrick D. Caldwell

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

November 14, 2019

Mr. Caldwell
1315 W Glendale Ave, Apt. 115
Phoenix, AZ 85051

No: 19-5226

Mr. Caldwell:


Your petition for rehearing in the above-entitled case was postmarked October 31, 2019 and received November 4, 2019 and is herewith returned for failure to comply with Rule 44.6 of the Rules of this Court. The petition must briefly and distinctly state its grounds and must be accompanied by a certificate stating that the grounds are limited to changing circumstances of substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial grounds not previously presented.

You must also certify that the petition for rehearing is presented in good faith and not to delay.

Please correct and resubmit as soon as possible. Unless the petition is submitted to the Office in corrected form within 15 days of the date of this letter, the petition will not be filed. Rule 44.6.

Additionally, please note that you need only submit one copy of a petition for rehearing.

Sincerely,
Scott S. Harris, Clerk

By: 
Clara Houghteling
(202) 479-5955

Enclosures