

19 - 5378

No. _____

ORIGINAL
ORIGINAL

FILED

JUN 24 2019

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ARTHUR ROY DEERE SR. — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

VS.

DEAN BORDERS - WARDEN — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

ARTHUR ROY DEERE SR.
(Your Name)

PO. Box 3100
(Address)

CHINO, CA. 91708
(City, State, Zip Code)

N/A
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

ORIGINAL

DID THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT VIOLATE
 MY FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS UNDER THE 14TH AS WELL
 AS MY CONFINEMENT RIGHTS, BY RUBBER STAMPING ITS
 DENIAL OF MY HABEAS CORPUS PETITION, THAT CLEARLY
 SHOWED THE STATE FAILED TO PROVIDE ME EFFECTIVE
 ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL AND THE STATE WITHHELD VITAL
 BRADY MATERIAL IN THE WAY OF THE NEGATIVE GSR.
 RESULTS. THE COURT OF APPEALS WITHHELD MARSDEN
 EVIDENCE THAT TRIPLE COUNSEL WAS REMOVED
 OF REPRESENTATION OF ME ON 6-8-07. THE CALIFORNIA
 SUPREME COURT USED CLARK, ROBBINS AND MILLER
 TO COVER UP THE STATES EGREGIOUS VIOLATIONS OF
 MY FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS, THAT HAS LED TO
 MY FALSE IMPRISONMENT FOR 15 YEARS SO FAR WITH NO
 OTHER RECOURSE OR REASONABLE MEANS TO FIGHT MY
 CASE FURTHER ACCEPT TO THIS COURT,

LIST OF PARTIES

ORIGINAL

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

☐ All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

ORIGINAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW..... 1

JURISDICTION..... 28 USC § 1257(A)

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED 6TH 14TH AMEND USc

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 1-14

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

CONCLUSION.....

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A COURT OF APPEALS DENIAL OF EVIDENTIARY DOCUMENT = 1 page

APPENDIX B 2ND ATTEMPT TO GET EVIDENTIARY DOCUMENT FOR POST CONVICTION HABEAS CORPUS
8-29-18 FILED UNANSWERED JUST REFERS TO ALIEN 8-8-14 DENIAL

APPENDIX C CIR SUPREME COURT DENIAL OF HABEAS CORPUS

APPENDIX D MOTION FOR REHEARING FILED 4-8-19 - 10 COPIES SENT BACK WITH NO EXPLANATION
1 COPY OF MOTION + PROOF OF SERVICE. LAW LIBRARY ALINTOUT FROM SUPREME COURT
DOES NOT SHOW COURT EVEN RECEIVED MY MOTION FOR REHEARING

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

ORIGINAL

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

NEPHEE vs. ILLINOIS 360 US, 264-79 S. CT 1123

MIRANDA

~~MIRANDA~~ vs. ARIZONA

384 U.S. 436-86 S. CT. 1202

BRADY vs. MARYLAND

DO NOT HAVE CITATION NO.

STATUTES AND RULES

TITLE 18 § 1114

664-187(A)

664(E) P.C.

P.C. 12022.53 (d)

P.C. 12022.5(A)

OTHER

FEDERAL JURISDICTION SUPERCEDES STATE JURISDICTION UNLESS
WOULD BE FEDERAL A.G.

ORIGINAL

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

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

OPINIONS BELOW

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

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

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

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

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

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

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

- ☐ reported at NOT REPORTED JUST DENIE; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☒ is unpublished.

The opinion of the SUPREME COURT OF CA. court appears at Appendix C to the petition and is

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

JURISDICTION

ORIGINAL

[] For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was _____.

[] No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

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

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

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

☒ For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was 3-27-19.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix C.

☒ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: 7 SEP 2019 D, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix D.

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

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

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED
ORIGINAL

THE EGREGIOUS VIOLATION OF MY 6TH AMENDMENT
~~VIOLATION~~ RIGHTS AND DUE PROCESS AND EQUAL
PROTECTION OF MY 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHTS

WAS THE BASIS FOR THE SUPREME COURT USING
EN RE CLARK, EN RE ROBBINS, AND EN RE MILLER THESE ARE
ALL STATE MADE BLANKETS TO COVER THE STATES VIOLATIONS
OF MY FEDERAL RIGHTS UNDER THE 6TH AMENDMENT. I SHOWED
IN MY HABEAS CORPUS THE BRIBERY VIOLATIONS, MIRANDA VIOLATION
AND ~~MANY OTHER~~ MANY OTHER VIOLATIONS THE SUPREME COURT IS CONSPIRING
WITH LOWER COURTS TO COVER UP THE RECKLESS VIOLATION OF MY CIVIL
AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS AND THE SUPREME COURT ISSUED ITS
DECISION TO DENY KNOWING THERE WERE NO EVIDENTIARY HEARINGS AT
ANY LEVEL BECAUSE IT WOULD HAVE SHOWN A CONSPIRACY BETWEEN
THE STATE COURTS AND ATTORNEYS FOR THE DEFENCE COUNSELS, THIS CASE
PROPERLY INVESTIGATED WILL SHOCK THE CONSCIOUS OF THIS COURT.
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA ILLEGALLY INTENTIONALLY IGNORED THE U.S.
CONSTITUTION TO MAINTAIN A FALSE CONVICTION AND HAS THWARTED
ALL MY ATTEMPTS TO GET EVIDENCE TO PROVE I WAS FALSELY CONVICTED

ORIGINAL

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

ON 10-13-04 RIVERSIDE COUNTY SHERIFFS DEPUTIES

~~RE~~ UNLAWFULLY USED AN INFORMANT TO ENTRAP ME INTO AN

AMBUSH IN BLYTHE CALIFORNIA. POLICE ALSO USE U.S. BORDER

PATROL AGENT IN THE UNLAWFUL ARREST OF ME. IN FACT THERE ^{WAS} ~~WAS~~

NO LOW FULL REASON TO ARREST ME, THE REASON WAS TO SUOT

ME. UNDER COLOR OF LOW, AFTER THE UNLAWFUL STOP. IT TOOK

A COUPLE OF YEARS TO FIGURE OUT AFTER ALL OF THE PUBLICITY

AND BACK PATTING THEY REALIZED THEY HAD NO CASE SO THEY

STARTED MANUFACTURING ONE BY INLISTING THE BARBARA BRAND

CONFLICT PANEL TO REPRESENT ME, BRANDS HUSBAND WAS A ADA.

AT THE TIME, THIS WAS NEVER DISCLOSED. DURING THE 1ST 2

YEARS ~~OR~~ PERIOD THE PORPORE OF APPOINTED ATTORNEYS STARTED ALL

REFUSED TO COME SEE ME AT THE SDIC AND GIVE ME A COPY OF THE

DISCOVERY ALL SAID THEY WOULD BE OVER TONIGHT BUT NEVER DID

ORIGINAL

STATEMENT OF COST Page 2

THE ONLY TIME I WOULD SEE THE ATTORNEY'S AGAIN WOULD BE 90 DAYS

LATER, AND THEN ONLY TO GET ANOTHER 90 DAY CONTINUANCE. HAVE

OF THESE CONTINUANCES WERE FOR MY BENEFIT!! IT WAS JUST TO

GENERATE FEES FOR BARBARA BRUNS LAW FIRM. I NOTICED THE DISTRICT

ATTORNEY'S OFFICE NEVER OPPOSED THESE CONTINUANCES AND THESE

ATTORNEYS ~~NEVER~~ NEVER EXPLOITED THE EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE

AS IN MY CASE, THE GSK. WAS NEGATIVE AND THAT'S WHAT I WOULD

NOT FIND A WEAPON. MY TRIAL HAD BEEN CONSPIRED WITH DDA

DICTATION WEISS TO SUPPRESS ~~AND~~ THIS BRADY MATERIAL AND HE

DID SO AS I SHOWED IN MY HANSEN CONJUGAL PETITION. THE ATTORNEY

ADMITTED ON THE TRIAL RECORD HE WAS INCOMPETENT WHEN HE TOLD

THE JUDGE HE MISPOKE AT THE IMPROVED HEARING ON 6-8-07 WHEN

HE FACTUALLY TOLD THE COURT NO YOUR HONOR THE GUN POLICE FOUND

DID NOT HAVE MY CLIENT'S PRINTS, BUT GSK. WAS "NEGATIVE"

②

AT TRIAL HE TELL THE SAME JUDGE NO YOUR WAGON IS "MISSPOKE" THIS

IS CLEARLY EPC. OF TRIAL COUNSEL AT A MARSHED HEARING THIS IS

THE SOME MARSHED HEARING IVE BEEN TRYING TO GET UNSEALED, IT

CLEARLY STATES JUDGE KYN REMOVES BARBARA ~~BARBARA~~ CONFLICT

PROVE FROM ANY FURTHER REASSASSINATION OF ME, THEN JUDGE KYN

TRYING TO REMIND WITH POSSIBLE DENIALITY ASKS VICTIM TONIES

MY COUNSEL IF HE IS INDEPENDENT OF BARBARA BRAND TONIES LIES

AND SAYS YES. THERE IS NO WHY IN ALIENATED COUNTY TONIES DID

NOT WORK FOR BARBARA BRANDS CONFLICT PROVE, SHE WAS APPOINTED

AND SHE ASSIGNED TONIES AFTER 2 OR 3 OTHERS WHO WERE DOING NOTHING

I SHOWED ON MY HEARINGS WHERE TONIES ADONES AND WAS THE

SOME PS BARBARA BRAND OFFICE SO TONIES LIES JUDGE KYN IS GAY

PS WITH TONIES, JUDGE KYN WAS PART OF THE CONSPIRACY TO

CONVICT ME. COMMON SENSE WOULD TELL YOU WHY WOULD HE REMOVE

ORIGINAL

STATEMENT OF CASE PAGE 4

~~BARBARA BROWN~~ BARBARA BROWN IF TORRES WAS INDEPENDANT? Judge

RYAN WAS PART OF THE CONSPIRACY TO FALSLEY CONVICT ME

IT TOOK THE 3 YEARS TO WAIT FOR JUDGE RYAN TO GET INTO THE PROPER

NOTATION TO TAKE THE CASE. I SUBMITTED EXCERPTS OF THE TRIAL

TRANSCRIPTS IN MY APPEALS. I WAS LIED TO COMPLETELY BY MY ATTORNEYS

AT EVERY STAGE OF MY TRIAL. JUDGE RYAN ORDERED THE INFORMANT

TO BE PRODUCED AND THE D.A. OFFICE DID NOT DO ~~SO~~ SO MY

ATTORNEY TOLD ME IT WAS TOMMY BASINGER THE DRIVER OF THE

CAR I WAS IN THAT NIGHT YET WHEN I TOLD HIM TO SUBPOENA

BASINGER

~~BASINGER~~ HE TOLD ME HE COULDN'T FIND ~~him~~ him. BUT BASINGER'S

TESTIMONY WOULD HAVE IMPERCH OFFICER SEFF PHIPPS AND SERGEANT

MILLER'S TESTIMONY. OFFICER PHIPPS LIED ABOUT SPEEDING THERE

WAS NO PROBABLE CAUSE FOR THE STOP. BASINGER WOULD HAVE TOLD

THE JURY EITHER SEFF PHIPPS OR SERGEANT MILLER INSTRUCTED HIM TO

ORIGINAL

STATEMENT OF CDSK PAGE 5

GO OUT TO RIPLEY AND PICK ME UP AT HIS, "BASINGER'S HOUSE" AND

BRING ME INTO TOWN TO 311 SOUTH 6TH STREET WAS WHERE THE

FIRST AMBUSH WAS SET UP FOR ME. I WAS STAYING WITH BASINGER

FOR ABOUT 2 DAYS I WAS HIDING FROM POLICE AFTER LONG KNOW

INFORMANTS HAD TOLD ME SHERIFFS DEPUTIES WERE GOING TO

KILL ME. THE PLAN WAS BASINGER WAS TO PICK ME UP AT HIS

HOUSE SOUTH OF RLYTHE AND TAKE ME TO EL CENTRO TO CAPTURE

BUT TO PHOENIX TILL I COULD FIND OUT WHY SHERIFFS DEPUTIES

WERE TRYING TO KILL ME. BUT BASINGER TOLD ME HE NEEDED TO

GO TO TOWN REAL QUICK BEFORE WE GO TO EL CENTRO. OFFICER PHIPPS

OR MILLER SENT BASINGER TO BRING ME INTO THE AMBUSH

IN RLYTHE ON 311 S 6TH STREET THIS WOULD HAVE IMPERICH PHIPPS AND

SERGEANT MILLER'S ^{TESTIMONY} ~~WAS~~ THE WHOLE TRIP WAS ONE SIDED

IF I HAD HAD ACCESS TO THE DISCOVERY I COULD HAVE OBJECTED

ORIGINAL

STATEMENT OF CASE PAGE 6

AND PUT MORE ON THE RECORD MY ATTORNEY KNOWS HOW TO KEEP

EXCERPTORY EVIDENCE OFF THE RECORD. I THOUGHT THE DISCOVERY

POCKET WAS PART OF THE RECORD ON APPEAL AND THE CONSTITUTION FAILED

ME BY GIVING A BUNCH OF GLENNY ATTORNEYS. WERE IT NOT FOR

THE CORRUPT U.S. BORDER PATROL AGENT WITH AN ALTIMAN AND CONSPIRING

WITH RIVERSIDE COUNTY SHERIFFS OFFICE AND DISTRICT ATTORNEYS OFFICE TO

COVER UP A FEDERAL CRIME. THE TESTIMONY OF AGENT ALTIMAN HAD ESTABLISHED

A FEDERAL CRIME IN VIOLATION OF TITLE 18 USC, § 1114 CLEARLY SHOW THE STATE

USURPED FEDERAL JURISDICTION BECAUSE ALL THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

VIOLATIONS WOULD NOT HAVE GONE OVER IN A FEDERAL COURT. I WOULD HAVE HAD

AT LEAST A HALF DECENT LAWYER. THE FBI WOULD HAVE BEEN VERY THOROUGH

AND ALL THE PURGERS WOULD HAVE DISCLOSED BUT THE CASE DISMISSED

I FILED A MOTION STOPPING MY IDENTITY WAS A HOMOSEXUAL AND

I WAS A WHITE SOUTHERN CHRISTIAN AND I COULDN'T WORK WITH A HOMO

②

ORIGINAL

STATEMENT OF CASE Page 7

I COMMITTED NO CRIME EXCEPT NOT BEING LIKED BY CROOKED

LOCAL COPS. POLICE SHOT ME IN MY FOREHEAD WITHOUT CHARGE

AND SUELIAS OFFICE HAD TO JUSTIFY THEIR ACTIONS FIRST IT WAS

I HAD A PAROLE WARRANT, A NO RAIL WARRANT ~~WHICH~~ WHICH WAS A FALSE

STATEMENT ON THE DECLARATION AND DETERMINATION OF PROBABLE CAUSE

FOR WARRANTLESS ARREST) EXHIBIT "A" IS THIS WAIT CLEARLY SHOWS A

FEDERAL CRIME LABOR FILE IS USC-1114 AT THE VERY BOTTOM OF THIS

EXHIBIT "A" CLAIMS A NO RAIL PAROLE WOULD BY CAC TO JUSTIFY AND SHOW

PROBABLE CAUSE THE RECORD SHOWS NO PAROLE WOULD WAS PLACED UNTILL THE

NEXT DAY 10-14-04 THIS INITIAL CASE WAS RICHOLDED ~~ON~~ WITH THESE TYPES

OF FALSE ALLEGATIONS NONE OF MY ATTORNEYS AND NO BUY DETENTION THEY KNEW

THERE WAS NO CASE YET THEY JUST ~~WANTED~~ MILKED IT FOR ALL THEY

COULD AND PASSED MY CASE ON VIOLENTLY MY SPEEDY TRIAL RIGHTS. THIS

COUNT NEEDS TO READDRESS THE CTH DIVERGEMENT ISSUES TODAY ONLY

⑦

ORIGINAL

STATEMENT OF CASE PAGE 8

REFLECT THIS COURTS KEY CASE IN THE 2003 POWEL VS PLUMB

THESE CONFLICT PAYMENTS TODAY ARE JUST MONEY MILLS. COME OVER, COME

ALL IF YOU HAVE A LAW LICENSE DO NOT QUITE MAKE THAT 3M CONDO

PAYMENT COME ON OVER WE WILL GIVE YOU CASES YOU JUST COME IN ONCE

EVERY 90 DAYS FOR 5 MINUTES AND GET PAID THE AM. DON'T SAY ANYTHING YOU

DO NOT HAVE TO WORRY ABOUT APPEALS AND JUDGES SEND IMPROVED MOTIONS TO

PROTECT YOU, WHILE WE HAVE THE TAXPAYERS AND SEND CLIENTS TO PRISON

GUilty OR NOT. THIS IS EXACTLY WHATS GOING ON, THE FEDERAL COURTS

ARE SCARED OF THE STATE COURTS NOW. THE CONSTITUTION IS BEING VIOLATED

PIECE OF PAPER NOW. THE SLIM CHANCE THIS COURT WILL EVER TAKE

ON THIS CASE IS BEING COUNTED ON BY THE CLERKS AND

ATTORNEYS. THIS COURT MUST MAKE THESE LAW FIRMS SHOW WHAT

WONK TUEYDIO AND THE RECOVERY SHOULD BE AUTOMATICALLY PAID

OF THE RECORD ON APPEAL HOW CAN A PRO SE LITIGANT INVESTIGATE

(8)

ORIGINAL

STATEMENT OF CASE PAGE 9

HIS CASE FROM A CELL WITH NO PROPER ASSISTANCE. I HAD THE
IMPRESSION THAT HAITIANS CORPUS WAS TO PREVENT THIS TYPE OF FALSE
CONVICTIONS. EVIDENTLY THIS COURT FIGURES ITS BETTER TO STICK YOUR
NEED IN THE GROUND THAN UPHOLD THE CONSTITUTION.

EXHIBIT "B" CLEARLY SHOW A.D.A. VICTORIA WEISS LYING TO THE
COURT ABOUT G.S.R. WAS NOT PROCESSED TRIAL ATTORNEY SHOULD HAVE

MOVED FOR A MISTRIAL AND HAD THE G.S.R. PROCESSED HE DID NOT DO SO

BECAUSE HE KNEW IT HAD BEEN PROCESSED AND HE HAD PULLED IT FROM

THE DISCOVERY PER HIS AGREEMENT WITH A.D.A. WEISS. THIS COURT WILL

BE SHOCKED AT THE CONSPIRACY IN THIS CASE. THE MANSOEN TRANSCRIPTS

ALONE WOULD HAVE MANDATED A NEW TRIAL. THAT IS WHY THE COURT OF

APPEALS REFUSED TO GIVE ME A COPY OF THE (8-07) MANSOEN. I WAS

SPECIFIC WHY I WANTED THE TRANSCRIPT AND THE COURT KNEW IT DID

NOT GIVE MY APPELATE ATTORNEY A COPY SO I WAS INTITLED TO IT.

ORIGINAL

STATEMENT OF CASE PAGE 10

APPENDIX "B" SHOWS IT WAS NOT JUSTIFIED DENYING MY REQUEST

THIS INABILITY TO GATHER DOCUMENTS IS WHY I HAVE HAD MULTIPLE

PSYCHICS, THESE COURTS ALL SEE IF IT IS OUT FRONT ALL THE JUDGES AND

ATTORNEYS WILL BE IN DEEP TROUBLE THEY HAVE ALL VIOLATED MY CIVIL

AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS. THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT DID THE

FIND CIRCULAR OF THE WAGONS FOR ALL THE LOWER COURTS AND ATTORNEYS

TO KEEP THIS CONTINUING RICO VIOLATION GOING ON. BARBARA BARBA

AND ~~THE~~ HER CONFLICT PANEL SHOULD BEING JAIL FOR THE YEARS

SHE HAS MILKED THE TAXPAYERS OUT OF MILLIONS. AT THE LEAST SHE

SHOULD BE DISBARRED AND FORCED TO PAY BACK ALL THE FUNDS SHE HAS

BIKED TAXPAYER OUT OF THIS IS THE PERFECT CASE TO STRAIGHTEN UP

COURT CORRUPTION. THE PRISONS IN CALIFORNIA WOULD NOT BE SO

FULL WERE IT NOT FOR FALSE CONVICTIONS LIKE MINE POLICE JUST

FRAMING OR ENTRAPPING PEOPLE THEY DON'T LIKE AND CONVICING THEM

ORIGINAL

STATEMENT OF COSE PAGE 11

EXHIBIT "C" PLEASEN I WROTE MY LOWLIFE PHOENIX SEVERAL DAYS AFTER

I GOT THE DISCOVERY ON 11-14-78. THESE ARE WHY I HAD TO FILE MULTIPLE

TIMES TO GET EVIDENCE THAT WAS SUPPRESSED. EXHIBIT "D" IS

PROOF ~~OF~~ BARBARA BARROS ~~CONFLICT~~ CONFLICT ~~WAS~~ PROOF WAS

RECEIVED THE YEAR BEFOR ON 10-4-76. SHOWS THE CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT

ME ANY HALF DECENT PHOENIX WOULD ~~BE~~ HAVE HAD THIS CASE DISMISSED

BT PRELIM. BARBARA BARROS CONFLICT PROOF ALONE IS THE MAIN

NEEDSON RIVERSIDE COUNTY'S CONVICTION ~~WAS~~ RATE IS ~~38~~ 38% HIGH

ON A RETAIL I AM SEVERELY PREJUDICED BY THE DEATH OF

THE INFORMANT TOMMY BOYSSINGER, I JUST LEARNED OF THIS FROM

INVESTIGATOR COLAS ESCOBEDO OF THE FEDERAL INVESTIGATING FROM

THE FEDERAL DEPT. OF JUSTICE OFFICE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF

CALIFORNIA IS SPREADWATER TO PHONE # (916) 498-6666

FOR (916) 498-6657 I LEARNED DURING AN INTERVIEW ON

ORIGINAL

STATEMENT OF CASE PAGE 12

ADDITIONAL QUALIFIED MEMBER. I ONLY WAS AT THE OTHER

END OF THE FIELD AND WE HEARD 20 TO 30 ROUNDS FIRED AT ME

THAT NIGHT I LOST COUNT AT 18 WHEN THE BULLET STUNNED ME

I WAS IN AND OUT FROM THEM ON. SERGEANT MILLER PURSUED

HIMSELF AT THE TRIAL BY STATING HE ONLY FIRED 8 OR 9 - 1 CLIP

MY TRIAL ATTORNEY DID NOT EVEN IMPEACH SERGEANT MILLER THOUGH HE

HAD THIS REPORT BE SUPPRESSED BOYSINGEN AS A RELIABLE CIT

COULD HAVE IMPEACHED MILLER'S TESTIMONY THIS IS ONE OF MANY

ISSUES TRIAL ATTORNEY COULD HAVE HELPED ME YET HIS CONSPIRACY

WITH THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE HE DID NOTHING. I SUBMIT TO THIS

COURT THE ~~HAND~~ HOMO SEXUALS AND SEXUAL DEVIATES DID

THAT DEVIATE PERSONS ~~ARE~~ ^{IS} NOT STERICALLY SEXUAL AS THE

RECORD SHOWS IS CRIMINAL ALSO. EXHIBIT 'E' IS THE MOTION

I FILED PRIOR TO COURT THE COURT NEVER MENTIONED IT ~~EXHIBIT~~

(12)

STATEMENT OF CASE PAGE 13

ON THE RECORD, THE DA- HAD THE RIGHT JUDGE AND RIGHT

DEFENCE COUNSEL THEY WERE NOT GOING TO HAVE ANY DELAYS BY

WAITING FOR A NEW ATTORNEY TO GET UP TO PAR WOULD LOSE THE

RINGER JUDGE IT TOOK 3 YEARS TO WAIT FOR JUDGE RYAN TO COME

INTO THE TRIAL ROTATION. EXHIBIT "E" 3 PAGES SHOWS HOW THEY KEEP

IT OFF OF THE TRANSCRIPTS. THIS COURT SHOULD ORDER THE ERL TO

INVESTIGATE RIVERSIDE COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT SHERIFFS OFFICE AND

BARBARA BRAND FOR RICO VIOLATIONS.

EXHIBIT "F" A DOCUMENT SUPPRESSED BY TRIAL COUNSEL NOT HAD A

COPY OF THE DISCOVERY PRIOR TO TRIAL I COULD HAVE RAISED THESE ISSUES

ON THE RECORD THIS AGAIN SHOWS THE FACT THERE WAS A CONSPIRACY TO

COVER UP BRADY MATERIAL.

EXHIBIT "G" CLEARLY SHOWS A VIOLATION ON "my MIRANDA RIGHTS

IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 35 TO 38 U.S. PER M.C. IS IMPOSED THE

ORIGINAL

STATEMENT OF CASE Page 14

EXHIBIT "G" CLEARLY STATES I HAD 500 PG RE ML IN MY BLOOD

ALSO THE DRUGS I WAS SELF MEDICATING MYSELF WITH WERE PROVIDED

BY THE STATES AGENT OR C.I. PROVIDED TO ME BY TOMMY BAYSINGER

THIS IS MY BEST SHORT VERSION OF EVENTS IT WAS MORE DETAILED

WITH EXHIBITS A-N. STATEMENTS I MADE ILLEGALLY TO POLICE

DURING A 10 1/2 HOUR INTERVIEW WERE NOT EVEN SUPPORTED BY THE

PHYSICAL EVIDENCE IE GSR. THE DRUG TEST CLEARLY PROVES I WAS

DELUSIONAL AS THE INTERVIEW SHOWED. FOR ALL THESE REASONS I

ASK THIS COURT TO REVIEW MY FALCE OF A TRIAL

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED 6-23-19

Ray Dene Jr. P.94040 6-23-19

ADENDUM

ALSO TRIAL COUNSEL CALLED NO WITNESSES AND PUT ON

NO EVIDENCE WHATSOEVER. SO AS STATE RESTED ITS CASE

DEFENSE COUNSEL STOOD UP AND SAID NO EVIDENCE NO WITNESSES

DEFENSE RESTS.

(14)

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED 6-23-19

Ray Dene Jr. P.94040 6-23-19

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

ORIGINAL

PETITIONER HAS SHOWN EAC- OF FAIR COUNSEL
AN APPELATE COUNSEL AND THE STATE CONSPIRED AND
VIOLATED MY CITIZENSHIP AMENDMENT RIGHT IT IS
TIME TO READDRESS THE STATES VIOLATION OF THE
RIGHT TO EFFECTIVE COUNSEL TO INDIGENT CITIZENS
FOBIENERS GET ~~THE~~ BETWEEN ATTORNEYS TURN US CITIZENS
IT TIME TO FOLLOW THE CONSTITUTION VERBATIM
AS IT WAS WRITTEN. THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT
HAS BEEN USING JUDGE CLARK JUDGE ROBBINS WREMLER
AS A BLANKET TO COVER UP SERIOUS CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS
BY THE STATE

ORIGINAL

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Ray Dore Jr.

Date: 6-23-19