

No. 12-CR-40098-JPG-1

19-5861

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Louise K. Saine

(Your Name)

PETITIONER

vs.

USDC SDIL — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

FILED

APR 23 2019

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT U.S.

Southern District of Illinois

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Louise K. Saine

(Your Name)

1308 S. 26th St.

(Address)

Mt. Vernon, IL. 62864

(City, State, Zip Code)

(618) 214-8894

(Phone Number)

RECEIVED

AUG 1 - 2019

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

RECEIVED

JUL 15 2019

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

My name is Louise K. Saine and I do not have an attorney assigned to my case to address my concerns on my behalf. The following questions are being presented for review in the matter of case no. 12-CR-40098-JTG-1:

1. When can Rule 35 be used error?
2. Can a state case be classified as a federal case if defendant has never been convicted of prior felonies?
3. What is the law and/or policy as it relates to using prior convictions?
4. Please explain the protocol for denial of appeals as it pertains to the federal court.
5. Is it possible for counts 1, 2 and 3 to be counted as three counts versus one count?
6. Have there been any changes implemented for career offenders that I may meet the qualifications for?
7. Should the defendant be informed how and why they are being classified as a career offender?
8. How is time credit earned for the completion of rehabilitation programs such as RDAP?
9. Have the sentencing guidelines been revised as it pertains to my case and if so have these guidelines been applied?
10. Would changes to the definition of crime of violence impact the defendant?
11. Does the sentencing Reform Act Law of 2010 impact my case?
12. Can a state officer use a federal assistant without proper authorization?
13. Can a state officer pose as a US Marshall?
14. How does the drug law for a 2- point reduction effect the sentencing guidelines in this case?
15. Does notice of issuing a mandate by the court of appeal make a difference in the sentencing of this case?

Please feel free to contact me via mail or I may be reached at (618)214-8894 for any concerns.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Louise K. Saine". The signature is fluid and cursive, with "Louise" on the top line and "K. Saine" on the bottom line.

## LIST OF PARTIES

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:

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW .....	1
JURISDICTION.....	
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....	
CONCLUSION.....	

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A *Decision of a Federal court*

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
Case No. 14-CV-00397 JRG	2, 3, 4, 5
Case No. 12-1542	1, 2, 3
Case No. 14-CV-00397 JRG	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
Case No. 12-1985	1
17-1985	1, 2
17-1985	1, 2, 3
Case No. 12-CR-40098 JRG	1, 2, 3

### STATUTES AND RULES

28 U.S.C. 1746	14. <del>14</del>
18 U.S.C. 1621	
28 U.S.C. 2255	
21 U.S.C. § 841 (b) (1) and 841 (b) (1) (C)	
18 U.S.C. § 3582	
18 U.S.C. § 3553	
21 U.S.C. § 851	

### OTHER

U.S.S.G § 4B1.1 (2)	4B1.2 (b)
U.S.S.G § 1B1.10	
U.S.S.G 2D1.1	

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 A 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 \_\_\_\_\_ 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 \_\_\_\_\_ 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.

## JURISDICTION

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

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was February 29, 2013 February 19, 2019

Case No. 14-CV-40098-JPG

[ ] 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: January 17, 2014, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix A Case 17, 1985 17,1985

[ ] 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).

*Rule 18 or 29.5C*

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

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was \_\_\_\_\_. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.  
X

[ ] A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: \_\_\_\_\_, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.  
X

[ ] 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 \_\_\_\_\_.  
X

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

**CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED**

29. 4 b, c unconstitutional of state statutes

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

The sentencing reform act law of 2018  
and How does it effect my sentencing  
Using the career offender and 851  
enhancement, as prior offenses.

Louise Saine

07-05-2019

Statement of the case and reasoning for granting the petition.

Defendant Louise K. Saine, hereby appeals the judgement and sentencing in a criminal case, which time has been served with a pending term of 6 years of probation. The honorable J. Phil Gilbert U.S. District judge for the Southern District of Illinois entering on the 4<sup>th</sup> day of March 2013 enclosed a certificate of service by Melissa A. Day, Assistant Federal Defender. Attorney Day filed the foregoing document to the clerk of court using the CMIECF system, sending notification of filing to AUSA George Norwood.

After Attorney Day put in a notice to be removed from Saine's case docket number:

4:12-cr-40098 JPG. Saine's appeal was removed and stated that Saine had no grounds for appeal.

All Attorney's assigned to Saine's case refused to look at the grounds and reason for dismissal.

Arguments and grounds for dismissal for nature of a crime.

Crime

1. Falsifying Identity.
2. Using unauthorized personal.
3. Entering Saine into Federal System.
4. Error's in Saine's PSI report.
5. Amount and weight of drug used in sentencing Saine.
6. Johnson Vs United States, double jeopardy and unconstitutional vague.
7. Saine's case was a state case.
8. Forced sentencing upon Federal Government.
9. Using prior as 851 enhancement along with using the old law as a guideline of 2010.
10. 2-point drug reduction.
11. Harsh sentencing for first time and non-violent offender.
12. Refused counsel for Saine.