

In The Supreme Court of The United States
in Washington D.C.
Mitchel Tardel
Vi
Doug Ducey Case No. 19-5906

Petitioner for Rehearing per Rule 44

This Court has Mandatory Jurisdiction
on this Civil Action And
on this Emergency Motion
for An Injunction Against
Deprivation of Liberty by
An Obvious Unconstitutional
Prosecution, See Landmark
Supreme Court Cases (2004)
which states "Furthermore,
the Court has two types of
Appellate jurisdiction, Mandatory
and discretionary." Appellant is
claiming Direct Jurisdiction
under 28 USC § 1332. In A
Case Where this Court Ordered
the Lower U.S. Courts to
grant An Injunction Against
A Malicious Prosecution "We
conclude that, on the allegations
of the Complaint, if true

abstention and the Denial of injunctive relief may well result in the Denial of Any effective safeguards Against the loss of protected freedoms of expression And cannot be justified." See *Dombrowski v. Pfister*, 380 U.S. 479 (1965). "The cases in this book that refer to the parties as Appellant and Appellee are cases of Mandatory appellate jurisdiction." See *Landmark Supreme Court Cases (2004) (Introduction)*. "Obviously the Federal Courts would become invalidated if State police or anyone else could keep complaints filed in the USDC, from a trial by citizen jury. Judges of a USDC who dismiss a valid complaint could be fired or criminally charged for willfully violating a plaintiff's seventh Amendment rights. - See *Screws v. U.S.*, 325 U.S. 91 (1945). This petition for certiorari is for the

2 Dismissal of an Emergency motion for Rule 8/US Ninth Cir./Rule 27-3

Injunction Against An Obvious
unlawful prosecution Made in Bad
faith for illegitimate reasons such
As harassment, which Does require
equitable relief, See *Younger v.
Harris*, 401 U.S. 37 (1971) which only
remanded Due to this Courts
previous ruling upholding the statute
challenged, See *Whitney v. California*,
279 U.S. 357 (1927).

This is A Subsequent False Arrest
And legal kidnapping in violation of the
Civil Rights Acts Signed by Lyndon
B. Johnson, see Also *U.S. v. Price*,
383 U.S. 787 (1966) which Appellant
cited on TV, to A series of
False Arrests And law enforcement
harassment similarly described in
The Declaration of Independence
see "sent hither swarms of officers
to harass our people". On Jan 24th
Helicopter cameras captured An Hour
long pursuit of Appellant's Grand
Chevy Kev 4x4 2014 limited Red
luxury vehicle lifted on 33" tires
with Camo Tan wheels And Matching
leather interior with custom Hood stripes.
in What Must be considered one of

the Most Patriotic Acts Captured
on Television Cameras at the
Decade A Victimless non Dangerous
Demonstration of A Refusal to
Comply with An UnConstitutional
illegal Order of A less than
credible officer out of jurisdiction,
See "Obviously, however, one cannot
be punished for failing to obey
the command of an officer if
that command is itself violative
of the Constitution.", *Wainwright
v. City of New Orleans, Louisiana*,
392 U.S. 598 (1968); quoting *Wright
v. State of Georgia*, 373 U.S. 284
(1963); see also "one has an undoubted
right to resist an unlawful arrest",
U.S. v. Di Re, 332 U.S. 581 (1948); see
Bad Elk v. U.S., 177 U.S. 529 (1900); see also
Thomas v. Collins, 323 U.S. 576 (1945) where
one has an undoubted right, outside military,
to refuse even an unconstitutional
Court Order. The reason for
Appellant's refusal to stop was
also due to Appellant's recent filing
of a number of civil actions in
the U.S. Courts, which show a series
of the most undisguised false

Arrests ever captured on Video often without legitimate Due process of Law following the Unlawful Arrests And Attempted Coercion For guilty pleas, see Lee v. Weisman, 505 U.S. 577 (1992). Our Major War Hero Patrick Henry clearly would have gone to War before A False Arrest And O.J. Simpson Almost shot himself, there was No Accident until After About Seven Counts of Aggravated Assault by officers Also captured on Camera, instigating A Collision which would Not have otherwise occurred And is therefore barred from Prosecution by The Sherman-Sorrells Doctrine (see Also U.S. v. Russell, 411 U.S. 423 (1973) (w/ Dissents)). "Those lawfully within the Country, entitled to use the public highways, have a right to free passage without interruption or search", see Almeida Sanchez v. U.S., 413 U.S. 266 (1973). A vehicle may not lawfully be stopped without having committed A traffic violation or in rare occasion lawful Reasonable Suspicion, see U.S. v. Brignoni-

Ronce, 422 U.S. 873 (1975); See Also Florida v. J.L., 529 U.S. 266 (2000). Justice Douglas of the Supreme Court for 36 years Dissented Against unreasonable stops in general stating "to give the police greater power than a magistrate is to take a long step down the totalitarian path", See Terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S. 2 (1968). Appellant has been to over Twenty Countries Around the World And has Studied At three Universities And three High Schools. Appellant is Demanding A Union for professional Advance And other Common interests Among the Alumni of every School And A Reunion At the Roosevelt Hotel in Hollywood upon my release. Appellant Studied And lived At La Lumiere Academy From 2001 to 2002, where Chris Farley And Supreme Court Chief Justice Roberts Attended. Appellant Studied At Marguette Catholic H.S. in the Fall of 2002 Before Moving to Arizona where Appellant Studied And lived on campus At Oak-Creek Ranch H.S. where

Appellant Was A state Football
Champion And on Academic Honors
Before graduating A Semester
early in 2005 Where Appellant
then Resided At The Ranch At
Star Pass Near Tucson With Five
girls. Appellant then Moved to
Colorado to Study in Steamboat
Springs with two girls Appellant
Dated in HS, and Resided in
the Colorado Mountain College Rooms
From 2005 to 2006, Where
Appellant Before graduating in
2010 Studied on Semester
At Sea Fall 2007 through
University of Virginia Founded
by Thomas Jefferson And James
Madison. In 2018 Appellant
Applied for Scholarships to
Film & Media Production programs
Around the World And ended up
Enrolling As A Full time Schoolman
At the Largest University in
the Country, Arizona State
University, With over 80,000
students. "An arrest is Not justified
by what the subsequent search
discloses", see Henry v. US, 361 US.

98 (1959); see Also Johnson v. U.S.,
333 U.S. 10 (1948); officers looked
worried After A vehicle search
revealed only An 84" LCD touch
screen, leather upholstery
luxury interior, high end Film
equipment And A Business Suite
A Drug And Alcohol screen Also
proved No recent substance use.
Appellant Made Six phone calls to
report the unlawful attempted
arrest without probable cause, calling
the Phoenix Mayors office, 911, the
U.S. Court of Federal Claims in Washington
D.C. Where Appellant had recently Filed several
lawsuits Against officer harassment And
Fox News stating officers would
be sued And prosecuted if they
proceeded to Make A False Arrest.

An ABC 15 News Article I have on
hand states the incident "grabbed
national headlines because it ended
in A terrifying crash" And The Department
of Public Safety was "facing questions about
how it handled the pursuit", the Article
of Four pages shows Appellant Called
to Notify the state law enforcement
that Appellant was lawfully resisting An

unlawful Arrest. Appellant At that time had the Supreme Court of the U.S. Ruling of John Bad Elk v. U.S., 177 U.S. 529 (1900) on Appellants website Mitch Tarbel, U.S. The 911 transcripts And the police reports state Appellant "was doing the speed limit" And "was Driving perfectly" before officers attempted to make a stop "without probable cause". The Online Docket History shows the Majority of the False Arrest charges have Already been Dismissed For Lack of Probable Cause. This Court ruled "An officer generally needs more evidence establish Probable Cause than A Magistrate needs to issue A warrant, see Aguilar v. State of Tex., 378 U.S. 108 (1964); see also Spinelli v. U.S., 393 U.S. 410 (1969). This Court has Also ruled that two conflicting testimonies As to "Who said What" Cannot establish Probable Cause see Lewis v. City of New Orleans, 415 U.S. 130 (1974) (Powell, J. Concurring); see also City of Houston Tex. v. Hill, 482 U.S. 451 (1987) (F.N. #3). Less than 33% of the U.S. population has Attained A College Degree which is Supplemental character evidence to

the legal presumption of innocence in this country, those with a Degree statistically earn about twice as much as those without.

"The press does not simply publish information about trials but guards against the miscarriage of justice by subjecting the police, prosecutors, and judicial processes to extensive public scrutiny and criticism." See

Sheppard v. Maxwell, 384 U.S. 333 (1966). The conditions of the greater Phoenix Area jails could have led to 9/11 by extensive unaddressed violations of constitutional standards in law, since the mid Nineties, the U.S. Courts have ruled conditions one hundred times better than this, with in person visits, personal radios, TVs and outdoor recreation were unconstitutional and illegal, see *Brunnerman v. Madigan*, 343 F.Supp. 128 (1972); See also *Jones v. Wittenburg*, 509 F.Supp. 653 (1980).

Appellant has an IMDb page as a director and producer as well as a portfolio of several small business websites including Epic productions Inc. net, Acting Headshots.net and WI

GuideService.Com Which Are ALL
Six Figure business platforms.

Punative pre trial Detainment has
'Always' been illegal, Griffin v.
Illinois, 351 U.S. 12 (1951); Shapiro
v. Thompson, 394 U.S. 618 (1969); see
Also William v. Illinois, 399 U.S. 235
(1970) where the only legitimate interest
is to insure presence at trial. Appellant
has A "traditional right to release... to
prepare An unhampered Defense" And
"there is No discretion to refuse to
reduce excessive Bail", Stack v. Boyle,
392 U.S. 1 (1951). Appellant has been
Detained by excessive or No Bail At
All Since the False Arrest And by Arbitrary
prejudicial ruling in violation of
The Equal protections of The XIV
Amendment, see In re Murchison, U.S.
(1955) And Compare the Bail And charges
to that of Any twelve or more randomly
selected other cases. The state has
Also Forced State Appointed, licensed And
paid Fraudulent Assistance of Counsel
upon the Defense in violation of Fareeta
v. California, 422 U.S. 806 (1975) which
has prohibited self representation
And the Ability to Make A Defense, see

the Unanimous Supreme Court ruling of Washington v. Texas, 388 U.S. 14 (1967). Appellant Filed An official Demand For Self Representation Within A few Weeks of the False Arrest And it Was Not Honored by the State, see Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 51 (1972); Tower v. Glover, 457 U.S. 17 (1982) until Almost one year later on Jan. 8th 2019 About the time the Arraignment was held. The State has repeated its Rule 11 similar to An 18 USC § 4241 evaluation twice taking Almost A year each time, refusing to reduce the excessive Bail And even temporarily revoking the Bail twice. The State has essentially Attempted to Circumvent Any of its obligations to Due Process of Law by Ludicrous Allegations of incompetence while police illegally And Accidentally Arrested Appellant Driving A Vehicle Nicer than three of four AZ governors Drive And A vehicle that was owned in the Name of Appellant And was purchased with About 17,000 mi. False Arrests And even Malicious prosecutions Could happen to About Anyone, see Also Awabdy v. City of Adelanto, 1368 F.3d 1062

(2004); Donahoe v. Arpaio, 869 F. Supp. 1020 (2012) where two elected politicians were maliciously prosecuted according to their complaints in the Fed. U.S. Courts As I have Filed. This case reflects that of Ronald E. Wagenmann the ex-fire fighter and police officer who was unlawfully arrested out of state on false allegations and police alleged mental illness in order to maliciously prosecute without due process of law and where a jury awarded over \$1.6 million for about 36 hrs of detainment and bond his \$500 bail illegal, excessive and unconstitutional, see Wagenmann v. Adams, 829 F.2d 196 (1st Cir. 1987). The police reports show officers were deliberately prejudicial omitting Appellants high-profession, Academic standing and standard google search results while fraudulently alleging signs of mental incompetence in order to unlawfully prosecute as the Federal Courts have seen many times and always ruled false evidence of incompetence is no avenue for deprivation of liberty without due process

of Law, see *Pate v. Robinson*, 457 U.S. (1966);
Dusky v. United States, 457 U.S. (1966); *Jackson*
v. Indiana, 457 U.S. (1972); *Cessard v.*
Schmidt, 457 U.S. (1972); *Bishop v.*
United States, 457 U.S. (1973); see
Also *O'Connor v. Donaldson*, 457
(1975). No government employee
has immunity Against knowingly
Fraudulent rulings or Allegations,
see *Scheuer v. Rhodes*, 457 U.S. (1974);
Kalina v. Fletcher, 457 U.S. (1977); see
Also *Malley v. Briggs*, 457 U.S. (1986). Any
single violation of A Supreme Court
ruling or An established Constitutional
right of A citizen by Any state
employee is A criminal offense,
Screws v. U.S., 325 U.S. 91 (1945) in
Addition to kidnapping or even Attempted
kidnapping with No Deprivation of liberty
whatsoever, under the U.S. Civil
Rights Acts Signed by The President
Affirmed by The U.S. Supreme
Court, see *U.S. v. Price*, 457 U.S. (1966);
U.S. v. Guest, 457 U.S. (1966) which contains
the Congressional Codes Appellant Cited
in the 911 call And on TV when
making A press statement the following
Day to NBC, Fox, ABC, AZ Family

And UNIDAD. Where Appellant Also
stated the Officers And City were
liable for the pursuit And Accident,
See *Natschway v. City of Tempe*, 184 Ariz. 379
(1995). The U.S. Ninth Circuit Court
Made An Epic Ruling And quote Against
An Arizona judge to the Detriment of
their credibility "Without (Notice and a hearing)
No Citizen would be safe from the
machinations of secret tribunals, and the
most sane members of the community
might be adjudged insane", *Rankin v.
Howard*, 633 F.2d 844 (9th Cir. 1980) (F.N.#3).
I am detained in violation of U.S. Court
Order Against this County, *Lopez-Valenzuela
v. Arpaio*, 770 F.3d 772 (9th Cir. 2014) by excess
of Bail/Speedy Trial For which Arpaio
was already convicted of violating July 31st
2017. The Supreme Court Dismissed A Case
For a two hour Delay in *Malloy v. U.S.*, 354
U.S. 449 (1957) And Affirmed two injunctions
in *Carey v. Piphus*, U.S. (1989). Wherefore this
Court has mandatory jurisdiction And must
hear this case.

15 Dated Dec. 16th Mitch Jacob T430659
of yr. 2019, 201 S. 4th Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85003

In The Supreme Court of the United States
in Washington D.C.

Mitch Tazbel

v.

Case No. 19-5906

Doug Pacey et.al.

Certificate of Service

I, Mitch Tazbel, Appellant Affirm in Oath
And Affirmation that this Petition
For Rehearing per Rules 44 And 33.2
to be Constructed liberally by Appraiser
Litigant, Haines V. Keener, US (1972) has
been presented in good faith and
not for Delay And Mailed to;

Supreme Court of the US,
Office of the Clerk
Washington, D.C. 20543

Timothy Watson (602) 542-8057

timothy.watson@azag.gov

Byron Babione (602) 542-7690

byron.babione@azag.gov

2005 N. Central Ave

Phoenix, AZ 85004 Mitch Tazbel (+1430659)

Dated Dec, 16th 2019 2015. 4th Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85003