

19-6026  
No. 19-55722

D.C. NO 3:18-cv-01335-AJB-BGS

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ORIGINAL

ROLAND MICHAEL SIMON JR. PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT — RESPONDENT (SSEP 17 2019  
ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

FILED  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS 9<sup>TH</sup> CIRCUIT  
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

ROLAND MICHAEL SIMON JR.  
(Your Name)

44710 DIVISION ST. APT. 3301  
(Address)

LANCASTER, CA 93535  
(City, State, Zip Code)

310-415-6631  
(Phone Number)

RECEIVED  
SEP 24 2019  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

The Question(s) I would like the Court to decide is to find me Innocent by the way of § 410 Direct Evidence, § 115 Evidence by clear and Convincing Proof, or by Proof Beyond a reasonable doubt. I would more ask for Delete of my State record (criminal) and Compensation for Incarceration; Loss of property, Loss of Persons life, and injury/suffering. I have included a copy of Lie Detector Examination with findings, and Examiners name, number, address.

Thank You

Roland Simon Jr.

Polygraph Examination

Conducted by: Rachel Levy

On June 4, 2018

(818) 987-1241

Rachel@stilettosecurity.com

www. STILETTOSECURITY.COM

## 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: **STATE OF CALIFORNIA, FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, & UNITED NATIONS.**

## RELATED CASES

Brady v Maryland (1963) 373 US 83  
The United States expressing the view that the Polygraph results were material under the Brady rule, shows overturn in favor of the plaintiff, In fact a violation of Due Process.

Leonard v. Texas, court of Appeals; Dallas Texas which decided that Polygraph test results are admissible Evidence, RE: Rule 401 Test for relevant Evidence

Federal Rules of Evidence

Rule 702. Testimony By Expert

Rule 901. Authenticating Evidence.

Rule 902. Acknowledged Documents.

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 Fed R. App. P 24(a)(1); 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 B to the petition and is

reported at Cal. R. C. & 551(a); 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 JULY 30, 2019.

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: JULY 30, 2019, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix C.

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 April 128, 2015. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix B.

A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: April 128, 2015, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix B.

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).

## 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            FEDERAL COURTS

APPENDIX B            STATE COURTS

APPENDIX C            FEDERAL COURTS ; UNITED STATES  
                          COURT OF APPEALS

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

### CASES

	PAGE NUMBER
Brady v. Maryland (1963) 373 U.S 83	1
Leonard v. Texas, Dallas Texas Court of Appeals	2
Frye v. United States (D.C. cir 1923)	3

### STATUTES AND RULES

The Equality Act	4
The Civil Rights Act	5
§ 115 Evidence by Clear and Convincing Proof.	6
California Penal code § 4901(a)(b)	
§ 190 Proof	
§ Direct Evidence	
10 CFR 709.2 Title 10 Chapter III; Part 709	
28 USC 1254 & 1257	
28 USC § 1291	

### OTHER

28 U.S.C. § 2241	6
------------------	---

California Code § 4901(a)(b) for purposes  
of Release from custody allows me two  
years to file. Re: certain instruments  
hard or unable to obtain to prove  
innocent. (Polygraph Test(s)) -

## CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Amendment 1 - Petition of the Government  
for Redress of Grievances.

Amendment 5 - Protection of Rights to  
Life, Liberty, and Property.

Amendment 8 - Nor Cruel and Unusual  
Punishment inflicted.

Amendment 13 - Slavery

Amendment 14 - Rights of Citizenship

California Code - Penal Code § 4901(a) & (b)

Extension of filing time  
for Parolee, re: long term  
effects.

§ 410 Direct  
Evidence

§ 115 Evidence by clear and Convincing  
Proof, or Proof beyond a reasonable  
Doubt.

§ 190 Proof.

The Equality Act

The Civil Rights Act of 1964

## CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Amendment 1 - Petition of the Government  
for redress of Grievances.

Amendment 5 - Protection of Rights to  
Life, Liberty, and Property.

Amendment 8 - Nor Cruel and Unusual  
Punishment inflicted.

Amendment 13 - Slavery

Amendment 14 - Rights of Citizenship

California Code - Penal Code § 4901(a)&(b)

Extension of filing time  
for Parolee, re: long term  
effects.

§ 410 Direct  
Evidence

§ 115 Evidence by clear and convincing  
Proof, or Proof beyond a reasonable  
Doubt.

§ 190 Proof.

The Equality Act

The Civil Rights Act of 1964

### STATEMENT OF THE CASE

I have been falsely judged and convicted, the judgement was a violation of my Civil Rights, and other peoples as well who have been given a Verdict in the same Judges courtroom. I am one of those individual who have taken action about this kind of ill within this society which has been guided in the wrong direction. I hope for a new outlook on this situation by a grant to pursue overturning of prosecution, by adhering to the Axciton computerized Polygraph system.

Having high hopes that we can rejoice to have had caught a real criminal one who perpetratis on a judgement bench.

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

It is to me and all Justices within that I ask of you to grant my petition for the reason of Truthfulness in the Polygraph Examination submitted. The type of test is Renowned and has helped many Exonerating from false convictions, as well convicted. I believe it is important not only to me but others falsely judged within this courtroom that the case(s) against me be dismissed because of high prejudice, and racism. The lower court, and high court decisions are erroneous with the Polygraph Test to shed new light on my case. It is extremely important and such national importance because of the racist involvement in the matter and the amount that have been handed a sentence within this Courthouse because Genocide is relevantly

## **CONCLUSION**

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Roland Srinivasan

Date: SEPTEMBER 17 2019