

ORIGINAL

No. 19-6251

FILED

NOV 07 2019

RECEIVED

NOV 15 2019

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

In Re : Adib Eddie Ramez Makdessi, Pro se - PETITIONER

RECEIVED

DEC 10 2019

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

PETITION FOR REHEARING IN BANC

COME NOW Pro se Petitioner and submits this Petition For Rehearing In Banc, Because, by denying the petition on Nov. 4, 2019, this Supreme Court has "Endorsed a Miscarriage of Justice", according to ALL

**JUSTICES Rulings:**

"IF new evidence proves that Constitutional Violations have resulted in the conviction of petitioner who is actually innocent, 'Such that, A FEDERAL COURT'S REFUSAL TO HEAR THE CLAIMS WOULD BE A MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE' " quoting Chief Justice in House at 556 and ALL JUSTICES in House v. Bell, 547 U.S. 518, at 536-37 & 556 (2006) and and in McQuiggin v. Perkins, 569 U.S. 383, at 391-92 (2013).

- 1- Therefore, Not only the Lower Federal Courts had Endorsed a Miscarriage of Justice by Refusing to hear the Claims, But, the Supreme Court has also "Endorsed a Miscarriage of Justice" by denying the Petition on Nov. 4, 2019 according to the Supreme Court's ruling. Because,
- 2- Not only new Exculpatory evidence proves that Constitutional violations have resulted in the conviction of this Petitioner who is 100% actually innocent, But also because;
- 3- Prosecutors Confessed to Judge Shockley Four years after Petitioner's conviction when they paid their Jailhous witness the Fraudulently concealed promise of Leniency in (claim 8 page 7 of petition) that :

8- This Supreme Court had also endorsed a miscarriage of Justice previously in 2016, when denied the writ of Mandamus with so much more newly discovered exculpatory evidence proving actual innocence in this Supreme Court No. 16-7993. Because,

9- This Supreme Court ruled in House at 538, that "all evidence must be considered, old & new, without regard to whether it would necessarily be admitted under rules of admissibility that would govern at trial." 28 U.S.C.A. § 2244(b)(3)(C).

10- According to ALL JUSTICES in House, denying this Habeas is a Miscarriage of Justice. See Supreme Court ruling above on First page.

11- Defense and direct appeal Attorneys are so **DEFECTIVE** they could not discover all the newly discovered evidence proving constitutional violations resulted in the conviction of this actually innocent petitioner. see Habeas brief pages 5 to 9.

Respectfully Submitted

11-7-2019

Adib Eddie Ramez Makdessi resubmitted 12-2-2019

Adib Eddie Ramez Makdessi, #1187926  
Red Onion State Prison  
Protective Custody Unit  
P.O. Box 970  
Pound, VA 24279