

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OCTOBER TERM 2019

NO. _____

JONATHAN CRUZ-RAMIREZ,

PETITIONER,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

RESPONDENT.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

J. FRANK McCABE
Post Office Box 1573
Burlingame, California 94011-1573
Telephone: (650) 343-6268
Counsel for Petitioner
Jonathan Cruz-Ramirez

QUESTION PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

Whether the Ninth Circuit's sanctioning of the admission of a vile and obscenity-laced rap poem found inside the purse of a 16-year-old girl and not written by or belonging to petitioner or any of his co-defendants in the trial conflicted with established federal and state case law and violated petitioner's Fifth and Sixth Amendment rights.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	3
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	5
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT	7
OPINION BELOW	8
JURISDICTION	8
QUESTION PRESENTED FOR REVIEW	8
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	9
REASON FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	
THE RULING OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT SANCTIONING THE ADMISSION INTO EVIDENCE OF AN INFLAMMATORY RAP POEM FOUND IN A JOURNAL INSIDE THE PURSE OF A 16-YEAR-OLD GIRL AND NOT WRITTEN BY OR BELONGING TO ANY DEFENDANT IN THE TRIAL CONFLICTED WITH ESTABLISHED LAW AND VIOLATED PETITIONER'S FIFTH AND SIXTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS	11
A. Factual Circumstances	11
B. The Decision Upholding the Trial Court's Admission of the Poem Conflicts With Decisions of Federal and State Appellate Courts Including the Ninth Circuit	14

C. The Admission of the Vile Poem Was Prejudicial And Was Not Harmless	18
CONCLUSION	20
CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT	21
ATTACHMENTS	
APPENDIX A	
APPENDIX B	
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<u>Boyd v. City and County of San Francisco</u> , 576 F.3d 938 (9th Cir. 2009)	16
<u>Hannah v. State</u> , 420 Md. 339; 23 A.3d 192 (2011)	15, 17
<u>Kyles v. Whitley</u> , 514 U.S. 419 (1995).	19
<u>State v. Skinner</u> , 218 N.J. 496, 95 A.3d 236 (2014)	15, 16, 17
<u>United States v. Ellis</u> , 147 F.3d 1131 (9th Cir. 1998)	16, 17
<u>United States v. Curtin</u> , 489 F.3d 935 (9th Cir. 2007) (en banc)	16
<u>United States v. Gamory</u> , 635 F.3d 480 (11th Cir.), <u>cert. denied</u> , 565 U.S. 1080 (2011)	14, 15
<u>United States v. Giese</u> , 597 F.2d 1170 (9th Cir.), <u>cert. denied</u> , 444 U.S. 979 (1979)	16
<u>United States v. McCrea</u> , 583 F.2d 1083 (9th Cir. 1978)	16
<u>United States v. Pierce</u> , 785 F.3d 832 (2d Cir.), <u>cert. denied</u> , 136 S.Ct. 172 (2015)	16
<u>United States v. Waters</u> , 627 F.3d 345 (9th Cir. 2010)	16

STATUTES

18 U.S.C. section 924	9, 10
18 U.S.C. section 1959	9
28 U.S.C. § 1254	8

CONSTITUTIONAL

United States Constitution, Fifth Amendment 8, 11

United States Constitution, Sixth Amendment 8, 11

SECONDARY AUTHORITY

Fed.R.Evid. 403 13, 14

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OCTOBER TERM 2019

NO. _____

JONATHAN CRUZ-RAMIREZ,
PETITIONER,
v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
RESPONDENT.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED
STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

The petitioner, Jonathan Cruz-Ramirez, respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, entered July 19, 2019.

OPINION BELOW

The Court of Appeals entered an unpublished memorandum opinion on July 19, 2019. A copy of this Opinion is annexed hereto as Appendix A.¹ Petitioner and two co-defendants filed petitions for rehearing en banc which were denied on October 2, 2019. A copy of the Order denying the petitions is annexed hereto as Appendix B.

JURISDICTION

Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(a).

QUESTION PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

Whether the Ninth Circuit's sanctioning of the admission of a vile and obscenity-laced rap poem found inside the purse of a 16-year-old girl and not written by or belonging to petitioner or any of his co-defendants in the trial conflicted with established federal and state case law and violated petitioner's Fifth and Sixth Amendment rights.

¹ The caption of this Opinion contains a list of all parties to the proceedings.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner Cruz-Ramirez was indicted, along with 28 other defendants, in a fifty-nine count third superseding indictment filed on September 24, 2009 in the Northern District of California. JER 427-558.²

Petitioner was named in ten counts of the indictment. In addition to the first three counts which alleged RICO and VICAR conspiracies in furtherance of the LaMara Salvatrucha criminal street gang, petitioner was charged in seven additional counts.

Counts ten through twelve alleged that petitioner murdered Juan Rodriguez on May 31, 2008 and that he possessed, brandished and discharged a firearm in furtherance of that crime. JER 525-526.³

Count 13 charged petitioner and Guillermo Herrera with the murder in aid of racketeering of Armando Estrada on July 11, 2008, in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 1959(a)(1) and 2. Count 14 alleged that petitioner and Herrera possessed a firearm and caused the death of Estrada through the use of that firearm, in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 924(j)(1) and 2. Count 15 charged petitioner and Herrera with brandishing and discharging a firearm in furtherance

² Abbreviation key: "JER" refers to the Joint Excerpt of Record.

³ The jury found appellant not guilty of those three counts.

of the murder alleged in count 13, in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 924(c)(1)(A).

JER 526-527.

Finally, petitioner was charged in count 16 with possessing, brandishing and discharging a firearm on July 25, 2008 in violation of 18 U.S.C. sections 924(c)(1)(A) and 2. JER 528.

Petitioner was tried along with six other defendants in a jury trial before the Hon. William H. Alsup in the District Court for the Northern District of California between April 4 and August 30, 2011. The jury found petitioner guilty on counts 1-3 and 13-16, and not guilty on counts 10-12. JER 3394-3403.

On November 30, 2011, the court sentenced petitioner to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for life imprisonment on counts 1, 13, 14 and 15, the sentences to run concurrently, to 120 months on count two, to thirty-six months on count three to run concurrently, and to 300 months on count 16 to run consecutively. JER 869-876.

The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, on July 19, 2019, vacated petitioner's convictions on counts 15 and 16, and affirmed his judgment of conviction on the remaining counts. Appendix A. The court denied his petition for rehearing en banc on October 2, 2019. Appendix B.

REASON FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

THE RULING OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT SANCTIONING THE ADMISSION INTO EVIDENCE OF AN INFLAMMATORY RAP POEM FOUND IN A JOURNAL INSIDE THE PURSE OF A 16-YEAR-OLD GIRL AND NOT WRITTEN BY OR BELONGING TO ANY DEFENDANT IN THE TRIAL CONFLICTED WITH ESTABLISHED LAW AND VIOLATED PETITIONER'S FIFTH AND SIXTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS

A. Factual Circumstances.

During petitioner's trial, the district court, over defense objections, admitted into evidence and allowed the prosecution to read to the jury a rap poem found in a journal inside the purse of a 16-year-old girl, Veronica Hernandez, who was not named as a conspirator nor charged in the indictment. JER 1448-51.

The poem was read into the record at trial by San Francisco Police Sergeant Scott Lau who described it as, "it appears to be a poem or a rhyme or a -- a rap rhyme." JER 1469. Sergeant Lau read the poem with his own editorial comments, as follows:

"113 Ways to Take a Busterz Life."

A "Buster" is a derogatory term for Norteños.

"13,000 more for a reason why.

“Murder killer murder.

“13 stabs make it rain blood.

“13 more make ‘em choke till they die.

“Burn dat dirty tampon they call a rag.

“Bring the fire out of my eyes and to a busters grave.

“Eat on the ashes and stomp to da gates of hell.

“Puto you ain’t knowin?”

That’s “bitch” you ain’t knowin.

“You shoulda done your homework.

“Bangin that red is another word for suicide.

“Grumpy loca puto you chapas know the name
Westborough’s craziest.

“Beat your brain out your skull with your own
fuckin cuete.”

“Cuite” is a name for a gun.

“Grab your fuckin hand.

“Move you take your own life.”

I think that first word is “piss.” I’m not a hundred percent.
Says:

“Piss on that bloody tampon they call a rag.

“Stuff it down a busters throat.”

“Buster” is a derogatory term for Norteño.

“And make them taste that ugly color they love so much.

“Run their asses over.

“Flip it in reverse and hit ‘em again.

“187 a buster freestyle with nothing but a blade.

“Behind bars put you chapetes to shame.

“Chapetes” is a derogatory term for Norteños.

“Have you drinking piss right off the ground.

“The south side will never die.

“Taking over worldwide.

“Murdress ways won’t stop till every busters casket drops.

“I’ll see you” --

“Chaputos” is a two-prong insult. “Chapete” is a derogatory term for Norteños. And she links it with “Puto,” which is “bitch” in Spanish.

“I’ll see you chaputos in hell where I’ll kill you all over again.

“113 ways to take a busters life.

“13,000 more for a reason why.”

JER 1469-71, 3797-801.

In its opinion, the Ninth Circuit ruled that the district court did not abuse its discretion by admitting the poem. Appendix A, p. 5. The Court found that the district court “appropriately exercised its discretion pursuant to Rule 403,” and ruled that the poem posed “no risk of unfair prejudice to” petitioner. Id. at 6.

B. The Decision Upholding the Trial Court's Admission of the Poem Conflicts With Decisions of Federal and State Appellate Courts Including the Ninth Circuit.

The ruling of the appellate court below unreasonably minimized the significance of the vile poem and conflicts with virtually all of the opinions of federal and state appellate courts which have recognized that the admission of writings, such as this one, that reflect someone's political or social views, even those advocating violent criminal activity, should not be admitted as evidence of a defendant's commission of a crime.

In the closely analogous case of United States v. Gamory, 635 F.3d 480 (11th Cir.), cert. denied, 565 U.S. 1080 (2011), the trial court admitted a rap video which was performed by someone other than defendant-appellant Gamory. The court of appeal ruled that it was error under Fed.R.Evid. 403 to play the rap video to the jury even though the video could be construed to discuss Gamory.

The Eleventh Circuit wrote:

[T]he substance of the rap video was heavily prejudicial. The lyrics presented a substantial danger of unfair prejudice because they contained violence, profanity, sex, promiscuity, and misogyny and could reasonably be understood as promoting a violent and unlawful lifestyle. At the same time, the video was not clearly probative of Gamory's guilt. We cannot ignore the simple fact that Gamory was not in the video. Neither was there any evidence that Gamory authored the lyrics or that the

views and values reflected in the video were, in fact, adopted or shared by Gamory.

Id. at 493.

See also State v. Skinner, 218 N.J. 496, 95 A.3d 236 (2014); Hannah v. State, 420 Md. 339; 23 A.3d 192 (2011).

In Skinner, the New Jersey Supreme Court found that, in the absence of any “strong nexus” to the specific charged crimes, the admission of such evidence flouted the traditional prohibition on criminal propensity and had the effect of penalizing artistic expression and free speech. Skinner, supra, 95 A.3d at 250. The court reasoned:

[T]he violent, profane, and disturbing rap lyrics authored by defendant constituted highly prejudicial evidence against him for little or no probative value as to any motive or intent behind the attempted murder offense with which he was charged. The admission of appellant’s inflammatory rap verses, a genre that certain members of society view as art and others view as distasteful and descriptive of a mean-spirited culture, risked poisoning the jury against defendant. Fictional forms of inflammatory self-expression, such as poems, musical compositions, and other like writings about bad acts, wrongful acts, or crimes, are not properly evidential unless the writing reveals a strong nexus between the specific details of the artistic composition and the circumstances of the underlying offense for which a

person is charged, and the probative value of that evidence outweighs its apparent prejudicial impact.

Id. at 251.

And, in Skinner the rap lyrics were the defendant's. Here, the poem was not authored by petitioner or any of his co-defendants.

The opinion below also conflicts with a series of Ninth Circuit decisions. See, e.g., United States v. Waters, 627 F.3d 345, 354-57 (9th Cir. 2010); United States v. Curtin, 489 F.3d 935, 950-56 (9th Cir. 2007) (en banc); United States v. Ellis, 147 F.3d 1131, 1135 (9th Cir. 1998); United States v. McCrea, 583 F.2d 1083, 1086 (9th Cir. 1978). See also Boyd v. City and County of San Francisco, 576 F.3d 938, 949 (9th Cir. 2009).

And, specifically, in cases in which appellate courts have found literature or videos admissible -- such as United States v. Giese, 597 F.2d 1170 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 444 U.S. 979 (1979), and United States v. Pierce, 785 F.3d 832, 840-41 (2d Cir.), cert. denied, 136 S.Ct. 172 (2015) -- the document in question was authored by or found in the possession of the defendant. Here, the rap poem was found in the purse of young Ms. Hernandez and, as discussed supra, there was no evidence that petitioner or any of the other defendants had seen it or had been aware of its existence, let alone endorsed its contents.

The poem admitted and read to the jury in its entirety herein was not written or possessed by (1) any of the trial defendants, (2) any of the 29 defendants named in the indictment, (3) a named conspirator, or (4) a member of the MS-13 gang. Second, the poem had no nexus to the specific crimes charged against the defendants. While it generally discusses stabbings, guns, and murder -- all crimes that were alleged against the defendants -- the poem does not refer to any of the stabbings, shootings or homicides alleged in this case. See Hannah, supra, 420 Md. 339; Skinner, supra, 95 A.3d at 250. The only similarity was the poem's mention of stabbing and the fact that stabbing assaults occurred. The lack of a particularized nexus shows that the rap was admitted as propensity evidence, to show the violent character of the associates of MS-13. Indeed, the government essentially conceded this by contending that the poem was admissible because it glorified violence, as a “vile and disgusting verbal act of rumination ...” JER 1454-55. As such, it should have been excluded, not admitted, because its probative value was not the type of probative value that is admissible: the rap embodied propensity evidence.

The Ninth Circuit wrote in United States v. Ellis, supra, that the book, “The Anarchist Cookbook,” found in the appellant’s possession was likely to elicit a verdict “based on emotion rather than the evidence presented.” 147 F.3d at

1136. This is exactly the situation here. It is more likely that the jurors would find all of the defendants guilty of conspiracy, murder and the assaults charged in the indictment because of their emotional reaction to the abhorrent content of the rap poem admitted as to all of them without any limiting instruction.

C. The Admission of the Vile Poem Was Prejudicial And Was Not Harmless.

Contrary to the conclusion of the Ninth Circuit, the admission of the rap poem was not harmless as to petitioner Cruz-Ramirez or any of his co-defendants. A more vile and offensive document cannot be imagined. And, its prejudicial impact was heightened because it was read to the jury by a San Francisco police inspector who offered his own personal interpretations of some of the lyrics' meanings. Providing this rap to the jury early in the case created an inflammatory foundation upon which the government built the rest of its case. The language of the rap poem is so chilling that its effect is analogous to showing child pornography. The poem is so inflammatory that it necessarily affected the verdict. The jury could not be expected to have placed its minimal probative value in proper perspective when evaluating the rest of the evidence, which was largely circumstantial or presented by cooperators.

The lack of harmless error is further demonstrated by the prosecutor's reference to the poem in his closing argument. JER 3386-A. This Court has recognized that "the likely damage is best understood by taking the word of the prosecutor." Kyles v. Whitley, 514 U.S. 419, 444 (1995). The government used the erroneously admitted poem to prove that petitioner and his co-defendants committed particular crimes of violence , despite the fact that the poem lacked a connection to any of them.

In summary, this Court should grant this petition because the admission of "113 Ways To Take A Busterz Life" was immensely prejudicial, minimally probative and not harmless. Its admission conflicts with the previously-cited opinions of federal and state appellate courts.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, petitioner Jonathan Cruz-Ramirez respectfully suggests a writ of certiorari should issue in this case.

DATED: December 23, 2019.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Frank McCabe

J. FRANK McCABE

Attorney for Petitioner

Jonathan Cruz-Ramirez

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OCTOBER TERM 2019

NO.

JONATHAN CRUZ-RAMIREZ,

PETITIONER,

V.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

RESPONDENT.

CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT

Petitioner hereby certifies that the software used in preparing the Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is Corel WordPerfect Times New Roman 14 and contains approximately 2,396 words.

DATED: December 23, 2019. Respectfully submitted,

J. Frank McCabe
J. FRANK McCABE
Attorney for Petitioner
Jonathan Cruz-Ramirez

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

J. FRANK McCABE, a member of the Bar of this Court, certifies that pursuant to Rule 29.3, Rules of the Supreme Court, he served the Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit on the counsel for respondent by enclosing a copy thereof in an envelope, first-class postage prepaid, addressed to:

SANGITA K. RAO
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
950 PENNSYLVANIA AVE NW RM 1248
WASHINGTON, DC 20530

and to:

AJAY KRISHNAMURTHY
ASSIST US ATTORNEY
450 GOLDEN GATE AVE
BOX 36055
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3495

and depositing same in the United States mail at Burlingame, California, on December 23, 2019 and further certifies that all parties required to be served have been served.

J. Frank McCabe
J FRANK McCABE