

19-7502
No.

ORIGINAL

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

SCOTT PETERS — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

People of the
STATE OF ILLINOIS — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

Supreme Court of the State of Illinois
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

SCOTT PETERS PROSE 115851
(Your Name)

711 KASRAS KCA Street
(Address)

MENARD, ILLINOIS 62259
(City, State, Zip Code)

N/A
(Phone Number)

A according to UNITED STATES Supreme Court Rules 10 (TWO)

"CONSIDERATIONS GOVERNING REVIEW IN AN CERTIORARI"

INDICATING THE CHARACTER OF REASON THE COURT CONSIDERS;

(C) A STATE COURT OR A UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS HAS DECIDED AN IMPORTANT QUESTION OF FEDERAL LAW THAT HAS NOT BEEN, BUT SHOULD BE SETTLED BY THE COURT, OR HAS DECIDED AN IMPORTANT FEDERAL QUESTION IN A WAY THAT CONFLICTS WITH RELEVANT DECISIONS OF THE COURT.

I.) WHETHER THE STATE OF ILLINOIS TRIAL, APPELLATE AND SUPREME COURT VIOLATED THERE OWN CONSTITUTIONAL STANDARDS AND ALSO DECIDED IMPORTANT FEDERAL QUESTIONS IN A WAY THAT CONFLICTS WITH RELEVANT DECISIONS OF THE COURT AS PERTAINS TO ACCESS TO JUDICIAL PROCESS.

II.) WHETHER IN VIOLATION OF THESE CONSTITUTIONAL STANDARDS PETITIONER WAS DENIED JUDICIAL PROCESS IN HIS ABILITY TO PRESENT, PRESERVE AND PERFECT AND EXHAUST EVIDENCE FOR USE IN OTHER PROCEEDINGS.

III.) WHETHER BY DOING SO PETITIONER HAS ALREADY DEMONSTRATED OPPORTUNITIES TO PRESENT ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE WHICH MAY HAVE AFFORDED PETITIONER THE ABILITY TO PRESENT EVIDENCE BY LIMITED INCOME. INSTEAD BEING DENIED FULL OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT BY LIMITED CIRCUMSTANCE.

IV.) WHETHER IN VIOLATION OF PETITIONER'S SOCIOECONOMIC POSITION IT VIOLATED HIS ACCESS TO THE COURTS AND BY DOING SO CONFLICTS WITH THE RELEVANT DECISIONS OF THE COURT.

(!)

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES		PAGE NUMBER
GRiffin v- ILLINOIS	76 S.Ct. 528	5
UNITED STATES v- Reynolds	73 S.Ct. 528	5
People v- GRAU	263 ILL. APP. 3d 874, 876	6

STATUTES AND RULES

ILLINOIS Supreme Court Rule 63, CANNON 3, (A)(9).	6
ILLINOIS Supreme Court Rule 607(b).	6

OTHER

ILLINOIS Constitution of 1970, ARTICLE I, SECTION TWO.	6
UNITED STATES Constitution, AMENDMENT XIV.	5

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:

(iii)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	5, 6
CONCLUSION.....	7

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A — LISTED —

APPENDIX B — LISTED —

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

(IV)

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 _____ 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 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 Appellate Second District court appears at Appendix B to the petition and is Exhibit 11

☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☒ is unpublished.

(1.)

JURISDICTION

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was _____.

☐ 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: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

☐ 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 26 NOVEMBER 2019. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix A.

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

☐ 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).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT - FOURTEEN

SECTION 1. "no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law; nor deny any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of laws."

ILLEGALS CONSTITUTION OF 1970, ARTICLE I, SECTION TWO

SECTION 2. "no Person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law nor be denied the equal protection of the laws."

ILLEGALS SUPREME COURT RULE 63, CANON 3.

(A)(9) A Judge shall perform judicial duties without bias or prejudice. A Judge shall not, in the performance of judicial duties, by words or conduct manifest bias or prejudice, including but not limited to bias or prejudice based upon race, sex, religion, marital status, age, sexual orientation or socio economic status, and shall not permit staff (clerk) court officers (clerk) and others subject to the Judges Direction and control to do so.

ILLEGALS SUPREME COURT RULE 607 (b).

SECTION 3 "IF THE JUDGE WHO IMPOSED SANCTIONS OR ENTERED THE ORDER

REVERSING PROTECTION OR CONDONING DISCHARGE OR MODIFYING THE CONDITIONS OR IN THE ABSENCE ANY OTHER JUDGE OF THE COURT, FINDS THAT THE DEFENDANT IS WITHOUT FINANCIAL MEANS WITH WHICH TO OBTAIN THE REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS AT THAT TIME OR HEREON, HE SHALL ORDER THE COURT REPORTING PERSONNEL AS REFERRED IN RULE 46 TO TRANSCRIBE AN ORIGINAL AND COPY OF THE NOTES, THE CLERK SHALL THEN, UPON WRITTEN REQUEST OF THE DEFENDANT, SHALL RELEASE A COPY OF THE REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS TO THE DEFENDANT'S ATTORNEY AT RECORDS APPEAR, (PROSE) "WITHOUT CHARGE".

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

PETITIONER "PETERS" FOUND GUILTY BY FALSE NARRATIVE OF 5 COUNTS OF ATTEMPTED MURDER AND SENTENCED TO 135 YEARS.

PLEADED NOT GUILTY ASSERTING LAWFUL INNOCENCE. DEFENSE COUNSEL PLEADED "PETERS" GUILTY BY INSANITY. (R31000002014) "PETERS"

CONTINUED TO ASSERT LAWFUL INNOCENCE BY SELF DEFENSE, OR USE OF FORCE IN REFUSE OF PERSON (CIVIL) AND DWELLING. "PETERS" CONTINUES TO INSIST ON HIS LAWFUL INNOCENCE. PLAINTIFFS, THE COURT AND JURY HAVE

"PETERS" AND DEFENSE COUNSEL TO INCLUDE APPELLATE DEFENDERS HAVE CONTINUED BY OBTAINING "PETERS" ACCESS TO MATERIALS AND EVIDENCE TO BE USED IN COURTS NEEDED TO FORM A DEFENSE OR ASSIST IN

FORMING A DEFENSE. (SEE RECORDS CASES 14 CF 939, 02-15-0650, 02-16-299, 02-17-857, 02-18-929). BLOCKING "PETERS" ACCESS TO THE COURTS, IN

HAIR OF THESE LISHED CASES "PETERS" HAS BEEN DENIED THE RECORD NEEDED TO PRESENT A COHERENT BRIEF AS DEMANDED BY THE STATES OWN

APPELLATE RULES OR DISMISSAL. THIS PUTS "PETERS" AT A SIGNIFICANT DISADVANTAGE WITH NO CHANCE AT ALL TO COUNTER-ACT THE STATES

UNLIMITED TARPAPER BUDGET AND RESOURCES. PREVENTING THEM WITH A RECORD "PETERS" DOES NOT HAVE. "PETERS" IS DENIED AN ECONOMIC

TERMS ANY ABILITY TO DEFEND HIMSELF OR ARGUE HIS MERITS. "PETERS" HAS DONE ONE COLLUSION FROM INCEPTION TO PRESENT TO PURSUE A COMPLETE RECORD PLUS IT WITH THESE MATERIALS AND PERFECT

EVIDENCE NEEDED TO PROVE HIS LAWFUL INNOCENCE BUT HAS BEEN STONEWALLED AS HERE. SEE ALSO RECORD OF (02-19-106). "PETERS" NOW

PUTS FRONT ANOTHER DENIAL OF HIS ORIGINAL INNOCENCE. PETERS STATES FROM (CASE 14-CF-939) AS DOCUMENTED. BECAUSE "PETERS" IS DENIED CANNOT

ACCUSE HIS RIGHTS TO PROVE HIS LAWFUL INNOCENCE, AND BECAUSE OF DENIAL THROUGHOUT WAS UNABLE TO PROVE HIS LAWFUL INNOCENCE BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT-DENYING ACCESS.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Eloquently Put TO THIS Honorable Court, AND WHAT THIS COURT HAS ALREADY DECIDED, IS THE STATE OF ILLINOIS IS THUMBING ITS NOSE AT THE RELEVANT DECISIONS OF THIS COURT BY AGAIN MAKING CONFLICTING RULING IN THIS CASE, UNDERMINING THE CONFIDENCE IN THIS COURT AND THE JUDICIAL PROCESS. TO ENHANCE FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS, THIS Honorable COURT HAS ALREADY ASSERTED ITS UNDERSTANDING THAT A CRIMINAL ACTION MUST BE DISMISSED WHEN THE GOVERNMENT ON THE GROUND OF PRIVILEGE REFUSES NOT TO DISCLOSE FOR THE ACCUSED'S INSPECTION RELEVANT EVIDENCE, STATEMENTS AND REPORTS NEEDED BY AND TO FORM AND IN ASSISTING IN A DEFENSE'S PRESENTATION. THE GOVERNMENT CAN INVOKE ITS EVIDENTIARY PRIVILEGE ONLY AT THE PRICE OF LETTING THE DEFENDANT GO FREE. U.S. V. REYNOLDS 73 S. CT. 528. SIGNIFICANTLY, IN CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS, DIFFERENCES IN ACCESS TO INSTRUMENTS NEEDED TO VINDICATE LEGAL RIGHTS WHEN BASED ON FINANCIAL SITUATION OF A DEFENDANT, ARE REPUGNANT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES. SEE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT XIV, MOREOVER, THERE CAN BE NO EQUAL JUSTICE WHEN THE KIND OF TRIAL A MAN GETS DEPENDS ON THE AMOUNT OF MONEY HE HAS, SEE S.H.A ILLINOIS CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT, ARTICLE I, SECTION TWO, SEE ALSO U.S.C.A. XIV. OR AS STATED ON THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT BUILDING "EQUAL JUSTICE UNDER THE LAW". THERE IS NO MEANINGFUL DISTINCTION, AS RESPECTS DUE PROCESS AND EQUAL PROTECTION, BETWEEN ONE WHICH WOULD DENY THE POOR THE RIGHT TO DEFEND THEMSELVES IN A TRIAL CASE AND ONE WHICH EFFECTIVELY DENIES THE POOR AN ADEQUATE APPELLATE REVIEW ACCORDING ALL WHO HAVE MONEY ENOUGH TO PAY COSTS IN ADVANCE. GRIFFIN V. ILLINOIS 76 S. CT. 585

Reasons For Granting Petition

U.S.C.A. XIV, A state that does after appellate review cannot be said to be continuing an inquiry. Lastly the reversal of records needed to prosecute an appeal without cost is a denial of Equal protection, 514A ILV CH375163F, CH380 §§ 769a, 826-831.

Further, this court can and should take notice of judicial court fees and orders of other courts. People v. Gears 313 IL. App. 3d 874-876.

Moreover, even the Illinois Supreme Court has denounced the very behavior it condones in this case by creating a rule that applies to the very judges of these courts and their control of the conduct of the judges who are responsible as much as the judge who is allowing it the "court clerk" (see Exhibit A) (see also Illinois Supreme Court Rule 63, Canon 3, (A)(9)). A judge shall refrain judicial rates without bias or prejudice. And Illinois Supreme Court Rule 67(b) which defendant is entitled to a copy of the report of proceedings without charge and a certificate acted.

Significantly, the courts, the judges and the officials tasked here with ensuring the integrity of the judicial system to ensure public confidence, have ignored here own state system of laws as well as the laws of the Supreme Court of the land. While if a state has no respect for its own judicial laws, how can there be respect for them by the people there designed to protect. Respect for what respect be there for the law of the land. worst yet

(6.)

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: 6 January 2020