

NOV 16 2019

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

19-7815

No. _____

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ROBERT GRIMSLEY Pro Se — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

STATE OF OREGON et al. — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS # 19-35066
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Robert Grimsley # 21089091
(Your Name)

777 Stanton Blvd.
(Address)

Ontario, OR, 97914
(City, State, Zip Code)

N/A
(Phone Number)

ORIGINAL

* ISSUE OF NATIONAL IMPORTANCE *

&

* INTERNATIONAL IMPORTANCE *
(NON-U.S. CITIZENS AFFECTED)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- ① Can a state commit the crimes of fraud in the facta of its own sentencing guidelines to renege on prison contracts?
- ② How can there be Habeas Corpus relief when a writ of Habeas is on "behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a state court," pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (b)? I.E. Since the states fraud in the facta contractual renege 'We The Inmates' are not incarcerated pursuant to a state court.

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:

Tim Welsh

Heidi Steward

Bethany Smith

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	DISTRICT COURT RULING - 3 pages
APPENDIX B	NINTH CIRCUIT COA RULING - 2 pages
APPENDIX C	
APPENDIX D	
APPENDIX E	
APPENDIX F	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

STATUTES AND RULES

ORS 137.370

3

OTHER

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 B to the petition and is

☒ reported at Appendix B; 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☐ is unpublished.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 1A to the petition and is

☒ reported at Appendix A; 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☐ is unpublished.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 _____ 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 _____ 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:

* Filed a Motion for Reconsideration within the 2 week deadline & Never received a response.

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was 8/26/01.

☐ 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: Never Received a Response, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix N/A.

☐ 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 _____.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix _____.

☐ 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

14th Amendment Constitutional Right of Due Process

Oregon Revised Statute 137.370 Sentencing Guidelines

In Context Facta being the plural variation of factum.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

PER DETAILED EXHIBITS IN CASE - The state is committing
fraud in the fact with ORS sentencing guidelines and applying those
errant executions to petitioners/inmates court ordered judgments which
consequently causes that instrument to be executed differently via
breaking it down & running counts consecutive instead of the court
ordered concurrent.

The state is blurring the line between the so-called
"Discretionary immunity" and "omissions" public officials are granted
to commit large scale fraud against thousands of inmates within the
Oregon Dept of Corrections.

These crimes are structured in a way to keep the illicit acts
off the record & out of the lower courts. Furthermore the complex
scheme could only of been conceived by individuals with a legal background
out of the Attorney Generals office here in Oregon.

Again these are not mere unconstitutional 'interpretive methods'
of instruments; these are crimes of fraud in the fact equating false
imprisonment & unlawfully stripping U.S. citizens as well as non U.S.
citizens (Inmates Awaiting Deportation) of their freedom.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

It is an issue of National & International importance. States finding a loophole to abuse their powers-violating Federal Constitutional & International World court laws.

Since petitioner exposing the fraud and filing a formal bar complaint last month against the states Attorney General "Rosenblum" for "Asserting fraud in the factum of ORS sentencing guidelines;" he has just been maliciously indicted on severe bogus charges.

Petitioner needs the motion for federal Marshal extraction approved within the case as well as a restraining order against the DOJ.

Thank you for your time & Consideration on this matter.
Thousands of inmates are affected by this fraud within Oregon.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

R. Gansley

Date: 11/10/19