

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON D.C. 20543-0001

RONALD O'ROURKE, M-18779

Plaintiff, Appellant | CASE NO # 19-7925

-VS-

MOTION FOR REHEARING
OF AN ORDER DENYING -FRANKLIN LAWRENCE, | WRIT OF CERTIORARI -
Warden: | Petition:

Defendant(s) Appellee(s).

PETITION FOR THE REHEARING OF AN ORDER -
DENYING A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI:
UNDER U.S. SUPREME COURT Rule-44.NOW COME PETITIONER RONALD O'ROURKE, -
AN PRO SE - ATTORNEY, AND IN SUPPORT OF HIS -
PETITION FOR THE REHEARING OF AN ORDER -
DENYING A PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI,
UNDER U.S. SUPREME COURT - Rule 44. -
REHEARING STATE AS FOLLOWS; - - -

(1) PETITIONER RONALD O'ROURKE, AN PRO SE -
ATTORNEY SUBMITTED A WRIT FOR CERTIORARI IN
THE CASE RONALD O'ROURKE - VS - FRANKLIN LAWRENCE -
NO # 19-7925, COMMITTED A UNITED STATES -
CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATION BY REMOVING RONALD -
O'ROURKE'S VIABLE ARGUMENTS CREMING EQUAL -
PROTECTION - ISSUES THROUGH DEPRIVATION BY SOLRO -
ECONOMIC MEANS, AND BIAS - AND PREJUDICE ON -
MAY 18, 2020, THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT . . .

Denied the Writ of Certiorari:

② PETITIONER Ronald O'Rourke, AN PRO SE ATTORNEY -
Brings the ReHearing of an order Denying A -
Petition For Writ of Certiorari, PURSUANT to -
UNITED STATES Supreme Court Rule 44, 28 U.S.C.A.-
S.Ct. Rule 44.

③ PETITIONER; Ronald O'Rourke, AN PRO-SE ATTORNEY -
Request This Honorable Court Please take a Full -
Good Faith Hearing of The issues involved IN
This Writ of Certiorari.

④ PETITIONER. Ronald O'Rourke AN PRO-SE ATTORNEY -
Comes Forth. IN Good Faith AND Not For Purposes
of Delay and States PETITIONERS CASE. IN cludes
Violations of the Petitioner Constitutional Rights -
That Have Not Been Challenged Previously AND -
Continue to go with out Challenge OR Preident -
on any level.

⑤ PETITIONER, Ronald O'Rourke, AN PRO-SE ATTORNEY -
States, The STATE of Illinois AND officers, Involved
Have neglected Petitioners Constitutional Rights By -
Stepping Ronald O'Rourke of His only Viable Arguments
Including ABANDONING Ronald O'Rourke's only Defenses of
the 5th, 6th, and 14th, ADMENDMENTS.

⑥ SPECIFICALLY, The Purposeful Disregard from -
Defense Counsel's failures to RAISE issue's on
Direct Appeal, As Petitioner Requested, how could -
This be excused or Ignored, Under the Equal Justice -

3
⑥ (Continued)

for All And Cause and Prejudice test." -
Supremacy Clause, Apparently did not Require -
The Illinois Courts to follow the "Seventh Circuit" -
Precedent interpreting, The Fifth Amendment, -
in Passing on Federal Constitutional questions, -
States Court and Lower federal Courts have the -
Same Responsibility to occupy the same position -
U.S.C.A. Const. Art 6, Ci-2: Amendment (5th).
"FREEMAN-V-LANE" 819. F. 2d (1252) (7th Cir).

⑦ Petitioner, Ronald O'Rourke, Failure to testify -
ON Appeal from denial of Successive Post-Conviction -
Relief, STATES Appellate Court failed, to RAISE ^(Meritsful) Issues, -
IN the Direct-Appeal Petition, AND the same Prejudice
Attorney in the Successive Post-Conviction -
Petition, That Refusing Ronald O'Rourke A -
Fundamentally Fair outcome. By NOT RAISING the
Issues of Constitutional Merits Failures to -
RAISE these Arguments is A Constitutional -
Violations of my (5th) and (6th) Constitutional -
Amendment Rights. [Criminal LAW 641.13(1)]. -
Performance Prong of test for ineffective assistance of -
counsel. "Cause and Prejudice test."

⑧ Petitioner: Ronald O'Rourke, Was Refused the -
Right to standard of Reasonableness "at 687-88",
A Conflict Attorney, OR At least be given a -
Kranke hearing - IN A Post-trial hearing this -
Would've been ON RECORD, that the errors or -

⑧ Continue
from

Complaints would've been violations of "Procedural-
due-Process Claims A Procedural-Default for
This Reason. Ronald O'Rourke was not given -
Supplemental Counsel in Court or A Determination-
Hearing trial and Direct-Appeal- The Court Failed-
The Standard of Reasonableness -

At 687-88 OR A Right to Post-trial-Krankel hearing...
Krankel hearing that was deprived the Petitioners -
U.S. Constitutional Rights. & "Fundamental due-process-
Rights". Fundamental Rights: People v- Washington-
101 L. 2d 104, 109 (1984).

⑨ Petitioner: Ronald O'Rourke: AN Pro-SE Attorney-
Further Points out that It Should Be Repugnant to
the Constitution When Legal Rights Are Based
ON A PERSON'S FINANCIAL SITUATION AND WHERE THE
POOR ARE DENIED JUSTICE Because they Don't have
money, Enough to Pay Costs. IN ADVANCE to (14th) -
Amendment. However The RICH, AND The Attorneys-
Always Have There CASES Argued Almost Immediately -
While the Poor Suffer. Proper INVESTIGATION Deprives -
the Poor of Justice.

⑩ PETITIONER, Ronald O'Rourke, AN Pro-SE Attorney-
Further Points out The Duty of The UNITED STATES-
Supreme Court is to MAKE ITS OWN INDEPENDANT-
EXAMINATION of The Records and Claims AND then-
Determine the Facts, When Federal Constitutional -
Rights Deprivations Are Alledged. NAPUE-VS-PEOPLE -

@Continue

NAPUE-VS-People. of He State of Illinois 360, U.S. -
264 (1959). A Proper Showing And IN an -
APPROPRIATE Proceeding For That Purpose, -
Mooney-Vs-Holoman. 294 U.S. 103 (1935).

Ronald O'Rourke, Petitioner, Was Denied His Proper-
Showing at The Appropriate Proceedings, And denying -
"Him/me Re-dress Significantly, This And All He-
Previous Page and Paragraphs Violated. -

Petitioner Ronald O'Rourke's Fourteenth Amendment -
Rights. And All the other Rights of the United-
States Constitution. He has Been Excluded -
From Equal Justice For All.

This Petition is in hopes and Prayers that get a
Full Good Faith, Under the "Equal Justice For all
AND Cause and Prejudice test", Precedent and
interpreting, The Fifth Amendment, - IN Passing
on Federal Constitutional question states Court -
And Lower Federal Courts have the same Responsibility
to occupy the same Position U.S.C.A. Const. -
Art 6, Ci-2: 5th Amendment. . .

IN Response to the Petition for a writ of Certiorari -
was denied on May 18, 2020. . .