

In The  
Supreme Court of the United States

---

John P. Greiner; Jr.

*Petitioner,*

v.

Macomb County "et al"

*Respondents*

---

Second Corrected Petition for Rehearing (SCPR)

This (SCPR) is supported by my rejected original petition for rehearing, (ROP); and my Corrected Petition for Rehearing. (CPR) The (ROP) and the (CPR) are resubmitted as part of this, complete document; this complete document titled (SCPR) corrected petition for rehearing as appendix 2.

The (ROP) contains my petitioner supplemental brief (SB) as an appendix seen on page 5. My required certificates' for this (SCPR) are appendix 2.

My (SB) has supporting documentation from the record; that proves the allegations I have made to be true. My (SB) also contains corrections, case law that was filed in previous exhibits, and new grounds; not previously presented, and other intervening matters, and information that was not available at the time of my last filing, that I will bring into this, the (SCPR)

This (SCPR) can be described as the cliff notes; to my (CPR). My (CPR) can be described as the abridged version of my (ROP). The (ROP) is only a portion of the story that is contained in the record. Stated above, within my (SB) the supporting documentation, or evidence, proves that I have told the truth. I have not had due process. I have not had the equal protection of the law. I have not had justice. The provisional protections guaranteed in the United States Constitution have been decimated. Reading this entire document will prove my statements to be true.

---

JOHN P. GREINER; JR.

7 Second Street

Mount Clemens MI, 48043-2540

Phone 810-444-9393

Pro Se / in forma pauperis

**RECEIVED**

**DEC 28 2020**

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

# Table of Content

Table of Contents .....	ii
Table of Authorities .....	iii
Introduction .....	1
Statement or Facts .....	1
Affidavit .....	1
Conclusion .....	16
Appendix Index .....	17
Certificate stating that the grounds are limited to intervening circumstances of substantial or controlling effect, and to other substantial grounds not previously presented. ....	Appendix 1
Certificate certifying that the petition for rehearing is presented in good faith and not for delay. ....	Appendix 1
Rejected original petition for rehearing .....	Appendix 2

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases: in Second Corrected Petition for Rehearing

<i>Cummings v. Wayne County</i> Cite as 533N.W.2d 13 (Mich.App. 1995) .....	8
<i>Masterpiece Cakeshops, LTD., et al., Petitioner v. Colorado Civil Rights Commission, et al</i> 138 SCt. 1719 (2018) .....	2

Constitutional Violations

Article [I] (Amendment 1 - Freedom of expression and religion) .....	1, 2
Article [V] (Amendment 5 - Rights of Persons) .....	2, 6, 7, 8, 9
Article [XIV] (Amendment 14 - Rights Guaranteed: Privileges and Immunities of Citizenship, Due Process, and Equal Protection) .....	2, 6, 7, 8, 11

Cases: in Second Corrected Petition for Rehearing, Certificate

<i>Hurley v. Irish-Am. Gay, Lesbian &amp; Bisexual Grp. Of Bos.</i> , 515 U.S. 557, 569 (1995) .....	6
<i>Masterpiece Cakeshops, LTD., et al., Petitioner v. Colorado Civil Rights Commission, et al</i> 138 SCt. 1719 (2018) .....	6
<i>Wooley v. Maynard</i> , 430 U.S. 705, 715 (1977) .....	6
<i>Wooley</i> , 430 U.S. at 714 -15 (quoting <i>W.Va.State Bd. of Educ. V. Barnette</i> , 319 U.S. 624, 642 (1943)) .....	7

Constitutional Protection

Article [I] (Amendment 1 - Freedom of expression and religion) .....	6
--	---

INTRODUCTION / Statement of facts / and / Affidavit for this document

I John P. Greiner Jr, hereby state that the following matters are personally known to me, and if I was called upon to testify, I would be able to competently testify thereto: COMES NOW, the Affiant, John P. Greiner Jr, after being first duly sworn, deposes and states as follows:

I have meet you on the level, with the compass of Truth as my guide. The respondents have confirmed the positions, and facts, I presented in my Petition by electing to provide no Reply Brief.

Rule 15.2 clearly states "the brief in opposition should address any perceived misstatements of fact or law in the petition that bears on what issues properly would be before the court if certiorari was granted. Counsel are admonished that they have an obligation to the court to point out in the brief in opposition, and not later, any perceived misstatements made in the petition." They have no defense to the truth.

I have brought this action supported by my sincerely held religious beliefs, and the laws. It is against the law of God and man to lie and steal. The defendants lied to me, then, they lied about me, in retaliation for the first grievance I wrote; then they use my work related disabilities against me. To establish a pretext, to get me fired and, cover up the fact that they had been stealing money through overtime fraud. Today I realize that the word perjury is a vulgar word in a courtroom. I have written that in the pleadings and I have proven that by my documents; that I have provided them, and now. Those actions were, and are, a violation of the First Amendment; freedom of expression, regardless, of my religious beliefs. My written documents are

a form my free speech. My free speech is presented in the pleadings and documents; then and now. They are also an expression of my religious beliefs. The response I have received is a lack of recognition and respect. This case is built on the triangular foundation of *Roe et al. v. Wade, District Attorney of Dallas County*. 410 U.S. 113 (1973) is not cited, just stated because of your rule: *Masterpiece Cakeshops, LTD., et al., Petitioner v. Colorado Civil Rights Commission, et al* 138 SCt. 1719 (2018) and *Cleveland Board of Education v Loudermill* 470 U.S. 532, 84 L.Ed.2d 494. Loudermill is not cited, just stated because of your rule: Those cases, established, 1) individual liberty, 2) freedom of expression, and speech, and 3) the fact that public employees have a property right in continued employment and cannot be deprived of that property right by the state without due process. I have not had due process; or, the equal protection of the law, in retaliation and violation of the first, fifth, and fourteenth amendments of the Constitution.

In my petitioner's application to extend time (PA (to) ET) to file a writ of certiorari for 60 days from case # 17-2417 and case #19-1055; application No. 19A717, I provided an appendix that does not show on the record. Appendix 5 of the application No. 19A717 is my United States Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals (6<sup>th</sup> Cir), R 92 Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration of Rehearing and Petition for an En Banc Hearing to 6<sup>th</sup> Cir R90-2. Affidavit, Statement of Facts, Exhibits and Exhibit Index. There are two exhibits, exhibit 1, is a 515 page document, a letter dated 10/10/2019, with exhibits to Captain Thomas Deasy, of the Michigan State Police, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Special Investigations; that I filed in affidavit format. Exhibit 2, is an affidavit from

Debbie L. Stradling testifying: "The Supporting documentation contained in the Southfield police report, Exhibits 3, 4, and 5 prove that the allegations contained in Exhibit 1, (of this document) the Loudermill hearing notice are untrue. Balinski, testified, "Yes, he did." Reviewing the Exhibits mentioned that statement was obviously not true."

Those Exhibits 3, 4, and 5, and Exhibit 1, the Loudermill hearing notice from the Southfield police report, also appear in Exhibit 3, of my (SB); plaintiffs Detroit Police Report (DPR) filed with supporting documentation. See Appendix 1, Exhibit 3; of my (SB) and read the evidence.

The fact that I testified on page 12, of the (PA (to) ET) "Giving Henry the benefit of the doubt, I will provide him with the appendix pages (9a) and (10a)."

I met with Henry again, on 1/30/2020, and on 2/6/20. Because of the actions and inactions of Henry. On 2/26/2020, I wrote a second letter to Captain Deasy of the Michigan State Police, 2<sup>nd</sup> District Special Investigations. I also sent that letter to his boss Colonel Joseph Gasper, our Attorney General Dana Nessel, our Governor Gretchen Whitmer my State Representative Bill Sowerby and my State Senator Peter Lucido. No one from the State Police contacted me.

On 4/14/2020, I wrote directly to Michigan Attorney General (A.G.) Dana Nessel, I also sent a copy of the letter to Michigan Governor Whitmer, my Michigan State Senator Peter Lucido, my State Representative Bill Sowerby, First Lieutenant Weimer, Captain Thomas Deasy, Detective Sergeant Henry, Lieutenant Price, and Colonel Joseph Gasper; of the Michigan State Police.

I testified about all of the interaction I had with Detective Henry: and I testified and proved that Henry had lied to me at least six different times. Lying is Fraud.

### 3) Lie, vb lied: lying

1: to make an untrue statement with intent to deceive

2: to create a false or misleading impression: to affect by telling lies

Syn: Lie, Prevaricate, Equivocate, Palter, Fib mean to tell an untrue. Lie in the direct term, imputing dishonesty; Prevaricate softens the bluntness of lie by implying quibbling or confusing the issue; Equivocate implies using words having more than one sense so as to seem to say one thing but intend another; Palter implies making unreasonable statements of fact or intention or insincere promises; Fib applies to a telling of an untruth that is trivial in substance or significance

4) lie n 1a: an assertion of something known or believed by the speaker to be untrue with intent to deceive b: an untruth or inaccurate statement that may or may not be believed true by the speaker 2: something that misleads or deceives 3: a charge of lying

Fraud: 1 a: DECEIT, TRICKERY; *specif*: intentional perversion of truth in order to induce another to part with something of value or to surrender a legal right b: an act of deceiving or misrepresenting: TRICK 2 a: one who is not what he presents to be: IMPOSTER b: one who defrauds: CHEAT SYN See DECEPTION, IMPOSTURE These definitions, are from Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary (WD)

The Nessel letter also points out an additional reason to establish a national standard for Loudermill hearings; requiring all government employers, to adhere to, to ensure and protect all government employees from employers who intend to terminate an individual who resist an unethical or ill legal practice. Whether that individual is, or is not, a whistleblower. A standard that will prevent any action, by any President, of the United States to be able to repeat Donald Trump's actions; of terminating people for doing their jobs, to protect his, or her self-interests.

Because this court has the certified transcript, excerpts, of August 14, 2012, in the unpublished parts of the appendix for case 19-8006; pages 64a (to) 73a. Those excerpts prove that Paul Long did accept the 58 page Harassment Complaint (HC). Mentioned above, is the (DPR) that contains proof of the Southfield perjury and Longs perjury in Detroit. Now Read page 64a, page 2, #1), "On 8/14/12, before the second Loudermill hearing (LH) Union president Cheryl Carroll told me the employers intentions were that they are going to fire you." Now read the corresponding pages, 3, 4, and 5. On page 4-13 and 14, Carroll states: "That's what they indicated to Paul." The plan was set, and Long knew it. (LH) two and three were a charade. Now Read page 64a, page 2, #2), "the arbitration award was read that modified the Last Chance agreement and discussed with Paul Long and Cheryl Carroll." They both knew I had a right to arbitration, and that was the reason I was not fired on 8/14/12. That is also the reason my termination grievance was never processed to Council 25. Read the corresponding pages, 6 and 7 (to) -22. Now Read page 64a, page 2, #3), "Paul Long Council 25 staff representative accepts the 58 page harassment complaint and states it's got merit." Read the corresponding pages, 25 (to) 39. On page 30-17 (to)-24, I stated: "Mr. Long, I have a copy, I can let you take it home if you're willing to take the time to read it. It might make a lot more sense to you. But the point is, it's all started April 20, April 19, 2011." Long stated: "With the single grievance that you had." I confirmed: "With the single grievance." On page 33-21 & 22, Long stated: "Give it to me, let me take it with me." On page 35-14, Long stated; "You have some merit."



On 10/10/2012, Long and I discussed the third upcoming (LH); and I asked him about the (HC) and Long stated: "Yes, some of your arguments yes are meritorious." There is no question he had the complaint, and he had read it, when he made that statement. That statement is in the Audio Records at Work, folder, Book 5, record 18, that is on the flash drive that is part of the record in case 19-5052, and 19-8006. Those facts prove the other points of Longs perjury reported in the Detroit Police report. Those excerpts were also sent in the 4/14/2020, letter to Nessel and the others.

On 4/20/2020, I wrote to Mr. Scott Harris, the clerk of this court. I requested a delay in the distribution "because, the coronavirus had disrupted life as we knew it in the state of Michigan." That letter is Exhibit 4 of my (SB). Exhibit 4, has 2 exhibits within it. Exhibit 1, is a copy of the second letter I sent to Captain Thomas Dacey, dated 2/26/2020; mentioned above. Exhibit 2, is a copy of the letter I wrote to Attorney General Dana Nessel, dated 4/14/2020; mentioned above. Read all of Exhibit 4.

The 4/14/20 Nessel letter was sent and received over 7 months ago. I have not been contacted by her, or anyone from her office; or anyone form the State Police.

After reading appendix 5, in my (PA (to) ET) and the exhibits in Appendix 1, my (SB). It is an indisputable fact, I have not had the equal protection of the law, after proving the crimes of perjury. The individuals mentioned, have denied me, a person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. That collective lack of action is an obvious, unmistakable, deliberate action. The Supreme Court has established that is also a violation of Due Process and both are clearly guaranteed by the 5<sup>th</sup> & 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment in our United States Constitution. (USC)

Modern law interprets the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to impose the same substantive due process and procedural due process requirements on the federal and state governments. Citizens are entitle to representation from the actions of the federal and state governments.

The furnishing of counsel, is, in all cases, whatever dictated, by natural, or inherent acts, it is a fundamental principles that is required, to achieve the desired fairness promised in the United States Constitution. It is, the guaranteed equal protection of the laws. Also to preserve the integrity of the rights protected by the federal Constitution. “That Constitution is the supreme law of the land, and “Upon the state courts, equally with the courts of the union, rests the obligation to guard and enforce every right secured by that Constitution.” *Smith v. O’Grady, Warden* 312 U.S. 329 (1941) is not cited just stated because of your rule:

The following year, the court set precedents, in *Betts v. Brady, Warden* 316 U.S. 455 (1942) No. 837; is not cited, just stated because of your rule: “Due process of law is secured against invasion by the federal Government by the Fifth Amendment, and is safeguarded against state action in identical words by the Fourteenth.” “Asserted denial is to be tested by an appraisal of the totality of facts in a given case.” *Id.* That decision, is only conceivably made, after a failed individual attempt. That’s not fair. “The court stated further that “under the circumstances ... the necessity of counsel was so vital and imperative that the failure of the trial court to make an effective appointment of counsel was likewise a denial of due process.” *Id.* “Every court has power, if it deems proper, to appoint counsel where that course seems to be

required in the interest of fairness.” *Id.* “the Fourteenth Amendment extends the protection of due process to property as well as to life and liberty, if we hold with the petitioner, logic would require the furnishing of counsel in civil cases involving property.” *Id.* That is what is required when the Government is attempting to take away liberty as well as property. They took my property, “nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.” That is part of the Fifth Amendment protection, or guaranteed of the United States Constitution. There has never been any just compensation. There has not been anything fair about this experience for me, yet. Constitutional law 305(2) “Due process in civil cases generally requires notice of the nature of proceedings, opportunity to be heard in a meaningful time and manner, and impartial decision-maker;” *Cummings v. Wayne County* Cite as 533N.W.2d 13 (Mich.App. 1995) by reading Exhibit 13, plaintiffs Motion, relief from judgment based on fraud DCR #155 in my (SB);; that was intended to be read as one complete document. But for this specifically point read page 9, or Page ID 9872 (to) page, ID 9875 or page 13. Next read the presentation I made in Exhibit 3 in my (SB), contained in (DPR) that is proof I moved. See the flagging transcript; and the fact that I moved. Then it is obvious that Karen Bathanti Macomb County Human Resource and Labor Relations Service Partner was not an impartial decision maker. That fact also violates this Constitutional law 3875 “Due process is a flexible concept, the essence of which requires fundamental fairness.” *Al-Maliki v. Lagrant* Cite as 781 N.W.2d 853 (Mich.App. 2009) *Al-Maliki v. Lagrant* is not cited, just stated because of your rule. The property interest was clearly established in *Cleveland Board of*

*Education v. Loudermill* 470 U.S. 532, 84 L.Ed.2d 494. *Loudermill* is not cited, just stated because of your rule: “1. Constitutional law 278.4(3) Public employees having property right in continued employment cannot be deprived of that property right by the state without due process. U.S.C.A. Const. Amends. 5, 14. I have not had due process. Both of the lower courts denied my requests for Counsel.

3. Constitutional law 251.5 As relating to due process clause provision that substantive rights of life, liberty and property cannot be deprived except pursuant to constitutionally adequate procedures, categories of substance and procedure are distinct; once it is determined that due process clause applies, question remains what process is due. U.S.C.A. Const. Amends. 5, 14. *Id.* The fact that my direct requests to attorneys for assistance, and the direct request for the appointment of an attorney to the courts has been denied multiple times, it is a violation of due process.

Those Constitutional errors and the ambiguity that is unresolved in the procedural process stated above is this court's responsibility to correct for this nation's public employees that are entitled to due process; and make the words in the Constitution mean what they say for the benefit of all of our citizens. By this case, this court, is being given that opportunity, to make some meaningful changes.

In addition the first Amendment retaliation began because of my speech, my free speech, and my innocent, innocuous statement at work; when I asked about the timecard of a former coworker being punched in when that person was not at work.

That question, exposed the fact that I knew about the overtime fraud. Then, the first grievance I filed 4/20/2011, for being bypassed for overtime started the

retaliation from the supervisor, and the grievances that followed; against the supervisor's retaliation and ultimately my termination.

The decision, or decisions, that individuals made to keep the pretext alive was their decision. The continued decisions, to retaliate against me for my free speech, and to prevent me from exposing that pretext, or lie, or lies, that became perjury, is now, an eventual and ultimately a judicial decision. Individually your decisions.

On 4/29/2020, I received a rejection letter from the clerk, signed by, Laurie Wood. Stating: "Your motion to delay distribution of your petition for writ of certiorari, received on April 28, 2020, is herewith returned as it does not comply with the rules of the Court or the Court's Order dated March 19, 2020." Read Exhibit 5 in my (SB). That statement is not true. The March 19, 2020, order reads "In light of the ongoing public health concerns relating to COVID-19, the following shall apply to cases prior to a ruling on a petition for a writ of certiorari:" that was this case; then.

Exhibit 5, continues: Pursuant to the Court's Order dated March 19, 2020, the Clerk may "entertain motions to delay distribution of a petition for writ of certiorari where the grounds for the motion are that the petitioner needs additional time to file a reply due to difficulties relating to COVID-19."

I did not request the delay of distribution on the grounds that I needed more time to file a reply brief. I explained in the Exhibit 4 letter, the reason I was requesting the delay of distribution; was to have time to contact (A.G.) Dana Nessel.

Ms. Wood, elected to include the operative word "may" which does not appear in the order. The Clerk at the (6<sup>th</sup> Cir), also attempted an on-the-fly rule change, in

case #19-1055. In Exhibit 2, the 3/21/2019, order 8, "is DENIED as LATE." That is not true. I have always filed, on, or before the due date.

Judge Leitman, in the United States District Court Eastern District of Michigan Southern division, created an on-the-fly rule when he ordered "and prohibiting plaintiff from filing additional motions for reconsideration." Read Exhibit 6 in my (SB). That order violated, and abridged, my first amendment rights. Read Exhibit 7 in my (SB), is the Marion Webster.com dictionary definition of the word of "abridge abridged; abridging. #1, 3 formal: to reducing in scope: DIMINISH attempts to abridge the right of free speech; #2. Legal Definition of *abridge*: to diminish or reduce in scope no State shall make or enforce any law which shall *abridge* the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States – *U.S. Constitution* amend. XIV" Read Exhibit 7.

The Judges in the (6<sup>th</sup> Cir) did the same thing when they denied my request for an expansion of the word count and then the elimination of the word count. The (6<sup>th</sup> Cir) Judges also ignore their own rule citing "The Court holds pleadings of *pro se* litigants to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. *Spotts v. United States*, 429 F.3d 248, 250 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005) (citing *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972); see also *Boswell v. Mayer*, 169 F.3d 384, 387 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1999) (*pro se* plaintiffs enjoy the benefit of a liberal construction of their pleadings and filings); is not cited, just stated because of your rule. My respect for the rules caused me to ask them to grant my requests. Their decisions, clearly, violates the "freedom of expression," and the provision protected by the First Amendment of "the freedom of

speech.” This court cannot allow court rules enforced by Judges, or created by Judges or court staff, to violate the (USC). Rules, which, are not, created by the legislators or legislation, are not laws. They are only rules, those rules violated the (USC).

The Judges in both lower courts violated the due process protection in the fifth and fourteenth amendments of the Constitution “nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law;” by not providing a lawyer upon my request. Read Exhibit 8 in my (SB). The 3/14/2016 entry; “Counsel will not be appointed;” Next Read Exhibit 9 in my (SB). Which is (6<sup>th</sup> Cir) Document 24; Plaintiffs/Appellant (P/A) Motion for Appointment of Counsel Affidavit of John P. Greiner Supporting Statement of Facts; on Page 2, I wrote: After I was terminated, I filed for unemployment. I also filed a Whistleblower Lawsuit (WBLS) in Macomb County against Macomb County Pro Per because of the Statue of limitations. The employer’s response to Unemployment, alleged that I was insubordinate, that statement caused me to be denied unemployment benefits. I appealed the decision and there was a hearing 3/8/2013, in front of an AL J. That is where my former coworker’s untrue statements became perjury. I was denied. I appealed. The AL J was overturned. See my (SB) Appendix 1, Exhibit 3, (DPR) Exhibit 6. I received unemployment benefits. Then, the Employer appealed. From that appeal there was a new hearing; and, additional coworkers that I subpoenaed came and committed perjury supporting the former coworker’s perjury.”

This court cannot allow Judges or court staff, to create rules that violate the (USC) by creating rules to limit or restrict free speech; or, restrict, or, prevent filing.

Nor can this court allow the Judges in the lower courts to violate the due process provisions in the (USC) by not providing a lawyer upon my request; when it prevents required fairness. Stated above on page 7 "Every court has power, if it deems proper, to appoint counsel where that course seems to be required in the interest of fairness."

There decisions, were wrong. I explained the obligation for attorneys to accept clients in both the (SB) and in the (CPR) because of their oaths. Judges also take oaths. If individuals do not honor the oaths that they have taken to enter office, or employment, as police or lawyer, or a witness, there is no way justice will be achieved.

In my (SB) I praised the individuals that I am aware of who honored their oaths and have taken action to defend this our democracy and the (USC); they too are Patriots. They include Judge Emmet Sullivan, special counsel Robert Muller, and the appointed former Judge, John Gleeson who argue against the department of justice's dismissal request and examined whether Flynn should be charged with perjury. On 9/11/2020, reporter Jan Wolfe wrote for the Thomas Reuters trust principles an update. A retired judge blasted the U.S. Justice Department's plan to drop the criminal case against President Donald Trump's former national security advisor Michael Flynn as corrupt on Friday and urged the judge presiding over the case to reject the move. In a court filing, Gleeson said the department should not be allowed to drop the case. The department's effort to do so was a "corrupt and politically motivated favor unworthy of our justice system," Gleeson added. Now Gleeson, joins the voice of justice. Defending and supporting Judge Emmet Sullivan. Stating clearly the department should not be allowed to drop the case. You can't drop this case either.



You Judges have the same responsibility that Emmet Sullivan displayed. To appoint an outside lawyer, like Gleeson, or Gleeson, to review and assist me.

Because the court said: "The state court erroneously decided that the petition stated no cause of action. If petitioner can prove his allegations the judgment upon which his imprisonment rests was rendered in violation of due process and cannot stand." *Smith v. O'Grady, Warden* 312 U.S. 329 (1941) not cited, just stated because of your rule. That is what Leitman stated and the (6<sup>th</sup> Cir) agreed. I have proven the most important element. Their pretext is based on perjury. I've said no.

Clarence Thomas, and Brett Kavanaugh were both required to say no. That's not true, and defend themselves. They were both, in a he said, she said, situation. My situation is remarkably different. My situation resembles Nixon's resignation. The audio recording appeared, he resigned, my audio recordings are all in the record; no one has resigned, they doubled down. The Defendants knew about them, and they came in and lied. So, when the question is about veracity, the court said: "The simple issue was the veracity of the testimony for the state and that for the defendant." *Betts v. Brady, Warden* 316 U.S. 455 (1942) No. 837, not cited, just stated because of your rule. The audio recording speak for themselves, they impeached, or proved perjury.

Clinton's impeachment was the blue print for the Trump impeachment. In Clinton's impeachment the House of Representatives impeached him for lying under oath and obstructing justice; accusing the Democratic President of perjury before a grand jury. Then the house decided to split the difference, opting not to pass article 2, which alleged that Clinton committed perjury in his January 17 Jones deposition,

or article 4, which charge that he abused the power of his office by lying under oath. Perjury is easy to prove, if it's revealed that your testimony under oath was not true.

On 12/20/1998, reporters Peter Baker and Juliet Eilperin, wrote in the Washington Post "President Bill Clinton was impeached on Dec. 19, 1998. The Senate eventually acquitted Clinton after a trial" The article states: "Hyde called Clinton a "serial violator of the oath" to tell the truth. "Equal justice under the law, that's what we're fighting for," he said. "And when the chief law enforcement officer trivializes, ignores, shreds, minimizes the sanctity of the oath, then justice is wounded, and you're wounded, and your children are wounded." True. That's what Barr has done.

"If our country looks the other way, our country will lose its way," said Rep. J.C. Watts (R-Okla.). That is true too. Making it your job to keep us on the path. "Livingston made the case for impeachment, saying, "We're not ruled by kings or emperors and there is no divine right of President." You cannot ignore my evidence.

I included new case law in both, my (ROP) & my (CPR) that I am not able to restate, here, because of the rule I testified to in my certificate. That new case law, supports the fact that the lower court disregarded their own rules. Those documents are must read to have a complete understanding of the issues before this court.

The judges before Leitman, and after him, have also, all made the supporting decision to keep the lie alive, and that was an error; or mistake. That is what the Senators did for Trump. Decided they didn't need more evidence, or testimony.

I state clearly, here, the midnight ride of Paul Revere was done at midnight for a reason. There was no time to wait, and now, there is not time to wait, justice calls.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, specifically, the indisputable evidence, as well as those stated in the petition, this court should grant review.


Further, Affiant saith not.

John P. Greiner, Jr., Affiant  
John P. Greiner, Jr.

Subscribed and sworn to before me

This 8<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2020

Shanya Reed  
Notary Public



Wayne County, Michigan

My Commission Expires: 12.28.2020



## Appendix Index

Certificate stating that the grounds are limited to intervening circumstances of substantial or controlling effect, and to other substantial grounds not previously presented. ....	Appendix 1
Certificate certifying that the petition for rehearing is presented in good faith and not for delay. ....	Appendix 1
Rejected original petition for rehearing .....	Appendix 2



This is my Certificate, stating that the grounds are limited to intervening circumstances of substantial or controlling effect, and to other substantial grounds not previously presented. I make under the penalty of perjury.

This is my Certificate certifying that the petition for rehearing is presented in good faith and not for delay.

Martin Luther King is given credit for this quote: "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere." In my (ROP) I exposed many lies. Some of those lies have stood for centuries. To understand that statement you will have to read my (ROP) and the appendix; my (SB), and the exhibits; and my (CPR). Most recently Donald Trump has exposed at least seventy-one million Americans who believe it is okay to lie. He has amplified the fact that reality is irrelevant. There is only one antidote; truth.

The truth for us all, as Christians, is that, is a very unsettling reality. Joe Biden received eighty million votes in the 2020 election. If the election was considered an en banc hearing, and the 150 million people were divided in groups of 10 million each, representing 15 judges; that means that this country, that states "In God we trust" believes its okay to lie, and our democracy was decided by one casting vote.

I can take the horse to water; but I can't make him drink. I can take the water to the horse; but I can't make him drink. I can't make someone stop lying; when there are no consequences for lying. Or tell the truth when there are benefits for lying. The exposure and acceptance of this rampant lying is a threat to democracy in our nation.

Trump continues to damage our democracy and the confidence in democracy for the world by his unfounded statements and actions.

I explained clearly in my (SB) that Trump lied in the 2<sup>nd</sup> presidential debate that was reported by Anderson Cooper from 60 minutes. I also reported about the consequences for his hot mic statements captured by Bush for Access Hollywood.

I have known Jewish people my whole life. When I was between, 25 and 30 years old, I asked a well-respected Jewish man "What prevented the Jewish people from accepting Jesus as the Messiah?" He explained the general concept that is written in Isaiah 2:4, "and they shall beat their swords into plow shares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nations shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore." That cannot ever happen, until individuals representing nations, and individuals representing themselves, stop intentional lying.

In *Roe et al. v. Wade, District Attorney of Dallas County*. 410 U.S. 113 (1973). The court stated: @116 and 117, is not cited, just stated because of your rule. "One's philosophy, one's experience, one's exposure to the raw edges of human existence, one's religious training, one's attitude toward life and family and their values, and the moral standards one establishes and seeks to observe, are all likely to influence and to color one's thinking and conclusions" "Our task, of course, is to resolve the issue by constitutional measurement, free from emotion and of predilection." "[The Constitution] is made for people of fundamentally differing views, and the accident of our finding certain opinions natural and familiar or novel and even shocking ought not to conclude our judgment" I pray that that remains true for me too.

“One’s philosophy, one’s experience, one’s exposure to the raw edges of human existence, one’s religious training, one’s attitude toward life and family and their values, and the moral standards one establishes and seeks to observe, are all likely to influence and to color one’s thinking and conclusions” that is clearly true.

The moral standards one establishes and seeks to observe, are all influence and colored by one’s thinking, one’s beliefs, one’s experience, and ones conclusions.

Although, for this court, it ought not, conclude your judgment, even if you feel its okay to lie, or, if you were raised to believe, that it’s okay to lie, that may have worked with in your household. That may have become part of your individual philosophy; and part of your experience. Your exposure to the raw edges of human existence, or, your religious training might cause you to view your family, and their lives, and their attitude toward life, their values and moral standards as being correct when it comes to thinking it’s ok to lie. It’s not right thinking, Lying is fraud.

Individually, and collectively, this court has to stay free from emotion and predilection; as unpopular as it may be to you, you cannot participate in keeping the lie, or lies alive. I believe that lying is the greatest threat to our democracy; and potentially our civilization. Lying creates retaliation, violence, and wars.

On 7/9/2020, an analysis by Zachary B. Wolf was published for CNN asking the question, “Has John Roberts been watching Hamilton?” I watched Hamilton. I saw that he wrote. He took his shot. I have been writing for over ten years. I have presented indisputable facts. The late, splendid Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan once



famously asserted, "Everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but not their own facts." The facts have been denied. The facts I have presented prove the story. Erin Brockovich exposed PE & G with one lawyer who wanted to help. Erin Brockovich provided the facts, she proved, and told her story. It seems that no one wants to hear the truth. Like the child in the story "The Emperor's New Clothes" by Hans Christian Anderson. Hans Christian Anderson wrote another book called "It's perfectly true" Google it. See how the story, or an urban legends can be created.

During a meeting, I attended, a man said "I know there is a God, and I ain't it." That sounds like a true statement; but it's not. From the movie, eat love and pray with Julia Roberts there's a statement that's said, God lives in you as you, and God lives in me as me. Anyone can make up a story. Then, it becomes the veracity of the storyteller; and our willingness to believe the storyteller. We were told stories. Those stories represent a suggested, course of consciousness; and a suggested outline for surviving together. We were eventually given rules that are recognized as our 10 commandments, and our laws are derivatives. It is your collective consciousness to support the law; independent of an individual belief. I pray. Sometimes I pray the serenity prayer written by Reinhold Niebuhr, "God grant me the serenity to accept the things I cannot change; courage to change the things I can; and the wisdom to know the difference. Today I know, I don't know the difference. Today I know if I don't try and speak for myself like Clarence Thomas and Brett Kavanaugh did, I will be the victim of the lies of others; and we may all know, that saying, it only takes one

bad apple to spoil the bunch. Additionally I know that this country, and the world are depending on you.

We see. We all see the news; and today, I am stating facts. I am speaking truth to power. I have suffered retaliated, and discrimination for speaking the truth.

There are only two teams, named, truth, and error. Everyone makes mistakes, some are innocent, and some are intentional. But everyone makes mistakes.

When there are no consequences for the mistakes, there's no reason to change.

The court did not call up the record; so I put enough of it in front of you; attempting to allow you the ability, to avoid making an error.

The difference between a person who can't read, and a person who can read, and doesn't, is nothing.

In the third edition of the book Alcoholics Anonymous, on page 570, there is a quote by Herbert Spencer: "There is a principal which is a bar against all information which is proof against all arguments and which cannot fail to keep a man in everlasting ignorance - that principal is contempt prior to investigation."

Contempt, prior to investigation. That seems to have been the obstacle, contempt. I'm not supposed to tell the truth. I'm not supposed to speak for myself. I'm not a Christian. I'm not honoring the golden rule. I'm not supposed to be here.

Or, it's the preconceived decision that I am not telling the truth, and there is no need to read what I have presented, or, it has been the attempt to protect the system.

On page 96 of my (SB) I testified about lying Christians protecting Jews and the individual interpretations of the law; and what may be considered the highest

good; and the prioritizing them 1 to 10; and that each of us is required to live with our decisions. If those Christians had gotten caught they would've paid a price. That same reality needs to be present today. When individuals lie, they are stealing, they are withholding information from the decision-maker. Given enough time a person may come to think that it's okay to kill. It's just another one of the 10.

On pages 110 & 111, in my (SB) I testified about what the priest had described as our Judeo-Christian values; being the 10 Commandments. I continued explaining that there is a problematic underlying issue that is diametrically opposed between the 2 religions. I'm not supporting Hitler's behavior, or Trumps. I wish Trump would have held true to cleaning the swamp. Instead, he exposed his place in it; and benefits. To succeed by lying, and deceiving others is not Christian.

Within the *Masterpiece Cakeshops, LTD., et al., Petitioner v. Colorado Civil Rights Commission, et al* 138 SCt. 1719 (2018) "The First Amendment protects the right of individuals to hold a point of view differ from the majority and to refuse to foster ... an idea they find morally objectionable." *Wooley v. Maynard*, 430 U.S. 705, 715 (1977). Freedom of speech thus "includes both the right to speak freely and the right to refrain from speaking at all." *Id.* at 714. This right extends "beyond written or spoken words as mediums of expression," *Hurley v. Irish-Am. Gay, Lesbian & Bisexual Grp. Of Bos.*, 515 U.S. 557, 569 (1995), and applies both to individuals and business corporations generally," *Id.* at 574. Its function is to protect "the sphere of intellect and spirit" and "individual freedom of mind" that the first amendment "

reserve[s] from all official control.” *Wooley*, 430 U.S. at 714 -15 (quoting *W. Va. State Bd. of Educ. V. Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624, 642 (1943)).

On page 113 of my (SB) I testified there are others who spoke out, for equity. Who I believe were listening to our father. Other who had the courage to do the right thing in the face of resistance. I have also discovered Wilma P. Mankiller and Eloise Cobell. From her own admission Wilma described herself as an ordinary person who was in a position to do some extraordinary things. I don't know if any of the others thought that they were the sharpest pencil in the box; but I admit I am not. I imagine, all of their actions were all based on their belief. In James, in the King James Bible, 2:17: it is written: “Even so faith, if it has not works, is dead,” I believe it takes works.

This (SCPR) is presented to allow this court the opportunity to make a correct decision by making the words in the Constitution mean what they say; for the benefit of all Americans, and not delay.

This (SCPR) I describe as the cliff notes; to my (CPR). My (CPR) can be described as the abridged version of my (ROP). The (ROP) is only a portion of the story that is contained in the record. Stated above, on the cover page of this document, I wrote, within my (SB) the supporting documentation, or evidence, proves that I have told the truth. I have not had due process. I have not had the equal protection of the law. I have not had justice. The provisional protections guaranteed in the United States Constitution have been decimated. Reading this entire document will prove my statements to be true. Reading this entire document is a statement of fact.

**Additional material  
from this filing is  
available in the  
Clerk's Office.**