


ORIGINAL

No. 19-8432



IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

DON LAFAMME — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

JEFF LYNCH, WARDEN et al. RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

CALIFORNIA STATE SUPREME COURT
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

DON LAFAMME / C52818
(Your Name)

P.O. BOX 290066
(Address)

REPPESA, CA. 95671
(City, State, Zip Code)

N/A
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

IS THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AMENDMENTS ONE, FOURTH, EIGHTH, FOURTEENTH AND NINETEENTH RIGHTED PROTECTIONS, TOO BEING CONTINUED DICTATED FOR THE TITLE 15, (CCR) CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATION SECTIONS 3400 FAMILIARITY'S SUB-SECTION 5211 FORMER UNDUE FAMILIARITY IN PEOPLE V. DUVALL, (1995) 9 CAL. 4TH 464, 474.

TOO ALLOW FOR THE FIFTH AMENDMENTS CAPULATED BY THE MEN'S STATE PRISON'S OF CALIFORNIA ACTUAL REHABILITATION SERVICE. IN POLICY ROUTINED AS IN FOR 3005 CONDUCT ISSUED AS VIOLATION(S)?

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:

- 1) THE CALIFORNIA ATTORNEY GENERAL;
- 2) THE CALIFORNIA SECRETARY OF STATE;
- 3) THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ATTORNEY GENERAL;
- 4) THE SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES;

RELATED CASES

- 1) FLOOD V. RIGGS, (1978) 80 CAL. 3d 138, 151-157, (145 CAL. RPT. 573).
- 2) IN RE RODRIQUEZ, (1975) 14 CAL. 3d 639.
- 3) COFFIN V. REICHARD, 143 F.2d 443, (6TH CIR. 1944), CERT. DENIED 325 U.S. 887, 65 S. CT. 1568 (1945), (Id., AT 445 (5).)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	7
JURISDICTION.....	8
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	9
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	10
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	15
CONCLUSION.....	15-16

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	MULE CREEK STATE PRISON 115 DISCIPLINARY LOS NO. A-02-16-048 VIOLATION 3005(1) ACT OF ATTEMPTED MURDER DATED 2/10/16.
APPENDIX B	AMADOR COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT CASE NO. 16 CR 25171 SENTENCING FILED MARCH 28, 2018.
APPENDIX C	THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT COURT CASE NO. C086930 UNPUBLISHED DECISION FILED 1/9/ 2020.
APPENDIX D	CALIFORNIA STATE SUPREME COURT CASE NO. S260516 DECISION DENIED FILED APRIL 1, 2020.
APPENDIX E	602 APPEAL LOS NO. PBSP 90-4731 DATED MAY 25, 1990.
APPENDIX F	UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AMENDMENTS ONE, FOURTH, FIFTH, EIGHTH, FOURTEENTH AND NINETEENTH.

PEOPLE V. DUVALL, (1995) 9 CAL. 4TH 464, 474,	2,13
FLOOD V. RIGGS, (1978) 80 CAL. 3d 138, 151-157, (145 CAL. Rptr. 573).	3
IN RE RODRIQUEZ, (1975) 14 CAL. 3d 639.	3
COFFIN V. REICHARD, 143 F.2d 443, (6TH CIR. 1944), CERT. DENIED, 325 U.S. 887, 65 S. CT. 1568 (1945), (Id., AT 445(5).)	3
STONEHAM V. RUSHEN, (1982) 137 CAL. APP. 3d 729, (188 CAL. Rptr. 130), (Id., AT (736)(733))	11,16
SUPERIOR COURT OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY V. ROMERO, (1996) 13 CAL. 4TH 497, 917 P. 2d 628; 53 CAL. Rptr. 2d 789.	11,12
CAROTHERS V. FOLLETTE, 314 F. SUPP. (S.D.N.Y. 1970), (Id., AT 1023-26).	12
GOLDBERG V. KELLEY, 397 U.S. 254, 267, 90 S. CT. 1011, 1020 (1969), (Id., AT (267), (1020).)	12,13
PEOPLE V. SIDENER, (1962) 58 CAL. 2d 645, 375 P. 2d 641; 25 CAL. Rptr. 697, (Id., AT (647), (642), 698).	13
COLEMAN V. WILSON, (E.D. CAL. 1995) 912 F. SUPP. 1282.	15
MOORE V. DEMPSEY, (1923) 261 U.S. 86, 67 L. Ed. 543.	15
MURRAY V. CARRIER, (1986) 477 U.S. 478.	15

CALIFORNIA PENAL CODE

SECTION 667(e)(2)

SECTION 459

11

12

CASES	TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED	PAGE
CALIFORNIA PENAL CODE		
SECTION 136.1(a)(1)		12
SECTION 496		12
TITLE 15, CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATION		
SECTION 3400 SUB-SECT. ^S 5211 ALSO		2
SECTION 5211		2
SECTION 3005 (1)		10
SECTION 3005		2,10,11,12,13,14
SECTION 3005(c)		11

OTHER AUTHORITIES

PEOPLE V. KOPP, S257844 DATED: APRIL 1, 2020:	7
PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA V. RAY WALKER, CASE NO. 33606 KERN COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT SEPTEMBER 22, 1987 SENTENCING PLEA BARGAIN:	11,12

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 D to the petition and is

- ☒ reported at PEOPLE V. KAPP, 5257 844; or,
☒ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT court appears at Appendix C to the petition and is

- ☒ reported at REMITTITUR TO TRIAL COURT; 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 APRIL 1, 2020
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix D.

☐ 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 ONE	2
AMENDMENT FOURTH	2
AMENDMENT EIGHTH	2
AMENDMENT FOURTEENTH	2
AMENDMENT NINETEENTH	2
AMENDMENT FIFTH	2

FEDERAL CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE TWO	13
ARTICLE THREE	13

CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE

SECTION 11350 ALSO COVER-PAGE CITES BELOW 10

CALIFORNIA PROPOSITION 28,

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2, OF 6/5/12 ELECT. 10

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

CAN THE (CDCR) CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION AND REHABILITATIONS
(35) THIRTY-FIVE DIFFERENT MEN'S STATE PRISON(S).
BE RELIED UPON AS AN VOTING EQUALITY ETHIC?
FOR THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA PRESIDENT,
AND THE CALIFORNIA GOVERNOR VOTING PRIMARY
ELECTIONS. SEE CAL. GOV. CODE § 11350 CITE AT CAL.
PROP. 28, REORGN. PN. No. 2 OF JUNE 5, 2012 ELECT?

WHEN ENFORCED FROM INTER-
DEPARTMENTAL 115 DISCIPLINARY JUDGEMENTS FOR
APPENDIX A TITLE 15 CCR § 3005(1) CONDUCT ISSUED
VIOLATIONS. ACTS OF DESCRIPTIONS TITLED TOO
ANY STATE PENAL CODE STATUTE VIOLATION THE MEN
PRISON STAFF DESIRE PRECLUDE OF. FROM THEIR
LOCAL CALIFORNIA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT'S, AND
COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S TO PROSECUTE IN
BEHALF OF. APPENDIX B

IN BEHALF OF THEIR
PRIVILEGE TOO ENFORCE LAW EQUALITY FROM ACTS
OF EACH OTHERS IN PRISON STAFF'S AND PRISONER'S.
IS AN MEN(S) CREATION OF FRAUDULANT VOTING
SCHEME.

IN STATE RULED STONEHAM
V. RUSHEN, (1982) 137 CAL. APP 3d 729, (188 CAL. RPT. 130), SCHEME (736) MEANT TO ENCOURAGE THE
MEN'S STATE PRISON(S) REPOPULATION ETHIC'S. AS
AN TUNNEL VISIONED PREFEXISTING THREATENED
VOTING PROPOSITION. ENTITLED FROM ISSUING
(733) 11.5 DISCIPLINARY'S OF PREFERRED 3005
CONDUCT VIOLATIONS INTENTIONS.....

SUCH AS IN PETITIONER
LAFLAMME'S CASE 3005 CONDUCT VIOLATION, IS AN
UNPROSECUTED CHILD KILLER RAY WALKER/CHIOIZ
ASSIGNED UNDER 3005(C) CONDUCT, AS AN CELMATE
TO PETITIONER. FROM WHICH WALKER ENJOYED
TALKING ALSO FELLOW MEN PRISONER'S. AND
PRISON STAFF WOMEN INCLUDING MENTAL HEALTH
STAFF.

FOR ANY REASONINGS AS
TOO NOT BEING CHARGED. INSTEAD OF ALLOWED
THE DISCRETION PRIVILEGES IN CALIFORNIA
PENAL CODE SECTION 667(e)(2), ALSO SEE SUPERIOR
COURT OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY V. ROMERO, (1996) 13 CAL.
4TH 497; 917 P.2d 628; 53 CAL. RPT. 2d 789.

INSTEAD OF AS BEING
HELD IN PRISON TERM SENTENCE OF THE (3)THREE
STRIKES LAW, MANDATORY 25 YEARS TO LIFE

THREATENING, TO PASS UPON THE SAME REINS,
OF THE KERN COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT'S
DISCRETIONARY SENTENCING IN CASE NO. 33606
SEPTEMBER 22, 1987. IN ACCEPTING AN GUILTY
PLEA BARGAN OF CAL. P.C. §§ 459 1ST DEGREE
ENTERING AN HABITATION (3 COUNTS), 136.1(a)(1)
AND 496: (ROMERO (1996) SUPRA.)

TOO BEING ALLOWED THEIR
KERN COUNTY'S POLICY ROUTINE OF (3) THREE
MEN'S STATE PRISONS, TO INCORPORATE ETHICAL
REHABILITATION EXCUSES FOR REPOPULATING
BETWEEN INTER-DEPARTMENTAL COUNT-TIMES,
ALREADY POLICY ROUTINED IN MEN PRISONER'S
DISCIPLINARY'S PREEXISTING PRIVILEGED, IN
AS PETITIONER SUBJECTS FOR ANY 3005 CONDUCT
VIOLATIVE CHARGES OF RESPONDENT'S THREAT
MEANS. SEE CAROTHERS V. FOLLETTE, 314 F. SUPP. (S.D.
N.Y. 1970), (Id., AT 1023-26)

SUCH ETHIC'S AT APPENDIX
C HAS ALSO BEEN USED TO APPEAR PREVAILING, IN
THREATENING THE DUAL FAMILY'S OWNED
WINEARY PROPERTY SALES. GOLDBERG V. KELLEY,
397 U.S. 254, 267, 90 S. CT. 1011, 1020 (1969) HOLDS, AN
CASE INVOLVING PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS
A STATE MUST FOLLOW TO TERMINATE WELFARE
12 OF 16 STATEMENT OF THE CASE

AID: DOES NOT INCLUDE THE DUVAL FAMILY'S
DUE PROCESS AS THE STATES TO SUPPLEMENT
WITH AS AN INSTITUTIONAL SECURITY, (267),
(1020)

TOO BUILD AN MEN'S
SALANO STATE PRISON IN 1984 AT VACAVILLE,
CALIFORNIA. SEE PEOPLE V. DUVAL, (1995) 9 CAL. 4TH
464, 474 FOR THE (3) THREE POWER RETAINS OF 3005
CONDUCT VIOLATIONS. HELD AND ENFORCED BY
MEN'S STATE PRISON'S OF CALIFORNIA. SEE PEOPLE
V. SIDENER, (1962) 58 CAL. 2d 645; 375 P. 2d 641; 25
CAL. RPT. 697, (Id., AT (647), (642), (698))

THAT IN SIDENER ALL
THREE POWERS NAMELY LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE
AND JUDICIAL, MUST NOT BE HELD BY ONE POWERS
CLAIM OF IMMUNITY EQUALING THE ELECTED
PRESIDENT'S OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.
NEITHER IS THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION
ARTICLE II TO BEING READ ARTICLE III WHICH
STATES: THE POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT DONALD
TRUMP SHOULD SUFFICE HIS SEATED ELECTED
OFFICE.

NOT TOO BEING AS APPEARS
CRITIZED FROM PEACE OFFERING VOTER'S, FROM
THE MEN'S SHIFT-CHANGING (35) DIFFERENT STATE
13 OF 16 STATEMENT OF THE CASE

PRISON'S OF CALIFORNIA PEACE OFFICER'S.
CLAIMING INTER-CITIZENARY JUDGEMENTS
DISTURBUTIONING 3005 CONDUCT PROSECUTIONS,
(AS PRESIDENT MR. TRUMP'S PROBLEM TO ANSWER
TOO?) APPENDIX D 1/

1/ APPENDIX E P. 5 REVEALS THE FORMER UNITED
STATES PRESIDENT RONALD W. REAGAN ADMINISTRATIONS
RELATIONAL FAVORITISM ETHIC'S. FOR HIS NEPHEW
JACK REAGAN'S, CHIEF INMATE APPEALS BRANCH
POSITION. FOR ALL CALIFORNIA STATE PRISON'S
WOMEN/MEN 602 APPEALS INTER-DEPARTMENTAL
GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE. ID.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

CALIFORNIA'S DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION AND REHABILITATIONS IS NOT ANY SPECIALIZED NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL, OR AGENCY THEREOF, ALLOWED TO DICTATE TOO THE CITIZENARY OF CALIFORNIA OR UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. AS TO WHOM IS TOO BEING VOTED FOR AN ELECTED OFFICE. (AS AFOREMENTIONED PETITION PAGES PROPOSES?)

AND TAUNTONING WITH THE FORMER ELECTED CALIFORNIA GOVERNOR PETE WILSON'S DECISION. IN COLEMAN V. WILSON, (E.D. CAL. 1995) 912 F. SUPP. 1282 HOLDS, THE ENTIRE STATE OF VOTING CALIFORNIAN'S PRISON SYSTEM IS CONSTITUTIONALLY MENTAL HEALTH INADEQUATE. *Id.*

THAT THIS UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT WITH FORMER JUSTICE(S) INTEGRITY OF PROSECUTIONS. MUST ALSO HOLD TO THE LIBERTY INTEREST HELD IN JUSTICE BLACK'S OPINION IN MOORE V. DEMPSEY, (1923) 261 U.S. 86, 67 L. Ed. 543. ALSO HELD IN MURRAY V. CARRIER, (1986) 477 U.S. 478. NOW IS THE VOTING CITIZEN'S OF CALIFORNIA. AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICAN'S. 2/ CONCLUSION

CERTIORARI RELIEF IS DUE! GRANTED

15 OF 16 REASONS FOR GRANTING PETN.
CONCLUSION

DATED: APRIL 23, 2020

S/C

DON LAFLAMME IN-PRO-PR
PETITIONER

DECLARATION

I, DON LAFLAMME,
PETITIONER IN THIS MATTER, DO HEREBY
DECLARE ALL THE FORESAID TO BE TRUE AND
CORRECT, TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE.

DATED: APRIL 23, 2020

S/C

DECLARANT

2/TAKE NOTICE AT APPENDIX E PAGE 5 REVEALS
THE FORMER PRESIDENT RONALD W. REAGAN ELECTION.
INTO THE WASHINGTON, DC WHITE HOUSE OFFICE.

ALSO PROMULGATED HIS NEPHEW JACK REAGAN,
CHIEF INMATE APPEAL'S BRANCH OF THE SACRAMENTO,
CALIFORNIA MAIN (CDCR) OFFICE. WAS PROVIDING
THE PETITIONER'S FINAL CALIFORNIA MEN'S
PRISON'S INTER-DEPARTMENTAL 602 APPEAL DECISION.
TO DENY THE BOARD OF PRISON TERMS PRIOR
RECOMMENDATIONS, AFTER AN 115 DISCIPLINARY
ISSUEANCE (733) JUDGEMENT (736).

16 OF 16 CONCLUSION/DECLARATION