

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ILLINOIS - RESPONDENT,

17-2310

v.
MRAZEK - PLAINTIFF,

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION TO RECONSIDER INSTANT

- 1- PLAINTIFF APPROACHES THIS HON. HIGH COURT PRO SE SEEKING GRANT TO FILE ENJOINED MOTION TO RECONSIDER ITS 10-5-20 JUDGMENT.
- 2- PLAINTIFF AS INMATE CARRIES AN ESPECIALLY DIFFICULT BURDEN OF BOTH ACCESSING LEGAL DOCUMENTS + DEMONSTRATING ADEQUATE PERSUASION WHEN, SHERIFFS; S.A.; A.G.; POLICE DEPT.; P.O.D.A. OFFICERS + ILLINOIS SENATOR OVERSEEING ADEQUACY OF OPERATIONS; COURT REPORTER OFFICE(S); JUDICIAL INQUIRY BOARD; A.R.D.C.; CIRCUIT, APPELLATE + STATE SUPREME COURT; EXECUTIVE CLERK OF COURT OPERATIONS; ETHICS + ACCOUNTABILITY COMMISSION; ETC. ARE ONLY ACCESSIBLE THRU SNAIL MAIL CORRESPONDENCE.
- 3- PLAINTIFF SPECIFICALLY DISCLOSED A PLETHORA OF STATE-CREATED IMPEDIMENTS FACTUALLY INTERFERING W/ DUE PROCESS RIGHTS DUE HIM, MATERIALLY SUBSTANTIVE DEMONSTRATING ABSENCE OF ADEQUATE RELIEF OR ANY AVAILABLE CORRECTIVE ACTION IN FURTHERANCE OF BOTH : HIS CLAIMS OF ACTUAL, FACTUAL INNOCENCE + HIS D.A.C. CLAIM.
- 4- PLAINTIFF HUMBLY SEEKS GRACE ACKNOWLEDGING THIS MOST HON. JUSTICE TEAM (& NEWLY CELEBRATED JUSTICE MEMBER (A.C.B.)) AS EMPOWERED TO RAISE SUA SPONTE [ANY] UNNOTICED OR MISAPPLIED, THO NOT AN INTELLIGENTLY-WAIVED STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS DEFENSE OR EXHAUSTION OF STATE COURT REMEDIES IMPLICATING VALUES BEYOND CONCERNS OR PARTIES TOWARD TRUTH + JUSTICE CONSTITUTIONALLY AVAILABLE. WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF PRAYS INSTANT MOTION BE GRANTED.

DATE: 10-19-20

RESPECTFULLY GRATEFUL;

CRAIG MRAZEK

RECEIVED

OCT 28 2020

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PEOPLE OF ILLINOIS - RESPONDENT,
V.

#09-CV-14841

#17-2310

MRAZEK - PLAINTIFF

#125336 ILL. SUP. CT.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

1. PLAINTIFF PROACTIVELY & WITH GREAT CARE FILES INSTANT ACTION UPON THIS HON. HIGH COURT AWAY FROM:

R. #42 (2) "APPEAL";

R. #44 (1) "REHEARING" AS A PAUPER; AND

R. #45 (2) REQUESTING A STAY OF MANDATE,

EXPLICITLY DISCLOSING HIS UNCERTAINTY OF WHETHER THIS HON. HIGH COURT'S 10-5-'20 DENIAL RULING WAS UPON A

1.) MERE [PROCEEDURAL OR RULES] VIOLATION, ALLOWING FOR OPPORTUNITY TO AMEND HIS CAUSE OF ACTION;] OR

2.) IF THE MERITS WERE REACHED AND DISPOSITION OF HIS CASE WAS FULLY GROUNDED IN LAW JUSTIFYING ACTION TO BE VACATED.

2. INSTANT ACTION IS PRESENTED IN GOOD FAITH. EQUALLY PRECEDENTIAL TO ABOVE MATERIAL FACTORS WAS PLAINTIFF'S AND THIS HON. HIGH COURT'S "ACTIONS" CROSSING PATHS JUST ONE DAY APART, LIKELY IN PRISON'S MAIL ROOM. PLAINTIFF WAS FACTUALLY UNAWARE / UNAPPRISED OF S.C.O.T.U.S. RULING OF 10-5-'20, WHEN HE HAD OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE COPIES AND [MAIL OFF] FILE, PURSUANT MAIL BOX RULE #29, HIS MOTIONS TO SUPPLEMENT, & LEAVE TO SUPPLEMENT EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE, JUST NEWLY DISCOVERED. PLAINTIFF FILED HIS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (S) 10-14-'20 [AFFIRMED BY 'HIS' POSTAL MONEY VOUCHER, AUTHENTICATED BY A LT. & A CORRECTIONS OFFICIER'S SIGNATURE, (EXH. #P)]; WHILE TAKING (FIRST) RECEIPT OF COURT'S "DENIAL", 10-15-'20 [AFFIRMED BY A SIMULTANEOUS CORRESPONDENCE OF DR. HAUSER, (EXH. #R)].

3.

THE DOCTRINE OF "DISCOVERY RULE" PROVIDES IN PERTINENT PART, HEREIN, THAT FRAUDULENTLY CONCEALED EXCULPATORY BRADY MATERIAL CAN PROPERLY INVOKE, AS A GATEWAY, FACTUAL PREDICATE CORRECTLY IMPACTING THE JUDGMENT OF A CASE. ALSO, THE RULES OF FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS ARE TO BE LIBERALLY CONSERVED TOWARD A DEFENDANT WHO CAN DEMONSTRATE A MANIFEST WEIGHT OF EVIDENCE REGARDING CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS, EITHER SUBSTANTIVE OR PROCEDURAL.

4.

PLAINTIFF'S SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF WAS FILED BELIEVING NO RULING WAS YET ENTERED BY THIS HON. HIGH COURT. SAID BRIEF DISCLOSED PLAINTIFF'S MULTIPLIED EFFORTS USING VARIOUS INSTRUMENTS INTO SEVERAL AGENCIES TO PROCURE ANY EVIDENCE SUPPORTING HIS (WRONGFUL) CONVICTION; + SPECIFICALLY ANY PORTION OF A POLICE REPORT. NOT UNTIL SEPT. 2020 WAS PLAINTIFF GIVEN 'HIS' POLICE REPORT, + THAT, ONLY IN PART.

5.

THIS REPORT SEEMS PROPERLY ENTERED PURSUANT 725 P.L.C.S. 5/112 A-29, BUT, PRESENTED NEARLY TWENTY 20] DIRECT REASONS TO DISBELIEVE "ALLEGED VICTIM" (A) ACCUSERS, ESTABLISHING REPORT OF TESTIMONIES AS NOT BONA FIDE ALLEGATIONS. SAID DISQUALIFICATIONS OF HEARSAY EVIDENCE' FURTHER SUPPORTS CAUSATION OF CAMPAIGN TOWARD SECRECY OF PUBLIC RECORD DUE AN ACCUSED PARTY; ESPECIALLY EVIL AS OPEN-FILE POLICY + DUTY TO DISCLOSE HAVE CONSTITUTIONAL FOOTING AND PUBLIC BODIES' RESTRAINING ACCESS BECOMES CRIMINAL.

6.

PLAINTIFF PRAYS THIS HON. HIGH COURT WILL RECALL ITS 10-5-'20 JUDGMENT, THEREBY AVOIDING ANY "JUDICIAL" INJURY IN THE IMPAIRMENT OF PLAINTIFF'S LEGAL CLAIM. BECAUSE NEITHER OPPOSING COUNSEL NOR THIS HON. HIGH COURT HAVE PRESENTED ANY EQUITABLE MATTERS OF DISPUTE, PLAINTIFF CANNOT SUFFICIENTLY PREPARE A DEFENSE.

7.

HOLY SPIRIT LIKELY USED THE EVASIVE COURT RECORD OF EXH. *A1, 1+2 TO DIRECT THIS HON. HIGH COURT TO INQUIRE THE EXTENT OF CONSTITUTIONAL WEIGHT IN S.C.T. R. *608(a) VIOLATION AWAY FROM VERBATIM TRANSCRIPTION OF COURT PROCEEDINGS, THO AN EXPLICIT PRONOUNCEMENT WAS MADE BY HON. JUDGE MOORE, 9-14-10 TO:

"DROP THIS CASE IF..." ;

THE RECORD OF APPEAL REMAINS:

"(WHEREUPON, THE COURT GAVE ATTENTION TO OTHER MATTERS ON THE CALENDAR, AFTER WHICH THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HAD:)" ;

UPON ALL 3] ILLINOIS COURTS COMPLICITY TO FORBID A NOTE CHECK AND KEEP PROBATIVE COURT RECORD UNDER "JUDICIAL SEAL", PLAINTIFF DEMONSTRATES A FACTUAL PRIMA FACIE CASE OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE ALSO AS A BRADY VIOLATION BY FRAUDULENTLY CONCEALING THIS OFFER TO DISMISS CHARGES.

8.

PRAGMATICALLY, "EXPRESS REFUSAL TO VIGILANTLY ADVOCATE NOT HAVING THE SINGLE AIM OF ACQUITTAL BY ALL MEANS FAIR & HONEST, ESTABLISHES EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE IS LACKING"; P. V. STODOL, 239 N.E.2d 441 ('68). ABOVE JUDICIAL "OFFER" WOULD SATISFY STRICKLAND'S PREJUDICIAL INQUIRY HURDLE & AFFIRM PLAINTIFF'S D.A.C. CLAIM; AS ALSO PLAINTIFF WAS PROSECUTION-PROOF PURSUANT 720 ILCS 5/3-6(C), RENDERING HIS INDICTMENT VOIDABLE UPON CONSTITUTIONAL GROUNDS AT 725 ILCS 5/114-(a), AS COMPLAINT FILED WAS TIME-BARRERED, 2 1/2 YEARS LATE.

9.

FOR THIS HON. HIGH COURT TO DISAVOW STATE-CREATED IMPEDIMENT OF PLAINTIFF'S "ANALYSIS" OF [POLICE REPORT] SUPPLEMENT WOULD PREJUDICE PLAINTIFF W/ A CONTINUING VIOLATION THAT JUSTIFIABLE RELIEF OF DUE PROCESS RIGHTS VIOLATION REMAINS UNLAWFULLY UNAVAILABLE. PLAINTIFF PRAYS THIS HON. COURT REVERSE 10-5-20 JUDGMENT & ADJUDICATE MERITS PRESENTED.
DATE: 10-19-20 RESPECTFULLY: 
CRAIG MRAZEK