


No. 19-8533 ORIGINAL



IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mike Lajeunesse — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

____ — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

COA 8

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


PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Michael A. Lajeunesse
(Your Name)

406 N. High St.
(Address)

Anamosa, IA 52205-0010
(City, State, Zip Code)

(319) 462-3504
(Phone Number)



QUESTIONS TO BE PRESENTED FOR REVIEW:

1. WHETHER OR NOT I CAN PETITION THE COURT FOR RELIEF AND OR AN INJUNCTION UNDER OUR CIVIL RIGHTS STATUTE TITLE 42 USCS § 1983, 1985, OR 1986 WHEN THE PROSECUTOR, COUNTY MEDICAL EXAMINER, AND MY DEFENSE ATTORNEY CONSPIRED TOGETHER THROUGH THE 'USE OF PERJURY AS A [W]EAPON' **WHERE** THEY HAD PURPOSEFULLY WITHHELD "EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE" BY FAILING TO ADMIT THE SAID **EVIDENCE** AS AN EXHIBIT?

2. IS THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND IT'S AMENDMENTS A CONTRACT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT AND THE PEOPLE CAPABLE OF BEING INFORCED THROUGH EQUITY AND LAW -- AND/OR THROUGH A BREACH OF CONTRACT "**RIGHTS?**"

3. HOW COME I COULDN'T HAVE TOOKEN JUDICIAL NOTICE OF MY STATE-COURT PROCEEDINGS WHERE THE JUDGE WENT AGAINST THE LAW DOCTRINE OF RES JUDICATA AND ISSUE PRECLUSION IMMEDIATELY IN THE FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT CALIMING THAT MY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS WERE VIOLATED AND WHERE I REPEADELY PETITIONED THE SUPREME COURT FOR RELIEF?

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
0. Chambers v Mississippi, 410 US 284 (1973)	Page(s) 300-01
1. Polk County v Dodson, 454 US 312 (1981)	Entire case
2. Tower v Glover, 467 US 914 (1984)	Color of Law
3. Dennis v Sparks , 449 US 24, 66 L.Ed.2d 185, 187, 101 S.Ct. 183 (1980)	Page 187
4. Heck, 512 US 477, 114 S.Ct. 2364, 129 L.Ed.2d 383 (1994)	False testimony
5. Mooney v Holohan , 294 US 103 (1935)	Page 112
6. Naupue v Illinious, 360 US 264 (1959)	Page 269
7. Brady v Maryland, 373 US 83 (1963)	Exculpatory
8. Gilio v United States, 405 US 150 (1972)	Page(s) 154-55
9. Cone v Bell, 556 US 449 (2009)	Page 476

STATUTES AND RULES

- 10. 18 USCS § 241 and 242
- 11. 28 USCS § 1343
- 13. 28 USCS § 1361 TAKING JUDICIAL NOTICE OF STATE COURT PROC.

OTHER

- 12. 28 USCS 2254(b)(1)(B)(ii)
- 13. Lambert v Polk County, Iowa, 723 F.Supp. 128 (S.D.Iowa 1989)

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. United States District Court for the Southern/Central Division of Iowa's Agency No. 4:18-cv-00348-RP-RAW;

2. United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit in ST. Louis, MO No. **19-3358**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	5
CONCLUSION.....	6

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

APPENDIX B

THE DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN CENTRAL DIVISION OF IOWA

APPENDIX C

SECTION A.1 AND SECTIONS B.1 ARE INCLUDED IN ASSISTING THE COURT
APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

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 A 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 B 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 _____ 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**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was Jan. 21, 2020.

☐ 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: Feb. 24, 2020, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix 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

28 U.S.C.S § 1343 gave the district court for Iowa jurisdiction to hear my case about the PCR-court's decision to dismiss my case.

Iowa Code § 822.7 Court to hear application gives the same Court authorization to GRANT relief where mistakes can be corrected directly back in the same district -- easily and more better because it is the same District Court hearing the Application where the conviction originally took place (2011).

Under equity I was entitled to relief based on the Law of the Doctrine of the Case; Issue Preclusion and Res Judicata?

However, the Court decided that they were going to ignore their own statutory law provisions and Federal Precedent by dismissing my PCR-action?

My Case was cut and dry and I needed that decision to move forward in my Legal Battles against the State.

The Process . . .

JUDICIAL NOTICE WAS REQUESTED MOVING FORWARD WITH MY LEGAL ARGUMENTS.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

I WAS CONVICTED BY A JURY OF MY PEERS ON FEB. 8, 2017, IN POLK COUNTY, IOWA (**FECR299756**).

MY APPEAL FOLLOWED CHALLENGING THE SUFFICIENCY OF THE EVIDENCE AND NUMEROUS IAC CLAIM(S) AS WELL AS CONSTITUTIONAL CLAIM(S) STEMMING FROM WHAT WENT ON IN THE COURTROOM THE DAYS OF MY TRIAL (STATE V LAJEUNESSE, **913 NW2D 275** (CT. APP. 2018): SUP. CT. NO. 17-0507

POSTCONVICTION WAS FILED BACK IN THE DISTRICT COURT UNDER PCCE082903.

DIRECTLY AFTER THE COURT DISMISSED MY PCR-ACTION I FILED FOR RELIEF FROM A JUDGEMNT IN THE IOWA DISTRICT COURT ASKING FOR "THAT COURT" TO TAKE JUDICIAL NOTICE OF THE STATE - COURT'S DECISION DENYING ME RELIEF BY STATING THAT 'THE USE OF WEAPONS OR **NOT** WAS NOT APART OF THE ELEMENTS THAT THE STATE WAS OBLIGATED TO PROVE?'

INJUNCTION WAS REQUESTED TOGETHER WITH PERMISSION TO ADD NEW DEFENDANTS BASED ON THE ADJUDICATION OF THE STATE COURT'S DECISION DISMISSING MY ACTION, AND, WHEREFORE, USING THE COURT TO MY ADVANTAGE ARGUING THAT MY OWN DEFENSE ATTORNEY, THE POLK COUNTY MEDICAL EXAMINER, MEGAN CHAMBERS, AND THOMAS H. MILLERAT-0005416 CONSPIRED TOGETHER WITHHOLDING EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE FROM MY PEERS IN VIOLATION OF OUR CIVIL RIGHTS CHAPTER SECTION 1986

THE DISTRICT COURT DENIED MY REQUEST AND IGNORED MY INJUNCTION AND PERMISSION TO ADD NEW DEFENDANTS.

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT IGNORED CASELAW AND PRECEDENT SUMMARILY AFFIRMING THEIR COLLUGES DECISION DISMISSING MY CLAIMS.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

THE REASON I FEEL THIS WRIT SHOULD BE GRANTED IS BECAUSE I SHOULDN'T [O]NLY HAVE A ONE PERCENT CHANCE TO HAVE MY CASE GRANTED BY THE HIGHEST COURT IN THE LAND WHERE I AM THE ONE TELLING THE TRUTH ABOUT MY DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SITUATION THAT WAS BLOWN WAY OUT OF PROPORTION BY THE PUBLIC OFFICIAL(S) INVOLVED AND WHERE MY OWN DEFENSE ATTORNEY SUPPRESSED THE MEDICAL RECORDS THAT WOULD HAVE COMPLETELY EXONERATED ME OF TRYING TO KILL MY GIRLFRIEND WITH A SHOWER CURTAIN.

THE JURY ARE THE FACT-FINDERS AND THEY WERE SUPPOSE TO SEE ALL OF THE EVIDENCE.

THE DISTRICT COURT IN IOWA FAILED TO ADDRESS MY ISSUES AND HOLD THE LAW IN PLACE -- EVEN THOUGH THEY WERE PROBABLY DISGUSTED WITH ME ... HOWEVER, I AM JUST USING THE LAW IN MY FAVOR AND TRYING TO GET THE RIGHT PUNISHMENT FOR MY INVOLVMENT WITH MEGAN -- NOT 17 AND A HALF YEARS FOR SOMETHING I DID NOT DO!

THEY ALL SUPPRESSED THE EVIDENCE AND KNEW THAT MEGAN WAS LYING ABOUT ME TRYING TO KILL HER.

I CAN NOT BELIEVE THEY HAD ME UP ON THE STAND TESTIFYING WHEN THEY ALL KNEW THAT MEGAN WAS LYING?

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Alexander Lajeunesse

Date: **MARCH 25, 2020**

Yours Truly and sorry if I was...