

Supreme Court of the United State

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

Mr. Emmanuel Adeyinka
~~10011 Richmond Avenue 18~~

~~Houston, TX 77042~~

P.O. Box 8131

Portland, OR, 97207

No. 19-35772 Emmanuel Adeyinka v. BRADY BARRS; et al.,
USDC No. 3:19-CV-00943-YY

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINE CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI


Signature:

Questions Presented for Review

In The opinion of the united state district court for the southern district of Texas Houston division memorandum opinion and appear in Appendix C (Docket Entry No. H-18-2782, 1) was DISMISSED with prejudice under 28 U.S.C 1915 (e) (2) for failure to state an actionable Claim. In These Cases Emmanuel Adeyinka is WARNED that he may face sanctions, including monetary penalties and restrictions on his ability to file lawsuit, if he continues to files meritless lawsuits in federal courts Case. Can Emmanuel Adeyinka Inherent right to prepare and present petition See in United State v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542,552(1876), wish is against the law violates the establishment clause of the first amendment. Redress No. 18-20589 the United State Fifth Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals dismissed these cases for failure to pay court fee. Entered on August 15, 2018 Lord Denning In McCarthy's Ltd V Smith [1979], If the time should come when our Parliament deliberately passes an Act

; [Note:] these Announced clauses in cases action. Civil Action No. 18-3696 In Appendix D submitted pursuant to the third circuit LAR 34.1(a) December 23, 2019 (Opinion filed: January 7, 2020) , District Court's ruling that such a claim is not cognizable because his convictions for indecent exposure have not been vacated, or its ruling that a claim based on charges that were withdrawn in 2009 are time-barred. The state court dockets reflect that partial expungement orders have been issued in Adeyinka's criminal cases since he filed his brief, but there is no indication that these orders affect these rulings

With the intention of repudiating the Treaty or any provision in it or intentionally Of acting inconsistently with it – and says so in express

terms – thenit would Be the duty of our courts to follow the statue of our Parliament.”

Memorandum opinion and that appear in Appendix A Civil Action No. 18-20588 and his Cross-Exam was dismissed in Appendix- B Civil Action No. 19-35772 as frivolous See 28 U.S.C 1915. In Rogers court held that due process prohibits retroactive application in Bouie v. City of Columbia, 378 U.S. 347(1964) is it a intentional tort case were fail to train is the question altering the definition of crimes with Brady Barra Ms. Armstrong Mr. Pearson C. Aquilera question the neglected the administrative law, and alter the definition of crimes the board of parole under the Connick v. Thompson, 2011 1983 liability failure-to-train a plaintiff must demonstrate a pattern of prior constitutional violations of a similar nature before liability can attach under this theory.

If it were to apply to judicial repeal of the year and a day is neither unexpected nor indefensible by the reference to the law prior to the conduct in issue. Calder v. Bull, 3 U.S. (3Dall.)386(1798). These is clearest proof of punitive effect. Ex post fact clause if there is no fact done by Bull and wife. Is it valid or invalid? The administrative law Texas doesn't have Jurisdiction to determine the laws in Philadelphia Pa Judicial System of Pennsylvania docket number MC-51-CR-0002986 and Docket number MC-51-CR-0002987?

State legislature, contrary to the constitution of Philadelphia pa State is invalid. R v. Ndhlovu, 2016 ABQB 595 the Main question for justice Moen was whether that interference was arbitrary overbroad, or grossly.

On theory if non-punitive see *In Campbell v. Clinton* 203 F.3d 19(D.C. Cir.2000). Donald Trump – Russia Investigation, Did Russia really hack Hillary Clinton email? Or is it how well Trump hiding Hillary oral encounter with Barack Obama and their social trap? Have Trump hiding the oral encounter with Hillary? See *In falsus in Uno, falsus in omnibus - false in one thing, false in everything* *Enyng Li v. Holder*, 738 F.3d 1160 (9th Cir. 2013) In 2006 Case of Harris County Emmanuel Adeyinka vs. Harris County Case # 1522647 , lack of probable cause , by a time service traffic ticket Emmanuel Adeyinka allegation of why the officer search and arrested Emmanuel Adeyinka , before the allegation of Retaliation on account a on private citizen. The opinion of the United State Third Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals Memorandum opinion and appear in Appendix D Civil Action No. 18-3696 , A allegation Assumption comment being review as malicious prosecution claim. Fails to state a plausible constitutional claim based on those conditions in his complaint, and from the cross exam view not under Emmanuel Adeyinka peer eye opinion of the United State Third Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals Memorandum opinion and appear in Appendix D Civil Action No. 18-3696, By failing to identify any error in district court's analysis, it is the same as if Adeyinka had notAppealed the dismissal of his complaint as frivolous. See *Brinkmann v. Dallas cty . Deputy Sheriff Abner* 813 F.2d 744,748 (5th Cir.1987). The appeal therefore lack arguable merit and is Frivolous. ?

Did Donald Trump have oral encounter with Hillary? Did Trump and Obama hill Hillary her vengeance to get back at Bill Clinton, But have they violates the establishment clause of the first amendment? Is these non-punitive?

List of Part

Brady Barra

Ms. Armstrong

Mr. Pearson

C. Aquilera

State Of Texas

First Judicial District of Pennsylvania Court

Flow misara

Texas Department of Justice

Appendix to the petition for a writ of certiorari

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Question Presented for review.....	1
List of Parties	2
Table of content	3
Table of Authorities	4
Opinions below	5
Jurisdiction	6
Statutory provisions involved	7
Statement	8
Reasons for granting the petition	9
Conclusion	10
Appendix B — the opinion of the United State Ninth Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals	
 Memorandum Opinion and Order.....	11

Table of Authorities

Smith v. Doe (2003)

Frank v. Mangum, 237 U.S. 309, 344 (1915)

Ross v. Oregon, 227 U.S. 150, 161 (1913).

Bouie v. City of Columbia, 378 U.S. 347 (1964)

Ginzburg v. United States, 383 U.S. 463 (1966).

Stogner v. California,

Dobbert v. Florida,

Gibson v. Mississippi, 162 U.S. 565, 590 (1896).

Gut v. Minnesota, 76 U.S. (9 Wall.) 35, 37 (1870).

Duncan v. Missouri, 152 U.S. 377 (1894).

Mallett v. North Carolina, 181 U.S. 589, 593 (1901).

Gibson v. Mississippi, 162 U.S. 565, 588 (1896).

Beazell v. Ohio, 269 U.S. 167 (1925).

Thompson v. Missouri, 171 U.S. 380, 381 (1898).

Duncan v. Missouri, 152 U.S. 377, 382–383 (1894);

Malloy v. South Carolina, 237 U.S. 180, 183 (1915);

Beazell v. Ohio, 269 U.S. 167, 171 (1925).

Thompson v. Utah, 170 U.S. 343 (1898)

Proffitt v. Florida, 428 U.S. 242 (1976). 432 U.S. at 297.

Jaehne v. New York, 128 U.S. 189, 194 (1888).

Rooney v. North Dakota, 196 U.S. 319, 325 (1905).

Chicago & Alton R.R. v. Tranbarger, 238 U.S. 67 (1915).

Samuels v. McCurdy, 267 U.S. 188 (1925).

Hawker v. New York, 170 U.S. 189, 190 (1898).

Reetz v. Michigan, 188 U.S. 505, 509 (1903);

Lehmann v. State Board of Public Accountancy, 263 U.S. 394 (1923).

De Veau v. Braisted, 363 U.S. 144, 160 (1960).

Cummings v. Missouri, 71 U.S. (4 Wall.) 277, 316 (1867).

Pierce v. Carskadon, 83 U.S. (16 Wall.) 234 (1873).

Lindsey v. Washington, 301 U.S. 397 (1937).

Dobbert v. Florida, 432 U.S. 282, 298–301 (1977).

Holden v. Minnesota, 137 U.S. 483, 491 (1890).

Medley, Petitioner, 134 U.S. 160, 171 (1890).

Miller v. Florida, 482 U.S. 423 (1987). *But see*

California Dep’t of Corrections v. Morales, 514 U.S. 499 (1995)

Splawn v. California, 431 U.S. 595 (1977)

Marks v. United States, 430 U.S. 188 (1977)

Collins v. Youngblood, 497 U.S. 37, 42 (1990)

Beazell v. Ohio, 269 U.S. 167, 169–170 (1925)).

Watson v. Mercer, 33 U.S. (8 Pet.) 88, 110 (1834);

Carmell v. Texas, 529 U.S. 513, 522 (2000).

Baltimore and Susquehanna R.R. v. Nesbit, 51 U.S. (10 How.) 395, 401 (1850);

Carpenter v. Pennsylvania, 58 U.S. (17 How.) 456, 463 (1855);

Loche v. New Orleans, 71 U.S. (4 Wall.) 172 (1867);

Orr v. Gilman, 183 U.S. 278, 285 (1902);

Kentucky Union Co. v. Kentucky, 219 U.S. 140 (1911).

Eastern Enterprises v. Apfel, 524 U.S. 498, 538 (1998)

Calder v. Bull,

Bowen v. Georgetown University Hospital.¹³

Bouie v. City of Columbia,

Rogers v. Tennessee,

Stogner v. California,

Republic of Austria v. Altmann, James Bamford and

Samuels v. McCurdy.

Edgar v. MITE Corp., 457 U.S. 624 (1982),

Sullivan v. United States, 990 A.2d 477 (D.C. 2010)

Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803),

Pennsylvania v. Nelson, 350 U.S. 497 (1956)

Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U.S. 1 (1958)

Steury v. Cardinal Health, Inc., 625 F.3d 262, 267 (5th Cir. 2010);

Kansas v. Hendricks

Martin v. Hunter's Lessee, 14 U.S. 304 (1816),

Ware v. Hylton, 3 U.S. (3 Dall.) 199 (1796),

Cohens v. Virginia, 19 U.S. 264 (1821),

Ableman v. Booth, 62 U.S. 506 (1859)

Brandy v. Maryland 373 U.S. 83

United State v. Burgin, 621 F.2d 1352, 1356 (5th Cir.)

United State v. Conover, 772 F.2d 765 (11th Cir. 1985), aff'd sub. nom. section 371

United State v. Gallup, 812 F.2d 1271, 1276 (10th Cir. 1987)

Furman v. Georgia, 408 U.S. 238 (1972)

Missouri v. Holland, 252 U.S. 416,

Commonwealth Edison Co. v. Montana, 453 U.S. 609 (1981),

California v. ARC America Corp., 490 U.S. 93 (1989),

Crosby v. National Foreign Trade Council, 530 U.S. 363 (2000),

Gryger v. Burke, 334 U.S. 728 (1948);

McDonald v. Massachusetts, 180 U.S. 311 (1901);

Graham v. West Virginia, 224 U.S. 616 (1912).

Malloy v. South Carolina, 237 U.S. 180 (1915).

Rooney v. North Dakota, 196 U.S. 319, 324 (1905).

Johnson v. Buttress HCA 41, (1936)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

OPINION BELOW

The opinion of the United State Ninth Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals

Memorandum opinion and appear in Appendix; B Civil Action No. 19-35772

Before: The Honorable Wallace, Canby and Tashima

JURISDICTION

In Appendix; B -The district court certified that this appeal is frivolous and revoked appellants in forma pauperis status. See 28 U.S.C. 1915(a). On September 24, 2019 the court ordered appellant To explain in writing why this appeal should not be dismissed as frivolous See 28 U.S.C 1915(e) (2) (court shall dismiss case at anytime, if court determine it is frivolous or malicious Upon a review of the record, the response to court's September 24, 2019 order, and the opening Brief received on November 26, 2019, we conclude this appeal is frivolous. We therefore deny Appellant's motion to proceed in forma pauperis (Docket Entry Nos.7&8) and dismiss this appeal as Frivolous, pursuant to 28 U.S.C 1915(e)(2). Appendix B

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

In 2008 Philadelphia Pa Judicial System of Pennsylvania docket number MC-51-CR-0002986 and Docket number MC-51-CR-0002987. Emmanuel Adeyinka Vs Commonwealth plead guilty for 2 class B Misdemeanors 18 § 3127 §§ A M2 Indecent Exposure witness was Adult all charge was Withdrawn and 18 § 2705 Recklessly Endangering another Person Withdrawn, In Philadelphia Pa jurisdiction Emmanuel Adeyinka and apart of his court order (is not to register as a sex offender) or label as a sex predator upon the plead in 2008. In 20016 Case of Harris County Emmanuel Adeyinka vs. Harris County Case # 1522647 Emmanuel Adeyinka Plead Guilty 2 year probation for Retaliation on account Chapter 62 of criminal procedure doesn't apply to Emmanuel Adeyinka specify in record Harris County Courts record page 18. Emmanuel violated probation reason no Job Emmanuel Adeyinka did eight months TDCJ was Parole in March of 2018 and currently appealing the case. Board of parole place **M condition upon his completion, mean will have to register** as a sex offender and take treatment course.

Emmanuel Adeyinka has two CLASS B that are Adjudicated not two conviction but two counts In the state of Philadelphia, PA in 2008, with Pa Judicial System of Pennsylvania docket number MC-51-CR-0002986. And Docket number MC-51-CR-0002987 Basic on the final decision of the court result Emmanuel Adeyinka doesn't and will not have to register on future occurrence for the case in Philadelphia Pa Judicial System of Pennsylvania docket number MC-51-CR-0002986, And Docket number MC-51-CR-0002987. **Jurisdiction power is the questions here separate power by the states.** In 2016 in Houston judicial system Case of Harris County Emmanuel Adeyinka vs. Harris County Case # 1522647 Emmanuel Adeyinka Plead Guilty 2 year probation for Retaliation on account a on private citizen, In the case filed Chapter 62 of criminal procedure doesn't apply to Emmanuel Adeyinka in Show In record of Harris County Courts record page 18. Emmanuel violated probation reason no Job, Emmanuel Adeyinka has did eight months TDCJ was Parole in March of 2018 and currently has appeal the case. **He was focus to register with Texas sex offender registration program.**

Statutory Provisions Involved

Amendment 1 *- Freedom of Religion, Speech, and the Press*

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

Article I

Article I describes the design of the legislative branch of US Government -- the Congress. Important ideas include the separation of powers between branches of government (checks and balances), the election of Senators and Representatives, and the process by which laws are made, and the powers that Congress has

Section 9.

The migration or importation of such persons as any of the states now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a tax or duty may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each person.

The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it.

No bill of attainder or ex post facto Law shall be passed.

No bill of attainder or ex post facto Law shall be passed.

No capitation, or other direct, tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census or enumeration herein before directed to be taken.

No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any state.

No preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one state over those of another: nor shall vessels bound to, or from, one state, be obliged to enter, clear or pay duties in another.

No money shall be drawn from the treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States: and no person holding any office of profit or trust under them, shall, without the consent of the Congress, accept of any present, emolument, office, or title, of any kind whatever, from any king, prince, or foreign state.

Article I

Section 10.

No state shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation; grant letters of marque and reprisal; coin money; emit bills of credit; make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts; pass any bill of attainder, ex post facto law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts, or grant any title of nobility.

No state shall, without the consent of the Congress, lay any imposts or duties on imports or exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection laws: and the net produce of all duties and imposts, laid by any state on imports or exports, shall be for the use of the treasury of the United States; and all such laws shall be subject to the revision and control of the Congress.

No state shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any duty of tonnage, keep troops, or ships of war in time of peace, enter into any agreement or compact with another state, or with a foreign power, or engage in war, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay.

Why is an ex post facto law illegal?

Ex post facto law, law that retroactively makes criminal conduct that was not criminal when performed, increases the punishment for crimes already committed, or changes the rules of procedure in force at the time an alleged crime was committed in a way substantially disadvantageous to the accused.

The Meaning

Article I, Section 9 specifically prohibit Congress from legislating in certain areas. In the first clause, the **Constitution** bars Congress from banning the importation of slaves before 1808. In the second and third clauses, the **Constitution** specifically guarantees rights to those accused of crimes.

The Meaning

Article I, Section 10, limit the power of the states. States may not enter into a treaty with a foreign nation; that power is given to the president, with the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senate present. States cannot make their own money, nor can they grant any title of nobility.

Reasons for granting the petition

To avoid erroneous deprivation of right to counsel , this Court should clarify the "initiation " Standard under *ex post facto* law .

Ms. Armstrong is Emmanuel Adeyinka parole offices parole sign to Emmanuel Adeyinka basic on his release from Huntsville penitentiary march of 2018 he was required to report to her the next counter day of his release. When reporting to her Ms. Armstrong she shows him some paper work with incorrect information, Emmanuel Adeyinka told Ms. Armstrong that's incorrect information about that case in Philadelphia PA. See in United States ex rel. Steury v. Cardinal Health, Inc., 625f.3d 262,267(5th Cir.2010); ", Martin v. Hunter's Lessee, 14 U.S. 304 (1816), also See. In In Ware v. Hylton, 3 U.S. (3 Dall.) 199 (1796), The parole office Ms. Armstrong misrepresentation neglected the law show no understanding of the withdrawing charge, Emmanuel Adeyinka that current and accurate information and the wrong procedure , wish is a *ex post fact clause*. the cases in Philadelphia Pa in 2008 , Emmanuel Adeyinka is not require to register Emmanuel Adeyinka is not court order or on the Megan law case load, those are final result of the case in 2008 held in Judicial System of Pennsylvania docket number MC-51-CR-0002986 And Docket number MC-51-CR-0002987 ("Megan's law "); See. In Cohens v. Virginia, 19 U.S. 264 (1821), See. In Ableman v. Booth, 62 U.S. 506 (1859) Emmanuel Adeyinka was forced also take a polygraph , See In *Calder v. Bull* also see In the Court ruled in *Stogner v. California*,⁵⁷ is prohibited as *ex post facto*. Courts that had upheld extension of unexpired statutes of limitation had been careful to distinguish situations in which the limitations periods have expired. Wish in 2008 in Judicial System of Pennsylvania docket number MC-51-CR-0002986 And Docket number MC-51-CR-0002987 registration of the Megan Law wasn't not recommended or requirement in Philadelphia Pa Judicial System of Pennsylvania docket number MC-51-CR-0002986 And Docket number MC-51-CR-0002987 , Is these unconstitutional In 2008 were the case take place at Judicial System of Pennsylvania docket number MC-51-CR-0002986 And Docket number MC-51-CR-0002987 registration of the Megan Law wasn't not recommended or requirement Emmanuel Adeyinka register, Emmanuel Adeyinka argue enlargement judicial Appendix; A Civil Action No. 18-20588 Appendix; B Civil Action No. 19-35772 Appendix; C Civil Action No. H-18-2782, 18-20589 The State of Texas and Ms. Armstrong, and Brady Berra , Mr. Pearson , C. Aguilera , Texas Department of Justice. Philadelphia Pa Judicial System of Pennsylvania granted Emmanuel Adeyinka effective amnesty *in within his agreement of the state constitution law 2008 and 2009* Texas inflict more punishment unforeseeable judicial enlargement. Emmanuel Adeyinka a spoke to Broad of Parole and his Parole officer why they force him to participate in treatment and force him upon the sex offender case load. See in *Stogner v. California* ⁵⁷ is prohibited and against the law as *ex post facto*; the case expires in 2009 under Philadelphia Pa constitutional state Law when the statute of limitation is encompass is unexpired statutes of limitation conduct not covered on the face of the statute increase the burden on Emmanuel Adeyinka wish is enacted after expiration of a

previously applicable statute of limitations period [as] applied to revive a previously time-barred prosecution." See In *Calder v. Bull* was not, by law, liable to any punishment"; and the other were laws that inflict greater punishment than was authorized.

Also see in *Calder v. Bull*, 3 U.S. (3Dall.)386(1798) Third, the Supreme Court Said that. No man should be compelled to do what the laws do not require.

See In *Brandy v. Maryland* 373 U.S. 83

Emmanuel Adeyinka spoke with Armstrong manger Pearson Emmanuel Adeyinka argue that don't have to register Emmanuel told him if he calling the state police or city police I'm not on the Megan's law case load in Philadelphia, PA , It not possible the state police and city police haven't contacted you , if so , other state officials watch the movement on sex offender. In Philadelphia, Pa jurisdiction Emmanuel Adeyinka is not requirement isn't a part of the Megan's law case load or his he court order of the judgment of final decision in Judicial System of Pennsylvania docket number MC-51-CR-0002986 And Docket number MC-51-CR-0002987. See In *Calder v. Bull*, 3 U.S. (3Dall.)386(1798) Third, the Supreme Court Said that.

No man should be compelled to do what the laws do

See in *Screw v. United States*, 325 U.S. 91 (1945)

not require

Conspiracy against rights is a federal offense in the United States of America under 18

U.S.C. § 241: If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any person [...] in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same;...

Ms. Armstrong and Mr. Pearson See In *SCREWS v. United States*, 325 U.S. 91 (1945) conspiracies against rights Told Emmanuel Adeyinka if don't participate in treatment or register he going back to prison. *SCREWS v. United States*, 325 U.S. 91 (1945) See in *Sullivan v. United States*, 990 A.2d 477 (D.C. 2010) Ms. Armstrong told Emmanuel Adeyinka to talk to the broad of parole, Emmanuel Adeyinka told Ms .Armstrong he did, when

Emmanuel was in prison, the board of parole told Emmanuel Adeyinka he would have to wait and talk with the parole office they sign to him about the M Condition. Emmanuel Adeyinka also was harass and fought in prison and force to move to a new dorm because of these allegation. Ms. Armstrong told Emmanuel Adeyinka to call the board of parole ,Emmanuel Adeyinka call the board of parole and explain his situation to the board of parole the board of parole told Emmanuel Adeyinka just to talk to Ms. Armstrong or her supervisor about it . Emmanuel Adeyinka asks to speak to Ms. Armstrong supervisor how is Mr. Pearson he told me I will have to participate in treatment classes and register with HPD Sex Offender Case Load, register or go back to prison .

See In *Collins v. Youngblood*, 497 U.S. 37, 42 (1990) (quoting *Beazell v. Ohio*, 269 U.S. 167, 169–170 (1925)). Alternatively, the Court described the reach of the clause as extending to laws that "alter the definition of crimes or increase the punishment for criminal acts." Id. at 43. Justice Chase's oft-cited formulation has a fourth category: "every law that aggravates a crime, or makes it greater than it was, when committed." and changes in evidentiary rules.

Emmanuel Adeyinka will have to continue to take Mr. Barrs treatment classes, the classes are 10 dollar per session ones a week, Emmanuel Adeyinka been pay Mr. Barrs for these classes since the first week , of being release from prison , March of 2018 . up to the completion of his parole wish is March of 2019 Emmanuel Adeyinka been force to participate these classes do home work and classes assignment and say thing that are and justifying to the cases in Philadelphia Pa Judicial System of Pennsylvania Mr. Barrs make statement like" you retarded Mr.Barrs constantly made statement about the Recklessly in his case justifying the decision of First Judicial District of Pennsylvania judgments and force Emmanuel Adeyinka take a polygraph Emmanuel Adeyinka complain that polygraph was basic on the right information, Emmanuel Adeyinka asks to talk to Mr.Pearson Emmanuel Adeyinka advice Mr. Pearson to talk to his lawyer that handle his case in Philadelphia, Pa Emmanuel even offer to give Mr.Pearson Ms. Flow number, Mr. Pearson told Emmanuel Adeyinka if he didn't take the polygraph he sends he back to prison. Emmanuel Adeyinka takes the polygraph forcedly. Emmanuel pay for these polygraph the price of the polygraph one hundred and fifty dollar to take a polygraph, the broad of parole or State didn't pay for these, Emmanuel Adeyinka pay for these polygraph out of pocket to say out of prison". Is this unconstitutional? To the Article 1 section 10 a Bill of Attainder, See in United State v. Lovett, 328 U.S. 303 (1946 See in International Finance trust company Ltd v. New South Wales Crime commission (Criminal assets Recovery Case) United State v. Burgin, 621 F.2d 1352, 1356 (5th Cir.) United State v.Conover, 772 F.2d 765 (11th Cir.1985), aff'd sub.nom. section 371 United State v. Gallup, 812 F.2d 1271, 1276(10th Cir.1987); Ricardo Polygraph tester at 10110 Northwest Fwy Houston, TX 77092 Before take the polygraph Emmanuel Adeyinka compliant that the information him basic the polygraph on is incorrect information , that is not what he plea for in court and the case and charges take place in another state jurisdiction and the incorrect information basic on the final judgment of the First Judicial District of Pennsylvania Court Summary Final judgments. His tests were basic on a sexual assault charge. Before the polygraph he ask Emmanuel Adeyinka question about Emmanuel Adeyinka residency in Philadelphia, PA Ricardo also said to Emmanuel he also live in Philadelphia, PA during the time of 2007 and 2008 that he live on a street in Philadelphia, Pa near center city on street call south street. They said Emmanuel Adeyinka failed the first polygraph test and they need him to take a sex polygraph. Emmanuel Adeyinka has tried many times to prove his point. by sending to Ms. Armstrong and showing her in Person legal document from Philadelphia jurisdiction and as well Texas jurisdiction Court Order See In CASE# No 152264701010 the RETALIATION charge of Harris County against Emmanuel Adeyinka where he was sentenced for two year then parole Sex Offender Registration Requirements DO NOT APPLY TO THE Defendant wish is Emmanuel Adeyinka of the. Tex CODE CRIME. PROC. chapter 62 there was not a legal plea or agreement to sex offender registration. Ms. Armstrong and the *Texas Department of Justice*. See in Brandy v. Maryland 373 U.S. 83 Decision undue influence and coercion See. In Johnson v. Buttress HCA 41, (1936) "By not Contacting priority of federal authority, Megan's law the federal authority, "Note"; The Case Parole and Department of Public safety was trying to register without the city of Philadelphia consent to register them In Philadelphia jurisdiction are not under the federal law. See. In *Martin v. Hunter's Lessee*, 14 U.S. 304 (1816), also See. In In *Ware v. Hylton*, 3 U.S. (3 Dall.) 199 (1796), the United States Supreme Court for the first time applied the Supremacy Clause to strike down a state statute. Virginia had passed a statute during the Revolutionary War allowing the state to confiscate debt payments by Virginia citizens to British creditors. The Supreme Court found that this Virginia statute was inconsistent with the Treaty of Paris with Britain, which protected the rights of British creditors. Relying on the Supremacy Clause, the Supreme Court held that the treaty superseded Virginia's statute, and that it was the duty of the courts to declare Virginia's statute "null and void".and Cohens v. Virginia, 19 U.S. 264 (1821), See. In Ableman v. Booth, 62 U.S. 506 (1859) the Fugitive Slave Act or to order the release of federal prisoners held for violation of that Act. The Supreme Court reasoned that because the Supremacy Clause established federal law as the law of the land, the Wisconsin courts could not nullify the judgments of a federal court. The Supreme Court held that under Article III of the Constitution, the

federal courts have the final jurisdiction in all cases involving the Constitution and laws of the United States, and that the states therefore cannot interfere with federal court judgments. Obligations of Parole broad decision impose on Private law Emmanuel Adeyinka and his Parole officer Decision been undue influences and coercion

See. In *Johnson v. Buttress* HCA 41, (1936) 56CLR 133 misrepresentation, the litigation is unconstitutional and this constitutes a due process violation. Section 21.08 of the Texas Penal Code, Amendment by Pub.L.112-81 sees 541(f) of Pub.L.122-81 See In *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137 (1803), the Supreme Court held that Congress cannot pass laws that are contrary to the Constitution, and it is the role of the Judicial system to interpret what the Constitution permits. Citing the Supremacy Clause, the Court found Section 13 of the Judiciary Act of 1789 to be unconstitutional to the extent it purported to enlarge the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court beyond that permitted by the Constitution. Also See. In *Pennsylvania v. Nelson*, 350 U.S. 497 (1956) the Supreme Court struck down the Pennsylvania Sedition Act, which made advocating the forceful overthrow of the federal government a crime under Pennsylvania state law. The Supreme Court held that when federal interest in an area of law is sufficiently dominant, federal law must be assumed to preclude enforcement of state laws on the same subject; and a state law is not to be declared a help when state law goes farther than Congress has seen fit to go. Also See In *Cooper v. Aaron*, 358 U.S. 1 (1958), the Supreme Court rejected attempts by Arkansas to nullify the Court's school desegregation decision, *Brown v. Board of Education*. The state of Arkansas, acting on a theory of states' rights, had adopted several statutes designed to nullify the desegregation ruling. The Supreme Court relied on the Supremacy Clause to hold that the federal law controlled and could not be nullified by state statutes or officials. Also See. In *Edgar v. MITE Corp.*, 457 U.S. 624 (1982), the Supreme Court ruled: "A state statute is void to the extent that it actually conflicts with a valid Federal statute". In effect, this means that a State law will be found to violate the Supremacy Clause when either of the following two conditions (or both) exist:[8]

- 1. Compliance with both the Federal and State laws is impossible**
- 2. "State law stands as an obstacle to the accomplishment and execution of the full purposes and objectives of Congress"**

In 1920, the Supreme Court applied the Supremacy Clause to international treaties, holding in the case of *Missouri v. Holland*, 252 U.S. 416, that the Federal government's ability to make treaties is supreme over any state concerns that such treaties might abrogate states' rights arising under the Tenth Amendment. The Supreme Court has also held that only specific, "unmistakable" acts of Congress may be held to trigger the Supremacy Clause. Montana had imposed a 30 percent tax on most sub-bituminous coal mined there. The Commonwealth Edison Company and other utility companies argued, in part, that the Montana tax "frustrated" the broad goals of the federal energy policy. However, in the case of *Commonwealth Edison Co. v. Montana*, 453 U.S. 609 (1981), the Supreme Court disagreed. Any appeal to claims about "national policy", the Court said, were insufficient to overturn a state law under the Supremacy Clause unless "the nature of the regulated subject matter permits no other conclusion, or that the Congress has unmistakably so ordained".[9] However, in the case of *California v. ARC America Corp.*, 490 U.S. 93 (1989), the Supreme Court held that if Congress expressly *intended* to act in an area, this would trigger the enforcement of the Supremacy Clause, and hence nullify the state action. The Supreme Court further found in *Crosby v. National Foreign Trade Council*, 530 U.S. 363 (2000), that even when a state law is not in direct conflict with a federal law, the state law could still be found unconstitutional under the Supremacy Clause if the "state law is an obstacle to the accomplishment and execution of Congress's full purposes and objectives".[10] Congress need not expressly assert any preemption over state laws either, because Congress may implicitly assume this preemption under the Constitution.[11]

On May 29th of 2018 Emmanuel Adeyinka was Force to register because an M Condition from that parole place on Emmanuel. C. Aquilera the officer that registers and set the appointment at the location at 8300 mykawa RD Houston, TX 77048 Houston police department. Emmanuel Adeyinka spoke to the officer C. Aquilera she show him some paper work with incorrect information, Emmanuel Adeyinka told C. Aquilera that's incorrect information. Because her record showed sexual assault, Emmanuel Adeyinka C. Aguilera that is incorrect information, He is not court order or required Emmanuel argue with couple of the officer and C. Aguilera they ask Emmanuel Adeyinka to step out of the office , till C. Aguilera get her paper works , The courts can't give record upon her request anyways , C. Aquilera would need to contact the state or city police sex offender program wish Megan's law . Even if so Megan's law can't give you any information upon a person that never register, Emmanuel Adeyinka waited about an hour, C. Aquilera said she received and email from the courts with the information. She registers the wrong information intentionally

The question here is it basic on a department liability 1983 failure -to - train. The Houston police department and board of parole is obligation to train there officers. Basic on the Harm cause from C. Aquilera and Brady Barra Ms.Armstrong, Mr. Pearson.

Texas Department of Justice have broking jurisdiction policy litigating Philadelphia state Jurisdiction statue with the charge wasn't under the federal Law for to be litigated or was a requirement of the city of Philadelphia courts in their judgment of when case take place of 2008 . And not a requirement in Texas courts in the case that bring Philadelphia state misdemeanor to question. Sex Offender Registration Requirements DO NOT APPLY TO Emmanuel Adeyinka in Texas criminal code and procedure chapter 62 for the case of retaliation page 18 of CLERK'S RECORD VOLUME I of I Trial Court Cause No. 1522647 In the County Criminal Court at Law # of Harris County, Texas In the 339TH District Court of Harris County, Texas Honorable MARIA T. JACKSON, Judge Presiding it clearly state chapter 62 of the Texas criminal code and procedure do not apply. But yet the Houston Texas Department of Justice question the misdemeanor charge under Philadelphia jurisdiction state law was call to question when they shouldn't have Been which violated Emmanuel Adeyinka rights and the **ex post facto** law See in Calder v. Bull, 3 U.S. (3 Dall.) 386 (1798), Lack the authority to nullify state laws that violate that state's constitution.

Conclusion

Ms. Armstrong and C. Aquilera the *Texas Department of Justice* didn't follow protocol Misrepresentation) See in *Brandy v. Maryland* 373 U.S. 83 Decision undue influence and coercion See. In *Johnson v. Buttress* HCA 41, (1936) "By not Contacting priority of federal authority, Megan's law the federal authority, "Note";; The Case Parole and Department of Public safety was trying to register without the city of Philadelphia consent locating the appropriate officials wish would been the state or city program officers upon registration, the charges in Philadelphia jurisdiction are not under the federal law the federal charge are withdrawal. The state court dockets reflect that partial expungement orders have been issued in Adeyinka's criminal cases; See in *Falsus in Uno, falsus in omnibus - false in one thing, false in everything* *Enyng Li v. Holder*, 738 F.3d 1160 (9th Cir. 2013) expungement orders has been issued basic on the United State Third Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals in Appendix D Civil Action No. 18-3696 , Emmanuel have suffer **Supremacy Clause with Texas still apply** punishment bring the charge held in Philadelphia Pa Judicial System of Pennsylvania state court charges **current and pass the statute of limitation**. The opinion of the united state district court for the southern district of Texas Houston division memorandum opinion and appear in Appendix C, the inherent right to prepare and present petition See in *United State v. Cruikshank*, 92 U.S. 542, 552(1876), violates the establishment clause of the first amendment . 5.the right of the people peaceably to assemble for the purpose of petitioning Congress for a redress of grievances ,or for anything else connected with the power or duties of the National Government ,is an attribute of national citizenship, and ,as such, under the protection of and guaranteed by the united state. The very idea of a government republican in form implies that right, and an invasion of it presents a case within the sovereignty of the United State. For the foregoing reasons, Mr. Adeyinka respectfully requests that this issue a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the United State Ninth Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals.