

AUG 12 2020

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 20-5600

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Jason Lee Harris — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

State of Arizona, et al. — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Jason Lee Harris
(Your Name)

MCDO-201 S. 4th Avenue

(Address)

Phoenix, AZ 85003

(City, State, Zip Code)

e-mail)-Ineo1@ychin.com
(Phone Number)

ORIGINAL

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- I. When Preponderance of the Evidence suffices inference the courts "Judicial Notice" "Judicial Knowledge" "Discretion" any given unconstitutional facts; deemed unsubstantial as to not warrant further review;
- II. When absolutely necessary to secure rights protected under the United States Constitution afforded the Petitioner satisfy Title 28 U.S.C. §1254 Application to the U.S. Supreme Court;
- III. When absolutely necessary to secure rights protected under the U.S. Constitution afforded the Petitioner warrant Rule 18 of the Supreme Court Rules of the United States, appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court;
- IV. Therefore satisfy the Exception Rule to 28 U.S.C. §1915(g).

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:

Officer Page No. B4627 of M.C.S.O.

MariCopa County

RELATED CASES

Harris v. State of Arizona, D.C. No. CV20-0886-
JJT-MHB.

Harris v. State of Arizona, Docket No. 20-14084 (9th
Cir.).

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 Opinion of U.S. Dist. Court for the Dist. of Arizona

APPENDIX B Judgment of U.S. Dist. Court for the Dist. of Arizona

APPENDIX C Abeyance order pending Rule 60 determinations
in U.S. Dist. Court by U.S. Court of Appeals (4th Cir.)

APPENDIX D Opinion of the Rule 60 Motion by U.S. Dist. Court for
the Dist. of Arizona

APPENDIX E Opinion of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth
Circuit

APPENDIX F Appeal filed to this court pursuant to Title 28
U.S.C. § 1254

APPENDIX G First attempt to have MCSO mail the Petition for Writ
of Certiorari to this court—But denied access
to this court.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
I. Hertz Corp. v. Friend, 559 U.S. 77	5
II. Hollingsworth v. Perry, 558 U.S. 183	5
III. In re Thomas, 508 F.3d 1225 (9th Cir. 2007). . .	5
IV. Shawnee Terminal R. Co., Inc. v. J.E. Estates Wood Co., Inc., 360 Fed. Appx. 963, 963, 1172 Cir. (Ala.)	5

STATUTES AND RULES

I. Title 28 U.S.C. § 1254	3
II. Title 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g)	3,4
III. Title 28 U.S.C. § 2283	3,4

OTHER

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 E 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 A, D 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 July 23, 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: _____, 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 _____. 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

Title 28 U.S.C. § 1254 - Jurisdictional Review.

Title 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) - Exception Rule.

Title 28 U.S.C. § 2283 - Intervention.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The gist of the (Civil) complaint was that the Defendant(s) (State of Arizona) (Maricopa County) does not forbrd and are therefore liable for the Maricopa County Sheriff's Office adopting policies, customs, practices notwithstanding laws that willfully and immediately interferes with any and all abilities under the United States Constitution, and to aid his Attorney on his own initiative, also with consultation and if necessary with consent of his Attorney; file relevant pleadings, motions, petitions, writs in general in aid of his criminal, and feasibly civil proceedings.

Supported by the Preponderance of the Evidence Sought Younger determinations, and therefore intervention under § 2283.

Such shall satisfy the Title 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) exception Rule in order to forfend the permissible practice(s) of civil rights contravention in general

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Therefore should be remanded to the U.S. Dist. Court for the Dist. of Arizona for determination of § 1254 purposes. Shawnee Terminal R. Co., Inc. v. JE Estates Wood Co., Inc., 360 Fed. Appx. 963, 963, 11th Cir. (Ala.) which is in conflict with the Ninth Circuits interpretation of what's unsubstantial in the complaint to warrant further review and not permitted to proceed under In re Thomas, 508 F. 3d 1225 (9th Cir. 2007) in that it's not respecting the doctrines of "jurisdictional review" of this court, see, Hertz Corp. v. Friend, 559 U.S. 77; see also, Hollingsworth v. Perry, 558 U.S. 183 in the presence of the "Filed Appeal", see, Appendix-F, "preponderance of the evidence", in general, "judicial notice" "judicial knowledge", "discretion" of the lower courts in general

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

August 5, 2020
Date: 