

20-5727

No. _____

FINAL

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Marter Edwards — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

FILED
JUL 08 2020
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

District Court Eastern District of Kentucky — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Marter LaJuan Edwards
(Your Name)

P.O. Box 8000
(Address)

Bradford, PA 16701
(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

RECEIVED
AUG 26 2020
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- I. The search of 803 State Lick Rd. violated my fourth amendment rights. This was not my home.
- II. My Arrest was violative of the fourth amendment and of due process.
- III. The evidence was insufficient to support the jury's verdict.
- IV. Should not have received a three Level Aggravating role enhancement.
- V. The statement that I originally made to the lawyer Mr. Bucklis was not ever presented at the trial.

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:

RELATED CASES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - Decision of united states court of appeals

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
Anders v. State of California 386 U.S. 738 (1967)	7
Jackson v. Virginia 443 U.S. 307 (1979)	10.
McFarland v. Pringle 540 U.S. 366 (2003)	9
U.S. v Anderson 795 F.3d 613	14
U.S. v Anderson 189 F.3d 1201	15
U.S. v Asker 676 Fed. Appx 447.	8
U.S. v. Ataya 884 F.3d 318	9, 10
STATUTES AND RULES	
21 U.S.C 846	
21 U.S.C 847	1
28 U.S.C 1291	1
U.S.S.G 3B1.1	1
	13, 14
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 P to the petition and is

reported at 3(a) 4(b) 32 (a)(7)(B) 34(a); 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[] is unpublished.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 _____ 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 May 12, 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

- I Fourth Amendment Rights violated - *Asper v. US* 676 Fed Appx 447, 462
US v. carcero 83 F.3d 1184, 1192. *U.S. v. Causay* 834 F.2d 1277, 1281
- II Violation of due process - *Ataya* 884 F.3d at 322
Causay 834 F.2d at 1281
- III Insufficient evidence *Jackson v. Virginia* 443 U.S. 307, 314,
(1979) Transcript of trial DE #315 pg 1D #1370
- IV Three points entrapment *U.S. v. Sexton* 894 F.3d 787, 794
U.S. v. Martinez 584 F.3d 1022, 1026, *U.S. v. Ronning* 47 F.3d
710, 712

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This is a criminal case wherein Mr Edwards was charged with conspiracy to distribute heroin and fentanyl (Count 1) and possession with intent to distribute (Count 14) was found guilty at a jury trial on both counts, was sentenced to 180 months.

On August 8, 2017 Detective Douglas Cole & other officers executed a search warrant at 803 State Wick Rd in Berea, Ky. Discovered Mr Edwards and two eventual co-defendants Keith Chambers and Terrell Matlock in a bedroom with a substantial amount of heroin.

On October 5, 2017 Mr Edwards was indicted by a grand jury along with several co-defendants for multiple counts relating to drug trafficking. Mr Edwards was charged in two counts.

Mr Edwards's jury trial was conducted on March (11-13 2019) The United States presented the testimony of numerous witnesses as well as three of Mr Edwards's co-defendants. The defense made a Rule 29 motion on Mr Edwards's behalf, The court overruled the motions (Rule 29). After deliberations, the jury returned verdicts of guilty to both counts (1 & 14).

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

I should not have been given a three point enhancement due to manager or supervisor role, I was ~~merely~~ merely present at the home of a person.

The 851 enhancement was withdrawn which made me not sign the cop-out ^(Plea) had I known about the 851 enhancement not being able to affect me I would have taken the cop sufficiency of evidence. The credibility of the co-defendant's should be in question.

There were inconsistencies in the witnessess testimony that need to be looked over. These people were lying on the stand.