

AUG 21 2020

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

20-5834

No:

Before The
Supreme Court of The United States

JOSE R. GARCIA-CHICOL

Petitioner

Vs:

State of Arkansas

Respondent

ON Petition for a writ of Certiorari to

Arkansas Supreme Court

Case No: CR-19-391

Petition for writ of Certiorari

ORIGINAL

JOSE R. GARCIA-CHICOL, Pro Se
171396 P.O. Box 970
Marianna, Arkansas
72360-0970

RECEIVED

SEP - 2 2020

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

Table of Contents

	Page
Unsettled Issues Presented for Review and Consideration _____	iii
List of Parties _____	vi
Table of Authorities _____	vii
Opinions below _____	1
Jurisdictional Statement _____	2
Constitutional, International Treaty, and Statutory Provisions Involved _____	3
Historical Nucleus _____	5
Statement of the Case _____	11
Legal Argument _____	23
Reasons for Granting Petition _____	28
Conclusion _____	31
Declaration/Verification _____	35
Certificate of Service _____	36

Certification of Institutional Filing _____ ^{Page} 37

Certification of Document Preparation _____ 38

ADDENDUM A - OPINIONS BELOW

ADDENDUM - Trial Transcript Excerpts

UNSETTLED ISSUES PRESENTED
for
REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION

1) Should the SECURED AND GUARANTEED PROTECTIONS OF A FOREIGN CITIZEN (UNDER THE TREATIES, CONSTITUTION, AND STATUTES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE STATE OF ARKANSAS BE ALLOWED TO BE VIOLATED IN CRIMINAL JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS BY THE STATE AFFECTING THE FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS EXPRESSED THEREIN?

2) Should a FOREIGN NATIONAL, WHO DOES NOT SPEAK OR UNDERSTAND THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE BE SUBJECTED TO CRIMINAL PROSECUTION WITHOUT THE KNOWLEDGE OF NOR REPRESENTATION FROM THEIR HOME NATION?

3) Should only that TESTIMONY AND EVIDENCE PRESENTED IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE BE CONSIDERED BY THE JURY FOR THE PURPOSE OF DELIBERATION IN CASES WITH FOREIGN NATURAL CITIZENS AS DEFENDANTS?

4) At what Point has mere Allegations become enough facts to support a term of Life imprisonment without any supporting Physical Evidence or Confession?

5) Should a properly Presented motion for Directed Verdict based on insufficiency of the Evidence be Denied as a Result of the opprobrium, Contempt, and Disdain for the Nature Allegations Created by the Influence of Today's Media on the Judiciary and Politics?

6) Can an Individual's Due Process Right, especially a Foreign Citizen, to speak and be heard on their own behalf at Trial be Compromised by the Trial Court Rushing them through their testimony in the interest of Expediting the proceedings for the

CONVENIENCE of the Trial Court and Jury?

What value Does the Life of a Foreign National
have?

List of Parties

All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

Table of Authorities

	Page TT
Arkansas Code Annotated § 16-89-125(e) _____	TT
Burch v. State, 370 Ark. 3, (2007) _____	4
Chapman v. California, 87 S.Ct. 824, (1967) _____	25
Exodus 18: 15-23 _____	30
Farretta v. California, 95 S.Ct. 2525, (1975) _____	19-22
Genesis 21: 8-21 _____	32
Genesis 25: 1-8 _____	32
Genesis 25: 19-17 _____	32
Genesis 28: 6-9 _____	32
Genesis 32: 4-9 _____	32
Genesis 33: 1-11 _____	32
King v. State, 100 Ark. App. 208, (2003) _____	18-24
Morrissey v. Brewer, 92 S.Ct. 2593, (1972) _____	25
Nance v. State, 2014 Ark 201 _____	27

	Page
Novus Franchising, Inc. v. Dawson, 725 F.3d 885, (8th Cir 2013)	16
Parrott v. Taylor, 101 S.Ct. 1908, (1981)	23
Proctor v. State, 349 Ark. 648 (2002)	13
Rhodes v. State, 290 Ark. 60,	TT
Richardson v. State, 314 Ark. 512, (1993)	12
Sanders v. State,	TT
State v. Mills, 19 Ark 476,	TT
State v. Short, 2009 Ark 630	TT
S.S. v. McMullen, 225 F.3d 960, (8th Cir 2000)	25
Taney v. State, 289 Ark 193,	TT
U.S. v. Chronic, 104 S.Ct. 2039, (1984)	14-15
Williams v. State, 264 Ark 77,	TT
Wilson v. State, 272 Ark 361,	TT
28 C.F.R. § 50.5	3-4-11

Petition for Writ of Certiorari

I, JOSE R. GARCIA-CHICOL, A LIVING BREATHING SENTIENT
NATURAL SOVEREIGN MORAL, PROCEEDING PRO SE, DO HEREBY
RESPECTFULLY REQUEST THAT A WRIT OF CERTIORARI BE
ISSUED TO REVIEW THE JUDGEMENTS BELOW.

OPINIONS BELOW

THE OPINION OF THE ARKANSAS SUPREME COURT
APPEARS IN APPENDIX A, AT PAGE 1 AND IS PUBLISHED
AT GARCIA-CHICOL V. ARKANSAS, 2020 ARK 148, 597 S.W.3D.
631, (ARK 2020)

Jurisdictional Statement

The date on which the Arkansas Supreme Court decided my case was on 16 April 2020 C.E.. A Timely Petition for Rehearing was denied by the Arkansas Supreme Court on 28 May 2020 C.E.

Therefore, knowing that Petitioner has ninety (90) days from the date denying his Petition for Rehearing in which to file a Petition for writ of Certiorari; Mr. Garcia-Chicol prays that this Court will render her opinion on the Square and by the Compass when reviewing the Constitutional Issues, Treaty Violations, and Questions of Law which raised herein and brought before this High Court.

Further, the Petitioner invokes the jurisdiction of this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a).

Constitutional, International Treaty, and
Statutory Provisions INVOLVED

1) MR. JOSE R. GARCIA-CHICOL'S SECURED AND GUARANTEED PROTECTION TO RECEIVE A FAIR AND IMPARTIAL TRIAL AS EXPRESSED AND PENNED IN THE SIXTH AMENDMENT WAS CLEARLY AND PLAINLY VIOLATED WHEN THE SILVER SPRINGS POLICE DEPARTMENT FAILED TO NOTIFY THE F.B.I. AND/OR THE U.S. MARSHALS SERVICE AND GUATEMALA CONSULAR OFFICERS AS REQUIRED BY INTERNATIONAL TREATY AND FURTHER EXPRESSED IN 28 C.F.R. § 50.5 WHEN DETAINING A FOREIGN CITIZEN.

2) THE SECURED PROTECTION OF EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL AS PENNED IN THE SIXTH AMENDMENT, GUARANTEED BY INTERNATIONAL TREATIES FOR FOREIGN NATIONALS, SUCH AS MR. GARCIA-CHICOL, WAS COMPROMISED BY THE LANGUAGE BARRIER BETWEEN MR. GARCIA-CHICOL AND THE STATE

Appointed LEGAL COUNSEL, LEE WARDEN, Compounded when Mr. Garcia-Chicol was also provided a state appointed Interpreter; Instead of Notifying the Guatemala Consulate, as Required by 28 C.F.R. § 50.5, to obtain an impartial Direct Specific Interpreter that Mr. Garcia-Chicol could fully and completely understand.

Mr. Garcia-Chicol's Rights as expressed and Secured by the Fourteenth Amendment have been extensively Violated by the Courts below.

The Courts below have departed far from the Constitutional, International Treaty, and Statutory Protections as found expressed therein.

The Courts below have acted with Legislative intent to usurp Secured and Guaranteed protections, this is not to be allowed. See Bunch v. State, 370 Ark. 3 (2007).

Historical Nucleus

IN ORDER GAIN A full understanding of the complexities of this case, A CONCISE OVERVIEW of the Labyrinthine Blended Family Dynamics must be the starting Point.

MR. JOSE R. GARCIA-CHICOL AND SARA JANETTE POSADA began a work place Romance approximately 8 years before the Allegations arose. MR. Garcia-Chicol was not aware that SARA JANETTE POSADA was then married to ERIC ANTHONY POSADA, Sr., the father of S.P., the ALLEGED victim. About two (2) months into this Relationship SARA JANETTE POSADA became pregnant with V.G.; About five (5) months into the pregnancy the Relationship between JOSE AND SARA dissolved with SARA JANETTE POSADA Reconciling with

HERZ THEN HUSBAND ERIC ANTHONY POSADA, SR. WITH V.G. BEING INTO THE MARRIAGE OF SARA JANETTE POSADA AND ERIC ANTHONY POSADA, SR.; HE BELIEVING THAT HE WAS V.G.'S BIOLOGICAL FATHER FOR THE FIRST YEAR OF HER LIFE. WHEN V.G. WAS ABOUT A YEAR OLD SARA JANETTE POSADA REKINDLED THE RELATIONSHIP WITH JOSE R. GARCIA-CHICOL, V.G.'S ACTUAL BIOLOGICAL FATHER. SHORTLY THEREAFTER IN 2013 SARA JANETTE AND ERIC ANTHONY WERE DIVORCED WITH THE THREE (3) CHILDREN OF THAT MARRIAGE: ASHLEY POSADA; ERIC ANTHONY POSADA, JR.; AND THE ALLEGED VICTIM, S.P. RESIDING WITH ERIC SR. IN A JOINT CUSTODY ARRANGEMENT. V.G. RESIDING WITH HER MOTHER, SARA JANETTE, AND FATHER, JOSE R. WHO MARRIED AND HAD ANOTHER CHILD, A.G.

MR. JOSE R. GARCIA-CHICOL BEGAN WORKING

IN THE CONSTRUCTION TRADES CAUSING him to be
OUT-OF-TOWN DURING most work weeks. His
DAUGHTER V.G., WHEN her father was HOME for the
FEW days of the WEEKEND; DID NOT WANT his ATTENTION
to be DIVIDED BETWEEN HER and HER HALF-SISTER,
S. P.. HENCEFORTH, V.G.'S HALF-SISTER, S.P.'S VISITS to
the FAMILY HOME of V.G. ON THESE WEEKENDS WERE
BEEN AN UNWARRANTED INTRUSION by V.G. AND A TRESPASS OF
her TIME OF HER father, JOSE R. GARCIA-CHICO

ON THE OCCASION OF ONE SUCH PROSPECTIVE VISIT
by S.P. to HER FAMILY HOME, V.G. PLEADED with HER
MOTHER, SARA JAWETTE GARCIA, to NOT PICK UP her
HALF-SISTER, S.P., TO SPEND time at V.G.'S FAMILY
home. AFTER BEING PRESSED SEVERAL TIMES by HER
MOTHER, SARA JAWETTE GARCIA, AS TO WHY V.G. DID

Not want her older Half-sister, S.P., to be at her house, V.G., concocts her Reason as being that she seen her father, Jose R. Garcia-Chicol and her Half-sister, S.P., kissing and V.G. did not like that going on.

There exist further Adversity between the Half-sisters, V.G. and S.P.; From the perspective of V.G., for the Bulk of the time she is the first born child, the oldest in her house. That is until her older half-sister, S.P., arrives then she becomes just a middle child, going from the Big Sister to the Little Sister instantly and repeatedly, WEEKEND OVER WEEKEND. S.P.'s perspective can only be described as Resentfully of V.G.'s very Existence. V.G. being seen as a major cause if not "the" cause of the

Break down of S.P.'s original family, Her Parents Divorcing, Creating a Complexity to Her Life. This is Emphasized by the Nearly Non-Existant Interaction between these half-sisters when under the same domicile!

SARA JANETTE GARCIA initially was not overly concerned about the Nature of this "Kiss" as she still brought her Daughter, S.P., to the house shared with Mrs. Garcia-Choeit; Waiting a full day before Seeking out S.P.'s take on the "Kiss". S.P.'s Narrative of the "Event" did not Raise SARA JANETTE GARCIA'S LEVEL of CONCERN as evident by her waiting an additional Three (3) days before Seeking out advise from Law Enforcement.

Over the Course of these proceedings, from initial Report to trial, the Singular Event has become

AN EVER INCREASING NUMBER OF EVENTS WITH AN INCREASE IN THE NATURE OF THE CONTACT AS WELL AS THE NARRATIVE OF THE EVENTS EVER INCREASING DETAIL AND DESCRIPTIVE IN TERMINOLOGY AS CONTACT WITH THE PROFESSIONALS WORKING WITH THE PROSECUTION TEAM INCREASED.

Clearly at the ages of Six(6) years old (V.G.) AND TEN(10) years old (S.P.) there exist significant Indifference to the consequence suffered by others for their actions. This concept has yet to be fully Developed at these ages.

Statement of the Case

MR. JOSE R GARCIA-CHICOL, A GUATEMALAN NATIONAL, WAS DETAINED BY THE SILOAM SPRINGS POLICE DEPARTMENT ON 18 DECEMBER 2017, C.E., AFTER BEING INTERVIEWED BY DETECTIVE RON COBLE. CONCERNING ALLEGATIONS OF SEXUAL MISCONDUCT WERE RAISED BY HIS SIX (6) YEAR OLD DAUGHTER, V.G., BETWEEN HER FATHER, MR. GARCIA-CHICOL AND HER TEN (10) YEAR OLD HALF-SISTER, S.P..

IT WAS AT THIS JUNCTURE THAT THE INITIAL VIOLATIONS TO MR. GARCIA-CHICOL'S SECURED AND GUARANTEED PROTECTIONS UNDER CONSTITUTIONAL, INTERNATIONAL TREATIES AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS OCCURRED; THE REQUIREMENT UNDER INTERNATIONAL TREATY AS EXPRESSED IN 28 C.F.R. § 50.5 THAT FEDERAL OFFICIALS BE CONTACTED UPON THE ARREST OF ANY FOREIGN

Citizen to Accommodate the Obligation of the Proper Foreign Consulate officials; The standard here, as held in Richardson v. State, 314 Ark 512, (1993), being only the Requirement that the Government official in Question to have a Reasonable Expectation of the Knowledge of what the Rules Require.

This Significant and Substantial Error by the Siloam Springs Police Department is the Leading Causation of the many other violations to Mr. Garcia-Chico's Secured and Guaranteed Constitutional, International treaty, and Statutory Protections; As Such, this cannot be Held to be a Harmless Error, as it is a ministerial task and Not Discretionary in Nature. And even slight Error cannot be said to be harmless in a case in which the

Question of Guilt or INNOCENCE is a Close one,
Such as this case is. SEE Proctor v. State,
349 Ark 648, (2002)

This Initial Error obstructed Mr. Garcia-Chico's
ability to Receive Effective Representation by Legal
Counsel that spoke the Direct specific Tongue of
Mr. Garcia-Chico. Instead Mr. Garcia-Chico was
provided with an English only speaking state sponsored
attorney and a state sponsored Spanish Interpreter.
This Lack of ability to Communicate and understanding
Between Mr. Garcia-Chico and Mr. Warden, Trial Counsel,
Resulted in a clear case of INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE of
Counsel.

The Core purpose of the Counsel Guarantee is to
Assure "Assistance" at Trial, where the Accused is

Confronted with both the intricacies of the Law and the advocacy of the state prosecutor. If no actual "assistance" is provided; The Constitutional Guarantee has been violated. To hold otherwise is to convert the appointment of state sponsored counsel into a sham and nothing more than a formal compliance with the Constitution's Requirement. The Guarantee cannot be satisfied by mere formal appointment. See O.S. v. CHRONIC, 104 S.Ct. 2039, (1984).

Mr. Garcia-Chicol Reported this conflict to the Trial Court; However, The Trial Court took no action or corrective measures to cure.

This type of Breakdown in the Adversarial process implicates a violation of the SIXTH AMENDMENT and is not limited to counsel's performance as a

Whole, but specific errors and omissions may be the focus for a claim of ineffective assistance as well. See U.S. v. Chronic, 104 S.Ct. 2039 (1984).

Failure of The Trial Court to take the correct and common practice of contacting the Guatemala Consulate officers to obtain proper legal counsel, or at the very least an impartial dialect specific Guatemalan interpreter, further compounded the initializing violation.

The Right to Effective assistance of counsel and to have a reasonably effective advocate, is recognized, not only for its own sake, but also because of the effect it has on the ability of the accused to receive a fair and impartial trial. See U.S. v. Chronic, 104 S.Ct. 2039 (1984).

During the Jury Trial proceedings The Trial Court Abused its Discretion, adding to the violations of the Secured AND Guaranteed Constitutional, International treaty, and Statute Protections Afforded to Foreign Nation citizens, such as Mr. Green-Chicol.

The Abuse-of-Standard means that the Court has a Range of Choice, and that its Decision will not be disturbed as long as it stays within that Range AND is not influenced by any mistake of law. SEE

NOVUS FRANCHISING, INC. V. DAWSON, 725 F.3d 885,

(8th Cir. 2013).

The first of these REVERSABLE ERRORS is The Trial Court's Instruction to the Jury to Disregard all testimony Not Given in English or through the official state sponsored Translator. SEE Trial

Transcript, Addendum B, pgs 254-255

The Next REVERSABLE ERROR is allowing the testimony of a SIX(6) year old minor, v.g.; where it is well established that a child of this age is highly IMPRESSIONABLE from what is viewed in the media and from those SEEN as authoritative figures; Having yet to fully develop the concept of the consequences that others may endure based on what they say or do. Especially when they may expect one outcome, such as a half-sister removed from her family home, but not that her father would spend the rest of his life in prison, away from her. SEE Trial Transcript, Addendum B, pgs 271-276 and 369-378.

When the "State's" case is made up of entirely circumstantial evidence, such as in this case, it

leaves the fact finder to speculation and conjecture,
then the evidence is insufficient as a matter of law.

See King v. State, 100 Ark. App. 208, (2007)

The Next of these Reversible Errors occurs

when at the Trial Court's Direction, The Prosecutor,
State Sponsored Defense Counsel and Trial Court
Collected to Dictate what a witness's testimony

would be. See Trial Transcript, Addendum B, pg 392.

The Next Reversible Error Consist of the Trial

Court's demand that the Accused, Mr. Garcia-Chicot,
Absolve the testimony of his defense and pushing
the State Sponsored defense Counsel to expedite their

Prosecution to the Jury. The Trial Court move
conceded with the length of time of trial that

allowing the accused to establish an understanding

of his presentation of Defence Narrative.

The Jury and Court's Time definitively more important than the Rest of Some Foreigners Life.

SEE Trial Transcript, Addendum B, pgs 489-491; 495-500; 506-511; 531; AND 543.

The Language and spirit of the SIXTH AMENDMENT contemplates that Counsel, like the other Defence tools guaranteed by it, shall be an aid to a willing Defendant and his Right to defend himself and not as an organ of the "state" interposed between the accused and the Courts. SEE Faretta v. California, 95 S.Ct. 2525, (1975).

The Trial Court committed yet another REVERSABLE Error by allowing the incomplete English Translation of a letter originally written in Spanish to be presented to the Jury, having only been sent twenty (20)

Days before the start of the Trial. The letter had yet to be authenticated and the individual that performed the translation to be used as a sign of guilt was not available at trial; thereby violating the Confrontation Clause of the Sixth Amendment. See Trial Transcript, Addendum B, pgs 530-531; 544-545; and 680-692.

After a review of both the original letter and the translation, one finds several places where the state translator could not complete the translation. Identifying that the state sponsored translator was not qualified to translate the specific dialect of Spanish used in the letter. With the Defence not being afforded the opportunity to have this letter independently translated nor authenticated this letter used to

Shows Guilt of Mr. Garcia-Chico should never been allowed to be entered into evidence and seen by the jury. SEE ALSO RULES 106; 403; 804; AND 901, FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE.

Improper Communication with the Jury by Trial Court Bailiff is the Next REVERSABLE ERROR to violate the SECURED AND GUARANTEED PROTECTIONS Apodictically Afforded to Mr. Jose R. Garcia-Chico. SEE TRIAL TRANSCRIPT, ADDENDUM B, PGS 628-647 AND 693-695. NO BETTER ARGUMENT THAT A MISTRIAL SHOULD HAVE BEEN DECLARED BY THE COURT AFTER RECEIVING THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE TRIAL COURT'S BAILIFF IMPROPER COMMUNICATION WITH THE JURY THAN THAT MADE AT TRIAL BY DEFENCE COUNSEL MR. WARDEN AND MR. LAMMERS INCLUDED WITH THE TRIAL TRANSCRIPT EXCEPTS.

The Concluding Reversible Error occurred with the Trial Court's abbreviating and abruptly ending of Mr. Garcia-Chico's address to the jury prior to sentencing on the grounds that the Trial Court had "heard enough" see Trial Transcript, Addendum B, pgs 730-733.

The Sixth Amendment does not provide merely that a Defence shall be made for the Accused, but Grants to the Accused, personally, the Right to make a defence; Right to Self-Representation, to make one's own defence personally is necessarily implied by the structure of the Amendment. see Forell v. California, 95 S.Ct. 2525, (1975) The Trial Court's acts and omissions fundamentally violated Mr. Garcia-Chico's sixth amendment Right.

LEGAL ARGUMENT

These malignant, ruinous, and tainted errors committed by the state of Arkansas amount in large to a compounded violation of the Due Process Clause as found penned in the Fifth Amendment; supported further by International treaty, statutes, and the fourteenth Amendment.

The secured and guaranteed protection to Due Process is a keystone to the legitimacy of the American Republic, from which all courts derive their charge and commission. The fundamental requirements of Due Process Clause being the opportunity to speak and be heard; that opportunity must be granted in a meaningful time frame and in a meaningful manner. see Parratt v. Taylor, 101 S.Ct. 1908,

(1981)

IN ORDER TO SUSTAIN A CONVICTION BASED SOLELY ON CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE, AS WAS DONE IN THIS MATTER, THE CIRCUMSTANCES MUST BE CONSISTENT WITH THE GUILT OF THE ACCUSED AND INCONSISTENT WITH HIS INNOCENCE, AND INCAPABLE OF EXPLANATION OR ANY OTHER HYPOTHESIS THAN THAT OF GUILT. SEE KING V. STATE, 100 Ark. App. 208, (2007)

Whether any procedural protections are due to the accused depends not on whether the governmental benefit is characterized as a "right" or as "privilege", but whether an individual will be condemned to suffer grievous loss; The question is not merely the weight of the individual's interest, but whether the nature of interest is one within

the Contemplation of the "Liberty or Property" Language of the fourteenth amendment. See Morrissey v. Brewer, 92 S.Ct. 2593, (1972).

If the "State" acts Affirmatively to Place someone in a Position of Danger that they would not have otherwise have faced, the "State" action, depending on their state of mind, may have committed a Constitutional Tort. See S.S. v. McMullen, 225 F.3d 960, (8th Cir. 2000)

The Authoritative Law, Rules, and Remedies Designed to protect individuals from Infractions, by the "States", of Federally Guaranteed Rights cannot be Left to the "States" themselves to employ, regulate, and/or enforce. See Chapman v. California, 87 S.Ct. 824 (1967)

The "State" needs to be continually reminded

that it exist to serve all, that is to say that they are to maintain an attitude of selflessness and sacrifice.

Credibility is always weighed heavily in favor of the "Authorities", who are keen to use the propaganda value of trials and pleas deals as weapons of war to show they are tough on crime in scoring political points to win election or smear their political opponents.

Please, it is prayed that you recognize the difference between symbolic gestures and effective actions.

Jurisdiction is the power of a court to hear and determine the matter in controversy. The court lacks jurisdiction, if it cannot hear the matter

under any circumstances, and is, wholly
incompetent to grant the relief sought. See NANCE v.
State, 2014 Ark. 201, by this definition the courts
below lacked jurisdiction over Mr. Garcia-Chico.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THIS PETITION

This Honorable Court should grant Mr. Garcin-Chicot's Petition based upon:

This is a case involving issues of first impressions, issues of significant international interest, and of substantial questions concerning the interpretations of the Constitution, international treaties, and acts of the Legislature. A review of this instant case will help to illuminate unconstitutional actions and omissions by public servants; and establish proper constitutional strict precedents.

That the decisions of the Courts below are erroneous and conflicting with the opinions previously held by other Appellate Courts and this High Court. The conduct of the Courts below are

prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the Courts and an affront to the efficiency of the Judiciary.

That the opinions of the Courts below, if allowed to stand, will have a severely adverse effect on the perception of the Courts ability for Independence, integrity, and impartiality; Its function in the checks and balances of the Power structure, one of the foundational stones of the American Republic. It will negatively effect the international Community and public's confidence in the American Judiciary

The Courts below have disregarded their duties and responsibilities as expressed in the founding documents and of the spirit of their

Pledge, mission, and function of being the
"watch dog" for the People against tyrannical
power seekers. As was intended by the founding
members of the American Republic.

That all Courts have an ethical and moral
duty to Act in Accordance with the Biblical principles
upon which the Institution finds its foundation. See
Exodus 18:15-23. We must only look to the Scriptures
for direction on how to apply the Justice of
Elohim; Including that the Magistrates be of a
Righteous and upright Nature, trust worthy, Spurn
ill-gotten gain, and keep their hands from bribes.

All Courts have a Responsibility to hold to the
Highest standards as required of them by the
Biblically Based founding documents of the Republic;

To Affirm the Lower Courts decision in this instant case is an outright declaration that these Republic creating documents, upon which all courts receive their Authority, ARE NO LONGER valid; Therefore, dissolving the American Republic and all of its institutions De-facto.

CONCLUSION

Under the Conditions Raised Above there was Absolutely No Plausible way for Mrs Jose R. Green-Chicol to Receive any form of a fair and impartial Trial in the Realm of the American Legal system.

Allegations of such magnitude should be of no surprise to anyone, in light of the Dynamics of this Complex blended family unit. There exist still

a conflict that has been waged for more than

4,000 years between Judeo-Christians and Muslims

from such sibling rivalry. See Genesis 21:8-21 and

25:1-8. From a very early age, children are taught

about the rivalry between Abraham's two sons;

Half-Brothers, Ishmael and Isaac. The sons of

Issac, Twins Esau and Jacob is yet another example

of the lengths, as exist in this case, that siblings will

undertake to endanger and supplant one another

in the face of gaining favor. See Genesis 25:19-27.

28:6-9; 32:4-9; and 33:1-11

If foreign National Citizens are treated in this

MANNER! Being "Rail Roaded" within the American Legal

System, as has been done to Mr. Jose R. Garcia-Chical.

How can it not be expected for American Citizens

Abroad to not be treated in like manner; Also
Violating International Laws!

It is for these herein that Mr. Jose R.
Garcia-Chicol Respectfully Request and believes
that this Honorable High Court of the American
Republic will find it Reasonable, Ruling on the
Square and by the Compass, to Review the opinions
and Judgements of the Courts below for abuse
Against the Constitution, International Law, and Statutes.

There is National and International Importance
for this Court to weigh in and Issue an opinion, not
only to Mr. Jose R. Garcia-Chicol but to all Individuals
Currently within the American Republic.

Respectfully Submitted
D 21 August 2020 C.E.
X Ben J. J. J.

Jose R. Green-Chicot, Pro Se
171396 P.O. Box 970
Marianna, Arkansas
72360-0970

Declaration / Verification

I, JOSE R. GARCIA-CHICO, do hereby DECLARE
AND VERIFY, UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY IN ACCORDANCE
WITH 28 U.S.C. § 1746 AND 18 U.S.C. § 1621, that the ABOVE
STATEMENTS CONTAINED HEREIN ARE TRUE AND CORRECT TO
THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF AS EXECUTED BY
MY HAND ON THIS 21st DAY OF AUGUST 2020 C.E..

Declarant
x for JRC
JOSE R. GARCIA-CHICO, Pro se
171396 P.O. Box 970
Marianna, Arkansas
72360-0970