

No. 20-5982

Supreme Court, U.S.  
FILED

JUL 16 2020

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Elmo Fortenberry — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

vs.

Board of Pardon and Parole et al RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

5<sup>th</sup> Cir Louisiana Court of Appeals

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Elmo Fortenberry  
(Your Name)

12071 Em 3522  
(Address)

Abilene TX 79601  
(City, State, Zip Code)

NA  
(Phone Number)

ORIGINAL

# QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- ① Is Fraud a Tort for which Relief can be granted.
- ② When Damages are willfully or negligently inflicted, knowingly and intentionally willfully is a felony.
- ③ Is Fraud any False Statement or evidence, used to induce another to make a bad faith operation.
- ④ Can Parole be Time Based or new harm by use of old known fraud.
- ⑤ Does Time Start on statute of limitations at last illegal act.
- ⑥ Does Parole Board have Absolute Immunity.
- ⑦ Does Parole Board members have Absolute Immunity.
- ⑧ Is there act willfully known by and intentional use of fraud.
- ⑨ Does it amend state there is no immunity when willfully violating rights and laws.
- ⑩ Should Forebear be able to confront and cross examine.
- ⑪ Accusals.
- ⑫ Has Forebear's Due Process rights been violated.
- ⑬ Has Forebear's involuntary seized been violated.

⑪ Should have These People Been made to answer All claims and bring a Default to each claim and Allegation. existed or just bring them down claim with a frivolous Defense.

⑫ Is this a miscarriage of Justice By All  
⑬ Should have The Courts and People looked at All Filings and Evidence letters,  
Request: I 605,

End of Questions

### LIST OF PARTIES

- ☒ All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. *OF WRIT OF Error*
- ☐ 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

*ALL CASES APPEAR ON FRONT PAGE OF WRIT*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                        |   |
|--------------------------------------------------------|---|
| OPINIONS BELOW .....                                   | 1 |
| JURISDICTION.....                                      |   |
| CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED ..... |   |
| STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....                            |   |
| REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....                    |   |
| CONCLUSION.....                                        |   |

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

|              |                                                                      |
|--------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| APPENDIX A   | Decision of 5 <sup>th</sup> Cir Court of Appeals, 3. Pages           |
| APPENDIX B   | Petition for rehearing; 2. Pages                                     |
| APPENDIX C   | Original Admonishments From Plea Agreement in 1991, 1. Page          |
| APPENDIX D   | Letter From Parole 2008 1 Page                                       |
| APPENDIX E   | 2. Requests or "I GO'S" From J Brown, First 1. Page, Second 2. Pages |
| APPENDIX F   | Letter From UNBudsman's Office 1 Page                                |
| APPENDIX G   | Index to writ of error, 1. Page                                      |
| APPENDIX H   | Writ of error 5. Pages                                               |
| APPENDIX I   | Original cover page to Appendix, 1. Page                             |
| APPENDIX J   | Original Appendix to writ of error 11, Page's                        |
| APPENDIX A.1 | Original 5 <sup>th</sup> Cir Per curiam opinion 3, Pages             |
| APPENDIX A.2 | US District Court (Judgments & briefs) 1. Page (4 Pages)             |

# TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

## CASES

## PAGE NUMBER

Erickson V. Pardus 551 US 89 (2007)  
 Haines V. Kerner 404 US 519 (1972)  
 Conley V. Gibson - US - 785 CT. 99, 102 (1952)  
 Erickson V. Pardus 551 US 89 (2007)  
 Perez V. US 312 F.3d 191, 195 (5th Cir 2002)  
 Ross V. Moffit 417 US 600 (1974)

{Cover to APP.  
 "APP. I"  
 Index to writ  
 of error  
 "APP. G"  
 Writ of Error  
 Page 4  
 "APP. H" }

McCluskey V. Zant - US - 110 S.Ct 1454 1489 (1991)  
 Stone V. Powell 428 US. AT 492 96 S.Ct. AT 305

Evitts V. Lucey 469 US. 387 (1985)

{Writ of error  
 Page 4  
 "APP. H" }

Howard V. King 707 F.2d. 215 (5th Cir 1983)

King V. Dubinsky 252 Sw.2d 937 (APP. I) (APP Page 9 "APP. J")

## STATUTES AND RULES

F.R.C.P. 15. (2) (2)

{Cover to APP) "APP. I"

Tex. R. APP. Proc. 36.3 (2) (b) (APP. J Page 9 ALSO Page 7

Tex. C.O.C.P. CHAPTER 62, ARTICLES 62.08 (2) (APP. J Page 9)

ART. 62.051, 62.059, 62.060 62.064, 62.063, 62.065

62.101, 62.151, 62.152, 62.153,

(APP. J Page 9.)

F.R. APP. PROC. Rule 12

(APP H. Page 4.)

US CONSTITUTION

1st Amend. APP J

(APP. J Page 11)

4th 5th 6th 13th 14th Amendments

{APP. I COVER  
 PAGE TO APP. }

11th 4th 5th 6th 13th 14th Amend

{Page 9) (APP. J. Pages 1, 2, 3)

## OTHER DEFINITIONS

CONVICTION; ADJUDICATION; OVERT ACT;

{APP. J. Page 4.)

OBJECTIVE; ILLEGAL; Due Process; LIABILITY;

{APP. J. Page 5.)

Fraud;

"Two Other Fed. Rules"

28 USCA §1343 (2) (1) (2) § 1350 (3) (b) (1) (2) (APP. J Page 11)

# CONTINUANCE OF CASE'S

NAPUE V. ILLINOIS 360 US. 264 (1959)  
MILLER V. PATE 386 US. 1 (1967)  
MOONEY V. HOLOHAN 294 US 103 (1935)  
PYLE V. KANSAS 317 US 213 (1942)

APP. & PAGE  
(APP. J. PAGE. 6.)  
(APP. J. PAGE. 6.)

## RUIZ

TERQUE V. QUARTERMAN 482 F.2d. 769-777 (5<sup>TH</sup> Cir, 2007) (APP. J. PAGE. 6.)  
BURNETT V. FAHEY 687 F.3d 171, 181 (4<sup>TH</sup> Cir 2012)  
KIRBY V. SIEGELMAN 195 F.3d 1285, 1291 (11<sup>TH</sup> Cir, 1999) (APP. J. PAGE. 6.)  
JENNINGS V. OWENS 602 F.3d, 652, 658 (5<sup>TH</sup> Cir 2010)  
SMITH V. WADE 461 US. 30, 36. (1983) (APP. J PAGE. 6.)  
HOLLINS V. POWELL 773 F.2d. 191, 198 (8<sup>TH</sup> Cir, 1985) (APP. J PAGE. 6.)  
BURNS V. PA DEPT OF CORR 544 F.3d 279 (3<sup>RD</sup> Cir, 08) (APP. J. PAGE. 7.)  
COLEMAN V. DRETKE 395 F.3d 216, 221 (5<sup>TH</sup> Cir, 2004)  
ESTATE OF DOMARCO V. WYOM. DEPT. CORR.  
473 F.3d, 1334, 1340 1344 (10<sup>TH</sup> Cir, 2007) (APP. J. PAGE. 7.)  
LTP V. DAVIS 61 F.3d. 288, 291 (5<sup>TH</sup> Cir, 1995) (APP. J PAGE. 7.)  
GUIDRY V. LA PRADCE 954 F.2d. 278, 281 (5<sup>TH</sup> Cir, 1992)  
CRUSE V. BETO 405 US. 319, 322 (1972) (APP. J. PAGE. 7.)  
407 US AT 299 ALSO  
BIVENS V. 6 UNKNOWN 403 US. 388 (1971) (APP. J. PAGE. 7.)  
KINS V. DOBIVSKY 253 SW.2d 937 (APP. J. PAGE. 7.) & PAGE. 9.)

US. V. EDELKIND 525 F.3d. 388, 400 (5<sup>TH</sup> Cir, 2008)  
TOUSSIE V. UNITED STATES 397 US. 112 (1970) (APP. J. PAGE. 8.)  
US V. JACOB 781 F.2d 643 649 (1986)  
MOON V. CITY OF EL PASO (5<sup>TH</sup> Cir, 2018) (APP. J PAGE. 8.)  
906 F.3d 352 (2018)  
ASKANASE V. FATJO 130 F.3d 657, 676 (5<sup>TH</sup> Cir, 1997) (APP. I cover PAGE  
TO APP.

EXCH V. HUFFMAN  
996 F.2d. 800 (1993) (APP. I cover PAGE  
TO APP

# CONTINUANCES OF CASES

Arnold Corp V. Bishop 928 SW 2d, 761 (Tex App 1996) (APP. J. Page 9)  
 UP John Co V. Freeman 885 SW 2d 538, 542 (Tex App 1994)  
 Adler V. Beverly Hills Hosp. 594 SW 2d, 153, 154 (Tex App 1980)  
 Imbler V. Pachtman 424 US 409, 426. (1976) (APP. J. Page 9.)  
 Kings V. Dubiusky <sup>253</sup>~~259~~ SW 2d 937 (APP. J. Page 9)  
 Imbler V. Pachtman 424 US 409, 426 (1976) (APP. J. Page 9)  
 Harlow V. Fitzgerald 457 US 800 818 (1982)  
 Wyatt V. Fletcher 718 F.2d 496 508 (5th Cir 2013) (APP. J. Page 9)  
 Morrison V. LeFevre 592 F. Supp 1052, 1073 (S.D.N.Y. 1984) (APP. J. Page 10)  
 USA V. Wallace 673 F. Supp 205 (1987) (APP. J. Page 10)  
 Moon V. Holohan 294 US 103. (1935)  
 Pyle V. Kansas 317 US 213 (1942) (APP. J. Page 10)  
 Napue V. Illinois 360 US 264 (1959)  
 Luna V. Betto 391 F.2d 329 (5th Cir 1967)  
 395 F.2d 35 (5th Cir 1968) (APP. J. Page 10)  
 394 US 966 (1969)  
 Briggs V. Goodwin <sup>569</sup>~~589~~ F.2d, 10-60 (1976) (APP. J. Page 10)  
 Butz V. Economou 438 US 478 500 (1978) (APP. J. Page 10)  
 Hulse V. Owens & Green 63 F.3d 354 (1995)  
 Howard V. King 707 F.2d 213 (5th Cir 1983) (APP. J. Page 10)  
 Coppedge V. US 369 US 438 (1962) (APP. J. Page 11.)  
 Carson V. Pollay 689 F.2d 562, 586 (5th Cir 1982)  
 Haines V. Kerner 404 US 519, 521 (1972) (APP. J. Page 11.)  
 McCleskey V. ZANT — US — 110 S.Ct 1454 1489 (1991) (APP. H. Page 4.)  
 Stone V. Powell 428 US 472 (1976) (APP. H. Page 4.)  
 Cruse V. Betto 405 US 319, 322 (1972) (APP. J. Page 11.)

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 \_\_\_\_\_ 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 \_\_\_\_\_ 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 Feb-5-2020.

☐ 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: 04-03-2020, 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**:

N/A  
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 DON'T UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU WANT

I CAN BE HELD TO THE SAME STANDARD FOR LITIGATION  
AND DECIDING RULES AS A LAWYER CONLEY V. GIBSON  
— US — 78 S. CT 99, 102 (1957) ERICKSON V. PAIDOS 55 US 89 (2007)  
PEREZ V. US 312 F.3D 191, 195 (5TH CIR 2002)

REFUSAL BY ALL STATE DEPARTMENTS TO FOLLOW THE  
CORRECTED JUDGEMENT CORRECTED BY ORIGINAL TRIAL  
JUDGE AND COURT; DUE PROCESS BY DENIAL OF FAIRNESS  
AT HEARING, BY NOT PRESENTING FALSE EVIDENCE KNOWN  
FALSE EVIDENCE TO INDUCE BAD FAITH OPINION;  
EQUAL PROTECTION BY NOT TREATING ME EQUAL TO  
OTHERS AND THREATENING MY LIFE.

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The original case was filed by US District Court and then the 2016 Court made me file an Amendment because the case originally stated Elmo Fortenberry V. Unknown Defendants 2-16-16. Date on notice from court. This case was dismissed to cover up the fraud by state departments and because courts did not like what I said on my response that the defendants had not answered the complaint, they defaulted. The letter from parole from 2008 and "ILD's" request returned from J Brown, prove knowledge and willful use of fraud to tort by extended stay in prison denial of parole and slander on data base.

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

To STOP Further harm And Torture By Parole  
And D.P.S. Parole Being made to release me  
WITHOUT Sex OFFENDER STIPULATION JUST USED TO  
EXTORT TAX DOLLARS AND CAUSE ME EXTRA MONEY  
ALSO. DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY TAKING ALL  
MY INFO OF DATA BASE TO STOP SCORN PUBLICLY.  
IF THIS CASE IS NOT CLEARED UP I WILL HAVE A  
NEW CHARGE BECAUSE OF REGISTRATION LAWS THAT  
I DON'T INTEND TO COMPLY WITH ANY LONGER.  
WHICH WILL CAUSE A NEW HARM THAT IS WHY  
THIS CASE IS A CONTINUED HARM ACTION BY STATE  
AND STATE EMPLOYEES. PAROLE AND TDCT ARE TRYING  
TO FORCE ME TO GO TO SEX OFFENDER TREATMENT TO  
EXTORT TAX DOLLARS WHEN THEY KNOW I AM  
LONG WAY DISCHARGING IN 1 YEAR 8-5-2021  
THAT IS WHEN I WILL BE ABLE TO GET TO MEDICAL  
IF CASE IS NOT CLEARED UP BY THEN TO STOP  
SLANDER IF I AM FORCED TO SLANDER MYSELF  
I WILL GO ALL THE WAY NOT JUST DATA  
BASE BUT TV RATED. SOCIAL MEDIA.

IF The writ is NOT GRANTED THIS COURT  
Along with The Other Two Are  
Giving These DEPARTMENTS The right  
TO WILLFULLY <sup>commit</sup> ~~commit~~ CRIMES. AND ASSISTING  
The Attorney General in Covering UP  
CRIMES AGAINST THE PUBLIC AND  
CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

#### CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Elmo Fortna

Date: 7-2-2020