

IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

)

Plaintiff and Respondent

)

US Supreme Court

)

v.

)

No. 20-6334

CHRISHMA HUNTER SINGHDEREWA

)

Defendant and Appellant

)

---

**RESPONSE TO RETURNED APPLICATION FOR ORDER ON STAY OF PROCEEDINGS**


C.H.SINGHDEREWA

808 W ALTADENA DRIVE ALTADENA CA

PHONE 209 782 7236

EMAIL:starhunterceo@hotmail.com

In Propria Persona



IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

)

Plaintiff and Respondent

)

US Supreme Court

)

v.

)

No. 20-6334

CHRISHMA HUNTER SINGHDEREWA

)

Defendant and Appellant

)

\_\_\_\_\_)

**RESPONSE TO RETURNED APPLICATION FOR ORDER ON STAY PROCEEDINGS**

TO THE HONORABLE SCOTT HARRIS CLERK Via MARA SILVER:

Comes now the Petitioner, CHRISHMA HUNTER SINGHDEREWA, to respond to the returned application for order on stay proceedings which was received via US MAIL on December 7<sup>th</sup> 2020.

1. The honorable court states:

You failed to comply with rule 23.3 of the Rules of this Court which requires that I first seek the same relief in the appropriate lower courts and attach orders from the lower courts to your application filed in this court.

**Response:** applications for stays were submitted to the lower courts and denied as indicated in the writ of certiorari exhibit A seen below :

Appendix A

SUPREME COURT  
FILED

Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three - No. B306954  
Jorge Navarrete Cler

S264331

Deputy

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA**

**En Banc**

CHRISHMA HUNTER SINGHDEREWA, Petitioner,

v.

SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY, Respondent;

THE PEOPLE, Real Party in Interest.

The petition for review and application for stay are denied.

Superior Court of California  
County of Los Angeles  
OCT 16 2020  
Clerk of Court

CANTIL-SAKAUYE  
Chief Justice

2. The honorable court states:

In accordance with rule 23.3 of the Rules of this Court you must set forth with particularity why relief is not available from any other Court and why a stay is justified.

**Response:** The petitioner states he has been particular in identifying the state of California's disregard for the US constitutional right to representation in his writ of certiorari in stating the below :

#### **V. Jurisdiction**

**A right to representation is a constitutional matter and therefore is within the jurisdiction of this Court. The Petitioner proposes this matter to be highly relevant and urgent to the American people. California refusing representation to a defendant is unconstitutional and a very timely discussion.**

A stay is justified as defined in the WRIT of CERTIORARI with particularity as stated below:

## **VII. Statement of the Case**

**The petitioner petitioned the California 2<sup>nd</sup> District Court of Appeals for a Writ of Mandamus on August 11<sup>th</sup>, 2020 attached as Exhibit B.**

**On the 28<sup>th</sup> August 2020 the petitioner received a denial the Appellate Court stating he had not demonstrated need extraordinary relief.**

**The petitioner submitted a Petition for Review directly with the California Supreme Court on 9/8/2020**

**On the 18<sup>th</sup> October 2020 the petitioner received a denial the California Supreme Court absent explanation.**

**The petitioner continues to seek the Extraordinary right to representation today 11/04/2020. Without this right the Petitioner may lose his life, liberty, happiness and perhaps most importantly his honor.**

The petitioner considers his life, liberty, pursuit of happiness and honor to be of extreme importance and worthy of a stay while the honorable Supreme Court of the United States decides if a right to representation is still a citizens right in this United States of America.

3. You must attach a certificate of service showing you have served all parties with this application.

**Response:** The certificate was part of the Writ and served to all parties as certified in the certificate of service as seen below:

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

I declare (or certify, verify, or state) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct: The petitioner Pro Se, has served by email and US MAIL this PETITION FOR REVIEW on:

The US Supreme Court 1 First St NE, Washington, DC 20543

The California Supreme Court 350 McAllister St Room 1295 San Francisco, Ca 94102-4797

The Los Angeles Court of Appeals 300 S Spring St 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor North Tower Los Angeles CA 90013

The Superior Court of Pasadena Criminal Division Clerk of Courts at 300 E Walnut St #103, Pasadena, CA 91101

The Superior Court of Pasadena Appellate Division Clerk of Court at 300 E Walnut St #103, Pasadena, CA 91101

The Superior Court of Los Angeles Court of Appeals Misdemeanor Division c/o Fredrick Bennett Room 546, Patti Jo McKay and Addie Lovelace 6<sup>th</sup> Floor at 111 N Hill St, Los Angeles, CA 90012

The District Attorney of the Superior Court of Pasadena Criminal Division at 300 E Walnut St #103, Pasadena, CA 91101

The District Attorney of the Superior Court of Los Angeles Court of Appeals Misdemeanor Division at 320 W Temple St. 5th Floor, #540 Los Angeles, CA 90012

On this day the 4th of November 2020



Signed:

C.H. Singhderewa

Counsel Pro Se

808 W Altadena, Altadena California 91001

4. You are required to state the grounds upon which this Courts jurisdiction is invoked, with citation of the statutory provision

**Response:** The petitioner has stated the jurisdiction as indicated above and pasted here again for convenience :

#### **V. Jurisdiction**

**A right to representation is a constitutional matter and therefore is within the jurisdiction of this Court. The Petitioner proposes this matter to be highly relevant and urgent to the American people. California refusing representation to a defendant is unconstitutional and a very timely discussion.**

Furthermore, the constitutional right known as the 6<sup>th</sup> Amendment in the Bill of Rights is included below for statutory reference:

#### **Amendment VI**

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the state and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

DATE: \_\_\_\_12/08/2020\_\_\_\_

Respectfully submitted,



C.H. Singhderewa

Counsel Pro Se

808 W Altadena

Altadena, CA

91001

