

20-6579
No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Amiee O'Neil — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.
Weld County — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Amiee O'Neil
(Your Name)

9717 Sandmist Ave
(Address)

Las Vegas, NV 89134
(City, State, Zip Code)

702-302-0481
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. Did Attorney Andrew Poland provide adequate representation?
2. Did Weld County provide fair procedure and equal protection in the courts?
3. Did Weld County deprive life, liberty, and property without due process?
4. Was Equal Protection granted as a matter of law?
Mandamus Rooding v. Peters
876 E. 946 Supp.
5. Did Attorney Andrew Poland know enough to contact the court and determine whether the judgment of conviction had actually been entered before he wrote an appeal brief for the court?

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

1. Strickland v. Washington
466 US 668, 688-92 (1984)
2. Polk County v. Dodson 454
3. Anders v. California
4. Argersinger v. Hamlin
407 US 25, 40 (1972)

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

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

US v. Price
Anders v. California
Boiling v. Sharp

1

1

1

STATUTES AND RULES

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 _____ to the petition and is

☐ reported at US v. Price; 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☐ is unpublished.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 Gideo v. Wainwright; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

372 US 335 P.

386 US 742

☐ 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 Anders v. California; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the Boiling v. Sharp 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.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

1. The Sixth Amendment, the right to competent counsel that owes a duty to its client for fair and equal protection standards.
2. The Fourteenth Amendment allowing for fair procedure and equal protection standards
3. The petitioner is physically disabled and was 3 days post operative, her judgment was impaired and a violation of the 5th Amendment of self incrimination has been breached.
4. Attorney Andrew Poland filed a frivolous Appeal when medical documentation justifies the petitioners condition at the time she was charged.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

1. Attorney Andrew Poland was assigned to represent an appeal from Weld County by the Alternate Defense Counsel. Andrew Poland alleged that the judgment of conviction was never entered, when in fact it was entered; thus he deliberately and intentionally lied to the Court and the Colorado Court of Appeals did not question this frivolous appeal.
2. Andrew Poland refused to meet with me and discuss the merits of this case, as I went to his office a number of times to meet with him but he refused.
3. The Attorney's incompetence and deliberate negligence of equal protection clearly identifies a private individual having a special relationship with governmental authority

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

1. The deprivation of fundamental fairness, equal protection, and individual's in similar circumstances being treated the same.
2. Violation of the right to competent counsel, A violation of the Sixth Amendment, Wainright
3. A violation of the Fourteenth Amendment of a procedural scheme created to oppress unlawful acts under the color of state law. A special relationship with a governmental authority is a direct violation of the Fourteenth Amendment guaranteeing equal protection
4. I was not granted a competent attorney that provided equal protection and fair procedures under the law

The petitioner concludes that her right to competent counsel of the 6th Amendment has been breached and fair and equal procedures have been violated and begs for the removal of this felony conviction, the only felony on her record,

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Aimee O'Neil

Date: December 1, 2020