

No. 20-6705

ORIGINAL

## IN THE

**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

IAN LaMONTÉ CORMIER — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

FILED  
NOV 13 2020  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

vs.

JAMES COMEY, et al. — RESPONDENT(S)

**ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO**

UNITED STATES Court of Appeals FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT  
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

IAN LaMONTÉ Cormier

(Your Name) LARRY D. SMITH CORRECTIONAL FACILITY  
1627 S. HARGRAVE STREET

ALSO: (P.O. Box 9416, MORENO VALLEY, CA. 92553 )

(Address) BANNING, CA. 92220

(City, State, Zip Code)

BEFORE PETITIONERS FALSE ARREST  
(951) 992-2022 (CELL #)

(Phone Number)

(In Pro-SE)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- 1) WAS JUDGE Napheen Jones Court in violation of giving DEFENDANT (IAN L. CORRIE) A FAIR TRIAL WHEN THE COURT PLACED DEFENDANT'S BOSS' WIFE ON DEFENDANT'S JURY? THIS PROMPTING DEFENDANT TO CALL HIS BOSS TO ASK IF ERLENE (SIC) WHITE WAS LINCOLN WHITE'S WIFE OR LINCOLN'S BROTHER, WHERE DEFENDANT WORKED WITH BOTH MEN. DID THIS VIOLATE DEFENDANT'S RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL?
- 2) DID JUDGE JONES PLACING ERLENE WHITE ON THE STAND TO TESTIFY ABOUT SAID PHONE CALL BETWEEN DEFENDANT, AND HIS BOSS CONSTITUTE HER SAY EVIDENCE, AND WAS INADMISSIBLE.
3. DID PUBLIC DEFENDER OF SAN DIEGO BRIAN BOLES RELUCTANCE TO OBJECT TO HER SAY TESTIMONY CONSTITUTE INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL. DID BRIAN BOLES RELUCTANCE TO OBJECT TO TESTIMONY OF A BLUE, DATSUN B-210. THAT WASN'T IMPROVED FOR STATE EVIDENCE CONSTITUTE INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL BY JAMES COMEY?
4. DID JUDGE JONES' JURY INSTRUCTION, AFTER RELIEVING ERLENE WHITE OF HER DUTIES CONSTITUTE, A PREJUDICIAL JURY INSTRUCTION WHEN HE TOLD THE JURY THAT "YOU CAN FIND THE DEFENDANT GUILTY IF YOU FEEL THE DEFENDANT CALLED HIS BOSS, TO HAVE HIS BOSS TO ASK HIS WIFE FOR LENIENCY FOR THE DEFENDANT."
5. DID EX F.B.I. DIRECTOR JAMES COMEY WORK AS A ATTORNEY, FOR SAN DIEGO PUBLIC DEFENDER'S OFFICE IN 1986? WAS HE AUTHORIZED TO PRACTICE LAW IN CALIFORNIA, AND SUBSTITUTE FOR BRIAN BOLES THE NEXT COURT DAY? UNETHICAL (UNETHICAL) PRACTICES.
6. WAS SUNNI HOSTIN (NOW CO-HOST OF THE VIEW) AUTHORIZE TO REPRESENT THE SAN DIEGO DISTRICT ATTORNEYS OFFICE, THE VERY SAME NEXT COURT DAY THAT JAMES COMEY STATED THAT HE WAS FILLING IN FOR BRIAN BOLES?
7. WAS SUNNI HOSTIN A ATTORNEY (D.A.) IN 1986, AND WAS SHE AUTHORIZE TO PRACTICE IN CALIFORNIA, FOR THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY OFFICE OF SAN DIEGO?
8. WAS DEFENDANT AFFORDED A FAIR TRIAL IN JUDGE JONES' COURT ROOM IN 1986?
9. DID ERLENE WHITE BEING PLACED ON PETITIONERS JURY DENY PETITIONER OF A FAIR TRIAL? (CALL RECOR

## 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:

JUDGE NAPOLEON JONES, SAN DIEGO PUBLIC DEFENDER BRIAN BOLES,  
JAMES COMEY (FORMER ATTORNEY SAN DIEGO PUBLIC DEFENDER).  
SARAH HOSTIN (SAN DIEGO DISTRICT ATTORNEYS OFFICE).

## RELATED CASES

JACKSON v. SUPERIOR COURT; 4 Cal. 5th 96

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW .....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....	5
CONCLUSION.....	6

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A : THE DATE ON WHICH THE UNITED STATES Court of Appeals  
DECIDED PETITIONERS CASE.

APPENDIX B : A TIMELY PETITION FOR REHEARING WAS DENIED By UNITED STATES  
COURT OF APPEAL, AND A COPY OF ORDER DENYING REHEARING.

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

### CASES

JACKSON v. SUPERIOR COURT; 4 CAL. 5TH 96

### PAGE NUMBER

### STATUTES AND RULES

42 U.S.C. § 1983.

### 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 A to the petition and is

reported at 20-55320; 5:19-CV-01198-SVW-AFM; 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 B to the petition and is

reported at 20-55320; 5:19-CV-01198-SVW-AFM; 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 8/21/2020.

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: 11/3/2020, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix B.

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).

42 U.S.C. § 1983.

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**

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO A FAIR TRIAL (14TH; DUE PROCESS).

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO ADEQUATE REPRESENTATION OF COUNSEL.

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

IN LATE 1986, DEFENDANT WAS ARRESTED FOR FALSE ALLEGATIONS; WHERE WHILE DEFENDANT WAS IN THE PROCESS OF PICKING HIS JURY, A AFRICAN-AMERICAN WOMAN BY THE NAME OF ERLENE (sic) WHITE WAS PLACED ON THE JURY. BECAUSE DEFENDANT AT THAT TIME WORKED AS SECURITY AT A YACHT CLUB NAMED MISSION BAY YACHT CLUB WITH TWO AFRICAN-AMERICAN MEN BY THE LAST NAME OF WHITE, SO AS MRS. WHITE ANSWERED THE VOID DIRE (sic) QUESTION ABOUT HER HUSBAND WORKING SECURITY AT A YACHT CLUB IN MISSION BAY, IT CAUGHT THIS PETITIONERS ATTENTION. SO, AFTER THAT DAY OF COURT ENDED, THIS PETITIONER CALLED HIS BOSS TO SEE IF HIS WIFE OR HIS BROTHERS HAD BEEN PLACED ON PETITIONERS JURY, SO, ALTHOUGH PETITIONER SPOKE WITH MR. WHITE, WHERE HE (Mr. WHITE) TRIED TO MAKE PETITIONER LOOK LIKE HE WAS JURY TAMPERING (THAT CALL WAS RECORDED) BY ASKING "IS THERE ANYTHING PETITIONER WANTED HIM (Mr. WHITE) TO ASK HIS WIFE, ONCE SHE CAME HOME", WHERE PETITIONER SAID "NO! BUT YOU CAN TELL HER ABOUT MY CHARACTER".

NOW BECAUSE THE COURT ERRONEOUSLY PLACED MY BOSS' WIFE ON PETITIONERS JURY (MAYBE INTENTIONALLY), JUDGE JONES USED ERLENE TESTIMONY WHICH COULD BE CONSTRUED AS HEAR-SAY AGAINST PETITIONER. THEN JUDGE JONES GAVE THE JURY THE PREJUDICIAL JURY INSTRUCTION, SAYING "...IF YOU FEEL THAT MR. CORMIER CALLED HIS BOSS, SO THAT HIS BOSS CAN ASK HIS WIFE TO SHOW HIM LENIENCY, THEN YOU CAN FIND HIM GUILTY". JUDGE JONES GAVE THE JURY THE GREEN LIGHT TO FIND PETITIONER GUILTY, BEFORE PETITIONERS TRIAL STARTED.

THE NEXT DAY IS WHEN JAMES COMEY SUBSTITUTED FOR BRIAN BOLES, AND SUNNI HOSTIN STATED THAT SHE WAS FILLING IN FOR THE PREVIOUS DISTRICT ATTORNEY. THE QUESTION IS WHETHER JAMES COMEY, AND SUNNI HOSTIN WAS AUTHORIZED TO PRACTICE LAW IN THOSE POSITIONS (WERE THEY OFFICERS OF THE COURT?). FOR CALIFORNIA, THE COURT TRANSCRIPT HAS BEEN MODIFIED TO SHOW NO CHANGE IN THESE PLAYERS.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

THE COURTS ARE A VENUE WHICH IS SUPPOSED TO FASTER JUSTICE,  
THIS PETITIONERS LAST NAME HAS BEEN GIVEN A SCARLET LETTER  
FOR THE LAST THIRTY-FOUR (34) YEARS. PETITIONER HAS BEEN TARGETED  
BY LAW ENFORCEMENT, THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS  
(SEE CORMIER V. LYNN E. WILLIAMS ET AL., D.C.# 5:20-cv-01877-SVW-AFM  
:CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA).

THE ACTORS IN THE LOWER COURTS SHOULDN'T BE ABLE TO ASSASSINATE  
ONES NAME, AND CHARACTER BY MANIPULATION THE COURT TRIAL PROCESS.  
THIS IS WHAT HAS BEEN DONE, AND BECAUSE PETITIONER CARES ABOUT  
HIS FATHERS LAST NAME (IT'S THE ONLY THING PETITIONERS FATHER GAVE HIM)  
LADY JUSTICE ISN'T SUPPOSED TO BE MANIPULATED IN THIS FASHION.  
I DIDN'T JUST MAKE THIS UP.

THE DISTRICT COURT HAS DONE EVERYTHING TO KEEP A JURY FROM  
HEARING WHAT THESE BAD ACTORS DONE TO ME (PETITIONER).

## **CONCLUSION**

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane L. Cornley

Date: 11/12/2020