

No. _____

20-7111

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

FILED
NOV 05 2020
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

Carlos Lopez-Vanezas — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

VS.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

Supreme Court of Pennsylvania
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Carlos Lopez-Vanezas
(Your Name)

1200 Mokychic Drive, P.O. Box 244
(Address)

Collegeville, Pennsylvania 19426
(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

RECEIVED
NOV 25 2020
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- i) Should be pursued an appeal process totally regarded to a Direct Appeal be properly-competent executed, When the mens rea and actus rea have not been presented to State Courts Officers to properly address the matter and facts

Factual Answer: Stillborne Appeal Process

- ii) How can a disguised due process of law contrary to the Constitution's Guaranteed Due Process of Law been presented upon a prima facie fashion to a jury, at which has been given free will as assume like a grand jury, to then serve to decide as jury at trial

Answer at Law: Imminently Guilty as Charged

- iii) Can a quiet foreign practice of non-separation of duties and feascases influence the execution of law, at do sight a case for adjudication

Requested Answer: Under what kind of jurisdiction do the court operates; and, under what jurisdiction do the public plea and protect their rights and interest

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

Movant based to have been actually restricted of movement, under the pretext as to be
own quarantine, do reserve the right to cite and refers his facts and matter to be recited as a matter
of law.

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 : Trial Court Appointment of Lawyer on *In Forma Pauperis*

APPENDIX B : Trial Court in question case opinion

APPENDIX C : Pennsylvania Superior Court Opinion-decision

APPENDIX D : Pennsylvania Supreme Court decision /Order

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

Mouant based to have been actually restricted of Movement, under the pretext as to be on Quarantine, do reserve the right to cite and refers his facts and Matter to be recited as a matter of law

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 _____; 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 A 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 of Common Pleas of the County of Norristown, Pa. court appears at Appendix B 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 _____.

☐ 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: _____, 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:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was Supreme Court, PA.. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix C.

☐ 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

- a). Amendment I; ... and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances
 - b). Amendment V.
 - c). Amendment VI.
 - d). Amendment XIII
 - e). Amendment XIV
-

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

After an unsuccessful trial by jury on July, 2018, on which was presented a disagreed (by Movant) a defense-denyver stillborne fact and issue; the trial court have appointed Mr. Brooks T. Thompson to Mr. Brooks T. Thompson, Esquire, as to pursue direct appeal lawyer. Movant diligently attempted to contact Mr. Thompson, as to discuss the point of interest for appeal before the filing of paper work in court; at which no response was produced by Mr. Thompson. Then, on his own criteria Mr. Thompson did file appeal at the PA's, Superior and Supreme Court pursuing direct appeal pursuing the same on res judicata stillborne issue presented by the trial lawyer.

The instant matter-action is regarding about the court officers has stopped to discharge their (Constitutional Contractual) duties on the course of a trial by jury (as its entirety process), to operate on a foreign jurisdiction to incarcerate an innocent man; not because Movant has tried to manipulate and/or evade the law; but, because the record and evidence acquit Movant of the claim against him.

In other words, movant have placed on a situation-controversy on which the jury has given a blank canvas-general title to find probable cause and guilty (judge) the Movant of the claim presented just based on assumption, but with the obligation to discharge ones duties without the understanding of corpus delicti, mens rea, and actus rea as to produce a legit outcome of the case, outside of the poisonous tree evidence left at the acquittance of the Movant pursuant to the evidence and records.

And regarding to the facts and merit for cause of action for appeal, as to have a claim which remedy and recourse should be provided, are based to the following factual facts:

1. A due process contrary to the guaranteed Constitutional Due Process to pursue a prima facie on assumption; after the cause of action have been void, and Movant been acquitted by the evidence
2. A pursuement of cause of action based upon assumption being intrusive to the family daily life, after the discovering of absence of harm/corpus delicti
3. Refusal to address on a competent fashion, the case mens rea, and, actus rea during the case and at appeal proceeding

Question: How prejudiced and/or right violation, infringement or deprivation Movant have suffered?

Answer: Yes. In fact.

The in question court procedural it is so prejudicial and harmful not just to the public at face a foreign deprivation due process; but, also to the due process of law, in which such court procedural the respondent just plea to be a defendant, no defense is acknowledged, and the defendant is left on a situation where is just listen and allowed the COMMONWEALTH to present and interject rhetoric evidence to establish the degree of the claim, as part of a summary judgment.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Movant an innocent man which have been sentenced to a Life Sentence on Numbers. Upon a prosecution on where the court officers has ceased to discharge duties pursuant to their (under Constitutional Contractual Oath of Office) title, to force Movant to go under a foreign jurisdiction without having understanding whatsoever of such due process, either provide notice - knowledge on such foreign jurisdiction relief and recourse available to Movant to response to the claim without incurr as belligerent - failure - negligent - at fault while during the course of such archaic egyptian pharaonic process.


Likewise, it is not in the best interest of justice to give freedom of will and manipulation of the process - circumstances to witnesses which are driven - guided with intention to prejudice and harm; and then restrict Movant at attempt to address of concerns on the seek of the truth and justice with the witnesses; as if the witnesses are not on general knowledge to been lent themselves to ask Wrongfully.

Further, it is fair, proper and in the best interest of justice; If Movant has been presented a claim or accusation under the law, and, has given notice to face a due process of law pursuant the Constitutional guaranteed due process, remedy, recourse and relief procedural; be given the the opportunity heard and treated pursuant to the Constitutional guaranteed due process, and, be given proper and fair opportunity to present response and proof to the claim as guaranteed to the public to be treated.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: _____