

No. _____

ORIGINAL

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ANDREW WATSON BUNN
Petitioner

v.

STATE OF WISCONSIN
Respondent

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
FEB 22 2021
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS**

**Andrew Watson Bunn, RN, pro se
473 Oakland Ave
Port Washington, WI 53074
andybunn@yandex.com
262-416-2880**

RECEIVED
MAR - 1 2021
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

QUESTION PRESENTED

Capital Case.

Whether a right to appeal is preserved when the questions presented remain unanswered.

LIST OF PARTIES

ALL PARTIES APPEAR IN THE CAPTION OF THE CASE ON THE COVER PAGE.

RELATED CASES

WISCONSIN v Bunn, No. 17CM1652, Milwaukee County Circuit Court. Judgment entered June 7, 2018.

WISCONSIN v Bunn, No. 2019AP2127-CR, Wisconsin Court of Appeals District I. Judgment entered Sept 09, 2020.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINION BELOW.....	3
JURISDICTION.....	4
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND STATUTES INVOLVED.....	4
STATEMENT OF CASE.....	5
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION.....	7

APPENDICES:

Appendix A - Opinion of Wisconsin Court of Appeal.....	11
Appendix B - Denial of Review by Wisconsin Supreme Court.....	16
Appendix C - Trial Court Decision Transcript.....	17
Appendix D - Relevant State Statutory and Rule Provisions.....	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Brady v Maryland 373 U.S. 83 (1963).....	6
Ohio v Clark , 576 U.S. 237 (2015).....	8
Connick v Thompson , 563 U.S. 51 (2011).....	7
Coy v Iowa , 487 U.S. 1012, 1015-16 (1988).....	7
Crawford v Washington , 541 U.S. 36 (2004).....	8
Giglio v United States , 405 U.S. 150 (1972).....	7
Giles v California , 554 U.S. 353, 128 S.Ct. 2678 (2008).....	7
Graham v Connor , 490 U.S. 386 (1989).....	8
Jencks v United States , 353 U.S. 657 (1957).....	7
Maryland v Craig , 497 U.S. 836 (1990).....	8
Wisconsin Statutes:	
167.31	5
808.03(1)	7
941.23	5
971.23	7

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[] is unpublished.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 _____.

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 01/20/2021. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix 4.

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).

No. _____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Andrew Watson Bunn, Petitioner

v.

STATE OF WISCONSIN, Respondent

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO WISCONSIN COURT OF APPEALS

Petitioner, Andrew Watson Bunn, respectfully asks that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment and opinion of the Wisconsin Court of Appeal, District I, filed on September 9, 2020.

OPINION BELOW

The opinion of the Wisconsin Court of Appeal, unpublished, was issued on September 9, 2020, and is attached as Appendix A. The Wisconsin Supreme Court's one-page order denying review is attached as Appendix B. The Decision of the trial court Motion to Suppress and Dismiss for Unlawful Stop hearing is attached as Appendix C.

JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a). The decision of the Wisconsin Court of Appeal for which petitioner seeks review was issued on September 9, 2020. The Wisconsin Supreme Court order denying petitioner's timely petition for discretionary review was filed on January 20, 2021. This petition is filed within 90 days of the Wisconsin Supreme Court's denial of discretionary review, under Rules 13.1 and 29.2 of this Court.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND STATUTES INVOLVED

United States Constitution, Amendment 6 provides, in pertinent part:

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.

United States Constitution, Amendment 14 provides, in relevant part:

No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

The Wisconsin statutory provisions and court rules that are presented in Appendix D.

STATEMENT OF CASE

A traffic stop was conducted in May 11, 2017 entirely based on an in person complaint from a "female" otherwise indescribable anonymous witness. All predictive aspects of the complaint demonstrated false. Physics can not support the tip of the witness. Three handguns were located in the vehicle properly transported according to Wisconsin Statute 167.31 and in conflict with Wisconsin 941.23. A criminal complaint was filed May 13, 2017 reporting the cause of the investigation was a 911 call. No record of a 911 call or "dispatch" record are on record. The body camera evidence disappeared and remains unexplained. The identity of the third of three officers is unknown.

A motion to suppress all evidence and dismiss for unlawful stop was conducted October 24, 2020 and Decided November 3, 2017 (Appendix C). The proceedings were stayed January 25, 2018 until

the Statute conflicts were resolved in State v. Granberry, 16AP173-CR.

The single State's witness, Kieran Sawyer, has testified to two mutually exclusive sets of facts under oath. He has both testified an Amy L Esperes with a Date of Birth of 09/20/1989 and Angela M Esperes with a Date of Birth of 01/19/1988 were in the vehicle.

Unable to attain the complete discovery as Ordered or internal coherence of testimony and evidence the matter was resolved with a plea agreement and Notice to Pursue Post-Conviction Relief dated June 7, 2018. The fine was in the amount of vandalism wrought on the vehicle post peaceful arrest.

On Appeal the Brady Motion to effect discovery was denied. Oral hearing refused. The Wisconsin Court of Appeals District I admits some puzzlement, "as best as we can tell" ignoring the 6th and 14th Amendment and incredibly pretending without merit an appeal must be limited to the 4th Amendment, but affirmed (Appendix B Page 2).

The Supreme Court of Wisconsin refused review January 20, 2021. In my Petition I detail an assassination attempt on me and the accidental death of my neighbor. Since filing this petition, more deaths have been documented and at least one was considered suspicious. Wisconsin does not have an attempted homicide

specific statute. We believe the State is complicit in the murder spree, and this action is a disarming, and therefore are forced to consider this a capital case and depart the State of Wisconsin statum.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

I

This case has risen to the high Court prematurated. In Wisconsin Appeal of a final decision is a matter of right (Wisconsin 808.03(1)). The appeal was broadly Constitutionally rooted citing verbatim: the preamble, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th. And 14th Amendments. The arguments were arbitrarily, obломовист, and anti-intellectually limited to the 4th Amendment, without authority and admitted unclarity.

Wisconsin law requires complete timely discovery by Statute 971.23. We know there would be body camera evidence. We infer the State knows of the lack of the body camera evidence and therefore did not provide corroborating testimony of the primary arresting officer, Officer Manuel Leucena-Martinez, instead the patrol Sergeant alone testified in order to deceive the Court. The Supreme Court has resolved the matter in *Brady v Maryland* 373 U.S. 83 (1963), as well as *Giglio v United States*, 405 U.S. 150 (1972) and *Connick v Thompson*, 563 U.S. 51 (2011) and *Jencks v United States*, 353 U.S. 657 (1957). What has happened to the evidence necessary for a fair trial here? And why has the Appeal Court refused to conform?

II

The secondary argument presented is the lack of Confrontation of the “witness” upon whom the entirety of the suspicion in order to effect the otherwise suspicion-less traffic stop where the witness is indescribable. Although the witness is termed, “she” and “woman” there is no objective criteria to distinguish the witness from hallucination, fabrication or apparition experience. There are objective and legal reasons to suspect the later few. We may infer the predictive aspect of the police tip is falsified by the lack of a charging decision (and by the police report itself). The inability or refusal to describe a witness lies outside of objectively reasonable police conduct. Officers are able to look at and describe objects. Without a memory or vision police tasks such as investigation, and patrol are not possible (Graham v Connor, 490 U.S. 386 (1989)). The witness derives credibility from the potential exposure (such as a license plate or phone number) but is an actual exposure not an imaginary or theoretical one. Although my email was hacked deleting my Petition so going from memory here, The Appeals Courts were briefed on and ignored the following authorities: Coy v Iowa, 487 U.S. 1012, 1015-16 (1988), Giles v California, 554 U.S. 353, 128 S.Ct. 2678 (2008), Crawford v Washington, 541 U.S. 36 (2004), Maryland v Craig, 497 U.S. 836 (1990), Ohio v Clark, 576 U.S. 237 (2015).

The trial court did find Sawyer’s testimony credible. On Appeal, I took liberty to demonstrate Sawyer’s perjury (no qualifier intended). The Appeals Court dishonestly termed this “rambling.” Sawyer remains uncharged.

The State likely knew of the dubious and murky claims and this is why the false Criminal Complaint was filed to shore up false authority. Knowing deception of a Court

violates Prosecutorial Ethics (Rule 3.8 a, d, g and h). Norms have rapidly changed. Rule of Law appears collapsed. Wisconsin lacks prosecutor integrity units or sufficient laws to protect the public from outrageous conduct. We have openly speculated in the Appeals Court this action truly commenced due to the leaking of the Petitioner's Security Clearance and represents a grave risk to the United States the list will be used as a kill list. Wisconsin has extensive business interests with a strategic enemy of the United States. We suspect the reason the State has attempted to murder the Petitioner is to protect this criminal scheme. The murderer is likely government supported due to the use of Federal Communications Commission restricted equipment and techniques (Communications Act of 1934).

Petitioner urges this Court to take review because state sponsored death dealing is a serious and tends to expand.

CONCLUSION

The Petitioner in this case is a not working health professional in a pandemic because basic security has been refused and this case has been demonstrated an injustice. Instead of pursue honesty, the Appeals Court may have errored by ignoring the settled arguments and authorities presented. For the foregoing reasons, Petitioner requests that this Court grant the petition for certiorari.

In the Alternative, the Court may demand the Wisconsin Appeals Court answer the arguments presented as a right. However, due to security failures, indigency, and pro

se status, the Petitioner is unable to present a defense or briefing within the State without risk to loss of life.

Dated: 1/19/2021

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Amy R.", is written over a horizontal line.

Respectfully submitted,