

20-7312  
No. \_\_\_\_\_

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Supreme Court, U.S.  
FILED  
FEB 19 2021  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

Raeon Terrell Parker — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

John Pickens, Detective 4636 vs.  
M. Wells Detective 4860  
J. Crump, Detective 4759 — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit  
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Raeon Terrell Parker  
(Your Name)

3848 Shenandoah Ave Apt 11  
(Address)

Saint Louis, Mo 63110  
(City, State, Zip Code)

314-728-2010  
(Phone Number)

**QUESTION(S) PRESENTED**

The question presented is was there probable cause enough to warrant a search and seizure. Did the defendant(s) subject the appellant to cruel and unusual punishment by arresting the appellant when the charge was only a violation to be cited for.

## 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

1922-CC00906 - Parker v. Kansas City Police Department  
ED 108221- Raevon Parker v. KC Police Department

4:20-cv-00311 SEP - Parker v. Pickens, M. Wells, J. Lanaman, J. Crumper

4:20-cv-00276 SRB - Parker v. Pickens, M. Wells, J. Lanaman, J. Crumper

20-2281 - Parker v. Pickens, M. Wells, J. Lanaman, J. Crumper

19-8982 - Incident Report Kansas City, Missouri Police Department

#GA00152710-7 Kansas City v. Raevon Terrell Parker

Terry v. Ohio 392 U.S. 1

New Jersey v. T.L.O 496 U.S. 325

Payton v. New York 445 U.S. 573

Rakas v. Illinois 439 U.S. 128

Chimel v. California 395 U.S. 752

Mapp v. Ohio 367 U.S. 634

Boyd v. United States 116 U.S. 616

Carroll v. United States 257 U.S. 132

, South Dakota v. Opperman 428 U.S. 364

, Chambers v. Maroney 399 U.S. 42

, Berger v. New York 388 U.S. 41

, Davis v. United States 514 U.S. 229 (2011)

, United States v. Chadwick 433 U.S. 1

## 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	1922-CC00906	Raeon Parker v. Kansas City Police Department
APPENDIX B	ED 108221	Raeon Parker v. KC Police Department
APPENDIX C	4:20-cv-00311 SEP	Parker v. Pickens, M. Wells, J. Lenaman, J. Crumper
APPENDIX D	4:20-cv-00276 SRB	" " " "
APPENDIX E	20-2281	Parker v. Pickens, M. Wells, J. Lenaman, J. Crumper
APPENDIX F	Kansas City Police Department Incident Report	19-8982
APPENDIX G	# G00152910-7	Kansas City v. Raeon Terrell Parker

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
Terry v. Ohio 392 U.S. 1	
New Jersey v. T.L.O 469 U.S. 325	
Payton v. New York 445 U.S. 573	
Rakas v. Illinois 439 U.S. 128	
Chimel v. California 395 U.S. 752	
Mapp v. Ohio 367 U.S. 643	
Boyd v. United States 116 U.S. 616	
Carroll v. United States 267 U.S. 132	
South Dakota v. Opperman 428 U.S. 364	
Chambers v. Maroney 399 U.S. 42	
Berger v. New York 388 U.S. 41	
Davis v. United States 564 U.S. 299 (2011)	
United States v. Chadwick 433 U.S. 1	

### STATUTES AND RULES

Amendment III, Amendment IV, Amendment VI  
Amendment III, Amendment XII

### 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 E 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 D 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 B 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 City of Saint Louis Circuit Court (22<sup>nd</sup>) court 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.

## JURISDICTION

For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was January 15, 2021.

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).

[x] Pending rehearing date: January 26, 2021

For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was June 27, 2019. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix A.

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**

Amendment IV ; Amendment I , Amendment VI , Amendment VII .  
Amendment XIV

### **STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

This case is about a unlawful arrest, search and seizure of person and property. Appellant constitutional rights have been violated.

### **REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION**

The petition should be granted because the only action is civil action. The appellants constitutional rights have been violated and appellant would like to request that the court compensate the appellant justly.

## **CONCLUSION**

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Raeon Parker

Date: 2-19-21