

No. 20-7352

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

In re

Henry Lee Rudolph - PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

RESPONDENT(S)
Extrordinary
ON PETITION FOR A WRIT of prohibition and mandamus

United States Court of Appeals - Tenth Circuit
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF

FILED
SEP 11 2019

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

Henry Lee Rudolph
(Your Name)
4610 Hephzibah, Ga. 30815
~~3020 Homestead~~

(Address)

Cheyenne, Wyoming 82001
(City, State, Zip Code)

307-220-0078 496-6935
(Phone Number)

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:

See the included Orders, docket and decisions Appendix A. 17-4168 and 0883

Timothy R. Hanson
Katherine Bernards-Goodman
Charles Behrens Jr.
Barbra Byrnes
Karen Stam
Alex Huggard
Erin Riley
Curtis Garner
Jesse Gallegos
Michael S. Webb
Keith Hamilton
Jeffrey Holt

SOEY prinmnl

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

In re

Henry Lee Rudolph — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT

United States Court of Appeals - Tenth Circuit
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF

Henry Lee Rudolph
(Your Name)

3020 - Homestead
(Address)

Cheyenne, Wyoming 82001
(City, State, Zip Code)

307-220-0078
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

Did the Utah Supreme Court commit fraud upon the Court by stating The transcripts were destroyed and Mr. Rudolph requested, counsel and by stating Three trials did not violate Double Jeopardy notwithstanding a jury verdict acquittal of the predicate offense?

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

I. Did the Utah Supreme Court falsely state Mr. Rudolph requested reappointment of Counsel. Thus violating Towari v. Tovar, in which this Court stated "The Constitution does not impose Counsel on a defendant?" See also Fare v. Cal. McKaskle v. Wiggins

II. Did the Utah Supreme Court mislead the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals by falsely stating the transcripts were "destroyed." Thus violating § 8 U.S.C. § 1001 and 60(b)3 FRCF

III. Did the Utah Supreme Court abuse its discretion as per Cooter and Gell v. Hartman Ashey v. Swenson, N. Cal. v. Pearce as well as the 5th Amendment's double jeopardy and collateral estoppel by stating that three (3) trials - not with standing acquittal of the predicate offense did not constitute a double jeopardy violation?

IV. Does this pattern of conduct constitute fraud upon the Court as per Abdur Rahman v. Bell, Gonzales v. Crosby, Bullock v. U.S. (10th Cir.)?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	42 USC §1985- §1983
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	18 USC §4, §1001 et seq
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	28 USC § 1343, § 1331
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT <i>Exposing public corruption, §1985-§1986</i>	18 USC
CONCLUSION.....	

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	17-4168, 10th Cir. Dec. 2:14-cv-0883-CW US Dist Ct. (Docket = proof of service.)
APPENDIX B	Utah Sup. Ct dec. Proof of violations of 18 USC §1001, etc.
APPENDIX C	10th Cir. petition for rehearing
APPENDIX D	Utah S. Ct. docket listing. Proofs same violations in Appendix B
APPENDIX E	Decision in 2:14-cv-883; same violations in
APPENDIX F	B, D Copy of transcript falsely said destroyed. 42 USC
APPENDIX G	APPENDIX H = Copy of motion to recall mandate (US Ct 10) Appendix G - Proof of breach of <u>Iowa v Tova</u> , same as A, B, D, E, F

Note
out
of
sequence

Appendix A - H
Search and Condiv
Evidence

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

	only 10 pages in	PAGE NUMBER in Mot.
Arizona v. Fulminante, 499 U.S. ___, 1991		
Bulloch v. U.S., 760 F.2d 1115, 1121 (9th Cir. 1985)	3	7
Butz v. Economou, 438 U.S. 478 (1978)	8	
Childs Advocate v. Lindgren, 296 F. Supp. 2d 178 (D.R.I. 2004)	8	
Empire Lite Inc. Co. v. Veldkamp, 468 F.2d 330 (1972) 5th Cir	2	
Ex parte Young, 209 U.S. 123 (1908)	8	
Gamble v. U.S., 587 U.S. ___, (2019)		6
Gideon v. Wainwright, 372 U.S. 335 (1963)	3, 9	
Gonzales v. Crosby, 366 F.3d 1253	7	
Ioway Tavar, 541 U.S. 77, 124 S.Ct. 1379, 158 L.Ed.2d 209, U.S. Lexis 1837		p.3
Liteky v. U.S., 114 S.Ct. 1147, 1162 (1994)		
McKaskle v. Wiggins, 465 U.S. 168 (1984)	10	13
Medina v. Barnes, Nos. 94-4222, 95-4006, Decided 12/5/1995 (9th Cir.)	4	
Quarles v. U.S. Case No. 17-778, S.Ct. (2019)	5	
*Rudolph v. Galetka, 439 Utah Adm. Rep. 8 (2002)	4	
Rushen v. Spain, 464 U.S. 614, 104 S.Ct. 433, 782. Ed. 2d 267 (1984)	3, 4	
Smith v. N.M. Dept. Corr., 50 F.3d 801, 806n (10th Cir.)		
State v. Dunk, 850 F.2d 1208 (1993)	8	
* State v. Rudolph, 470 P.2d 1221 (Utah, 1990)		
STATUTES AND RULES State v. Yenri Kokides, 925 F.2d 1255 (1996)	5, 6, 8	
<u>Sullivan v. La.</u> , 508 U.S. 275 (1993)	5, 6, 8	
Tumey v. Ohio, 273 U.S. 510 (1927)	2, 3, 9	
	3, 9	

Rule 60(b) 3 F.R.C.P.

18 U.S.C. § 4, § 1001 (inter alia)

42 U.S.C. § 1981, § 1983, § 1985, § 1988 (11 b sanctions) Appendix H

28 U.S.C. § 1333, § 1361

OTHER Abdur Rahman v. Bell No. 01-9044 (Dec. 10, 2002) p.7
Gonzales v. Crosby, 366 F.3d 1253

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

1st, 5th, 6th, 8th, 13th and 14th Amendments

42 U.S.C. §1981 i.e. intentional discrimination

42 U.S.C. §1983 Civil Rights

42 U.S.C. §1985 Conspiracy. 28 U.S.C. §1343 (same)

42 U.S.C. §1988 (Delay - 11th sanctions)

28 U.S.C. §1361

18 U.S.C. §4, misprision of felony

" §1001, false statements

" §1501-§1521. Obstruction of Justice

" §1621-§1623. Perjury/Subornation thereof

" §1951-§1962. RICO, et seq.

§1951-§1962. RICO, et seq.

§2071. mutilation, obliterat^{ion}, destruction

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/1 to the petition and is

[] reported at _____; or,
[] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☒ is unpublished.

AND A C/3

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix E/5 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/2 to the petition and is

[] reported at 439 Utah Adv. Rep. 8; 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 A/1.

[] 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 6/8/2002.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix B/2.

[] A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: 9-3-1998, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix D/4. See Sup.Ct docket entry listing 8/10/98 Extension of time granted for rehearing
[] 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).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Public Corruption-Fraud!
See Questions presented

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

To establish firmly established law as
determined by The United States
Constitution and the Supreme Court
of the United States

This is whistleblower litigation and clear and
convincing evidence thereof.

CONCLUSION

Extraordinary writ should be reviewed because it
will aid this Court in
application of firmly
established precedent a
per the United States
Constitution and the
United States Supreme Co

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry L. Pedalphy

Date: Sept 1, 2019

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

To re

Henry L. Rudolph PETITIONER
(Your Name)

VS.

RESPONDENT(S)

PROOF OF SERVICE *The Orders/decisions*

I, Henry Lee Rudolph, *and docket are proof*,
Sept. 11, 2019, do swear or declare that on this date, as required by Supreme Court Rule 29 I have served the enclosed MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS and PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI on each party to the above proceeding or that party's counsel, and on every other person required to be served, by depositing an envelope containing the above documents in the United States mail properly addressed to each of them and with first-class postage prepaid, or by delivery to a third-party commercial carrier for delivery within 3 calendar days.

The names and addresses of those served are as follows:

*See the Orders, decisions docket and
the clear and convincing evidence
provided especially Appendix H/8*

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on 9/1, 2019

Nov. 28, 2019 Henry L. Rudolph Henry L. Rudolph
(Signature)