

No. 20-7352

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

In re

Henry Lee Rudolph — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

VS.

RESPONDENT(S)  
ON PETITION FOR A WRIT <sup>Extraordinary</sup> 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

~~3220 Holmes Road~~

(Address)

~~Cherokee, Wyoming 82008~~  
(City, State, Zip Code)

~~307-220-0078~~ 996-6935  
(Phone Number)

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 Ioway v. Tovar, in which this Court stated "The Constitution does not impose Counsel on a defendant." See also Faretta 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 18 U.S.C. § 1001 and 60(b) 3 FRCP

III. Did the Utah Supreme Court abuse its discretion as per Cooter and Gell v. Hartm, Asher 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 §1981- §1988
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	18 USC §4, §1001 et seq
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	28 U.S.C. §1343, §1361
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....	18 U.S.C. § false statements
CONCLUSION.....	Exposing public corruption, §1951-§1961

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

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

Have  
not  
yet  
seen  
all

Appendix A - H  
 Clear and convincing  
 evidence

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	only 10 pages in PAGE NUMBER in Mot.
Arizona v. Fulminante, 499 U.S. —, — 1991	3
Bullock v. U.S., 760 F.2d 1115, 1121 (10th Cir.) (1985)	7
Butz v. Economou, 438 U.S. 478 (1978)	8
Childs advocate v. Lindgren, 296 F.Supp. 2d 178 (DRI 2004)	8
Empire Life Ins. Co. v. Valdez, 468 F.2d 336 (1972) 5th Cir	2
Ex parte Young, 249 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.2d 1253	7
Howay v. Tovar, 541 U.S. 77, 124 S.Ct. 1379, 158 L.Ed.2d 209, US Lexis 1937	p.3
Life Ky v US, 114 S.Ct. 1147, 1162 (1994)	10
McKaskle v. Wiggins, 465 U.S. 168 (1984)	13
Medina v. Barnes, Nos. 94-4222, 95-4006, Decided 12/5/1995 (10th Cir.)	4
Quarles v. U.S. Case No. 17-778, S.Ct. (2019)	5
*Rudolph v. Galetka, 439 Utah Adv. Rep. 8 (2002)	4
Rushen v. Spain, 464 U.S. 114, 104 S.Ct. 433 762. Ed. 2d 267 (1984)	3, 4
Scheury v. Rhodes, No. 82-914 decided April 17, 1974 U.S. S.Ct.	8
Smith v. N.M. Dep. Corr. 50 F.3d 801 806n 10th Cir. Cert. denied, 516 U.S. 905, 116 S.Ct. 272 p.5	5
*State v. Dunn, 850 P.2d 1201 (1993)	5
*State v. Rudolph, 970 P.2d 1221 (Utah, 1998)	5
STATUTES AND RULES	
State v. Eni Kokides 925 P.2d 1255 (1996)	5, 6, 8
Sullivan v. La., 508 U.S. 275 (1993)	2, 3, 9
Tumey v. Ohio, 273 U.S. 510 (1927)	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. § 1343, § 1361	H

OTHER Abdur Rahman v. Bell No. 01-9044 (Dec. 10, 2002 p.7  
 Gonzalez v. Crosby, 366 F.2d 1253 H

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 - 11 b sanctions)  
28 U.S.C. §1361  
18 U.S.C. §4, misprision of felony  
" §1006, false statements  
" §1501-§1521. Obstruction of Justice  
" §1621-§1623. Perjury/Subornation thereof  
§1951-§1962. R.I.C.O. et seq.  
§2071. mutilation, obliteration, 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 A11.

[ ] 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 6/18/2002.  
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 event 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  
The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.  
application of firmly  
established precedent  
per the United States  
Constitution and the  
United States Supreme Court.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry L. Fackelph

Date: Sept. 1, 2019

No. \_\_\_\_\_

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

In re

Henry L. Rudolph PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

VS.

RESPONDENT(S)

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Henry Lee Rudolph, do swear or declare that on this date, Sept 1, 2019, 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 Orders/decisions and docket are Proof.*

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 pro se Henry L. Rudolph  
(Signature)