

No. 20-7893

ORIGINAL

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES



ANTHONY EDWARD BRIDGET—PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA—RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)


PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Anthony Edward Bridget
(Your Name)

P.O. Box 5006
(Address)

Calipatria, California 92233
(City, State, Zip Code)

NONE
(Phone Number)



QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- 1) NEWLY DISCOVERED D-N-A EVIDENCE; is it fair for the district attorney's D-N-A EXPERT (who happen to work for the Orange County CRIME LAB) to conduct a unfinish D-N-A study and use it to testify AGAINST me AT trial. THE unfinish part of the D-N-A study WAS in FAVOR of me GREATLY. THE study COMPLETED days AFTER my trial.
- 2) IS it INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE of COUNSEL when COUNSEL KNEW AND did not object to unfinish D-N-A study during my trial, OR EVEN go to trial with unfinish study that was BEING USED AS testimony by STATES D-N-A EXPERT.
- 3) TRIAL COURT ERROR for misconduct. Is it allowed for a judge to tell OR ERROR to tell a jury who is deadlock 6-6 to CONTINUE DELIBERATING without COUNSEL or defendant knowledge. Along with DENIAL to a NEW trial MOTION of Newly DISCOVERED D-N-A EVIDENCE in the defendant FAVOR.
- 4) WAS my (14) fourteenth AMENDMENT violated when the TRUE finding on the lying-SPECIAL in-WAIT SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE ALLEGATION WAS NOT SUPPORTED by substantial EVIDENCE.

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3, 4, 5, 6
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4, 5, 6
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	7
CONCLUSION.....	8

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A DECISION COURT OF APPEAL STATE OF CALIFORNIA

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C DECISION OF SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
STRICKLAND v WASHINGTON (1984)	5
IN RE WILSON (1992)	5
JACKSON v. VIRGINIA (1979)	6

STATUTES AND RULES

PEN. CODE § 187	4
PEN. CODE § 182	4
PEN. CODE § 190.2	4
PEN. CODE § 236	4
PEN. CODE § 237	4

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 CALIFORNIA SUPREME court appears at Appendix C 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 11-10-20. 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 ORDER list 589 (date) on 3-19-20 (date) in Application No. A _____.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

United States Const, Fourteenth Amendment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

ON April 2, 2013 the ORANGE County district attorney filed a four count felony against me Anthony Edward Bridget. P.C 182, 187, 245, 236/237 AS WELL AS two ENHANCEMENTS 190.2(A)(1) 190.2(A)(15)

ON April 12, 2018 A jury RETURNED A guilty VERDICT ON ALL 4 COUNTS ALONG WITH BOTH ENHANCEMENTS.

BEFORE AND DURING MY TRIAL THE STATES D.N.A EXPERT DANIELLE WIELAND TESTIFIED SHE CONDUCTED A D.N.A STUDY WHICH CONSIST OF TWO PARTS. DURING MY TRIAL ONE PART OF THE STUDY WAS COMPLETED AND USED AGAINST ME. THE SECOND PART OF THE STUDY WAS STILL ON GOING AND NOT YET COMPLETED. RIGHT AFTER MY JURY TRIAL THE STUDY WAS COMPLETED WHICH SHOWED IN MY FAVOR GREATLY. THAT WAS THE REASON FOR THE NEW TRIAL MOTION (SEE CLERK'S TRANSCRIPT PAGE 504) DANIELLE WIELAND TESTIFIED THAT D.N.A TRANSFER STUDY USING GLOVES SHE STARTED AND NOT YET COMPLETED, IT LEAD TO MANY QUESTION ABOUT USING GLOVES, AND NOT THERE'S ACTUALLY FUTURE STUDIES THAT ARE PLANNED, THAT SHE WAS IN THE MIDDLE OF A VALIDATION. AS SOON AS THAT VALIDATION IS COMPLETED, SHE'LL RETURN TO THE TRANSFER STUDY TO COMPLETE THE GLOVE STUDY. (SEE REPORTER TRANSCRIPT ON APPEAL PAGE 655) (LINE 22-26) SHE THEN STATED IT LEFT SOME QUESTIONS AS TO THE RESULTS, SO ADDITIONAL TESTS ARE GOING TO BE DONE. ADDITIONAL STUDIES ARE GOING TO BE DONE. (SEE REPORTER TRANSCRIPTS ON APPEAL) PAGE 656 LINE 3-5) THE UNFINISH GLOVE STUDY WAS VERY CRITICAL IT SHOWED IN MY FAVOR. WHEN THE JURY WAS DEADLOCK 6-6 AND ASKED FOR D.N.A READ BACK THEY WASN'T ALLOWED

that information of high rates of D.N.A transfer to fabrics.

Right to counsel is the right to the effective assistance of counsel (Strickland v. Washington 1984) INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE HAS BEEN FOUND WHEN DEFENSE COUNSEL INEXPLICABLY FAILED TO OBJECT TO OTHERWISE INADMISSIBLE DAMAGING EVIDENCE (SEE, EG. IN RE WILSON 1992) WHETHER COUNSEL KNEW OR MISSED THE OBJECTION TO UNFINISH D.N.A STUDY, THE JURY WAS DEADLOCK 6-6 WHEN ASKED FOR D.N.A READ BACK. THE SECOND PART OF THE STUDY WHICH WAS A KEY PART TO MY CASE OF touch D.N.A WASN'T ABLE TO BE HEARD.

TRAIL COURT MISCONDUCT WAS NOT A HARMLESS ERROR. DURING MY DELIBERATION THE JURY CAME BACK DEADLOCK 6-6. THE JUDGE TOLD THEM TO CONTINUE THEY WASN'T DELIBERATING LONG ENOUGH WHICH AFTER THE FACT THE JUDGE CALLED MY LAWYER & I BACK INTO THE COURT ROOM WHERE MY LAWYER ASKED TO HAVE MY JURY INSTRUCTION REENTERED. HE SAID MY LAWYER WAS TRYING TO BE ARGUMENTIVE WHICH WAS UNTRUE. MY LAWYER ASKED A NEUTRAL AND ACCURATE STATEMENT OF THE LAW. ALONG WITH DENIVING MY NEW TRAIL MOTION WITH THE NEW D.N.A ~~ED~~ EVIDENCE STUDY DONE BY THE PEOPLES EXPERT IT WAS TOTAL ERROR AND DEFINITLY NOT HARMLESS.

THE FLAWED STANDARD OF REVIEW INVOKED BY THE COURT OF APPEAL. THE COURT OF APPEAL'S EXPLANATION OF THE STANDARD OF APPELLATE REVIEW APPLICABLE TO MY CLAIM OF INSUFFICIENCY OF THE EVIDENCE INCLUDED THE FOLLOWING: "A REVERSAL FOR INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE IS UNWARRANTED UNLESS IT APPEARS THAT UPON NO

hypothesis whatever is there sufficient substantial evidence to support "the jury's verdict. That standard, which allows the accused to be convicted of a crime merely because someone can construct a hypothesis on which the accused is guilty, is inconsistent with the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, as interpreted by the United States Supreme Court in *Jackson v. Virginia* (1979)

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

THE REASON FOR GRANTING THIS PETITION
IT SHOWS IN LAYMEN TERMS TO EXPLAIN
THAT MY TRAIL LAWYER AND JUDGE
WERE ERRONEOUS AND WITH THAT IT SHOWED
ERROR IN APPELLATE COURT JUST AGREES
WHILE NOT LOOKING INTO THE ERRORS. THE
PETITIONER SEEKS RELIEF AND REVIEW BE
GRANTED TO DETERMINE THE LOWER COURT
ERROR IN RESPECT TO THESE GROUNDS,

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony Bridget

Date: 4.8.21