

No. 20-7929

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

William Rouser — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

Patrick Couello — RESPONDENT(S)

ORIGINAL

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

FILED
APR 21 2021
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

William Rouser
(Your Name)

P.O. Box 409040
(Address)

Los Angeles 95640
(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

Do A STATE INMATE HAVE DUE PROCESS RIGHTS IN THE FEDERAL AND U.S. SUPREME COURT IN PROBATION DISCIPLINARY HEARINGS, WHERE THE RULING OR OUTCOME OF THE HEARING DOES EFFECT SAID INMATE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AT THE HEARING.

THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION IS REQUIRED TO FOLLOW ITS RULES AS ESTABLISHED IN THE TITLE 15 WHICH IS BACKED BY LAW.

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

Roussa v. UNKNOWN U.S. Supreme Court 20-68655

Roussa v. Lozano 4th Cir

Roussa v. Dyck 21-15100

Roussa v. Crouse 9th Circuit 21-15037

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

WOIFF V, Mc DONNELL 418 U.S. 539 571

DOE V. TROST 329 F3d 1135 9th Cir 2003

STATUTES AND RULES

Titls 18 3320 (3)(h)

OTHER

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 *California Supreme Court Rules* 2
APPENDIX B *Supreme Court of California Decisions/Writ* 3
APPENDIX C
APPENDIX D
APPENDIX E
APPENDIX F

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 is unpublished.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 is unpublished.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 Supreme Court court 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.

1.

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 3-17-2020.
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

WOLFF V. Mc DONOUGH 418 U.S. 534 571

The Right to Due Process in having a Impartial
Trier of Fact at Disciplinary Hearing

DOG V. TENOET 329 F3d 1135 (9th Cir 2003) An Agency is
generally Required to Follow its own Rules.

Title 15 3320 (3)(h) Staff who observed, Reported, Classified,
Supplied Supplemental Reports to, or investigated the alleged Rule
Violations, or for any other reason have a Discretionary Right of the
Inmate's Guilt or Innocence. Shall not hear the charges.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petrason was found guilty at a Prison Disciplinary Hearing by a Hearing officer who did the initial lock up order for the disciplinary which was an "alleged fight." After exhaustion to the State Supreme Court, Petrasone must file to the U.S. Supreme Court for Petrasone is doing a 3 strike 25 to life for possession of less than a half a gram of Meth in prison.

In cases of *Roussa v. Puffer*, *Roussa v. unknown*, *Roussa v. Lynch*, *Roussa v. Sullivan*. The Federal District Court and the 9th Circuit has determined that a inmate doing a 10 year sentence do not have the right to Federal Habeas Relief. Even when there is the results of said disciplinary had a direct effect in the parole board giving Petrasone a 10 year denial.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION


The Law is WOLFF V. Mc DANWELL IS CONCEPTS AND THE FACT THAT DISTINGUISH IS ONLY A DISTINGUISHMENT SENTENCE SHOULD NOT ALLOW HIM TO BE DISCRIMINATED AGAINST FOR AS THE PAROLE BOARD HAS STATED THEY CAN AND WILL USE SUSAN THUR IN A INSTANCES "C" FILE TO DETERMINE IF THEY ARE ELIGIBLE FOR PAROLE.

THUS FOR THE DENIAL OF THE PETITION OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF DUE PROCESS GIVEN TO INSTANCES WITH A DISTINGUISHMENT SENTENCE ESTABLISHES A TRAVEL OF JUSTICE AND ALLOWS THE INSTANCES TO HAVE SUCH A LEVEL OF DISCRIMINATION IT SHOULD BE CRIMINAL.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: 4-19-21