

No. 20-7977

ORIGINAL

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

APR 20 2021

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

BOBBY CARL TERRICK — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

DARRELL VANNOY — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FIFTH CIRCUIT
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Bobby Carl Terrick
(Your Name)

17544 Tunica Trace
(Address)

Angola, La. 70012 (70712)
(City, State, Zip Code)

(225) 655-4411
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1)

CAN PLEADINGS FROM UNDISTURBED CONVICTION BE
CHALLENGED FIRST IN TIME WITH "NEW JUDGMENT"?

2)

CAN TRIBUNAL DECISION MAKING TO RETROACTIVELY
APPLY A STATUTORY ENACTMENT CREATED AFTER COMMISSION
OF OFFENSE AND SENTENCE WITHSTAND THE PROHIBITIONS
OF DUE PROCESS CLAUSE FAIR WARNING?

3)

PERMANENT ERROR REVIEW SHALL BE HAD BEFORE ANY
COURT TO SUSTAIN WHETHER PLEADINGS BEFORE ANY
LOWER COURT CHALLENGING CONVICTIONS OR SENTENCES
WITHOUT A COMPLETE RECORD IS VALID?

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

4)

WHETHER RETROSPECTIVE LAWS CREATED BY LEGISLATURES
TO ABRIDGE PRE-EXISTING GUARANTEES LIVE WITHIN BOUNDS OF
TERRICKS' PROTECTED CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT CONFINED IN
EX POST FACTO REGULATIONS?

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:

JEFF LAUDRY, Attorney General for the state of Louisiana,
COLIN CHASE, Assistant Attorney General, Louisiana Department
of Justice, PAUL D. CAWZEC, JR., District Attorney, Parish
of Jefferson, THOMAS BUTLER, Assistant District Attorney, Parish
of Jefferson.

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 UNITED STATES FIFTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

APPENDIX B UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

APPENDIX C STATE COURT JUDGEMENTS

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
<u>UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT</u>	
ALEXANDER V. SANDOVAL, 121 S.Ct. 1511 (4-24-2001)	18
ARMSTRONG V. EXCEPTIONAL CHILD CENTER, INC., 135 S.Ct. 1378	19
BOULIE V. CITY OF COLUMBIA, 84 S.Ct. 1697	21-22
CALDER V. BUNK, 3 DALL. 886	29
ERIE R. CO. V. TOMPKINS 58 S.Ct. 817	19
EX PARTE YOUNG, 28 S.Ct. 817	19
GARNER V. TEAMSTER, CHAUFFEURS AND HELPERS LOCAL UNION, NO. 776 74 S.Ct. 161	19
GIBSON V. OGDEN 9 WHEAT 1	19
N.A.A.C.P. V. ALABAMA 78 S.Ct. 1163	22
MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER & SMITH, INC. V. CURRAN 102 S.Ct. 1825	18
 STATUTES AND RULES	
LOUISIANA CODE CRIMINAL PROCEDURE 814 ARTICLE	23, 25, 30
LOUISIANA CODE CRIMINAL PROCEDURE LOUISIANA STATUTES ANNOTATED 14:30.1	30
Act 277 of 2017 La. Legislation	32
LSA.R.S. 14:30.1 Second Degree Murder	30
LSA.R.S. 14:31 Manslaughter	30

OTHER

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED
CONTINUE

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
<u>UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT</u>	
MAGWOOD V. PATTERSON 130 S.Ct. 2708	19
ROGERS V. TENNESSEE 121 S.Ct. 1693	21-22
MILLER V. ALABAMA 132 S.Ct. — (2012)	4
TRANSAMERICA MORTGAGE ADVISORS, INC. V. LEWIS 100 S.Ct. 242	19
WRIGHT V. GEORGIA 83 S.Ct. 1240	22
MONTGOMERY V. LOUISIANA 136 S.Ct. — (2016)	5
<u>UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS</u>	
IN RE CAIN, 137 F.3d 234 (5th Cir. 1998)	20
IN RE PARKER, 575 F.Appx. 415, 418 n.3 (5th Cir. 2014)	26
UNITED STATES V. JONES, 681 F.Appx. 294 (4th Cir. 2011)	20
<u>UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT</u>	
BOBBY CARL TERRICK V. DARRELL VANNOY NO. 19-11515	20
TERRICK V. CAIN, 06-0541	26
TERRICK V. VANNOY, 19-0985	26

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

1st Amendment

5th Amendment

13th Amendment

14th Amendment

Article 1 § 1 Cl. 3

Article 1 § 10 Cl. 1

Article 3 Cl. 2

Article 6 Cl. 2

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 to the petition and is

- ☒ reported at NO. 20-30227; 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 B to the petition and is

- ☒ reported at 19-985 "B" (5); 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 C to the petition and is

- ☒ reported at 19-KH-488 and 19-KH-02063, (18-K-532); or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the 11th Circuit court appears at Appendix D to the petition and is

- ☒ reported at 19-KH-43 and 19-KH-261 and 19-KH-471; (18-KA-0102); 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 March 19, 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).

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was ^{1.24.19}10.15.19 / 8.11.2020.
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 _____ (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

3

July 31, 2001, petitioner was arrested for the Murder of Edward Sanchez. Approximately September 13, 2001 he was re-indicted for Manslaughter. June 7th 2002, the indictment for Manslaughter was Amended to Second-Degree Murder. July 17th 2002, he was convicted for the Murder of the victim.

August 2nd 2002, Motion for New Trial and Post-Verdict Judgment of Acquittal was denied by the trial judge. August 11th 2002, the Court sentenced him to Life without Parole, Probation or Suspension of Sentence.

May 27th 2003 brief by appellate Counsel was filed on his behalf to the Louisiana Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. On June 23rd 2003 the State filed its brief in the case.

Oral argument was held on September 11, 2003. On September 30, 2003, the Louisiana Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals issued opinion affirming petitioner's conviction and sentence.

After utilizing state available remedies as well as federal procedural vehicle to challenge his original conviction and sentence from his first appeal right, the United States Supreme Court in the summer term announced *Miller v. Alabama* 132 S.Ct. 2455 (2012)

The United States Supreme Court clearly expressed in *Miller* the Eighth Amendment prohibits mandatory life sentences for those who committed offense under the Age of 18.

Four years after the Miller decision, *Montgomery v. Louisiana* served as a place holder before the U.S.S.C on the retroactivity of Miller. (*Montgomery v. Loe* S.Ct. (2016))

The U.S.S.C declared Miller to be retroactive in *Montgomery* reviving all case that were final after its decision.

November 30, 2017, petitioner was resentenced before Jefferson Parish District Court Judge. Objection were made on the issue and appeal followed. A second appeal was granted to petitioner.

The District Court judge granted him appeals Counsel to assist him on appeal. April 9, 2018, Appeals Counsel

6
filed brief to the sentencing court. Counsel filed
and Anders brief and one assignment of Error. The assign-
ment of Error asked the Court to Error Patent Conviction and
Sentence.

April 25, 2018, the State of Louisiana filed response
brief. Soon after, petitioner filed supplement brief to appeals
counsel brief, specifically challenging his resentencing.

August 29, 2018, the La. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeal
denied Appeal brief. State v. Terrick, (18-KA-0102) (La. App.
5th Cir. 8-29-2018) 254 So.3d 1246.

September 19, 2018, Writ of Certiorari was filed to the La.
Supreme Court challenging the La. Circuit Court decision. January
14, 2019, the La. Supreme Court denied writ. 18-KO-532 Terrick
v. State 260 So.3d 1217.

January 23, 2019, petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus was filed in the United States District Court Eastern District of Louisiana.

while pending in the federal District Court, petitioner filed two state Application for Post-Conviction Relief. the first of the two was filed on November 7, 2018 with the Jefferson Parish District Court challenging allege Confession.

January 3, 2019, the District Court denied relief on state procedural grounds. January 30, 2019, Supervisory writ to the La. State Appeals Court was filed to review district Court denial of PCR.

February 19, 2019, under NO: 19-KH-43 (La. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals) the La. Fifth Circuit denied Supervisory writ on state Uniform Rules and State Procedural Grounds.

March 14, 2019, writ of Certiorari was filed challenging the Circuit Court judgment to the La. Supreme Court. October 15, 2019, the La. Supreme Court denied Certiorari 19-KH-00488.

The Second APCL was filed April 16, 2019 in the Jefferson Parish District Court challenging grand jury proceeding in his case. May 2nd, 2019, the District Court denied relief on state procedural grounds. Approximately May 20th 2019, Supervisory writ was filed to the La. Circuit Court on the district courts denial of relief on pleadings. June 24, 2019, the La. Circuit Court No. 19-KH-261 Granted writ on Conditional Term and remanded by to the district Court for evidentiary hearing.

July 8th 2019, the District Court ordered the state to file any procedural objections whatever raised within 30 days or answer merits within those thirty days.

August 7, 2019, the state of Louisiana filed opposition brief of granting Post-Conviction Relief. August 28, 2019, the District Court Ordered Denial of Granting Post-Conviction Relief (Aug. 28, 2019).

September 20, 2019, petitioner challenged the District Courts denial of Application of Post-Conviction Relief. November 14, 2019 the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeal denied review NO. 19-KR-471, on challenge of district Court denial by petitioner.

December 2, 2019, writ of Certiorari to La. Supreme Court challenged both District Court and Circuit Court denials. Writ of Certiorari by La. Supreme Court was denied Nov. 14, 2020.

Utilizing state available remedy in congruent with federal law.

Petitioner filed two Motions to Amend Habeas Corpus on the issues of Allege Confession and Grand Jury Proceeding while pending in La. Courts, (September 25, 2019; November 18 2019) both were denied.

Before Motion to Amends were filed petitioner proceeded to the Court on Motion to Consolidate. The Eastern District of La. issued Writ of Transfer Order Separating Motion to Consolidate from Original Habeas Corpus proceeding NO: 19-11515. The Court stipulated the Motion was a Second or Successive petition. August 13th 2019, Senior United States District Judge ordered the Motion is transferred for Authorization to proceed from the United States Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

August 14, 2019, the United States Court of Appeals sent to petitioner Notice on when Successive Application shall be filed.

September 26, 2019, 19-30652 because Terrick did not timely file Successive Habeas Corpus Petition, the Court dismissed Successive Habeas Corpus Petition. Approximately, October 15, 2019, Successive Application was filed by petitioner challenging whether Application was successive and shall be dismissed from September 20, 2019 Summary proceeding. November 18, 2019 Civil Action was reopened 19-CV-11515.

During this pending litigation, in Between and before Motion for Revival was filed September 3, 2019 on Motion to Amend or Consolidate Motion was denied.

Relating back to Habeas Corpus NO: 19-985 "B" (5) the state of la. filed its Response in Opposition to Grant writ of Habeas Corpus 5.15.2019.

After July 1, 2019, Motion For Abeyance was filed on petitioners behalf to Habeas Corpus 19-985 "B" (5). It's substance was to incorporate the two claims allege Confession and Grand Jury Proceeding to Habeas Corpus 19-985 "B" (5).

July 31, 2019, the state of Louisiana filed Response in opposition to Motion For Abeyance.

January 13th 2020, the U.S. Magistrate Judge filed Report and Recommendation referenced to deny petitioners Habeas Corpus and Motion For Abeyance.

January 21, 2020, objection To Magistrates Report and Recommendation was filed by Terrick. March 17, 2020, Writ of Habeas Corpus was denied.

Following the denial, Terrick filed a Motion for Certificate of Appealability and A Motion to Grant Certificate of appealability in the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeal March 27, 2020.

Approximately April 12 or 15 2020, Notice was sent to him from the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeal that his Motion for Certificate of Appealability was transferred to the United States District Court Eastern District of La. for decision on whether COA shall be issued for him to proceed in the latter Court.

From the partial order, Terrick appealed to the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeal denial of Informa Pauperis and sought an Order to Grant Motion For Certificate of Appealability and filed a Separate Motion For Certificate of Appealability May 12, 2020.

14

May 15, 2020, the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeal notified Terrick that his Motion For Certificate of Appealability is premature. As soon as the District Court notify the Court on the ruling of the prior motion for COA, the Court will give instructions on the next step of appeal.

June 2, 2020, the U.S. District Court Eastern District of La. Justice Denied Certificate of Appealability and Informa Pauperis. June 5, 2020, Motion for Revival was filed to this Court and Order to Grant Motion for Revival.

June 25, 2020, Motion To Proceed Informa Pauperis, Motion For Certificate of Appealability with Ex. was prepared by petitioner. July 1, 2020, it was handed to prison official for filing. March 19, 2021, U.S. Fifth Circuit ordered denial of COA and Informa Pauperis.

January 10, 2020, Authorization to file Habeas Corpus was denied by the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeal because it was premature. 19-cv-11515 NO: 19-30652.

The pleading asserting the Grand Jury proceeding was defective was pending separately in the lower Supreme Court state of Louisiana. Effectively, utilizing federal remedy to resolve alleged Constitutional violation, August 14th 2020, the la. Supreme Court denied pleading that Grand Jury proceeding was defective.

August 19, 2021, Habeas Corpus was filed to the federal Court on the Grand Jury proceeding being defective.

September 11, 2020, the District Court of United States Eastern District of la.

transferred the Application to the U.S. Court of Appeal
Fifth Circuit NO: 20-cv-2356 as to authorization to file
as Second or Successive Habeas Corpus.

September 14th 2020, the U.S. Court of Appeal Fifth Circuit
Sent Notice to Terrick on when to file 2254 & 2255 Successive
Application. Motion For Authorization was Approximately filed
October 9th 2020 or September 27th 2020 or inbetween.

November 6, 2020, the United States Fifth Circuit Court
Appeal denied as premature.

MARCH 19, 2021, the United States Fifth Circuit Court
of Appeals Denied COA and Informa Pauperis.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

17

1)
Prejudice Conclusions used by tribunal to erad.

i. cate a private right of remedy subverts
constitutional mandates. law is had on consistency,

Fragment opinions shall never surrogate redress for
grievance the Constitution forbids such.

When the pleadings substance are reciprocated
in adjudication forum to alterate premise of what
the Constitution is, foreclose judicial proceeding is void
truncated by Private Interest.

Denovo review is always foreseeable when Inquiry
is on perspective fissure on what the Constitution's
operative scope shall be first in time.

Peremptory Action shall not be enforced to preclude adjudication of a private Cause of Action. When tribunal use perfunctory methodologies to presume the pleadings to be reviewed before its Court has not identically to the existing right without conferring to the Constitution the judgment rendered is void.

Relevant to the settling effect, the First Amendment of the United States Constitution assures all private individuals utilizing agencies available remedy shall continue to seek review from injury sustained in the capacity.^①

Affirmative Defenses shall not be principle objectives when pleadings are purely federal

^① Alexander v. Sandoval, 121 S.Ct. 1511, 532 U.S. 275 (4.24. 2001), First Amendment of U.S. Constitution, Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc. v. Curran, 456 U.S. 353, 102 S.Ct. 1825 (1982)

and inconsistency in how the Courts shall G.V.R serves as a touchstone to support judgment. Deference is vested in this Court^②

In (2016) the United States Supreme Court concluded in *Magwood v. Patterson* 130 S.Ct. 2798 that a New Judgment for the purpose of Habeas Corpus proceeding can never be lock by abuse-of-the-whet principles successive or second proceedings.

what is intriguing about the *Magwood* mandate is the Court was silent on whether a undisturbed conviction can be challenged under this "New Judgment". Nor was it decided whether state procedural rules would estop challenge to undisturbed conviction when brought before the Court.

② Article III of U.S. Constitution; Article VI cl. 2; *Garner v. Teamsters, Chauffeurs and Helpers local Union*, No. 776 346 U.S. 485, 74 S.Ct. 1161; *Transamerica Mortgage Advisors, Inc. v. Lewis* 100 S.Ct. 242 (1979); *Ex Parte Young* 28 S.Ct. 441; *Gibben v. Ogden* 9 Wheat 1 (1824); *Ex Parte R. C. v. Tompkins* 58 S.Ct. 817 (1938) *Armstrong v. Exceptional Child Center, Inc.* 135 S.Ct. 1378 (U.S. 2015)

The question is also split in U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals and among other Circuits^③

Perhaps, this Court shall consider defining such operative scope. Petitioner raised claims of conviction in the lower state and lower federal Court, (see state and federal Appendix attached).

(2)

Affirmative Action by this Court exceeds res judicata and assumptions of Judicial estoppel by natural instinct. Prior judgments from Interlocutory Appeals can never be conceded to infer permanent injunction being both transitive and intransitive as to whether any justice enforced code of conduct when adjudicating the pleadings on the merits before its administrative forum.

③ In *Re Parker*, 575 F. Appx. 415, 418 n.3 (6th Cir. 2014); In *Re Cain*, 137 F.3d 234 (5th Cir 1998) *Bobby Carl Terrick v. Darrell Vannoy* NO. 19-11515 Section "B" (6); *United States v. Jones*, 681 F. Appx. 294 (4th Cir. 2012) indicating split among Circuit Courts on this question in the context of Motions filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255, but joining a "chorus of our sister circuit in finding when a habeas petition is the first to challenge a new judgment, it is not second or successive regardless of whether it challenges the sentence or the underlying conviction."

Administrative Agencies shall never reconstruct prophylactic Rules developed to protect private individuals whom over their rights had been violated by opposing parties. Defiance is repugnant by Constitutional demand and shall never be crystallized to hold bearing in determining what the law shall be.

Baile v. City of Columbia 84 S.Ct. 1697 (1964)
and *Rogers v. Tennessee* 121 S.Ct. 1693 (2001) pre-empt any judicial decisionmaking that retroactively apply statutes that are unexpected and indefensible by reference to the law which has been expressed prior to conduct in issue.

The two are congruent as to categorical bars by express Due Process Safeguards. First is fair warnings more forward in the Rogers precept, can not be overruled by judicial evolution

that alters or modify Case-by-Case descriptive
Circumstance where Common Law has been settled.

Second, foreseeability, by the Baile analysis
state acute Concepts involving state Court decision.

Baile's clarifying Gloss of what constitutes un-
justified and unpredictable breaks with prior
law which is unworkable and unacceptable is
when and how the state Court contemplated
conduct is no longer supported by state
Independent and Adequate Ground^①

Last, but not least, Notice shall be
given to prevent judicial disregard on what
Sanction shall be given when allege rule
breakers are convicted for law existing^②

① N.A.A.C.P. v. Alabama 357 U.S. 449, 78 S.Ct. 1163; Wright v. Georgia 373 U.S. 284;
83 S.Ct. 1240.

② Baile v. City of Columbia 84 S.Ct. 1697 (1964); Rogers v. Tennessee 121 S.Ct. 1293 (2001)

July 31, 2001, petitioner was indicted for First-Degree Murder. September 13, 2001, (Approximate date) his first-Degree Murder was amended to Manslaughter. He was offered a plea but refused to Agree to the terms of the Deal.

Soon after June 6th 2002, the Manslaughter Indictment was amended to Second-Degree Murder. July 17th 2002, Terrick proceeded to Trial and was found guilty on that day.

hawaii law that was enacted during the Commission of the Offense for the Crime allegedly committed by petitioner was Art. 814 Responsive Verdicts.

③ (See Jury Instructions before July 17th 2002 Trial for Murder.)

Before November 30th, 2017, new sentencing proceeding Notice was sent to the sentencing Court by Motion. The Motion expressed that any sanction given to petitioner besides what the law prescribed for alleged violation of Commission offense when found guilty is in violation of Federal as well as state law.

June 23rd 2016, order was given by the Court to be heard on the Matter. (see Motion and order attached). (In state Appendix)

November 30th, 2017, petitioner was re-sentenced to a new statutory provision that did not exist during the Commission of offense.

Also, during the Sentencing of November 30th 2017,
the Motion was never heard by the Court. (see re-
Sentence Transcript 11.30.2017 in State Appendix).

La. C.C.P. Article 814 Responsive Verdicts still
remain on the La. C.C.P. until this very day.

this same pleading was brought before
federal and state judiciary (see State and Federal
Appendix).

2)

The Due Process Clause forbid taking of life,
Liberty or Property without Due Process.

order was given in petitioners' first-Habes Corpus from first-appeal right under Terrick v. Cain, 06-0541, and Habes Corpus 19-0985, Terrick v. Vannoy, Second Appeal right from a new judgment.

Justices presiding over both Habes Corpus ordered the state of la. to produce the entire record from all pleadings, briefs, and memoranda, and other documents filed in connection with any application for Post-Conviction Relief or appeal, transcripts of all proceedings held in any state court, and all state court dispositions.

In pages four and five of first-Habes Corpus from first Appeal right, the state of la. contended the record was complete to all material requested by Court order.

16 years later after multiple Habeas Corpus filings
and now Habeas Corpus from "New Judgment" on pgs.
13-14, the State of Ia. now admits in FN 25 and FN 26:

FN 25: The 24th Judicial District Court Clerk's Record for
the instant case was digitalized after completion
of trial and direct appeal.

FN 26: As noted above, the Clerk's Record for the 24th
Judicial District Court was digitalized sometime
after trial and direct appeal. The digitalized Clerk's
Record was made available to the respondent;
however, it was incomplete, as it was missing
certain filings. Although the original Clerk's Record
was destroyed when the record was digitalized, the
State obtained a back-up copy of the Clerk's
record. Accordingly, the respondent attaches both
the digitalized copy and the back-up copy of
the Clerk's record.

Furthermore, on Page 14 paragraph 1 sentence 3 it is
stated

portions of these volumes were reproduced for the appellate record; therefore, the substance of much of the pre-trial and trial portions of the Clerk's Record is also included in the Appellate Court record.

Petitioner ask this Court to error patent review prior filings of state and Federal Court and upon such review is their and error in ① Grand Jury pleadings and proceedings, ② Trial Jury verdicts and Grand Jury verdicts, ③ Pre-trial proceedings, ④ Appeals as to First Appeal rights, ⑤ Appeals as to Second Appeal rights, ⑥ Habeas Corpus, ⑦ Second or Successive Application, ⑧ Certificate of Appealabilities, and Claims following this Habeas Corpus, Certificate of Appealability Action from Second Appeal Right if so, because the filings were had from an incomplete record relief shall be given.

4)

Retrospective laws shall never be enacted to repeal vested rights. When legislatures render conclusions to enact laws that disregard pre-existing entitlements to those whom punishment for committing the same alleged act was to be had on Maximum and Minimum Sanction by Circumstance of offense *Calder V. Bull* 3 Dall. 386, Article 189 cl. 3, Article 1810 cl. 1 prohibits such.

This exactly what happened in petitioner's case.

Petitioner was indicted for Murder on July 27, 2001.

Indictment for Murder was Amended to Manslaughter September 13th - 15th 2001 Approximately.

June 7th, 2002 Indictment was Amended

Again

to Second Degree-Murder. July 17th, 2002, trial was had and he was convicted by trial jury. The law during the time of petitioner's offense, if the trial jury could not find him guilty for Second-Degree Murder, "Responsive Verdict", next lesser included offense Manslaughter was the next legal conclusion to be rendered by law.^①

The law when petitioner was convicted and sentence allows the judge to render a sentencing from 0-40 years. The judge could take into consideration Age, circumstances of offense (whether Aid & Abet), educational level

① See Trial Jury Instruction in State Appendix; Article 214 I.A.C.R.P. Responsive Verdict in State Appendix.

family background, whether petitioner could be re-habilitated from committing offense.

The law in has have been consistently used when the U.S.S.C declared mandatory sentencing used to punish an individual without possibility of release.²

this was the term agreed to by the Court, petitioner and D.A.³

Petitioner was a 16 year old teen when indicted, years later Miller v. Alabama 132 S.Ct. — (2012) declared his mandatory sentence according to state law was unconstitutional.⁴

² See Original Motion To Correct Illegal Sentence Brief in State Court Appendix.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Life without Parole, Probation or Suspension of Sentence 14:80.1 LSA.R.S. Second-Degree Murder.

November 30, 2017, re-sentence by the Court instead of sentencing, petitioner to terms in brief stipulated "Responsive Verdicts" the same law enacted during the Commitment of offense and Sentence. Petitioner was re-sentence to Act No: 277 of 2017 law enacted by h.c. ⑤


Terrick is not the only child that had been abused by state legislature. How long has a child like petitioner has to suffer from adult Drama,

⑤ See November 30, 2017 re-sentence Transcripts in State Appendix.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Bobby Carl Jernick", written over a horizontal line.

Date: April 9th 2021