

20-8106
No. _____

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

MAY 18 2021

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PAMELA ROTH ATTNY ON BEHALF OF.,
ROY TAYLOR, PRO'SE — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

CYNTHIA BRANN ET AL — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

NEW YORK STATE COURT OF APPEALS

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

ROY TAYLOR B/C 3491804923 QUAD 12UPPER 18

(Your Name)

AMKC RIKERS ISLAND 1818 HAZEN STREET
EAST ELMHURST, N.Y. 11370

(Address)

EAST ELMHURST, N.Y. 11370

(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

12.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

WHETHER NEW YORK STATE COURTS "ERRORED" NOT ADDRESSING THE MERITS OF:

1. WHETHER THE NEW YORK COUNTY SUPREME COURT ERRED EXONERATING BAIL (\$125,000) WHILE AT LIBERTY FOR BEING CHARGED WITH MISDEMEANORS PURSUANT TO CPL§ 530.60 MANDATE RAISING BAIL TO \$230,000 ?
2. AND WHETHER THE ABOVE ISSUE IS DEEM MOOT ONCE NY COUNTY SUPREME COURT MISTERIOUSLY DROPPED BAIL (THE \$230,000) DOWN TO \$155,000?
3. AND WHETHER IT WAS ABUSE OF DISCRETION FOR THE ABOVE ACTS IN QUESTION 1. AND 2. AND 3. RAISING THE \$155,000 UPON PETITIONER'S BAIL REDUCTION APPLICATION TO \$175,000 UNDER THE NEW BAIL REFORM ACT & DID ALL CONSTITUTE " "EXCESSIVE BAIL" , INCLUDING THE WHOPPING \$5000 THE NY CO. CRIMINAL COURT PASSED DOWN FOR SAID MISDEMEANORS ABOVE ?

10.

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:

NEW YORK COUNTY SUPREME COURT
APPELLATE COURT FIRST DEPT
NYS COURT OF APPEALS

RELATED CASES

SEE ATTACHED TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ATTACHED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	4
JURISDICTION.....	5
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	6
Preliminary STATEMENT OF THE CASE	8
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	11
CONCLUSION.....	16

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A } EXHIBIT A } All Court Decisions } Everything of
| | See Answers } Records
| | Centraize of Record
APPENDIX B }

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

APPENDIX A & EXHIBITA
CERTIFICATE OF RECORD

I PETITIONER ROY TAYLOR PRO'SE HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I'VE SUBMITTED THE FOLLOWING RECORD TO WRIT OF CERTIORARI COURT:

APPENDIXA THE SUP COURT, THE APPELLATE CT 1ST DEPT, NYS COURT OF APPEALS DECISION

18 PG WRIT OF CERTIORARI & HABEAS CORPUS WRIT

ALL PRETRIAL OCCURRENCES DOCUMENT

SUP CT JUDGE FARBER CONST VIOLATION EXONERATION OF BAIL

BIAS JUDGE MICHELLE RODNEY (EX BRONX DA) FAILURES

JUDGE PAAK BAAIL REDUCTION & PRO'SE DENIAL FAILURES

SUPREME COURT HABEAS CORPUS WRIT & AFFIRMATION

MOTION TO STAY BAIL DECISION AMENDMENT & TO PROCEED PRO'SE PENDING APP REVIEW

NOTICE OF APPEAL TO THE SUPREME COURT & APPEAL

ADDEDUM MOTION TO AMEND HABEAS CORPUS

AMENDED MOTION TO RENEW REATGUE WRIT HABEAS CORPUS

MOTION TO RECONSIDER NEWLY DISCOVERED EVIDENC TO APPEAL TO 1ST DEPT FROM SUP

MOTION FOR STATUS OF CASE & ADDEDUM AMEDNDE MOTION TO RENEW REARGUE WRIT & RENDER DECISION

MOTION TO RENDER DECISION ON REINSTATEMENT OF \$75,000 BAIL

NY CO. DA OFFICE CORRESPONDENCES 10-18-19, extension of time requet 1-8-20

2-7-2020 NOTION LETTER ARGUE APPEAL IS MOOT, 12-28-2020

1ST DEPT APPELLANT'S RESPONSE TO RESPONDENT'S BRIEF IN OPPOSITION HAB CORPUS

MOTION TO RECONSIDER ADDRESSING APPEAL WITH FINDING OF FACTS & CONCLUSION OF LAW

APPELLANT BRIEF TO NYS COURT OF APPEALS

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL TO NYS COURT OF APPEALS

MOTION TO VACATE JUDGMENT TO ADDRESS CASE ON IT'S MERITS WITH CONCLUSION OF LAW & STATEMENT OF FACTS & DECISION EMBANC

CPL § 530.60 2 PAGES HIGHLIGHTED

INFORMATION ON NEW BAIL REFORM

PETITIONER TAYLOR'S SOURCE OF INCOME INMATE TRUST FUND ACCT TRANSACTIONS

NY CO. CRIMINAL COURT PART N 7-13-16 MINS JUDGE MENNIN/ADA KOEVARY QUOTING I, PETITIONER TYLOR HAS A DOC HOLD, DENYING OPEN COURT APPEARANCE ON MY 180 & NYSTATE UNIFIED DOCKET SHEET SHOWING ALL CASES PENDING

ALL BAILS OF \$50,000, \$75,000, over SHOWING JUDGE WILEY ARBITRARILY RAISING BAIL TO \$300,000 & THE APPELLATE DIV 1ST DEPT REVESING BAIL TO \$125,000

LETTER REESTAMER ATTNY GARDNER TO HANDLE APPEAL

APPEAL REVERSAL FROM 1ST DEPT FROM JUDGES RICHTER,MAZZARELLI,KAHN,MOULTON TURN PAPER OVER & FIND 6-28-18 CHARGES REDUCED TO MISDEMEANORS LAB REPORT DOESN'T SUPPORT FELONY CHARGE HIGHLIGHTED

TURN PG ORIGINAL REMAND, ROCHE SURITY CO. TERMS OF CONDITIONS

SUPREME COURT TAP B JUDGE 7-16-18 MINS EXONERATION OF BAIL FOR MISDEMEANORS BAIL SHEET WHERE BAIL WAS RAISED TO \$230,000 & ON BEHIND THIS PAGE TO \$299,999

4.

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 Ex A to the petition and is

reported at SEE TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ATTACHED; 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 Ex A to the petition and is

reported at SEE ATTACHED TABLE OF AUTHORITY; 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 Ex A to the petition and is

reported at SEE ATTACHED TABLE OF AUTHORITIES; 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 _____.

[] 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).

[X] For cases from state courts:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was 2-18-21 7.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix A. [An Court Decisions & Records
EX "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

CPL § 530.60

THAT A PERSON OUT AT LIBERTY ON BAIL CAN NOT BE REVOKED/AND OR EXONERATED IF HE COMMITS A MISDEMEANOR. IT HAS TO BE A "FELONY".

(SEE ATTACHED STATUTORY LAW ATTACHED EXHIBIT "A")

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES:

<u>KRIMSTOCK V. KELLY</u> , 306F. 3D 40	pg	<u>15</u>
<u>JOHNSON V. SPENCER</u> , 950 F. 3D 680.....	pg	<u>15</u>
<u>PEOPLE EXREL MANHATTAN R.CO. V. BARKER</u> , 152 N.Y. 417.....	pg	<u>15</u>
<u>PEOPLEEX REL. MACCRACKEN V. MILLER</u> , 291 N.Y. 55.....	pg	<u>15</u>
<u>WILLEY V. KIRKPATRICK</u> , 801 F. 3D 51, 62.....	pg	<u>15</u>
<u>BURGOS V. HORKINS</u> , 14 F. 3D 790	pg	<u>15</u>

STATUTES AND RULES

28USCS §1260

ART§§ 70.10, 70.09

CPL§ 530.60 2(a)

THE USCA OF THE CONSTITUTION

EIGHTH AMENDMENT : EXCESSIVE BAIL & ABUSE OF DISCRETION

14TH AMENDMENT: DUE PROCESS

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

8.

IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK
RESPONDENTS
-AGAINST-

NO. _____
NYS NO. _____

ROY TAYLOR,
PETITIONER

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT OF CASE

THIS IS A WRIT OF CERTIORARI APPEAL FROM A STATE HABEAS CORPUS FILED IN THE NEW YORK COUNTY SUPREME COURT WHERE THE PETITIONER TAYLOR PRO'SE CHALLENGED THE SUPREME COURT'S DECISION THAT EXONERATED HIS \$125,000 BAIL RAISING BAIL TO \$230,000 BY SUPREME COURT JUDGE FARBER FOR BEING CHARGED ON MISDEMEANOR OFFENSES WHILE AT LIBERTY. ONCE APPEALED SAID BAIL MISTERIOUSLY WAS DROPPED TO \$155,000 AND THE NY COUNTY DA OFFICE NOW ARGUES FOR THIS JUDGE SAID ISSUE ON APPEAL IS "MOOT" REQUESTING DISMISSAL, WHICH THE APPELLATE 1ST DEPT, AND THE NYS SUPREME COURT DENIED AND DISMISSED THIS ACTION WITHOUT PRESENTING ANY FINDINGS OF FACT OR CONCLUSION OF LAW ON THE MERITS AND WHEN I FILED MOTION REQUESTING THIS THESE COURTS FAILED TO ADDRESS IT. FOR THESE REASONS PETITIONER APPEALS THIS DECISION TO THIS WRIT OF CERTIORARI COURT COMPELLING A DECISION ON THE MERITS OF THIS CASE, ALSO FOR SAID MISDEMEANOR BAIL BEING EXTREMELY HIGH AT \$5000 AND BETWEEN THIS TIME A BAIL REDUCTION APPLICATION TO LOWER THE \$155,000 BAIL MISTERIOUSLY DROPPED UNDER THE "NEW BAIL REFORM" WAS AGAIN RAISED TO \$175,000 BY THEN ANOTHER TAP B SUPREME COURT JUDGE PAEK ARBITRARILY WHICH WAS EXCESSIVE BEING ALSO CHALLENGED HEREIN. PETITIONER IS SEEKING REVIEW AND REVERSAL AND "REINSTATEMENT" OF THE ORIGINAL \$125,000 BAIL OR THE ALTERNATIVE IT'S ORIGINAL \$75,000 BAIL ALL 3CASES WERE BEFORE SUPREME COURT JUDGE WILEY PREVIOUSLY ARBITRARILY RAISED AS "REPRISAL" FOR COMPLAINTS FILED BY PETITIONER AGAINST THIS JUDGE COLLEAGES (KONVISER & MENNIN SUP CT JUDGES IN NY CO.) OVER NON OPEN COURT APPEARANCES FOR MORE THAN A YEAR I COMPLAINED ABOUT

AND THE DENIAL OF APPEARANCE ON MY 180. DATE(BY MENNIN) & RECUSAL REQUEST
(ON KONVISER DO TO PREVIOUS TRIAL MISCONDUCT) AS INDICATED ON ENCLOSED
PRETRIAL OCCURRENCES BY THESE JUDGES ATTACHED (SEE EXHIBIT "A")

11

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

THE REASON FOR GRANTING THIS PETITION IS FOR THIS COURT TO COMPEL THE STATE COURT TO ADDRESS ALL ISSUES ON IT'S MERITS WHICH THEY REFUSE TO DO WHICH THEY HAD A DUTY TO RULE WITH A FINDING OF FACT WITH CONCLUSION OF LAW IN THEIR DECISION EXPLAINING HOW THEY REACHED THEIR DECISION.

CPL§530.60 PLAINLY STATES THE SUPREME COURT CAN'T EXONERATE AND RAISE BAIL ON A MISDEMEANOR OFFENSE, YET THEY DID SO ILLEGALLY. THEN ONCE APPEAL ~~now~~ NOW THAT COURT MISTERIOUSLY DROPPED BAIL TO \$155,000 AND NOW ARGUE APPEAL IS "MOOT" ISSUE-WISE WHICH IS "ERROR". PETITIONER ARGUES HIS FAMILY PUT UP THEIR HARDEARNED MONEY TO MAKE PETITIONER'S BAIL AND THE N.Y. CO. SUPREME COURT ARBITRARILY EXONERATED BAIL OVER A MISDEMEANORS & ISSUED A RATHER LARGE \$5000 BAIL ON THIS!" (EMPHASIS ADDED) IN MISDEMEANOR COURT AND UPON APPEARANCE IN THE SUPREME COURT THAT COURT EXONERATED AND RAISED BAIL TO A WHOPPING \$230,000, THEN MISTERIOUSLY DROPPED ONCE THEY GOT WIND THAT IT WAS APPEALED TO \$155,000. IN addition, TO the High \$5000 BAIL ON SAID MISDEMEANORS, UPON SUBMITTING A BAIL REDUCTION APPLICATION TO LOWER BAIL, THIS SAME SUPREME COURT RAISED THE \$155,000 BAIL TO \$175,000 BAIL UNDER THE NEW BAIL REFORM WHEN THE NEW BAIL REFORM ACT WAS TO LOWER BAIL, BUT THIS NEW YORK COUNTY JUDGES CLEARLY SHOW ABUSE OF DISCRETION & BIAS WHEN A DEFENDANT COMPLAINS OVER NONOPEN COURT APPEARANCES AND JUDGE ABUSE DESCRIBE IN COMPLAINT!" (EMPHASIS ADDED)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

WHETHER NEW YORK STATE COURTS "ERRORED" NOT ADDRESSING THE MERITS OF:

1. WHETHER THE NEW YORK COUNTY SUPREME COURT ERRED EXONERATING BAIL (\$125,000) WHILE AT LIBERTY FOR BEING CHARGED WITH MISDEMEANORS PURSUANT TO CPL§ 530.60 MANDATE RAISING BAIL TO \$230,000 ?
2. AND WHETHER THE ABOVE ISSUE IS DEEM MOOT ONCE NY COUNTY SUPREME COURT MISTERIOUSLY DROPPED BAIL (THE \$230,000) DOWN TO \$155,000?
3. AND WHETHER IT WAS ABUSE OF DISCRETION FOR THE ABOVE ACTS IN QUESTION

1. AND 2. AND 3. RAISING THE \$155,000 UPON PETITIONER'S BAIL REDUCTION APPLICATION TO \$175,000 UNDER THE NEW BAIL REFORM ACT & DID ALL CONSTITUTE " "EXCESSIVE BAIL" , INCLUDING THE WHOPPING \$5000 THE NY CO. CRIMINAL COURT PASSED DOWN FOR SAID MISDEMEANORS ABOVE ?

ARGUMENT AND MEMORANDUM OF LAW

1. PETITIONER ARGUES THAT ONCE HE GOT ARRESTED 6-28-2018 FOR CPCs AND TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS AND PARAPHENALIA, ORIGINALLY THE PEOPLE SOUGHT FELONY & REMAND (SEE EX "A" ENCLOSED) CHARGES; HOWEVER THE JUDGE PRESIDING OVER THIS CASE DROPPED THE FELONY FINDINGS REDUCING CHARGES TO MISDEMEANOR OFFENSES WHICH THE INITIAL REMAND WERE DROPPED WHERE PETITIONER RECEIVED A RATHER HIGH \$5000 BAIL ON THESE CHARGES. (SEE EXHIBIT A" ATTACHED SUPPORTING PAPERS) THIS WAS "EXCESSIVE".

2. THIS ,AS EXPLAINED IN PRELIMINARY STATEMENT OF FACTS CAME WHILE OUT AT LIBERTY (BAIL \$125,000).

3. PETITIONER ARGUES THE N.Y. CO. SUPREME COURT WERE BARRED FROM EXONERATING BAIL UNLESS I COMMITTED A FELONY BASED ON CPL§530.60 MANDATE, YET DID IT ANYWAY. (SEE EX"A" STATUTORY LAW CPL§530.60 ATTACHED) I ONLY HAD MISDEMEANOR CHARGES WHICH ONLY WARRANTED ANOTHER BAIL WHICH WAS TOO HIGH AT \$5000.

4. BY THIS, PETITIONER ARGUES THE COURT ABUSED THEIR DISCRETION BY VIOLATING MY 8TH AMENDMENT RIGHTS TO "EXCESSIVE BAIL" AND ABUSE OF DISCRETION, BY THIS AND BY THE 7-16-18 SUPREME COURT APPEARANCE BEFORE TAP B JUDGE FARBER -

THAT COURT TOOK IT UPON THEIRSELF AND "EXONERATED" THE \$125,000 BAIL I HAD RAISING BAIL TO A "WHOPPING" \$230,000 "UNLAWFULLY BASED ON THE STATUTE & THE 8TH AMENDENT OF THE US & STATE CONSTITUTION WHICH CLEARLY STATES: **"EXCESSIVE BAIL SHALL NOT BE REQUIRED, NOR EXCESSIVE FINES IMPOSED, NOR CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENTS INFILCTED"**

5. THEN ONCE THE ABOVE WAS APPEALED AND THE LOWER COURT GOT WIND OF IT THE NY COUNTY DA'S OFFICE ANSWERED FOR THE NYS SUPREME COURT IN LETTER MOTION AND IN AN AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE BEFORE THE 1ST DEPT, AFTER THE LOWER COURTS "MISTERIOUSLY LOWERED BAIL TO \$155,000 THEN ARGUED THE CASE AS "MOOT".

6. HERE, THE SUPREME COURT DID SOMETHING THEY WERE NOT ALLOWED TO DO AND NOW THEY TURN AROUND AND NOW ARGUE THE "MOOTNESS CLAIM" ! (EMPHASIS ADDED) PETITIONER LOSS HIS FAMILIES "HARDEARNED" MONEY RAISED ON BAIL FOR A MEASLY "MISDEMEANOR OFFENSES BY THE COURT'S ACTIONS WHEN THEY WERE FORBIDDEN TO ACTUALLY DO THIS "IN THE FIRST PLACE!" THIS SHOWS CLEARLY "ABUSE OF DISCRETION" BY THE NY CO. SUPREME COURT IN THIS ACTION.

7. AND FURTHER, IN BETWEEN THIS TIME THE "NEW BAIL REFORM" CAME INTO PLAY WHERE PETITIONER SUBMITTED A BAIL REDUCTION APPLICATION OF THE \$155,000 BAIL BUT RECEIVED IN FARBER'S COURT WHO NOW NEWLY ASSIGNED SUPREME COURT JUDGE KATHERINE PAEK, THIS JUDGE RAISED THE \$155,000 TO \$175,000 WHICH ALSO WAS ABUSE OF DISCRETION AND EXCESSIVE BAIL BY THIS.

8. MOREOVER, PAEK FAILED TO APPLY THE NEW CRITERIA UNDER THE NEW BAIL REFORM WHICH HAS TO BE BASED ON WHAT I CAN AFFORD AND BE ALLOWED TO PAY 10% TO THE COURT AND BASED IT ON NON HEARSAY EVIDENCE WHICH THIS COURT IS ASKED TO ORDER THE 2-6-20 BAIL HEARING IN 100 CENTRE STREET COURT BEFORE JUDGE PAEK WHEN ATTNY NESTER ROSADO WAS RETAINED TO REPRESENT ME, PETITIONER. THE COURT WAS REQUIRED TO UNDER THE NEW BAIL REFORM SHOW WHETHER I'D MAKE COURT APPEARANCES WHICH WHILE ON BAIL I NEVER MISSED A DATE AND FOR THOSE MISDEMEANORS OF 6-28-18 ARREST BAIL WAS \$5000 WHICH WAS EXTREMELY HIGH FOR THESE OFFENSES

AND THERE WERE NO HISTORY OF BAIL JUMPING OR ESCAPES SO THIS JUDGE CLEARLY ABUSED HER DISCRETION IN RAISING BAIL IN THIS CASE, WHICH IT'S BELIEVED THIS JUDGE IS OR WAS DISPLAYING "REPRISAL" FOR THOSE COMPLAINTS FILED AGAINST HER SUPREME COURT COLLEAGUES ALSO, AS JUDGE WILEY AND FARBER DID!" (SEE EXHIBIT "A" PRETRIAL OCCURRENCES SHEET DESCRIBED ATTACHED HEREIN)

9. ALL ACTS EXHIBITED AGAINST PETITIONER BY THESE JUDGES IN NEW YORK COUNTY RESULTED BELIEVED ONCE WILEY'S ARBITRARY RAISING OF BAIL "FOR NO REASON BUT FOR PRIOR COMPLAINTS (AGAINST KONVISER & MINNEN) AND THE APPEAL REVERSED THAT EXCESSIVE BAIL, UPON RETURN WITH THESE MISDEMEANOR OFFENSES (THEY WANTED FELONIES) THESE PEOPLE IS BELIEVED TO HAVE "GOTTEN A 2ND BITE OF THE APPLE" IN AGAIN SHOWING REPRISAL BUT WHAT JUDGE FARBER DID (RAISING/EXONERATING \$125K TO \$230K AND NOW PAEK RAISED THE (MISTERIOUS LOWERING OF \$155,000 BAIL TO THE NOW \$175,000 WHICH UNDER THE NEW BAIL REFORM THIS SHOULD NEVER HAVE HAPPENED AND WAS "CLEARLY" ABUSE OF DISCRETION & EXCESSIVE BAIL BY THIS JUDGE ALSO. PAEK ALSO FAILED TO PASS DOWN AFFORDING ME TO PAY 10% WHICH THE COURT IS NOW ALLOWED TO DO, BUT DIDN'T HERE!" (EMPHASIS ADDED) WHAT'S THEIR EXCUSE ? THE RAISING OF MY PETITIONER'S BAIL WAS "UNFOUNDED" AND ALL OTHER ACTS DESCRIBED WERE ALSO WHICH ALL OF THIS WERE PRETRIAL MALICIOUS PROSECUTION AT IT'S BEST BY THESE COURTS AND MOREOVER, ONCE APPEALED TO THE APPELLATE DIVISION 1ST DEPT AND TO THE NYS COURT OF APPEALS, THESE COURTS FAILED TO EVEN ADDRESS THE MERITS OF WHAT I RAISED CLEARLY DESCRIBED IN THESE APPEALS. (SEE EXHIBIT "A" ALL APPEALS FROM THE SUPREME COURT, TO THE APPELLATE COURT AND TO THE NYS COURT OF APPEALS AND THE DECISIONS¹ FROM ALL OF THESE COURTS)

10. EVEN WHEN PETITIONER FILED MOTIONS PROSE IN OPPOSITION REQUESTING ALL THESE COURTS TO ADDRESS MY ISSUES MERITS WITH FINDINGS AND FACT AND CONCLUSION OF LAW THESE COURT FAILED TO ADDRESS THEM. (SEE EXHIBIT "A" ALL PLEADINGS) BY THIS THE LOWER NYS COURTS FAILED IN THEIR DUTIES TO ADDRESS THE MERITS IN

THIS CASE WHICH I SOUGHT REVIEW AND THE COURT HEREIN TO COMPEL THEM TO AND ALTERNATIVELY RULE TO REINSTATE THE ORIGINAL 75,000 BAIL ALL CASES WERE UNDER AS IF IT NEVER OCCURRED OR ALTERNATIVELY REVERSE AND REINSTATE THE \$125,000 BAIL AS IF IT "NEVER OCCURRED" AND FURTHER SANCTION THESE COURTS FOR THEIR ABUSES TOWARDS ME AT ALL LEVELS MENTIONED HEREIN.

11. THESE COURTS UNDER THE NEW BAIL REFORM ARE ALSO REQUIRED TO SUBMIT THEIR CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE AS THE DAS IN COMPLYING TO THE NEW REFORM YET HERE THEY'RE NOT COMPLYING WITH THE NEW LAWS PASSED DOWN IN THIS CASE.

12. MANY COURTS HAVE RULED ON COURT REVIEW THE PRESIDING COURTS ARE OBLIGATED TO RULE IN A CASE ON IT'S MERITS DETERMINING IF WITH FINDINGS OF FACT AND WITH CONCLUSION OF LAW IN REACHING IT'S DECISION. SEE KRIMSTOCK V. KELLY, 306 F. 3D 40; JOHNSON V. SPENCER, 950 F. 3D 680; PEOPLE EX REL. MANH R. CO. BARKER, 152 N.Y. 417; PEOPLE EX REL. MACCRACKEN V. MILLER, 291 N.Y.55, COURTS HAVE FURTHER RULED THE SOLE ISSUES IN PROCEEDINGS WHEN TAKEN AND A QUESTION OF VALUATION IS ALWAYS QUESTION OF LAW & FACT. COURT REPEATIVELY DECLARED THE RULES OF UNANIMOUS AFFIRMANCE WHICH APPLIES TO SPECIAL PROCEEDING AS WELL AS ACTIONS TO FINAL ORDERS, AS WELL AS JUDGMENTS AND TO APPLIED FINDINGS, AS WELL AS THOSE WRITTEN OUT IN FULL. PEOPLE V. MANHATTAN V. BARKER.

13. THE STANDARDS OF REVIEW THIS COURT IS REQUIRED TO CONSTRUE PRO'SE COMPLAINTS LIBERALLY AND TO CONSIDER THE "STRONGEST ARGUMENTS THE CASE SUGGEST. SEE WILLEY V. KIRKPATRICK 801 F. 3D 51,62; BURGOS V. MORKINS, 14 F. 3D 790.

14. PETITIONER ARGUES "HERE, THE LOWER COURTS FAILED TO ADDRESS HIS ISSUES IN THE QUESTIONS OF LAW DESCRIBED HEREIN AND NONE OF THE NY COUNTY SUPREME, THE APPELLATE, NOR THE NYS COURT OF APPEALS EVER ONCE ENTERTAINED THESE QUESTIONS OF LAW IN THE CASE. THEY SIMPLY DENIED AND DISMISSED THIS ACTION WITHOUT ADDRESSING THE MERITS IN PLAIN DETAIL. BY THIS THIS BODY OF COURTS ULTIMATELY FAILED TO PERFORM A DUTY ENJOINED UPON IT BY LAW WHICH IS ASKED TO BE REVIEWED PURSUANT TO APPLICABLE NYCLS AND CPLR.

WHEREFORE; PETITIONER PRAYS BASED ON THE FOREGOING ARGUMENT SUBMITTED THAT THIS COURT IS AUTHORIZED TO REVIEW AND CONSIDER AND DECIDES THIS CASE AND IT IS RESPECTFULLY REQUESTED FOR THIS COURT TO GRANT THIS RELIEF SUCH AS ORDER REVERSAL AND REMAND FOR THE NYS COURTS TO ADDRESS THE MERITS OF THIS CASE ON ALL QUESTIONS OF LAW PRESENTED AND THAT THIS COURT ORDER IN THE ALTERNATIVE REINSTATEMENT OF THE \$125,000 BAIL AS IF IT NEVER OCCURRED OR ALTERNATIVELY REVERSE & REINSTATE THE ORIGINAL \$75,000 BAIL ALL 3 CASES WERE ON BEFORE JUDGE WILEY ARBITRARILY RAISED AN EXCESSIVE BAIL AND THIS COURT DEEM THE NYS COURT "ABUSED IT'S DISCRETION WITH ALL THE EXCESSIVE BAIL IN ALL INSTANCES AND REVERSE THESE FINDINGS IN IT'S ENTIRETIES AND FOR SUCH FURTHER RELIEF AS JUST AND PROPER.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Roy Taylor

ROY TAYLOR, PRO'SE PETITIONER
AMKC RIKERS 1818 HAZEN STREET, EAST ELMHURST, NY 11370
Date: 5-12-2021

Sworn to Before me this

11th DAY OF MAY 2021

Michael Veal

Notary Public

MICHAEL C. VEAL

Notary Public, State of New York

No. 01VE6029177

Qualified in Queens County

Commission Expires April 19, 20 23