

ORIGINAL

No. 20-8112

FILED
JUL 12 2020

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Richard K. Jackson PETITIONER
(Your Name) Pro se

vs.

U.S.A. — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

6th circuit court of Appeals
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Richard Jackson
(Your Name)

P O Box 1000 Fed. Det. Ctr.
(Address)

Milan Mi. 48160
(City, State, Zip Code)

N/A
(Phone Number)

RECEIVED

JAN 25 2021

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IV

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

Why is hearsay being allowed in court of law?

SP 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:

U.S.A. v Richard Jackson case no. 16-20799
6th circuit court of appeals case no. 20-1458

RELATED CASES

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 *6th cir. court of appeals*

APPENDIX B *District court decisions*

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

STATUTES AND RULES

Federal rules of evidence 801

802

803

14th amendment

6th amendment

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 4 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 is unpublished.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 13 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 is unpublished.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 _____ 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 is unpublished.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 _____ 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 6-23-20.

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: 6-23-20, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix 17.

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 _____. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix _____.

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

14th amendment - equal protection up under the law.

6th amendment - right to fair and impartial trial.

Federal rules of evidence - 809

802

803

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

See Attached

STATEMENT of the CASE

XII

Judge admitted hearsay on his own motion to admit 911 calls he knew and stated were false (pg 4, ln 5 of acquittal denial, ECF no 281). Judge did not instruct jury on which/or all statements were false, only stated some were false (1-10-20 trial day).

Of relevant facts, there were none. Only speculation hospital statement by nurse examiner from statements made by Av 1) of what could (possibility) have happened on 11-17-16. This can only confuse jury.

Also judge interprets some hearsay of his own quoting incorrectly Av 1's 911 call of giving her drugs and not letting her leave the house Tr. Ex. 1a-1g. (pg 3 ln 18) (ECF 281)

Plus judge interprets hearsay of "threats of force" is contained in USC 81591(a) (pg 2, ln 18 of acquittal denial omnibus order). Unfortunately it is not.

Point is lies in 911 calls (pg 4 ln 5 ECF 281) makes them hearsay established % declarant. Judge further discourses of hearsay planted by prosecutor on Internet and in papers tainted fair trial possibilities. Hearsay lies of government theories (pg 7 ln 4 ECF 281) places hearsay over the equal line on fairness

Lastly no questions to internet access (for jury) since 11-18-16.

XIII SEE Attached (next page) [Reason for granting petition]
11-17-16 is when this case started and ended. Do the right thing

XIV

date 7-8-20

Richard Jackson
551460134

XV

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Supreme court rule 14 1(e)(i) in reference to Rule 11 which states imperative to public importance.

When judge admits hearsay of which he states are lies (p.4, ln.5 of Acquittal denial, ECF no. 281) to jury.

Of relevant facts (better known as best evidence of events of 11-17-16: There were none only speculation of what could have been.

Also judge interprets some hearsay of his own quoting incorrectly Avi's 911 call of giving Avi drugs and not letting her leave the house, trial exhibit 14 to 19. (p.93, ln.18) of (281 ECF) answer to motion of acquittal.

Plus judge interprets threats of force Hearsay is contained in § 1591(a) (p.92, ln.18 of Acquittal denial omnibus order). Which it is not.

Point is lies in 911 calls (p.4, ln.5, ECF 281) makes them Hearsay w/o declarant (Avi died), judges further discovery of hearsay planted by prosecutor on internet, and in papers (p.7, bottom) tainted fair trial possibilities. Judges hearsay lies of government theories (p.7, ln.4, ECF 281) places Hearsay over the gatekeeping line of Fairness.

11-17-16 is when this case started and ended. Do the right thing.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard K. Jackson

Date: 11-27-20