

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

JUN 10 2021

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

20-8446
No. _____

PROVIDED FOR MAILING
AT CALHOUN CI ON

JUN 11 2021

STAFF INITIALS _____
INMATE INITIALS 

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

HEWITT A. GRANT II — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

STATE OF Florida — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

District Court of Appeal Second District

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

HEWITT A. GRANT II #H12344
(Your Name)

CALHOUN C.I.
19562 SE INSTITUTION DRIVE
(Address)

BLOUNTSTOWN, FLORIDA 32424-5156
(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

ORIGINAL

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- 1.) CAN PETITIONER BE CONVICTED OF A DOUBLE JEOPARDY CLAIM, OF BEING PROSECUTED AGAIN OF THE SAME EVIDENCE AND OFFENSES THAT PETITIONER WAS ACQUITTED OF AND EVIDENCE RETURN TO HIM ?
- 2.) QUESTION (1) VIOLATES U.S. CONSTITUTION FIFTH AMENDMENT. DOES IT ALSO VIOLATE FLORIDA CONSTITUTION 9 ?
- 3.) THE STATE OF FLORIDA USED SAME EVIDENCE AND OFFENSES FROM PETITIONER'S 2006 CASE # CF06-000776 IN PETITIONER'S PRESENT CASE # CP14-008299.
Did this action violate Rules and procedure Florida Statutes § 910.11 ? "No person shall be held to answer on a second information for an offense and evidence for which this person has been acquitted" Grant v. State, 978 So. 2d 862 (Fla. 2nd DCA 2008)

- 4.) AS A UNITED STATES CITIZEN, PRESIDENT OF FLORIDA, did THE STATE OF FLORIDA VIOLATED PETITIONER'S UNITED STATES AND FLORIDA CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS ? SAME FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

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:

TENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, JUDGE DONALD G. JACOBSEN

SECOND DISTRICT APPELLATE COURT, JUDGES SILBERMAN, ROTSTEIN-YOUAKIN
AND ATKINSON

RELATED CASES

GRANT V. STATE, 978 So.2d 862 (FLA. 2nd DCA 2008)
WOODALL V. STATE, 719 So.2d 1 (FLA. 2nd DCA 1998)
WILLIAMS V. STATE, 255 So.3d 464 (FLA. 3rd DCA 2018)
HINSON V. STATE, 709 So.2d 629 (FLA. 1st DCA 1998)
Nardizlo V. STATE, 93 So.3d 178 (FLA. 2012)

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 ORDER Denying SUCCESSIVE motion For Postconviction RELIEF
(Double Jeopardy), Tenth Circuit, CF14-008299, April 16, 2020

APPENDIX B ORDER Denying Motion For Rehearing (Double Jeopardy),
Tenth Circuit, CF14-008299, May 12, 2020

APPENDIX C PER CURIAM AFFIRMED by Second District, 2D20-2201, March
10th, 2021. Missing document

APPENDIX D DENIED Rehearing, Rehearing En Banc And CERTIFICATION, Second
District, 2D20-2201, April 15, 2021

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
Grant v. State, 978 So.2d 862 (Fla. 2 nd DCA 2008)	#3,6/2
Woodall v. State, 719 So.2d 1 (Fla. 2 nd DCA 1998)	#3
Williams v. State, 255 So.3d 464 (Fla. 3 rd DCA 2018)	#3
Hinson v. State, 709 So.2d 629 (Fla. 1 st DCA 1998)	#3
Nordello v. State, 93 So.3d 178 (Fla. 2012)	#4
Crowell v. State, 238 So.2d 690 (Fla. 1970)	#7
Thomas v. State, 74 Fla. 200 (Fla. 1917)	#7
Daniels v. State, 156 So.2d 14 (Fla. 2 nd DCA 1963)	#7
State v. Boyd, 846 So.2d 458 (Fla. 2003)	#7

STATUTES AND RULES

United States Fifth Amendment
 United States Fourteenth Amendment
 Fla. Stat. § 910.11
 Florida Constitution Art. I § 9

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 C/D 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 Second District Appeal Court court appears at Appendix C/D 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 March 10, 2021. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix C.

A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: April 15, 2021, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix D.

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

United States Constitution, Fifth Amendment
United States Constitution, Fourteenth Amendment
Florida Constitution, Art. I, § 9
Fla. Stat. § 910:11

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

In 2006, CASE # CF06-000776, Petitioner was charged and convicted of Fla. Stat. 828.122 dogfighting.

Evidence used against Petitioner was a book called "History of Fighting Dogs", photographs of dogs, business cards, predators of dogs, advertisements and documents all in a duffel bag.

Petitioner CASE # CF06-000776 was acquitted or reversed in the Second District Court Grant v. State, 978 So. 2d 962 (Fla. 2nd DCA 2008) for illegalities by deputies, warrantless entry and search.

In 2014, CASE # CF14-008299, after an illegal entry and detainment without a warrant or probable cause and without calling out their present and purpose or Miranda warning, Petitioner was charged and convicted of Fla. Stat. 828.122 dogfighting.

Evidence used book "History of Fighting Dogs", photo's of dogs, business ad's, business cards, records of dogs predators, document in a duffel bag. See Evidence list and reports in CASES # CF06-000776 and # CF14-008299, Item 2039 duffel bag.

There was a former prosecution in 2006 and a current prosecution in 2014 in the same county and state, same offenses, same evidence, same sheriff, same state attorney and same judges, that this same person "Hawitt Grant" is in jeopardy on the same prosecution with identical facts without any times, dates, places or witnesses testifying to the commission of a crime that occurred or bill of particulars.

Petitioner is being held to answer a second indictment, information or affidavit for Fla. Stat. 828.122 that he was acquitted of, but the this duffel bag of evidence has been used again to convict after illegal conduct by police and state attorney's and judges.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

PETITIONER IS A UNITED STATES CITIZEN, RESIDENT OF FLORIDA AND HIS RIGHTS HAVE BEEN ABRIDGED AND VIOLATED BY THE STATE OF FLORIDA. THE UNITED STATES AND FLORIDA CONSTITUTION PROTECTS PETITIONER FROM DOUBLE JURIDICAL VIOLATIONS AND IS CLEAR WITH PLA. STAT. 3910:11.

HENCE, THE GOVERNMENT WITH ITS OVERWHELMING RESOURCES AND POWER SHOULD NOT BE PERMITTED TO ILLEGALLY ARREST AND DETAIN PETITIONER MULTIPLE TIMES AND MAKE MULTIPLE ATTEMPTS TO CONVICT FOR NONEXISTED OR NEVER OCCURRED CHARGES OR OFFENSES, USING THE SAME EVIDENCE THAT WAS RETURNED TO HIM.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Shanti Arora AB

Date: 6-10-2021