

No. 21-206

Supreme Court, U.S.  
FILED  
FEB 04 2021  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

MOURICE NEAL — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

vs.

DETROIT POLICE DEPARTMENT RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Maurice Neal  
(Your Name)

319 1/2 Garrison St., Apt 2R  
(Address)

Fremont, OH 43420  
(City, State, Zip Code)

313-516-4596  
(Phone Number)

---

## QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. United States constitution is the supreme law governing this land correct?
2. All judges in every state is bound by oath or affirmation federal and state level correct?
3. Michigan state constitution of 1963 requires their judges to support Michigan and the U.S. constitution article 11, section 1 correct?
4. Article 4, section 23 is also part of Michigan state constitution of 1963 that the judges of the state of Michigan and police officers must support correct?
5. It is also required that judges in every state follow the court rules correct?
6. It is also right that if a person can find a case within their jurisdiction to support their side of the argument, it can be used as case law or cited in that manor correct?
7. MCL 752.11 is a state of Michigan law according to Michigan constitution of 1963 article 4, section 23 correct?
8. So if the constitution recognize MCL 752.11 and does not recognize all I have been charged with creates a conflict between constitution and state statues correct?
9. That means all my charges does not meet Michigan constitution of 1963 article 4, section 23 style of laws meaning every one of their state of Michigan laws must bear proof by way it came into existences correct?
10. And if it is not meeting the requirements of the constitution then that is a crime correct?
11. Both constitutions U.S. and the state where the action took or taken place must be followed correct?
12. The court rules federal and state level must be honored and followed correct?
13. If it is found that the judgements I have face is improper state of MI laws. I do have the right to get back what I have loss correct?

14. And all the judges whom have illegally held me accountable for violation of Mich. Law(s) will be charged for violating their oath or affirmation?
15. If the constitution does not allow a judge to give a decision other than to reverse the action and that judge does not it is a personal decision they have made correct?
16. That also means that is usurpation of power?
17. Also meaning that personal decision can cost that judge incarceration correct?

---

## 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:

Officer Baxtresser Branden Dpt. #0349003, Officer Lach Ronald Dpt. 0349003, Officer Jones Loranzo. G Dpt. 0349062, Officer Lee Lester Dpt. 0349010, Officer Vickers Daniel Dpt. 0349062, Officer Dinnan Michael Dpt. 0349004. Judge Ford Deboran G. P-35273, Judge Bright, Izetta F. P-29689, Judge Giles, Ronald P-38107

## RELATED CASES

Mourice Neal Vs. Karen Fort Hood, et. al. Case No. 10-8610  
United States Supreme Court

Mourice Neal Vs. Detroit Police Department, et al., Case No. 15-12317  
United States District Court Eastern District of Michigan Southern  
Division

Mourice Neal Vs. Wayne County Treasurer In Re,. Case No. 18-7580  
United States Supreme Court

I believe this to be Mourice Neal Vs. Michigan Department of  
Correction, Case No. 10-14168, United States Court of Appeals

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW .....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....	69
CONCLUSION.....	70

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	State of Michigan Court of Appeals	13
APPENDIX B	36th District Court, State of Michigan Register of Action	16-63
APPENDIX C	Michigan Supreme Court Order	68
APPENDIX D		
APPENDIX E		
APPENDIX F		

# TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
People V. Dettenthaler, 77 N.W. 450, 451, 118 Mich	9
595 (1898) 62 Swan V. Buck, 40 Miss. 268 (1866)	
Register of actions	16-63
161595 Mich. Supreme Court	65
161595 Mich. Supreme	70
19361619 Landlord tenant 36 District court	74
161595 Mich. Supreme court	79
STATUTES AND RULES	PAGE NUMBER
28 U.S.C.S. <del>1254</del> (1), 28 U.S.C.S. <del>1257</del> (a)	2
Const. and statutory provisions involved	3
Statement of the case	4
MCL 752.11	5
MCR 2.603 (A)(1), MCR	10
MCR 7.212 (C)	14
MCR 7.216 (A)(10)	14
MCR 2.603 (A)(1)	15
MCR 2.603 (A)(1)	70
OTHER	PAGE NUMBER
Register of actions	16-63
Notice of filing application	64
Case number 161595 Mich. Supreme Court	65
36th District court letter	67
Notice of filing application	68
Front of envelope	69
Letter requesting default judgment	70
Cover letter	71
Mail change notice	72
Police report or incident	73
36th district case dismissal	74
Mail change notice	75
New identification card	76

# TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

## OTHER

## PAGE NUMBER

Mail change notice

79

Proof of service

78

---

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 Michigan Appeals 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.



## 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 12-22-2020.  
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).

**CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED**

United States Constitution and Michigan State constitution  
~~article 11, section 1. , article 4, section 23.~~

All of the Register of actions

Mich. Const. of 1963 article 1, section 17.

MCLA 752.11

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

---

I Mourice Neal challenged the validity of the MCL'S charged against me on the register of actions page's 16-63. These charge's conflict with the United states constitution and Bill of rights and Michigan state constitution of 1963 dating back as far as 1850, article 4, section 23 does not appear on the face of any of my charges within Michigan jurisdiction. And according to article 11, section 1 the police officer's and all judges are required to support both United States constitution and Michigan state constitution. Looking at hard cover books only you find MCL 752.11 having the enacting clause on its face. That gives that state law its identity. Meaning it show by way that state law came into existence. Also the only case to support my argument is (page 9). So upon review of all my case within Mich. Const. jurisdiction usurpation of power, tyranny, and treason against both United States constitution and Michigan state constitution of 1963 article 11, section 1.

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

---

My reason is that I am a United States citizen whom have constitutional rights. No different from any other citizen within its jurisdiction. Whom is looking for protection against the act of usurpation of power, tyranny, and treason against the constitution of the United States of America or Bill of Rights and the state of Michigan constitution where all my actions have taking place. Let's not forget Black History Month all of February aired for at less 80 years or more. I have faced county time, incarcerated in Michigan department of correction. Plus property taking, multiple vehicles taken, my children removed from home while in my care as their father. Money as well taken and my daughter almost lost her life while in the care of her mother. All of which is clear usurpation of power police officer's arrest, and traffic tickets has to meet the requirement of the style of laws not law! So I ask that my petition be granted for review please!!! Please keep in mind that the highest state court are not persuaded to answer whether or not all of their laws most meet Mich., Const., article 4, section 23 like I have shown so many time with MCL 752.11 must view hard cover books. Thanks for the time taken!!!

80

69

---

### CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted. In good faith because Michigan supreme court is not persuaded that the question presented should be reviewed by their court. That leaves only the highest court in country of United States of America.

Respectfully submitted,

Maurice Neal

Date: 4-05-2021