

FROM: 09463104
TO: Washington, Janeice; Washington, Janeisha
SUBJECT: Petition for Rehearing of an order denying cert-
DATE: 12/08/2021 09:09:15 AM

..Petition for Rehearing of an order denying certiorari:

21-5242

No: _____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Joshua Sadat Washington

_____-PETITIONER

vs.

United States of America

_____-RESPONDENT

Petition for Rehearing to Petition for an order denying Writ of Certiorari


PETITION FOR REHEARING


Joshua Sadat Washington # 09463-104

Atlanta USP, P.O. BOX 150160

Atlanta, GA 30315

Respectfully Submitted


Joshua Sadat Washington
09463-104 Date 12/08/21



FROM: 09463104
TO: Washington, Janeice; Washington, Janeisha
SUBJECT: Petition For Rehearing of an order denying cert-
DATE: 12/08/2021 09:09:10 AM

Petition For Rehearing of an order denying certiorari: No. 21-5242

Petition presents it's petition for a rehearing of the above-entitled cause, and. in support of it respectfully shows:

On October 4, 2021, this Court denied the petition for writ of certiorari. See Attachment **1-A**

On October 29, 2021, petitioner submitted a petition for rehearing of an order denying certiorari. See Attachment **1-B**

On November 29, 2021, petitioner received a notice from the Courts, dated November 23, 2021; in which informed petitioner to please correct, resubmit, and comply with Rule 44 of the Rules of this Court. See Attachment **1-B**

-
Official Court records played a significance part with the normal process that started with the filing of the Criminal Complaint and immediately ended when the switched and replaced falsification of the original filed complaint, violated petitioner's right to due process; and which supports the reopening of the suppression hearing.

"...I had it in my possessions. I don't know how it disappeared...." See Exhibit **2**

I, do not know exactly when the initiating Court filing of the original Criminal Complaint was removed and switched with another; and I do not know how, but I prayerfully asked that this Court may receive and consider circumstantial evidence that will support substantial grounds presented in rehearing petition.

According to the Court's Records, in support of petitioner's substantial grounds, the record contains a track of evidence pointing to intervening circumstances, [With-In], in which continue to have an ongoing controlling effect that needs to be reviewed, God's Willing by this Court.

Track of Evidence - Supporting Illustration

To illustrate, the Court charges juries that they may receive and consider circumstantial evidence the same as direct evidence. Routinely, the court recites to the jury an example of circumstantial evidence learned from the late Honorable Frank M. Johnson, Jr., some fifty years ago, while the undersigned was an assistant U.S. Attorney, viz.:

If you go to sleep tonight and wake up in the morning and look out the window and see snow on the ground and rabbit tracks on the snow; you did not see it snow, so it is not direct evidence; but you may readily infer from what you do see that, while you were asleep, it must have snowed, and, after it snowed, a rabbit must have walked across the snow.

I, Joshua Sadat Washington, know for sure what Court Document said, "Criminal Complaint", that was giving to me at the beginning during my first Initial Appearance Hearing, and God knows I am telling the truth. Will this Court please allow petitioner to point to the track of evidence to support allegations.

FROM: 09463104
TO: Washington, Janeice; Washington, Janeisha
SUBJECT: Petition For Rehearing of an order denying cert-
DATE: 10/28/2021 05:32:41 PM

Petition For Rehearing of an order denying certiorari: No. 21-5242

Appellant presents its petition for a rehearing of the above-entitled cause, and, in support of it, respectfully shows:

On October 4, 2021, this Court denied the petition for writ of certiorari. *See Attachment 1-A*

Circumventing and deviations of the established procedures in regards to Court's records filings and PACER, "Public Access to Court Electronic Records", between Nevada, the charging district and Florida, the arresting district, is crucial to the petitioner's petition for rehearing requests.

A rehearing of the decision in this matter is in the interest of justice because there are facts relevant to the truth finding process, which includes fraud that seriously affected the integrity of the normal process of adjudication.

Official Court records played a significant part with the normal process that started with the filing of the Criminal Complaint and immediately ended when the switched and replaced falsification of the original filed complaint, violated petitioner's right to due process. Where such falsification proceeded without proper authorization for amending the complaint. Therefore caused extraordinary circumstances in which petitioners pray that the Chief Justice of The United States will take judicial notice of the records, in which this case filings contains several crucial, factual and procedural distinction that reveals conflict.

PACER, (acronym for Public Access to Court Electronic Records) is an electronic public access service of the United States federal court documents. It allows users to obtain case and docket information from the United States district courts, United States courts of appeals, and United States bankruptcy courts. The system is managed by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts in accordance with the policies of the Judicial Conference, headed by the Chief Justice of the United States.... *See Attachment 2*

Crucial, Factual, and Procedural conflicts which caused the defendants due process right to be violated from the conception of the case.

FROM: 09463104
TO: Washington, Janeice; Washington, Janeisha
SUBJECT: Petition for Rehearing of an order denying cert-
DATE: 10/29/2021 10:15:58 AM

Petition for Rehearing of an order denying certiorari: 21-5242

From the inception of the case, the petitioner pointed to evidence that contains several crucial, factual and procedural distinctions, in regards to the initial filings of the criminal complaint, by the charging district of Nevada's Court system, in which was electronically sent to the arresting district of Florida.

The procedural distinction between Nevada's Criminal Docket For Case # 2:16-mj-00571-NJK-1, and Florida's Criminal Docket For Case # 1:16-mj-03127-JG-1 was circumvently altered, to hide the illegality and unauthorized removal of Court record that has infected the entire frame work of this case. *See Attachment 3*

After petitioner's arrest in Florida, on August 17, 2016, the petitioner had his initial appearance proceeding before Magistrate Judge Goodman, the following day on August 18, 2016, at 2:14 pm. A copy of the initial filed criminal complaint and charges was electronically sent to the arresting district of Florida, from the prosecuting charging district. (See, Fact 4 within petition for writ of certiorari)

The petitioners now points to two specific distinctions of the record, that petitioners pray fully hope this Court will consider and investigate the district to district filings conflict.

- *A. The district of Nevada electronically sent the district of Florida, a criminal complaint with different charging counts. *see 3*
- *B. I have requested record information from my appointed attorney in Florida, in regards to requested charging papers. I was told that, "I was arrested here but my case stemmed from charges in Nevada". Nevada later tells me that Florida might have an issue down there. *Attachment 4*

In these two provided examples, there are distinctions, from within, that does not add up, in which causes a conflict that, in using common sense, reveals.

In *A., if the charging district originally and electronically sent the arresting district of Florida the complaint, in which contains two initiating charging counts from the beginning, then the docket along with the record should reflect two initiating charging counts as well. However the facts in the record reveals that the recorded charging count that Florida received and docketed was one initiating charging count that the complaint originally reflected.


In *B., due to the conflicts that surfaced within the records between the arresting district and charging district, reveals disputes on what district is responsible for the charging counts that are in question.

There are numerous of other evidence, based on record that left foot prints that tracks the evidence of the Court's records being manipulated and which infected petitioner's due process; in requiring the reopening of the suppression hearing.

A rehearing tightly and squarely focused on the distinctions between and "[within]" this case, in which these distinctions merit a different rule of judgment is matter of fundamental fairness to petitioner and would not unduly burden the Court.

Conclusion : Filed in good faith and not for delay -

For the reasons just stated, I, Joshua Sadat Washington, urges that this petition for rehearing be granted, and that, on further consideration, a review and investigation to the Petition for Certiorari be granted. (*God's Willing) Thank You-

Respectfully submitted

Joshua Sadat Washington # 09463-104
Atlanta USP, P.O. Box 150160
Atlanta, GA 30315 - Date: 10/29/21

12/8/21

4 of 29

FROM: 09463104
TO: Washington, Janeice; Washington, Janeisha
SUBJECT: Petition For Rehearing -Appendix, Attach- Exhibits
DATE: 12/08/2021 08:37:52 AM

Petition for Rehearing of an order denying certiorari: 21-5242

Petitioner's Appendix, Attachment, and Exhibits

Attachment : 1-A	Supreme Court Notice, Certiorari denied, Dated 10/04/2021	Pg. 7
Attachment : 1-B	Supreme Court Notice, Correct and Resubmit, Dated 11/23/2021	Pg. 9
Attachment: 1-C	Certificate of Service / Stating Grounds Certification	Pg. 11
Attachment: 1-D	Certificate, Proof of service to Solicitor General	Pg. 13
Attachment: 2	Pacer (law) Headed by the Chief Justice of the United States	Pg. 15
Attachment: 3	Criminal Docket -Intro	Pg. 17
Attachment: 4	Attorney Notice - Transcripts	Pg. 19
Attachment:		
Attachment:		
Attachment:		
-	Track of Evidence - Supporting illustrations	
-		
-		
Exhibit: 1	Before and After, illustration	Pg. 20
Exhibit: 2	July 26, 2017, Motion Hearing Transcript, Page 22, illustration	Pg. 23
Exhibit:		
Exhibit: 4	Complaint, Warrant, and Testimony - impossible (Storage West)	Pg. 25
Exhibit: 5	Complaint, Warrant, and Testimony - impossible (Flight info-)	Pg. 27
Exhibit:		
Exhibit:		
Exhibit:		
Exhibit: 11	2 charging counts vs. 1 charging count, illustration	Pg. 29
Exhibit:		
Exhibit:		
11 11		

**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**