


No. 21-5534

ORIGINAL

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES



Omolara Makini — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

Oakland County
Sheriff's Office et al — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Omolara Makini
(Your Name)

1200 N CHRIS ROAD
(Address)

BARTON CITY, MI 48705
(City, State, Zip Code)

(989) 335-0544
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

① Should the Michigan Supreme Court, Michigan Court of Appeals and Sixth Circuit Court of Oakland County be persuaded by the facts, questions, and evidence presented be reviewed by their court, granted opportunity for oral argument and grant Appellant-Plaintiff relief?

② Should the US Supreme Court consider the validity of Appellants claims of identity theft and police tampering with Evidence by reviewing & comparing an Oral Argument, color photo of Appellant and reviewing footage?

LIST OF PARTIES

[] All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

[X] 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:

- 1) Deputy Brandon Karsen
- 2) Oakland County Prosecutor Office

RELATED CASES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3-4
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	5-6
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	7
CONCLUSION.....	8

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	MI SUPREME COURT ORDER DENYING APPLICATION TO APPEAL
APPENDIX B	ORDER DENYING LEAVE TO APPEAL MICHIGAN COURT OF APPEALS
APPENDIX C	ORDER - SIXTH CIRCUIT COURT - GRATING DEF. SUMMARY DISPOSITION
APPENDIX D	
APPENDIX E	APPELLANT - COPY - PROOF OF INCOME FOR INDIGENT STATUS
APPENDIX F	BRIEF SUBMITTED TO COURT OF APPEALS AND SUPREME COURT OF MICHIGAN

→ NEW ISSUE FORM - SUBMITTED WITH Court of Appeals - case 356826

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☐ is unpublished.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 B 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 Supreme Court court 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.



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 2/5/2021.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix C.

☒ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: May 11, 2021, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix B.

☐ 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 Statutory Provisions
Index of Authorities**

Michigan Statutes

MCL 15.151(1).....	9
MCL 28.176 (4)(b)	9
MCL 330.1723(1).....	18
MCL 333.20201(2)(e)(f)(g)	19
MCL 435.361	15
MCL 445.61 et seq	15
MCL 445.65 (1)(a)(i)(ii)	15
MCL 445.65 (1)(b)(i)(ii)	15
MCL 600.5805(9).....	3
MCL 600.6805(9).....	6
MCL 691.1407 (8)(a)	12, 17
MCL 691.1407(2)(c)	3
MCL 691.1407(7) (4)	17
MCL 691.1407(8)(d)(i).....	2, 7
MCL 7.204(A)(1).....	6
MCL 750.218	14
MCL 750.218(1)(c).....	15
MCL 750.411	9
MCL691.1407(2)(a)(b)(c).....	3

Other Authorities

MCC 2.611(A)(1)(g)	6
MCC 2.611(G)(7)(ii) (iii).....	6

MCL 7.202(6)(a)(i).....	6
Rules	
MCR 2.119(1)(ii).....	6
Constitutional Provisions	
Eighth Amendment Protection 1789 (rev.1992).....	20
Fourteenth Amendment Protection 1789 (rev. 1992).....	13
Fourth Amendment Protection 1789 (rev. 1992).....	20
The False Statements Accountability Act, Pub. L. No. 104-292, H.R. 3166	11
The Thirteenth Amendment 1865	14
Federal Statutes	
42 USC.....	10
Federal Cases	
Owens v Okure, 488 US 235, 240 (1989).....	10
Graham vs. Connor, 490 U.S. 386 §1989	10
United States Supreme Court	
10 U.S. Code §897. Art. 97. Unlawful Detention	20
42 U.S.C §14141 (a)	11
42 USC §1988	10
Reports	
U.S Commission on Civil Rights. (2020). 2015. Police Use of Force: An Examination of Modern Policing Practices	11

STATEMENT OF FACTS

TYPE OF CASE: Civil Litigation

DATE OF ORIGINAL CASE LOSS/INCIDENT: May 17, 2017

DATE OF ORIGINAL CASE CLOSURE: November 15, 2019

DATE OF SECOND CIVIL CASE DISMISSAL: August 5, 2021

DATE OF COA ORIGINAL ACTION DISMISSAL: April 8, 2021

Oakland County Sheriff's Office team of officers tampered with evidence in the form of "police in-car surveillance with pre-installed camera and audio", replacing my identity, interactions, and voice entirely with that of an unknown person to cover an earlier brutal attack on Plaintiff by Deputy Brandon Karsen that took place on May 17, 2017 between 8pm and 10pm est in response to Plaintiffs 911 call for larceny. Deputy Brandon Karsen directly violated MCL 691.1407(8)(d)(i) by arriving to the scene of Plaintiffs reported larceny as if he were responding to a riot, terrorism threat, or imminent violent civic emergency.

Please find attached per the Table of Contents "Evidential Documents" a copy of the courts "Register of Actions" for both cases; initial felony docket# 2018-265950FH and civil litigation docket# 2019-178698CZ. The actions of Deputy Brandon Karsen led to a trail of court proceedings, one year of jail time, and a civil litigation filed immediately after release too ultimately bring us to the abrupt decision of Judge Jeffery S. Matis to issue an "Opinion and Order Granting Defendants Motion for Summary Disposition" on February 5, 2021 due to Plaintiff's missing deadline dated December 4, 2020 for response. The order was issued over two months past the motion deadline, within moments of payment rendered by Plaintiff to the Oakland Mediation Center, and on the same day February 5, 2021 for \$285 in response to order issued on December 11, 2020 to "Mediate Case Evaluation not to Exceed \$25,000".

The mediation was ordered as a result of the case evaluation offer rejection following the "Case Evaluation Hearing" scheduled on October 21, 2020. Plaintiff rejected the \$7,500 monetary offer for administrative cost of \$14,460,000 for damages including administrative cost presented in Plaintiffs "Case Evaluation Summary and Attachments" presented prior to the evaluation hearing.

In addition, Judge Jeffery S. Matis also ruled in Defendants favor for claims that Deputy Brandon Karsen is time barred pursuant MCL 600.5805(9) and that because Plaintiff did not respond to the motion by December 4, 2020, the motion granted authority to Defendant. However, Judge Matis failed to mention Plaintiffs counterclaim via "Case Evaluation Rejection" filing stating "there is no statute barring Plaintiff *exactly* 2yrs from the date of damages when the damages or injuries result at the hands of the Sheriff or Sheriff's Office. Statute MCL 600.5805(9) does not satisfy Defendants nor Judge Matis legal authority requirement."

An officer is immune from Tort or governmental immunity for damages or injury caused to a person granted all the following are met pursuant MCL691.1407(2)(a)(b)(c). Deputy Brandon Karsens brutal actions against Plaintiffs during arrest amounts to gross negligence that excludes authority under such rule pursuant MCL 691.1407(2)(c). Furthermore, Deputy Brandon Karsen aim to cover the interaction by concealing the true identity of Plaintiff and tampering with official evidence is a direct violation of Defendants oath of office.

On July 20, 2020 at 12:58pm est. Plaintiff received an official copy by certified mail from Defendant of in-car surveillance footage that does not display Plaintiff in any way, shape, or form. Defendants Corporate Counsel, Daniel Andrew Klemptner, stated that he had provided all was in the file as "video" of the incident at that time. Police "dash cam video with audio" footage available for viewing per records and audio only available as link in index of authorities.


REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Existence of a conflict between the decision of lower court - Sixth Circuit Court and the Michigan Supreme Court and Michigan Court of Appeals because the case has not been granted a fair trial to be heard in court of law and all courts appear to not be interested in fulfilling their duty by oath to offer fair trial and fair review of all facts presented.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,


Date: 8/10/2021