

21-5683

ORIGINAL

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

AUG 23 2021

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Jerome McBride — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

Solicitor General of the U.S. — RESPONDENT(S) - Solicitee

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Jerome McBride
(Your Name)
NBCI

14100 McMullen Highway
(Address)

Cumberland, MA 01502
(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

First's Question

Did the State-Division and the Federal-Division unconstitutional-Convent adopt depriving/ breaches governing-incorporating, on the Effective Executive (Maryland-Statute\U.S. Constitutional-Division); Identification-ingress, regress; Const of the U.S. Art I II, Section 1, 2; U.S. Const of the U.S. Art I V. Section 1, U.S. Constitution of the U.S. Art V I; Judiciary-Jural-Judicial. This question is limited to the constitutional supremacy suppression assert - For Feiture - This question is in light.

Second Question

Is the Petitioner being a subject to the constitution unconstitutional with a to wrong outrageous in a constitutional common-law Government system that's state and Federalism constitution. The question is on it's limit for a assert-devolution constitutional, more pointing to the state but still at a lighting on Federal.

Third Question

Have in the light of the Petitioner's Petition For Writ of cert stake, govern's the supreme constitutional in the questions of the system abuse's that the Division of the state and the Federalism-Service is in general unconstitutional to? The question is limited for a's exercise-constitutional Supreme assert

4th Question

Did the State-Division of a, Id., Counsel; State-Judge; State-Respondents adopt depriving Due-Process in a unconstitutional-irregular on petitioner Liberty the invalid oppression-Service of Forfeiture. The question is asked in a subject to each and to all as applied to the event.

Statement of case

Petitioner Jerome McBride was held on a grand-jury authorize indictment, indictment of 1st Deg Att Murder this included Second Deg Att Murder by charge and Jury-law, 1st Deg Assault and Handgun Use's in the Commission of a Crime. This was a criminal-cause within of Information the petitioner was charge with 1st Deg Att Mur on Kusan Hines and use's of a Handgun in the Commission of a Crime, second Deg Att Mur as above and 1st Deg Assault. Other counts been Remove on the other Viction for Error law.

On June 11, 2000 on the night time Hour's David Williams heard two people arguing by his home the argument was over heard by David Williams and David Williams heard it was about a girl he told both individual to leave. soon after both individual went away, out on that behalf David Williams heard 4 shots Kusan Hines was reported subject to a injury of a graze-shot to the arm. The petitioner was convicted by Jury in a Jury-trial and sentence by Jury Trial Judge Stephen M. Waldron on 1st Deg Att Murder and Handgun use's in the Commission of a Crime the sentence follow in the form of Life with parole a max's sentence for 1st Deg Att Mur of Kusan Hines and 5 years for the Handgun use's and 5 years probation upon parole with 63 year if any violation.

The Jury trial was process in the Harford County Circuit Court by a Jury.

The statement of the case is stated within to and on the Jury-trial proceeding. The second Deg Att Murder's within to Teann Peaker and Tonisha Smith have been Remove ORR because of Error-law that was Remedy File on Appeal the above is the statement of the case.

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: 1. Victim-Kusan Hines, 2. Witness-Teanns. Peaker, 3. Witness-Tonisha L. Smith,

4. Defense Attorney For Jury Trial John W. Janowich, 5. Harford County State's Attorney Mark Nelson, 6. Harford County Circuit Trial Judge Judge Stephen M. Waldron, 7. Police Officer Deputy Christopher Gibbons, 8. Detective Stephen M. Schwartz, 9. Appellate Public Defender Mark Colvin, Court of S. Appeals, 10. Courts. Appeals Judge J. Krauser, 11. Harford County 3 Judge Panel Judge Maurice W. Baldwin - Judge Thomas E. Marshall - Judge Emorey A. Plitt, 12. Evidence Collection Unit For Harford County Corporal Diane Newton, 13. State's Attorney Joseph I. Cassilly, 13. Post Conviction Public Defender Margaret Lanier, 14. Post Conviction Public Defender David L. Russell, 15. Court of Appeals For Maryland - Chief Judge Mary E. Barbera 16. U.S. District Judge George J. Hazel, 17. Attorney General - Daniel J. Jawor, Attorney General - Edward J. Kelley, 18. U.S. Court of Appeals 4th Cir Judge Thacker, Judge Quattlebaum, Judge Rushing, 19. Witness David Williams, 20. A State Witness Joe Allen, 21. Jury Trial Panel, 22. Post Conviction Judge Emorey A. Plitt, 23. Congress, 24. The Public Defender Post Conviction Division, 25. Post Conviction Reopen Judge Curtin.

RELATED CASES

U.S. Vs Woods 484 F.2d 133, 415 US 979

Michelson Vs US 335 US 475-76; U.S. Vs Baldivid 465 F.2d 1277, 409 US 1047

U.S. Beechums 582 F.2d 911-12, n.15, 440 US 920, 99 S.Ct 1244

U.S. Vs Masters 622 F.2d 86 (4th Cir)

Roberts Vs U.S. 548 F.2d 667, 431 US 92-97 S.Ct 2188

U.S. Vs Gibon 625 F.2d 888-89

U.S. Vs Larent 429 US 1098, 97 S.Ct 1117

U.S. Vs De John 638 F.2d 1052

Roberts 625 F.2d 1016

Mitchell Vs Green 2019 U.S. App. Lexis 11227

Solomon Vs U.S. of America 2006 U.S. App. Lexis 27157

U.S. Vs Hadoway 681 F.2d 219

U.S. Vs Kopituk 461 US 928, 103 S.Ct 2089

Ford Vs U.S. 632 F.2d 1354, 450 US 934, 101 S.Ct 1399

U.S. Vs Baskes 450 US 1000, 101 S.Ct 1706

U.S. Vs Brumman 655 F.2d 545 (4th Cir)

U.S. Vs Shaw 104 S.Ct 1419

Price Vs State 405 Md 10

Lopez Vs Smith 135 S.Ct 1 (2014)

Martinez Vs Ramirez 565 US 1 (2012)

Harper Vs E F Cole 648 F.3d 140 (2011)

Constitutional And Statutory Provisions Involved

Consist of the U.S. Art II Section 1.2. - Page 17, 29

6th Amend / 14 Amendment . . . page 19, 30

5th Amend . . . Page 20

8th Amendment

ABA Standards for Criminal Justice 4-4.1 - Appendix A, D, E • Page 22

ABA standards "The Defense Function" 4-1.1 to 4-8.6. Appendix A, D, C Page 23

U.S. Const. of Art. II sec. 1, 2; Const. of the U.S. Art. V, Amendment XIV - Appendix A, D - Page 29

28 USC § 2254(a) Appendix A, D, E, F • Page 44

28 USC § 2244(d)(1)(B) - Appendix D, F

28 USC 2244(d)(1)(B) - Appendix D, F

28 USC 1442(a)(1), 1443, 28 USC 1442(a)(1) and 1443) * Appendix A, D, E, F

Const of the U.S. Art I. Section 9 - Appendix A, D, F. Page 47
Black's Law Dictionary p. 298 (6th ed. 2002)

Black's law Dictionary p. 298 (9th ed 2009): ("collateral Attack") - Appendix e.g.,
Ann Code of Criminal Proc § 6-101 (1)(2) A.

Ann Code of Md Court And Jud proceeding § 12-101 (F) e.g. Appendix A & B • Page 20

Federal 6th, 14th, 5th Amend and state Md const Decl of Rights A, C, D • Page 20

Ann Code of Md Criminal Proc §7-102(a)(1), 28 USC §2254(a) • Page 36
6th, 5th, 4th Amend Rth Amend - Page 36

6th, 5th, 14 Amend, 8th Amend - Page 21,
 Court Report

6th, 5th, 14 Amend - Page 21, 34, 36, 29

6th Amerind - Page 31, 34

Const of the U.S. Art I II. s-1, 2, US Const of the U.S. Art II. s-1, 1/2. Const of the U.S. Art III. s-1, Art IV. section 1 - Page 51

Const of the U.S. Art III s. 1, Art IV. section 1 - Page 5 | U.S. const of the U.S. Art IV s. 1, U.S. const of the U.S. Art IV s. 1 - Page 33

Table of Contents

Motion For Petition For Writ of Cert, S.Ct Rule 21	1 to 70
Opinions Below	1, 1 of 1
Jurisdiction	2
List of Parties	3
Related Cases	3
Constitutional And Statutory Provisions Involved	4
Table of Authorities Cited	5, 6, 7 to 12 to 14
Statement of the Case	15
Question(s)	16
Reasons For Granting the Writ	17 to 54
Conclusion	54
Motion	55 to 70
Index To Appendices	

APPENDIX A	Decision of State Trial Court
APPENDIX B	Decision Maryland Court of S. Appeals
APPENDIX C	Decision Maryland Court of Appeals
APPENDIX D	Decision U.S. Dist Ct
APPENDIX E	Decision U.S. Court of Appeals
APPENDIX F	Decision U.S. Court of Appeals - Rehearing Petition

In this review on the behalf of the Appendix A to F the Review as below to the Appendix is following and the Decision is along to that Appendix.

APPENDIX A is a appendix that subject to state trial court, that's the Opinion, in appendix A that Appendix is in general to the 'Jury-Trial', 'Modification For Sentence Motions', '3 Judge-Panel Sentence', 'Post Conviction'. Hartford County Circuit Court in general.

1. Jury Trial - T8 page 8, 10 to 12 - New Trial T8 page 7 • 2. Modification 1-19-01; 3. Panel-Sentence Review 7-24-01 07-26-01
Opinion Sentence shall remain unchanged, ^{4p} Post Conviction Sept 30, 2011 Denied / Reopen 12-19-12 Denied • All Post Conviction denied, Trial-Court Sept 27, 2002 Court Remove a Opinion.

APPENDIX B Denied Court of S. Appeals In general

APPENDIX C Denied Court of Appeals In general

APPENDIX D Sup Sponte or dismiss U.S. District Court

APPENDIX E Dismissed U.S. Court of Appeals

APPENDIX F Denies U.S. Court of Appeals Rehearing-Petition

Table of Authorities Cited

Cases And Page Number

Michel Vs Louisiana 100 L. Ed 90 * PAGE 24

Salvatore Consiglio Vs Warden 153 Conn. 673 * PAGE 21

Wiggins Vs Smith 539 US 519 * PAGE 22

Wiggins Vs Smith 539 US 520, 521, 522; 539 US 524 * PAGE 22

Williams Vs Taylor, Supra at 369 * PAGE 22

Stack Vs Maine 492 A.2d 599 (1985) * PAGE 22

Cryler Vs Sullivan 446 US at 348 * PAGE 22

U.S. Vs Flynn 87 F.3d 996 * PAGE 22

Corey Vs U.S. 377 F.3d at 908 * PAGE 22

Webster Vs State 299 Md 632-474 A.2d 1332 * PAGE 22

Webster Vs State 299 Md 581 Footnote 9 Page 22, 24

Harris Vs State 303 Md 685, 496 A.2d 1074 * PAGE 22

Bowers Vs State 320 Md 416, 424, 578 A.2d 734, 738 * PAGE 22

Strickland Vs Washington 466 U.S. 1d at 687 * PAGE 22

Strickland Vs Washington 1d at 688 * PAGE 23

Strickland Vs Washington 446 US at 690, 691, 692 * PAGE 23

Strickland, 1d 685 * PAGE 23

Bowers 320 Md at 427, 578 A.2d at 739 * PAGE 23

Gray Vs Lynn 6 F.3d 269-70 (5th Cir) * PAGE 23

Strickland Vs Washington 466 US 668 - West Headnote 8 Criminal Law key 641.13(1); 9 Criminal Law Key 641.13(1), 13 Criminal Law key 641.13(6), * Page 23

Strickland 466 US 692, 104 S.Ct 2068 * PAGE 23

Hill Vs Lockhart 474 US 52, 59 * PAGE 23

Jones Vs US 527 US 389 * PAGE 24

Michel Vs Louisiana 100 L. Ed 88 * PAGE 23

Franklin Vs U.S. 434 F.3d at 429-430 • PAGE 22

11/1/2020

Shell Vs State, supra 307 Md at 55, 512 A.2d at 363, Wright Vs State, supra 307 Md at 576, 515 A.2d at 1169. • PAGE 29

Harris Vs Redd 489 U.S. 255, 262, 103 L. Ed. 2d 308, 109 S. Ct 1038 • PAGE 24

U.S. Vs Cronk 466 US 653-654, 80 L. Ed. 2d 657, 104 S. Ct 2039 • PAGE 24.

Ashcraft Vs Tennessee 372 U.S. 156, 157, 158, 159, 163, 164, 170, 171 • PAGE 24

In re Winship 397 US 364, 358 • PAGE 24

Illan Vs U.S. City of New York 407 US 203 • PAGE 24

Hankerson Vs North Carolina 432 US 241, 242, 243 • PAGE 24

U.S. Vs Gaudin 515 US 506 Citing Sullivan Vs Louisiana 508 US 277-278 • PAGE 24

Argersinger Vs Hamlin 407 US 27, McMann Vs Richardson 397 US 771 n. 14 • PAGE 24.

Ramdass Vs Angelone 530 US 156 • PAGE 25

Ramdass Vs Angelone 147 L. Ed 2d pg. 142 • PAGE 25

Di Paola Vs Riddle 581 F. 2d 1111, 1113 • PAGE 25

E.g., Dowel Vs Commonwealth 12 Va App 1145, 408 S.E. 2d 263, 265; Smith Vs Commonwealth 134

Va 589, 113 S.E. 707; Blair Vs Commonwealth 66 Va 850, 858, 861 • PAGE 25

Ramdass 147 L. Ed 2d pg 143 • PAGE 25.

O'Dell Vs Netherland 521 US, at 157, 138 L. Ed 2d 351, 117 S. Ct 1969 • PAGE 25

Ramdass 147 L. Ed 2d pg 144 • PAGE 25

Ramdass 147 L. Ed 2d pg 154 • PAGE 25

Simmons 512 US at 175 • PAGE 25

Ramdass 147 L. Ed 2d pg 161 • PAGE 25

Ramdass pg 162 • PAGE 25

Williams 529 US at , • PAGE 25

Lopez Vs Smith 135 S. Ct 1 • PAGE 25

Lopez Vs Smith (190 L. Ed. 2d 4) • PAGE 25

Lopez (135 S. Ct 3) • PAGE 25

Lopez 135 S. Ct 4 • PAGE 26

731 F. 3d at 866-867 citing Russell Vs U.S. 369 US 749, 763-764, 82 S. Ct 1038, 8 L. Ed. 2d 240,

In re Olive 333 U.S. 257, 273-274, 68 S. Ct 499, 92 L. Ed 682; Cole Vs Arkansas 333 US 196, 201, 68

S. Ct 514, 92 L. Ed 644 • PAGE 26

Lopez (135 S. Ct 4) • PAGE 26

Russell Supra, at 752 • PAGE 26.

Strickland; Supra, Williams Vs Taylor - Supra at 369 • PAGE 22

Page

6

Continue

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 E to the petition and is Notice of Appeal

☐ reported at No. 21-6038 (8:17-CV-02395-GJH); 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 D to the petition and is Federal Habeas Corpus

☐ reported at Civil Action No. GJH-17-2396; 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 E to the petition and is Petition For Writ of Certiorari / a Motion for reconsideration

☐ reported at Petition Docket No. 189, Sept Term, 2015; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☒ is unpublished.

The opinion of the State Trial Court - Court of S. Appeal court appears at Appendix A, B to the petition and is

☐ reported at Motions, Petitions, Sept Term 2000 No 2666, No. 1130 Sept Term 2011; 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 June 1, 2021.

☐ 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: June 1, 2021, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix F.

☐ 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 8-24-2015, Dec 4, 2015.
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).

Reasons For Granting the Petition

Page 23

Decisions, to keep the defendant informed of important developments in the course of the prosecution, and to use skill and knowledge to render the trial a reliable adversarial testing process. Id. at 688. The Strickland Supreme Court's basic guideline is whether counsel functioned as guaranteed by the 6th Amend. This is a standard which is usually determined by basic reasonable norms of defense attorney. A guideline for these norms can be found in the ABA Standards, "The Defense Function" 4-1.1 to 4-8.6. Strickland 446 US at 690, 691, 692 here prove the standard for the two prongs and also constitute the state's Attorney unconstitutional doing with counsel and as petitioner limit this petition to all reasons the trial court judge constituted unconstitutional the state division as to here a injustice acts on the laws of the provision petitioner govern a assert to. The Supreme Ct defined reasonable probability as "a probability sufficient enough to undermine confidence in the outcome" of the trial or sentencing hearing, id 685, the Md Court of Appeals decision in Bowers supra, "concluded that a substantial possibility, is the standard that applies in Maryland, and it aptly describes the prejudice standard the Supreme Court adopted in Strickland." Bowers 320 Md at 427, 578 A.2d at 739, and Bowers vs State 320 Md 416, 424, 578 A.2d 734, 738 Defense counsel's deficient performance in Murder prosecution, arising when he failed to introduce evidence that hair from person other than defendant to create "substantial possibility" that results of trial would have been different, as required to support ineffective assistance of counsel claim. The Bowers reading is subject to all petitioner constituted to, in this Petition that's place's constituting to a constitutional strategy for a Not guilty or a dismissal counsel could have showed up after all was done and at the Worses of all this, and proceeded lawfully on these Jury Instructions. See Actions concerning Jury Instructions; Gray vs Lynn 6 F.3d 269-70-5th Cir counsel's failure to object erroneous Jury instruction ineffective assistance of counsel, Uchenberg vs Smith 79 F.3d 388 Trial counsel's failure to object and request an expanded instruction in this case amounted to ineffective assistance. MPJ1-Cr 3:05, MPJ1-Cr 3:30, MPJ1-Cr 5:06, MPJ1-Cr 7:03. within to the above this reading is constituting on the Jury Instructions that Counsel unconstitutional let that action be abused by the 6th, 5th and 14 Amend but did not counsel any of the Maryland- construction, counsel was to get this trial of Jury in a stage of Constitutional-service of judicial and turn everything around for how the Trial Judge and the state actions played in this Jury-trial, this is a strategy that would have end this trial for of a dismissal, re-charges of lesser offense and so on. At a point the State Arg. is inhibit however alone the common-law construction of Maryland is for the better to a threat of the 6th/14 Amend Due-process to end up with a outcome lesser than Life with parole. On these reasons it's Not giving that this is less of a harm it's a unconstitutional-burty that is a deprive and deny to within it's Jurisdiction of the equal protection that is subject to the 5th Amendment condition of twice/twice put in Jeopardy or life. see Strickland vs Washington 466 US 668 West Headnotes 8 Criminal Law Key 641.13(1), 9 Criminal Law Key 641.13(1), 13 Criminal Law Key 641.13(6), 466 US 692, 104 S.Ct 2068 we believe that a defendant need not show that counsel's deficient conduct more likely than not altered the outcome in the case. This outcome-determinative standard has several strengths, it defines the relevant inquiry in a way familiar to courts, though the inquiry, as is inevitable, is anything but precise. The standard also reflects the profound importance of finality in criminal proceeding. When reviewing the record to the stated authorities that's T1 page 90, 91, 72 page 30, 46, 73 page 12 the strategy over all, this, if counsel would have Not Effor on a 6th Amendment of all that is in this petition a result by self show that Due-lau common-law would have been in light for and to all that show a lesser of a conviction or a lesser offense here is the common-law point and petitioner ask's this S. Ct to assert this constitutional. See Hill vs Lockbar 474 US 52, 59. In this petition petitioner file this petition for the reasons for Granting the Petition and on this reading as petitioner proceed to the Jury Instruction the Caselaw prove as applied Constitutional to that matter as follow. See Michel vs Louisiana 100 L. Ed 88 U.S. Ct Edelman vs California reading just's there on the case and below on the Federal Courts the 3 cases. Md v Tiet 241 (a) (c) adopt Ann Code of Md Criminal Law 83-206(b) (c). A not guilty also could have been.

Michel Vs Louisiana 100 L Ed 90 see on federal question Supreme Court consideration of the facts this is what a standard of Rule 15 which adopt this petition. Also see Michel Vs Louisiana 350 US 104 on the Supreme Ct the first sentence about the system ending at that the end of the Hovey Vs Elliott case. See Jones Vs U.S. 527 US 380 in petitioner's view, the 8th Amendment requires that the jurors be instructed as to the effect of their inability to agree. We alternatively argue that we should invoke our supervisory power over the federal courts and require that such an instruction be given. Before we turn to petitioner's 8th Amend argument, a question of statutory interpretation calls for our attention. See Jones Vs U.S. 527 US 389 this court held congress intent, statutory language, reversal, arbitrary factor, 3 Plain error standard and end at the U.S. Vs Atkinson case, also Jones Vs U.S. 527 US 390 the S. Ct held that S. Ct considered similar claims, proper standard for reviewing such claims is whether there is a reasonable likelihood that the jury has applied the challenged instruction in a way that violates the constitution, Estelle - Boyde - Victor. Jones 527 US 391 See on passages this reading goes into caselaw and stop at the Victor case, here as the caselaw constitute that the instructions must be evaluated not in isolation but in the context of the entire charge. Also Jones Vs U.S. 527 US 394, 395 constitute that any confusion and thus reading stop at the Lopez case. When reviewing that point the S. Ct held a point to that review but as here the petitioner case adopt this to reach the instructions as here in this petition is unconstitutional held on this state/federal decision and petitioner asks this S. Ct to Not adopt this in bad-faith the petitioner petition for a granting of this Petition. See Harris Vs Redd 489 U.S. 255, 262, 103 L. Ed. 2d 302, 109 S. Ct 1038 the doctrine of procedural default, demonstrate that failure to consider the claims will result in a fundamental miscarriage of justice. See U.S. Vs Cronin 466 US 653-654, 80 L. Ed. 2d 657, 104 S. Ct 2039 of all the rights that an accused person has, the right to be represented by counsel is by far the most pervasive for it affects his ability to assert any other rights he may have. See ~~Askerat~~ ~~the 7th~~ ~~see~~ ~~32208~~ 156, 157, 158, 159, 163, 164, 170, 171 within to this case the case was reversed because of a confession was properly admitted on this because of Counsel - Actions of his defense that counsel subject on T/page 90, al that statement is subject to a wide reach of question of what fact is that in where the petitioner was at fundamental to the time of what went on the petitioner never Evidence of being there by testimony, with this subject counsel to a unconstitutional abuse with counsel actions on this defense and then to allow what this petition say of happening an unconstitutional counsel defense alone along to this Aid And Abet act that was illegally done this all rest's on the Askerat case as above. See In re Winship 397 US 358, 358 the Supreme Ct held the Due Process clause of the 14th Amend protects an accused against conviction "except upon proof beyond a reasonable doubt of every fact necessary to constitute the crime with which he is charge, enforcement lies at the foundation of the administration of our criminal". See ~~Loch~~ V. Vs City of New York 407 US 203 on the Major which state purpose of new constitutional doctrine is to overcome an aspect of the criminal trial and so raises serious questions about the accuracy of guilty verdicts in past trials, this Reading go on govern administration of Justice with all reading to it. See Hankerson Vs North Carolina 432 US 241, 242, 243. and U.S. Vs Gaudin 515 US 506 citing Sullivan Vs Louisiana 508 US 277-278 these cases govern the jury that must be convinced that the prosecution has proven each and every element of the crime charged beyond a reasonable doubt. The 6th Amendment is in this, T/page 88, 89, 90 and T3 page 12. See Argersinger Vs Hamlin 407 US 27, Mc Mann Vs Richardson 397 US 77 n. 14 these cases is on 6th Amendment Due process clause of the 14th Amendment. Trial-court is not govern to personal set law. Processes over this point of this petition the construction show the state duty - see Webster Vs State 299 Md 581 Footnote 9.

Reasons For Granting the Petition

Page 25

3. Ct

This petition on the reason continue within to the Jury Instructions, in *Ram Dass Vs Angelone* 530 US 156 summary under criminal-law a conviction did not become final until (1) the jury returned a verdict and (2) the trial judge entered a final judgment of conviction knowingly. In *Ram Dass Vs Angelone* 147 L Ed 2d P9.142 Federal Judges familiar with Maryland practice have held that postverdict motions give a defendant a full and fair opportunity to raise claims of trial error; *DiPaola Vs Riddle* 581 F.2d 1111, 1113. In contexts beyond the Attempt-Murder statute, Virginia courts have held that the possibility of postverdict relief renders a jury verdict uncertain and unreliable until judgment is entered. E.g., *Dowell Vs Commonwealth*, 12 Va App 1145, 408 SE2d 263, 265; see also *Smith Vs Commonwealth* 134 Va 589, 113 SE 707; *Blair Vs Commonwealth* 66 Va 850, 858, 861 (availability of postverdict motions mean it is at the defendant's option whether to "let judgment be entered in regular order"). *Ram Dass* 147 L Ed 2d pg 143 *Ram Dass* complains that the Virginia S.Ct's selection of the entry of judgment rather than jury verdict is arbitrary. He points out that a trial court may set the judgment aside - see Jan 8, 2001, proceeding page 23, 13 Appeal is also permitted. We agree with *Ram Dass* that the availability of postjudgment relief in the trial court or on appeal renders uncertain the finality and reliability of even a judgment in the trial court. Our own jurisprudence under *Teague Vs Lane*, for example, does not consider a Virginia-state-court conviction final until the direct review process is completed. *O'Dell Vs Netherland* 521 US, at 157, 138 L Ed 2d 351, 117 S Ct 1869. States may take different approaches and we see no support for a rule that would require a state to declare a conviction final for purposes of a Attempt-Murder statute once a verdict has been rendered. Verdicts may be overturned by the state trial court, by a state appellate court, by the state supreme court, by a state court on collateral attack, by a federal court in Habeas Corpus, or by this court on review of any of these proceedings.

Petitioner disagrees with the part, on the part of of the state to declare a conviction here in petitioner conviction this petition is filed in reason to the law and under the Ann Code of Md State Government the section say the state's Attorney should not wrongly the law in a process and the constitution govern the law shall stand, that section adopt this on a level to be maintain. see *Ram Dass* 147 L Ed 2d pg 144 on due process and Jury's attention, this reading put that a petitioner should be with a opportunity to rebutting this the 6th Amend / 14 Amend adopt this, in *Ram Dass* 147 L Ed 2d pg 154. One such due process requirement is that a defendant must have an opportunity to rebut the case's against him. *Simmons* 512 US at 175. Also *Ram Dass* 147 L Ed 2d pg 161 the reading is subject to the verdict of guilty this explain trial safeguards, the shift and prior crime. The MPJ-Cr 6.01 is that and all that is in this petition is adopted to a constitutional shift. Petitioner asks the S.Ct to review on the shift of this unconstitutional reach.

The reading go over to *Ram Dass* pg 162 *Williams Vs Taylor* this reading applies a rule that contradicts the governing law set forth in our cases and *Williams* is explain that a state-court decision will also be contrary to this Court's clearly established precedent if the state court confronts a set of facts that are materially indistinguishable from a decision of this court and nevertheless arrives at a result different from our precedent. 529 US at 1. The reading here adopt the fully Petition. Petitioner fundamental points to the Aid At Abett charge which adopt the 5th Amend as said in this petition see *Lopez Vs Smith* 135 S.Ct 1 this case is on that Aid At Abetting theory under a Supreme Ct standard that Aid At Abetting deprived of adequate notice by a prosecutorial decision to focus on, *Lopez* (190 L Ed 2d 4). The defendant convicted Respondent of first-degree Murder without specifying which theory of guilt it adopted. (135 S.Ct 3). The court explained that "an accusatory pleading charging a defendant with murder need not specify the theory of murder on which the prosecution intends to rely," and noted that the "information charged defendant with murder in compliance with the governing statutes." Furthermore, the court held that "even if this case required greater specificity concerning the basis of defendant's liability, the evidence presented at his preliminary examination provided it".

Reasons For Granting the Petition

Page 26

The upshot was that "the information and preliminary examination testimony adequately notified defendant he could be prosecuted for murder as an aider and abettor." (Lopez 135 S.Ct. 41 the 9th Cir Court point out to 3 cases that stand for nothing more than the general proposition that a defendant must have adequate notice of the charges against him - see 731 F.3d at 866-867, citing Russell v. U.S. 369 U.S. 749, 763-764, 82 S.Ct. 1038, 8 L.Ed.2d 246; In re Oliver 333 U.S. 257, 273-274, 68 S.Ct. 499, 92 L.Ed. 682; Cole v. Arkansas 333 U.S. 196, 201, 68 S.Ct. 514, 92 L.Ed. 644). See Lopez (LED HR2) on Russell supra, at 752 and In re Oliver supra, at 259 and Cole supra, at 197. See Victor S. I. V. S. at 28, 114 S.Ct. at 1254 on (Blackmun and Souter, JJ. concurring)).

Petitioner here was never in a proceeding for any Jury Instruction notices which petitioner subject this to the petition. In Re Oliver 92 LED 687 A Michigan Judge sent a petitioner to jail the S.Ct. held whether the petitioner was denied the 14 Amendment, Re Oliver 333 U.S. 259 a habeas corpus was filed, in this case the Supreme Ct on grounds (92 LED pg 688) (333 U.S. 261) and grand jury chamber following state's first constitution (1835) like the 5th Amend to the Federal Constitution. Re Oliver 333 U.S. 265: When the work is finished by the return of an indictment, it cannot be used as evidence against the person indicted nor may he be fined or sentenced to jail until he has been tried and convicted after having been afforded the procedural safeguards required by due process of law, and 333 U.S. 266 this nation's accepted practice of guaranteeing a public trial to an accused has its root in our English common law heritage, settlement of our land. (333 U.S. 267) - (333 U.S. 268) - (333 U.S. 269) - (333 U.S. 270) in these reading adopt the 6th Amendment, judicial decision, Liberty and fair trial with public opinion is an effective restraint on possible abuse of judicial power.

In Re Oliver 333 U.S. 272 this S.Ct. held in Gaines v. Washington that a criminal trial conducted in secret would violate the procedural requirements of the 14 Amend, (333 U.S. 273) The S.Ct. held Federal and state that sentence is the 14 Amend subjecting secret proceedings and the view of this nation's this pick up on continuing to the S.Ct. second point on the nature of the charge. This continue see Re Oliver (333 U.S. 275) the S.Ct. start off with the Terry case ending at Cooke case this reading the S.Ct. set the function of the due process procedural safeguards with Terry Rule and the Cooke case the charge of Aid N Abett is an illegal abuse. However under this S.Ct. discretion of Service to all cases criminal the system is constitution by the 14 Amend due-process of law governing by self that the due-process is that Aid N Abett is a adopted crime it can not be a lone it must's adopt a crime under's under notice as petitioner place's in this petition, on this as here Aid N Abetting Adopt 1st deg Att Murder (Handgun) and the other way around is the same therefore this is the law see App 1 - Cr 6.01 far below on charge to give this instruction. All this adopt a verdict with a notice and the process of No less, see Re Oliver 333 U.S. 280 on adoption, Bill of Rights, and (333 U.S. 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286) see this reading on that behalf free's the above to be unconstitutional this case because the adoption to both these crimes turn this to a case of Aid N

Abetting A 1st degree Att Murder And a Indictment Notice both these crimes is also in 2 Degrees however second Deg Att Murder is already in a Error to Hines. Overall the petition explain and the Jury Instructions is misleading to the Jury 73 page 6, 8, this constitute bad-faith on innocent or guilt with No Supreme Ct authorize of a law of the land to be a securing conviction, see the above, see Hedgpeth v. Pulido 172 L.Ed.2d 388 harmless Error OR structural Error - Analysis of Jury Instruction error, Remanded on Habeas. See Case vs U.S. 498 U.S. at 40, 111 S.Ct. at 329 (doubt must be founded upon a real tangible substantial basis and such as would give rise to a grave uncertainty), e.g. Cordor v. State 63 Md App 471 (1985); Rudder v. State 181 Md App 458 (2008); People v. Johnson 595 N.E.2d 1340 (1992) The indictment operates as a whole and the predicate crime for the compound crime of use of a firearm takes its meaning from the lead counts.

Reasoning For Granting the Petition

Page 27

Price vs State 405 Md 10 Maryland common-law to hold that in most circumstances inconsistent jury verdict in criminal cases are not acceptable. See Victor 511 US At 28, 114 S. Ct at 254

In O'Neal vs McAninch the S. Ct held in this case a well pointed Error violating and Petitioner constitute this case to a adoption the law of the land case law, the case is so maintain to a constitution exercising the Juridical and the Judiciary, this case constitute to both jury instructions as petition to this S. Ct. See O'Neal vs McAninch 513 US 432 the Summary. In this as here the Opinion O'Neal vs McAninch 513 US 434 the S. Ct Response to all 3 questions state/Federal when the Court (1) reviews a state-court judgment from a criminal trial, (2) finds a constitutional error, and (3) is in grave doubt about whether or not that error is harmless. We recognize that this last mentioned circumstance, "grave doubt" is unusual. Normally a record review will permit a judge to make up his or her mind about the matter. And indeed a judge has an obligation to do so. But we consider here the legal rule that governs the special circumstance in which record review leaves the conscientious judge in grave doubt about the likely effect of an error on the jury's verdict. The reading continue ending on jury's verdict. In O'Neal vs McAninch 513 US 436 the S. Ct granted to decide the certiorari, explaining this subjecting the certiorari to a judge, after the grant the S. Ct continue on from there to (513 US 437, 438, 439, 440 ending at the Browder case, petitioner would like to add the reading civil cases part that go in to (513 US 441) petitioner asks the S. Ct to stop at (513 US 444) that last sentence, this would constitute (513 US 442, 443) to be subject. Also see O'Neal vs McAninch 513 US 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453. In this case of the O'Neal S. Ct moreover this petition is past the point of being harmless petitioner use's this case on the adoption that a matter took place this case of Hines is more favorable to the laws of Maryland under the construction which prove that the reason why the Error was done it was done for to suffer and under this outcome that Max's laws is subject, congress explain for the law to be enforce not in personal state of mind here it was a jury trial for the innocent or guilt this constitute constitutional for none of these things petitioner petition to this S. Ct to not have happen if all this Maryland-construction prove to be the 6th/14 Amend Due-process in general to all stages state/federal falling. See ROSE vs CLARK 478 US 570 Summary a second case an erroneous burden-shifting instruction could not be deemed "harmless", and in ROSE 92 L Ed 2d 470 that principle has been applied to a wide variety of constitutional errors. Eg, 1d at 684, 89 L Ed 2d 674, 106 S. Ct 1431 (failure to permit cross-examination concerning witness bias; Rushen vs Spain 464 US 114, 118, 78 L Ed 2d 67, 104 S. Ct 453 (per curiam) (denial of right to be present at trial); Moore vs Illinois 434 US 230, 232, 54 L Ed 2d 424, 98 S. Ct 458 (admission of witness identification obtained in violation of right to counsel); Hopper vs Evans 456 US 608, 613-614, 72 L Ed 2d 367, 102 S. Ct 2049 (citing Chapman and Ringling No prejudice from trial court's failure to give lesser included offense instruction). The matter at hand could be adopted in this with this case here and Delaware Rushen, Moore and Milton case all times cases is subject to this petition. The Delaware case adopt AIA Abetting issue because all evidence to the testimony against petitioner would be bias to not have face each witness on a 14 Amend AIA Abetting Att Murder, this is a failure, the Rushen case as petitioner said AIA Abetting adopt Att Murder and Att Murder adopt AIA Abetting this is law authorize which would make a indictment do to this petitioner have been denial of right to be present at trial this is the case however the petitioner have a right to a jury trial under the 6th, 5th, 14 Amendments these amendments adopt each other. The Moore case this case subject to Hines and other witnesses that is in the case for as identification this also constitute to discovery the level of function these witness subject and the case is still in question to the identification and what really happen this is all under counsel. The Milton case that part is on counsel on how counsel is stated in this petition to confession of the defense subjecting the defense to end up how it did.

Reasons For Granting the Petition

Page 28

The Hopper case is here constituting that a lesser included offense instruction that is authorize to be done and can be with this being showing this place is that this could have been active done but here the threat was not done.

See Rose vs Clark 478 US 577 the case start of explain the term of harmless error and the principle that the central of a criminal trial is to decide the factual question of the defendant's guilt or innocence the reading go on (478 US 578, 579, in this, this end of 584) also see Rose vs Clark 478 US 585 on Justice Stevens starting off (The principal question presented this reading go over to (Rose 478 US 586, 587) and stop at the racial discrimination part.

This case Rose 478 US 588, 589, 590 with Justice Blackmun govern the constitution on coherent harmless error. See fully it ends with the pleaded not guilty to both charges, At trial, Clark contested every element of the crime. He argued that he had not committed the Attempt Murder. The case there as page explain it's reach which take to the cashlaw of the S. Ct that identify the reach that this argument on the reading as to this petition fully adopt all this to be unconstitutional. The Rose 478 US 592 pick-up at the (close of trial, the court instructed the jury), this reading continue over to (Rose 478 US 593, 594, 595, 596. Rose explain the explaining is on a standards is at the end of the case which is - by a jury according to the procedures and standards required by the constitution. On plain constitutional authorize in light as to this petition in reason see Marshall vs U.S. (LEd 4R2) (2). It is beyond dispute that "6th Amendment safeguards to an accused who faces incarceration the right to counsel at all critical stages of the criminal process." Iowa vs Tovar 541 US 80-81, 124 S. Ct 1379, 158 L. Ed. 2d 209 (2004); see U.S. vs Cronin 466 US 653-654, 104 S. Ct 2039, 80 L. Ed. 2d 209 (1984); Gideon vs Wainwright 372 US 335, 344, 83 S. Ct 792, 9 L. Ed. 2d 299 (1963). See Md Health Gen Ann Code 8B-507.

The 6th Amendment constitute constitutional enjoy the right to a speedy trial, here petitioner constitute this to the Reason of petitioning to the S. Ct Barker vs Wingo 407 US 519 (1972) explain the right to a speedy trial, it stop at (accused). This continue see Barker vs Wingo 407 US 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, the reading end before (407 US 534), At 407 US 527 the reading start up at (The nature of the speedy) read fully from 527 to 533. See Barker 407 US 536 within the S. Ct the petitioner is under a Speedy Trial Rule and on the face of this petition continuance would need to be if Add A Abett was authorize by the constitution as here petitioner in reason to this that and in Barker the petitioner was represented by incompetent counsel the full reading is subject for a grant of this petition.

See Page 20, 21 of this petition and constitute Md Rule 4-642 (b) (c). Here the petitioner petition to this in Reasons for and to granting the petition this is filed on the the jury instructions as here. In Maryland the law is Ross vs State 276 Md 669-70, 350 A.2d 684 Citations omitted. Evidence of other crimes is independently relevant and thus admissible if introduced to prove or establish: (1) Motive, (2) Intent, (3) absence of mistake, (4) common scheme or plan embracing the commission of two or more crimes so related to each other that proof of one tends to establish the other, and (5) the identity of the person charged with the commission of a crime on trial. On this behalf the Rose case adopt U.S. vs Logan 949 F.2d 1370, 1377 n.12 (5th Cir. 1991) (reasoning that in determining whether to admit evidence of disputed authenticity, the court should utilize the protocol established in Federal Rule 104 (b), namely that "the judge make a preliminary determination as to whether a jury could reasonably conclude" that the evidence is what it purports to be. See Martignoli vs State 61 Md App 271 which involves charged and uncharge predicate crimes was instructive. See U.S. vs Hadaway 681 F.2d 1219 - Government case-in-chief; U.S. vs Ford 450 US 934, 101 S. Ct 1391 - Clear abuse of discretion; U.S. vs Baker 850 U.S. 1000, 100 S. Ct 1706 - great deference; U.S. vs Brugman 655 F.2d 545 - 4th Cir. wide discretion; U.S. vs Shaw 104 S. Ct 1419 - Clear showing of prejudice abuse of discretion. See U.S. vs Woods 484 F.2d 133, 415 US 979 the government and the defendant agree that Evidence of other crimes is not admissible to prove.

Reasons For Granting the Petition

Page 29

9

The Petitioner petition this S. Ct For and on the reasons of Granting the Petition for the U.S. Constitution that is Constitutional filed to this S. Ct, the petition is in the reason Subject in Law Terms and this petition is on the State Division at a In general Reason to these Officials as stated in this Petition that is in a authorize by law on effective Constitutional Judicial that's governing to the Amendments. 6th Amend in all criminal Prosecutions, enjoy the right to a speedy trial, 5th Amend indictment of a grand Jury, Subject for the same Offence twice put in jeopardy of life, 14 Amend deny No person within its Jurisdiction the equal Protection of the Laws. Constitution of the U.S Art. III section 1, Hill VS New York S28 US 116-17 (2000) a private party right may not be waived or release contravenes the statutory policy.

Skell VS State, supra, 307 Md at 55, 512 A.2d at 363 inconsistent jury verdicts does not justify inconsistent Verdicts from the trial Judge. Wright VS State, supra 307 Md at 576, 515 A.2d at 1169 Md-Commonlaw. In a Constitutional-Remedy of Constitutional-Service on post Conviction/Appeals the Petitioner move this Petition to Post Conviction and ask's the S. Ct within to the petition in reasons petitioner ask's this S. Ct to adopt this Remedy under the (Constitutional Judicial adoption Jurat/Judiciary). In reason petitioner ask's this S. Ct of and on constitutional-power to adopt the post conviction as to the service at if this was the Post Conviction S. Ct, the petitioner govern the S and on this behalf the Supreme Ct is a court that is the Court of the Law of the land this govern Const of the U.S. Art III section 1, section 2. The Judicial Power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the U.S., and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority;— to all cases the citizens thereof, Citizens or Subjects, Const of the U.S. Art V. Amendment XIV It's jurisdiction the equal Protection of the laws. Petitioner under the Post-conviction of Ann Code of Md Criminal Proc §7-101, §7-103(a), §7-104, Md Rule 1-201(a)(b)(c), Ann Code of Md Ct and Jud Proceeding §3-409(b)(e), Md 4-407(a) Federal 6th, 14th, 5th Amend and State Md Const Decl of Rights Art 24 Due-process. These reviews under the law have been enforce unconstitutional and the officials that is stated is the unlawful whom is the adoptee of (Unconstitutional deprived-derelection Services). In all reasons the petitioner constitute to this for the grant of this petition, In the behalf of Jan 8, 2001 sentencing page 24, 25 petitioner was not In form of the Right of Ann Code of Md Criminal Proc §7-103(b), on this matter petition was trying to have family put aside for a Post Conviction Attorney do to that time limit In §7-103(b) Resting out to that process that came to being what could not be done having a Attorney payed and supporting. Petitioner than filed with the Public Defender - Act. Petitioner Filed a letter to the Public Defender collateral Review Division, July 2009, never got a Response, in Jan 2, 2010 and Jan 10, 2010, for counsel the Division only Response to Jan 2010 2 letters, see Feb 2, 2010 Public Defender letter Chief Attorney Scott Whitney. I inform the Office I been filed before the 10 year deadline I stated this In my 2 Jan 2010 letters. The Public Defender Office wrote me In 3-29-2010 a letter this letter is being sent each one. Petitioner Received a 4-23-2010 letter from Deputy Chief Norman Handwerker of Counsel for Post Conviction. On further service I was contacted by Assistant Public Defender Margaret Lanier I don't have her first's letter but she also came to see me which soon after that she wrote me a Nov 29, 2010 letter 3 pages unconstitutional telling wrong full outcome's about my case on things that she could not do. Petitioner then complain about her actions and Deputy Chief Norm Handwerker wrote back letter dated 1-24-2011 2 page letter. On this behalf of the 1-24-2011 letter this came into a 3-11-2011 letter from Assistant Public Defender David Russell. Going back to 12-23-2010 petitioner got filed on the Public Defender not filing and forgot this petition was filed that petition Post conviction was for Not to lose my post conviction. On 9-5-2011 Assistant Public Defender David Russell wrote about a hearing being set. On Sept 30, 2011 petitioner was In a proceeding with Judge Emorey A. Plitt and state's Attorney however the petitioner was called to the stand which the Post conviction Judge Emorey A. Plitt in the proceeded to petitioner and ask's petitioner for all claims that petitioner had on counsel being

Reasoning For Granting the Petition

Page 30

ineffective assistance of counsel petitioner was not active at all to law and only can recall the things that took place in the Post's which petitioner claim that - Under post conviction the Remand of the Maryland Court of Appeals on the Appeal that the trial Judge said that he was removing the Second-Degree 1st Murder Counts and set for Retrial, the Next's day I came back to court but did go in the Court Room. In my mind all I knew was Double Jeopardy took place and that if that happen the trial get Dismiss. Here it's coming to that a New Trial was on Hines and I argue this to the Post's Court that I was sent to in on a second date. The Post's conviction Court held on that, My second issue was the sentence how high it was and my next point was that I was place's of who did not do the crime. The last's claim the Discovery. After all the Post's Judge proceeded and stated that he personally reviewed the Record his self and seen No wrong doing by counsel and this all was done in his Chamber which he maintain this Fully, the Post's conviction Judge also said on my claim about counsel keeping the Discovery from me and what happen on that the Judge had the pictures of what is in part in the Evidence that was the Discovery. On this behalf to everything the Post's Judge told, petitioner it's Nothing in there and that the pardon Hines being acqu is not a claim for Post conviction that claim to the Jury instruction is waived for Appeal and that the Post's Court can't do anything so with all this he denied the Post conviction and that counsel done counsel. This outcome here petitioner ask's this Court that is the sick to adopt all this each official for the abuse's. Petitioner also ask's this sick to treat this Petition that it is a Post conviction Reopening, petitioner ask's this sick to adopt this to U.S. Constitution is here for this. The public Defender Office Abused the Ann code of Md criminal Proc & 7-101, 7-102 (a) (1) (2) (3) (4) (b) (1) (2) - Legislation Intent and Maryland Intent Md Rule 4-401 (a); Rule 4-402 (a) (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (7); Rule 4-403, Md Rule 4-404, Md Rule 4-406 (a) (b) (c) (d), Md Rule 4-407 (a) (b). The Post's conviction Court abused the 6th, 14th Amendment - process and the Public Defender unconstitutional and not proceed with No petition or support petitioner filed with the Public Defender. In a letter in Jan 2010 for counsel and place's some issues of Hines testimony and the Discovery and I inform Assistant Public Defender Margaret Lanier on a visit to NBCI before she close's my case in a letter. None of the case's was proceeded and the Public Defender Office's failed to process my case for Post conviction. Application leave to Appeal Post conviction, writ of cert for Md Court of Appeals and Federal. see Oct 4, 2011 letter 2 pages Assit Public Defender David Russell. The state abused to filed back or to proceed the post conviction to some law, the Post's favorable the state over this type of case with a high W of prejudice to the petitioner and the Judge with held the Discovery and did not proceed it to the Post-conviction proceeding. Here the Post conviction Process under the Public Defender duty was unreasonable to have took place's the process took No lawful in put in fact the Post Court tried to deny the Application for leave to Appeal which stated in case History Oct 5, 2011 after the hearing. Petitioner filed a Application for leave to Appeal Post conviction sent one to the lower Court which was a typed up form one that Assit Public Defender had sent me David Russell, and a hand-copy one petitioner personally that one went to the Court of S. Appeals the hand-one. In this behalf when I get copies from both these Appeals they are not the same as I wrote it they both was change. I stated in my Appeal on this case law that was on a defendant where he took a plea and he Re-took his statement with a person saying he did not do the crime which they came forward. I constitute to this to Hines and Appealed my Post's conviction, after this was removed from my Appeal illegally and some other writing was put. My Application was in Court of S. Appeals from that time to 2015. I then file my writ of cert off the denial of my Application of Post's conviction.

Reasons For Granting the Petition

Page 31

70

Trial-Counsel was Not at the hearing under Post's Conviction-law.

On the behalf of all this the Illegal ~~Act~~ of a review is in the S.Ct mind which this is my reason that petitioner petition this S.Ct to grant the Petition, petitioner had no legal support doing this time and well off for support to form a Remedy which petitioner prayer of counsel for a judicial reach was for the Public Defender Office to file on this case that call for a treat over the suffering of this outcome. No construction of Maryland was used in Post Conviction or the Application for Appeal or the Modification Motion, the Public Defender could have Renew the 3 Judge panel and the modification motion and filed the Indictment on counsel as to how petitioner filing to the S.Ct and all other claims. Also along to the Discovery, petitioner did not know anything about Aid & Abetting and how the instruction bear as to what the ~~Case~~ law show in this petition that is a standard by and on the constitution. Within filing the writ of cert getting all that was in need for as the Post Conviction Record and processing the writ of cert to the Court of Appeals. Petitioner was told the wrong time to file the petition for writ of cert to the Md Court of Appeals. Under that Court of all consideration that Court failed to take actions under petitioner's suffering of law filing that suffer on counseling that filing personally within Self. In Dec 2026 Petitioner filed for a Post Conviction Reopening the Post's Court Denied without taking discretion in a interest of justice Ann Code of Md Criminal Proc § 7-104 on a further notice to proceed on a order for petitioner to follow in judicial term's to do this was done on 7-16-17.

In this State Division petitioner Reason to that under counsel Petitioner suffer the Remedy reach of filing this case under the constitution by Self and the Public Defender Constitutional Act, this is authorize and governing to Maryland as stated that the Public Defender have a Duty which petitioner Reason to this all that the 6th Amend Public Defender Abuse's is the reason. see Ann Code of Md Criminal Proc § Public Defender Act § 16-101 (a) (c) (d) (e) (1) (2) (b) (1), see 39 Md. L. REP. 584 giving Post convict Act and court the power to grant an appeal to rise issues not heard on Appeal due to the effective appellate counsel, Ann Code of Md Criminal Proc § 16-201 (1) (2) (3), § 16-203 (b) (1) (i) (ii) (2) (3) (i) (ii) (4) (1) (2) (d) (e) (f) (1) (2), § 16-204 (a) (b) (1) (i) a criminal proceeding, (ii) Criminal proceeding - Judge, (iii), (iv), (2) (1) criminal proceeding, Custody, Circuit Ct Judge, Appeal, § 16-207 (a) (b) (1) (2) (3) (i) (ii) correct individuals charged and convicted of crime, (iii) (iv) (4) (1) (2) (3) Services available to assist in the duties under this title, § 16-209 (a) (b) (1) (2), § 16-210 (a).

In this review the petition in Reason before petitioner Reason to the systematic Criminal-Proce, on the behalf of the Post Conviction Judge that Post's Court in proceeding as process and the Post Conviction Construction is unconstitutional and Not governing to the services of Petitioner Post Conviction the legislature Intent hold No governing Discretion for that Court to suspend all that was done do to Ruling on a petition. For both sides, that's one, 2) failing to let the state enforce it own law and 3.) took a In general Post Conviction Construction duty in chamber reviewing under Post Counsel and State Counsel of a Post Conviction-Act Judicial, Ann Code of Md Ct And Judicial proceeding § 203 Practice of law by Judge prohibited (a) General Rule. No judge may his term of office Practice law, maintain an office for the practice of law, or have any interest in an office for the practice of law, whether conducted in whole or in part by himself. A Judge may not allow his name to be used in connection with a law office, nor may he profit directly or indirectly from the practice of law. The Post Conviction Act adopt Ann Code of Md Ct And Judicial proceeding § 3-406 Any person under whose rights, status, or other legal relations are affected by a statute, administrative rule or regulation, may have determined any question of construction or validity arising under the instrument, statute, ordinance, administrative rule or regulation, or other legal relations under it; Md Rule 1-201 (a) ("these rules shall be construed to secure simplicity in procedure..."). Petitioner petition to this court in a reason contributing to the constitution that the Post Conviction Court constituted unconstitutional and the abuse's of Due Process is contributing with a breach. Over on the limit of the Post Conviction Public Defenders in that reason petitioner petition to this S.Ct the Service is a breach to that (Act) as above, Ann Code of Md Criminal Proc § 16-201 (1) Ann Code of Md Criminal Proc adopt Md Rule 16-103 d.

Reasons For Granting the Petition

Page 32

The Maryland Court of Appeals took no discretion on the point that the petitioner filed to that Court Issues of Counsel this adopt to have discretion that Petitioner took a reach to this of being the Public Defender Act Continuity of Counsel to indigent accused individuals. The State-Division that is authorize by the Constitution unconstitutional constituted these breaches which these adoptee's: Defense John W. Janowich, Harford County State's Attorney Mark Nelson, Harford County Jury-Trial Judge Stephen M. Waldron, Police Officer Christopher Gibbons, Detective Stephen M. Schwartz, Appellate Public Defender Mark Colvin, Court of S. Appeals For Maryland Judge J. Krauser, Harford County 3 Judge Panel Judge Maurice W. Baldwin, Judge Thomas E. Marshall, Judge E Morey A. Plitt, Evidence collection unit for Harford County Corporal Diane Newton, Post Conviction State's Attorney Joseph T. Cassilly, Post Conviction Public Defender Margaret Lanier, Post Conviction Public Defender David L. Russell, Maryland Court of Appeals Chief Judge Mary E. Barbera, Post Conviction Reopen Judge Cuntin, Harford County Cir. Court Jury-Trial Panel, the above on the 3 Judge Panel is the Sentence Review that Panel.

see Murray Vs Carrier 477 US 482-483 the terms Habeas Corpus and "collateral review" interchangeably. See Black's Law Dictionary p. 298 (9th ed 2009); The definition of the Related Phrase ("Collateral Attack") Points in the same in the direction. A "collateral Attack" is a "attack on a Judge proceeding other than a direct Appeal. e.g. Appendix A, D.

Reasons For Granting the Petition

Page 33

Petitioner petition to this S. Ct in reasons of granting the Petition and under this petition. For this constitutional proceeding in the S. Ct the petition for writ of certiorari is in a highly constitutional question.

First's Question.

Did the State-Division and the Federal-Division unconstitutional - Convert adopt depriving/breaches governing-Incorporating, on the Effective Executive (Maryland-state) (U.S. Constitutional-Division); Identification-ingress/egress; Const of the U.S. Art I II. section 1, 2; U.S. Const of the U.S. Art II. section 1; U.S. Constitution of the U.S. Art VI; Judiciary-Jural-Juridical. This question is limited to the Constitutional Superemacy/Suppression assert - Forfeiture - This question is in light.

Second Question

Is the Petitioner being subject to the Constitution unconstitutional within to wrong outrageous in a constitutional Common-law Government System that's state and Federalism Constitution. The question is on it's limit for a assert - devolution constitutional, More pointing to the state but still at a lighting on Federal.

Third Question

Have in the light of the Petition, this last's question that is for the end of this Petition. See page 54 of this Petition.

Supreme Ct Rule 10. Review on a writ of certiorari is not a matter of right, but of judicial discretion. A Petition for a writ of certiorari will be granted only for compelling reasons; (b) a state court of last resort has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with the decision of another state court of last resort.

Hewitt vs Helms 459 U.S. at 471 A liberty interest deserving of the procedural protections of the Due-Process Clause may arise from 2 sources: (1) the Federal Constitution itself or (2) State statute, regulations and practices.

Reasons For Granting the Petition

Page 34

In the Federal Division the same 2 questions govern here to the reasons to grant this Petition, Petitioner adopt that State Division to this proceeding Reason to Grant this Petition, Petitioner Petition to this S. Ct. Constitutional - Petitioner Filed a Writ of Habeas corpus in the U.S. Dist Ct under the same Reason or a claim that the Service of Counsel on Filing remedies is depriving Counsel terms of meeting this treat in reason to this this is the reason why these Remedys been in a lost's of Service. In this reason U.S. Dist Ct and the U.S. Court of Appeals in this matter which is all adopted under this reason to grant this petition for the 6th, 14th, 5th Amendment that is in conflict of the Federal question. This review as to the proceeding is in 2 parts of a Reason to grant this petition. 1) Is the Remedys and 2) Is the Tolling but in the First Reason the Federal Division conflict with a knowing IX of the 6th Amend abuse by not enforcing the Writ of Habeas Corpus. This reason of granting is in Case law - see *Weatherford vs Bersey* 429 US 554-55 n.4 Free exchanges between defendant and counsel. See *Harris vs Sherrill* 1212 F.3d 943 n.1 (6th Cir 2000) (1498 Ed. 2d 356, 121 S. Ct 1415 holding that where a state court decides a constitutional issue by Form order or without extended discussion, a Habeas Court should... focus on the result of the state court's decision, "and perform an "unreasonable application" analysis. (2001). See *Eko vs U.S.* 8 F.3d 11; *Strickland vs Washington* 466 US 668; *Massaro vs US* 536 US 990 In the federal court system, may be brought in the Dist Ct under Federal, in any other collateral proceeding, whether or not the petitioner could have raised the claim on direct Appeal of Ineffective of Counsel. See *Wilson vs State* 284 Md. 664 and *Schmitt vs State* 140 Md App 1 adopting each other this constitute to that Maryland take Constitutional Due-process to Appeals In Post conviction Act. See 528 US 470 *Roe vs Flores-Ortega* (2000) at 528 US at 476 In *Strickland vs Washington* 466 US 668, 80 L Ed 2d 674, 104 S. Ct 2052 (1984), we held that criminal defendants have a 6th Amend Right to "reasonably effective" legal assistance, id., at 687, 80 L Ed 2d 674, 104 S. Ct 2052, and announced a now-familiar test: A defendant claiming ineffective assistance of counsel must show (1) that counsel's representation "fell below an objective standard of Reasonableness," (528 US 477), id., at 688, 80 L Ed 2d 674, 104 S. Ct 2052, and (2) that counsel's deficient performance prejudiced the defendant, id., at 694, 80 L Ed 2d 674, 104 S. Ct 2052. Today we hold that this test applies to claims, like respondent's, that counsel was constitutionally ineffective for failing to file a Notice of Appeal. (*Rodriguez vs US*, 395 US 327, 23 L Ed 2d 340, 89 S. Ct 1715 (1969), cf. *Puero vs US* 526 US 23, 143 L Ed 2d 18, 119 S. Ct 961 (1999) ("when counsel fails to file a requested appeal, a defendant is entitled to a new appeal without showing that his appeal would likely have had merit"), *Roe vs Flores-Ortega* 528 US 478, 479, 480, 481, in this case petitioner is in reason to use this case that under Hines petitioner Inform the Appeal Counsel to file on Hines in the processing Appeal. The S. Ct *Roe* explain. See *Roe* 528 US 482, 483, 484, 486. We similarly conclude here that it is unfair to require an indigent, perhaps pro se, defendant to demonstrate that his hypothetical appeal might have had merit before any advocate has ever reviewed the record in his case in search of potentially meritorious grounds for appeal. Rather we require the defendant to demonstrate, but for counsel's deficient conduct, he would have appealed. *Roe* 528 US 489 It is unreasonable for a lawyer with a client like respondent Flores-Ortega to walk away from her representation after or after sentencing without at the very least acting affirmatively to ensure that the client understand the right to Appeal. See *Roe vs Flores-Ortega* 528 US 489, 490, 491 the reading start at *Strickland* and end at California, the nexts Reading start up at (Strategic Choices are) this go over to (528 US 492) stop a (App. 133). In (528 US 493) this case held state law with *Strickland* and that Reading end at the opinion and pick up on Justice Ginsburg (528 US 499), see *Edwards vs Carpenter* 146 L Ed 2d pg 522 (2000) S. Ct Held procedurally defaulted the effective-assistance claim can serve as cause to excuse the procedural default of another habeas claim only if the habeas petitioner can satisfy the "cause and prejudice" standard with respect to. See *Edwards vs Carpenter* 529 US 448 (2000) This case presents the question whether a Federal habeas court is barred from considering an ineffective-assistance-of-counsel claim as "cause" for the procedural default of another claim when the ineffective-claim has itself been procedurally defaulted. *Murray* 477 US 514 - We thus concluded that the appellate default would not bar Federal consideration of the constitutional claim, see 477 US 510, 511, 512, 513, 514 and 484; The deliberate tactic Petitioner only need to satisfy for a appeal claim on counsel.

Reasoning For Granting the Petition

Page 35

12

Edwards vs Carpenter 549 US 449 (2000) the reading start up at May 3, 1996 and end at the end of the case constitute (549 US 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459. The Edwards S. Ct state in the Reason of the default Rule and "Cause" at issue the "causes" or circumstances that might excuse a failure to comply with state rules the S. Ct can't find no satisfactory answer to these questions, the petition is in reason to the opinion. See Harrington vs Richter 131 S. Ct at 785 (2000), Williams vs Taylor 529 US 385-86 (2000) both these cases is in reason what the federal court is to exercise and serious to warrant the issuance of the writ on Federal Construction. See Conde vs Henry 188 F.3d 734 (9th Cir. 1999) and U.S. vs Miguel 338 F.3d 995 (9th Cir. 2003) to conclude that preventing a defendant from arguing a legitimate defense theory constitutes structural error; see Ross vs Moffitt 417 US 602, 603, 1974. We are asked in this case to decide whether Douglas vs California 372 US 353, 9 L Ed 2d 811, 83 S. Ct 814 (1963) which requires appointment of counsel for indigent state defendants on their first appeal as of right, should be extended to require counsel for discretionary state appeals and for applications for review in this court. The Court of Appeal for the 4th Cir held that such appointment was required by the Due Process and Equal Protection Protection Clauses of the 14th Amend. The next's reading in this case Ross pick up at the (Court of Appeals reverse) the two Dist Ct judgments. This reading to (Ross 417 US 605) the small number 7 where it stop at. In Ross (417 US 607) here that the state must go further and provide counsel for the indigent on his first appeal as of right. In Ross vs Moffitt 41 L Ed 2d 350 whether to provide counsel for an indigent seeking a discretionary by petition for writ for a writ of certiorari which lies within the court's discretion. The reading continue to (417 US 609, 610) this reading end at *Pg. 351. In Ross (417 US 610) the S. Ct held the differences between the trial and appellate stages of a criminal proceeding. The purpose of the trial stage from the state's point of view is to convert a criminal defendant from a person presumed innocent to one found guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. The reading end at defendant's guilt. In the next's part of Ross (417 US 611) start off with (the defendant needs) this continue on to (417 US 612) the reading end at (the question is not one of absolutes, but one of degrees). In that reading constitute to counsel on appeal and writ of cert the above is in all reasons. In this part of Ross 417 US 613, fully this reading and within to the proceeding of Reason Maryland law is in each Maryland case that is in this review within to case law a appeal which Ross adopt this the Appeal-law is in Ann Code of Md Ct And Judicial Proceeding. The S. Ct in Ross as the give reason on what constitute to this petition and the last's in (Ross 417 US 614) S. Ct held Waiver subjects in (3) terms all three of these meanings is in a reason to the granting of this petition adopting this fully case on a appeal. In Ross (417 US 617, 618) (the S. Ct as here give reason to S. Ct Petition that on a certiorari holding from that that (the suggestion that a state is responsible for providing counsel to one petitioning this court simply because it initiated the prosecution which led to the judgment sought to be reviewed is unsupported by either reason or authority). The reading continue to the (Reversed) (Ross 417 US 619). (Ross 417 US 619) we did not deal with the appointment of counsel for later levels of discretion and review. Either to the higher state courts, but we noted that "there can be no equal justice where the kind of an appeal a man enjoys depends on the amount of money he has." (Id. at 355, 7 L Ed 2d 811). Petitioner petition to this S. Ct in the reason to grant the petition, the petitioner continue, proceeding in Reason fundamental is next's after the petitioning Case-law-Reasons. See McFarland vs Scott 512 US 84 (Capital defendant entitle to counsel in state post conviction), Yates vs Aken 484 US 211 (state post conviction proceedings are subject to due-process protections). In Reasons petitioner petition to this S. Ct for a Grant of this constitutional petition for writ of certiorari, the Federal Division is constituting to the state Division in this (reasons) to Grant this Petition and Petitioner in this Reason to Reasons ask's the S. Ct to adopt these reasons in constitutional reasons that is being petition. The review by case-law is subjecting reasons to the Maryland Court of Appeals, in light to Petitioner Reasons condition to grant this Petition on the behalf. Petitioner Petition to this S. Ct in unconstitutional reasons on counsel ineffective.

Reasoning For Granting the Petition

In *Martinez vs Ryan* 566 U.S. 132 S.Ct. 1309, 1309, 182 L.Ed.2d 272, 2012 U.S. Lexis 2317, (2012), *Martinez vs Ryan* 182 L.Ed.2d 278 § 182 L.Ed.2d 277 (132 S.Ct. 1311) (566 U.S.1) (2012) a Prisoner may raise claims of claims of ineffective assistance of trial-counsel only in state collateral proceedings, not on direct review. In *Martinez*'s 1st state collateral proceedings, his counsel did not raise such a claim. In federal habeas review with new counsel, *Martinez* argued that he received ineffective assistance both at trial and in his 1st state collateral proceeding. His claim also that he had a constitutional right to an effective attorney in the collateral proceeding. He was denied by U.S. Dist Ct his petition finding that preclusion rule was an adequate and independent state-law ground barring. Petitioner petition to this Court the S.Ct. In Reasons for and to granting this petition the Petition is filed in adequate and independent state-law ground and Federal 6th Amend, 14th, 5th Amend, Md Rule 4-407 (a). See Post conviction proceeding page 25 to 31. See *Martinez vs Ryan* 2012 U.S. Lexis 2317 (566 U.S. 2) (2012 U.S. Lexis 2317, 4, 5, 6) the S.Ct. reason to Post conviction Counsel which petitioner file this Petition adopting these same reasons the *Martinez vs Ryan* constitute by the S.Ct. on Remedy of direct Appeal and Post conviction on a caused procedural default in an initial-review collateral proceeding. as an equitable matter that a collateral proceeding if unconstitutional undertaken with no counsel and ineffective. *Strickland vs Washington* 104 S.Ct. 2070 - 466 U.S. 698 - 466 U.S. 703 - 104 S.Ct. 2073 - 466 U.S. 695.

to overcome petitioner must also demonstrate that the underlying cause. Pp., 182 L.Ed.2d, at 282-288, Pp. 182 L.Ed.2d, at 286-288, Pp. 182 L.Ed.2d, at 288, see *Martinez*. In *Martinez* the S.Ct. Justice Kennedy delivered the opinion (132 S.Ct. 1313) (182 L.Ed.2d 280) (566 U.S. 4) (566 U.S. 5) ~~the~~ Prisoner must bring the claim in the state collateral proceedings. The petition filed Public Defender letters in on the behalf of what now constituting to the unconstitutional which is in the reasons to grant this petition, in *Martinez* that counsel done the same and filed a statement after reviewing the case. In *Martinez* (2012 U.S. Lexis 8) A recantations statement - testimony was done victim denied the petitioner actions of the sexual conduct. *Martinez* (132 S.Ct. 1315) (2012 U.S. Lexis 12) argued because he had caused for the default and his first Post conviction Counsel was ineffective in failing to raise any claims. See *Martinez* (566 U.S. 9) (182 L.Ed.2d 283) (2012 U.S. Lexis 14, 15) (182 L.Ed.2d 283) (566 U.S. 10) (2012 U.S. Lexis 16) in these readings as in the S.Ct. proceeding this S.Ct. Reasons of a right to effective counsel in collateral proceedings which provide the first occasion to raise a claim of ineffective assistance at trial and do to both these points to counsel these proceedings can be called in reasons, for purposes of this opinion within to "initial-review collateral proceedings" and the S.Ct. state over *Coleman* that however to resolve whether that exception exists as a constitutional matter the precise question here is whether to both counsel's Post conviction and trial-counsel may provide cause for a procedural default in a federal habeas proceeding. Federal Habeas courts reviewing the constitutionality of a state prisoner's conviction and sentence are guided by rules designed to ensure that state-court judgments are accorded the finality and respect necessary to preserve the integrity of legal proceedings within our (Ann Code of Md Criminal Proc § 7-107 (a)(1), 28 USC § 2254 (a), Md Rule 4-401, Md Rule 4-402 (a)(6), Md Rule 4-407 (a)(d), Ann Code of Md Criminal Proc § 7-101) system of Federalism. *Martinez* (2012 U.S. Lexis 16) The doctrine barring procedurally defaulted claims from being heard is not without exceptions. A prisoner may obtain federal review of a defaulted claim by showing cause for the default and prejudice from a violation of federal law or of a defaulted claim by to federal court can be hear ineffective-assistance claim only if he can establish cause to excuse the procedural default. However in light to *Coleman* 501 U.S. at 755 and in *Martinez* 182 L.Ed.2d 283 the reading by *Coleman* is subject to a missing point the case state by *Martinez* S.Ct. that (The alleged failure of counsel in *Coleman* was on appeal from an initial-review collateral proceeding, and in that proceeding the prisoner's claims had been addressed by the state habeas trial court). *Murray vs Carrier* 477 U.S. 496, 500 one who is actually innocent, a federal habeas court may grant in absence showing. The writ for safeguarding, Congress provided the writ.

Reasoning For Granting the Petition. Page 37

If Coleman was on a appeal relating to Post's Conviction Counsel proceeding that part is not being subject for S.Ct case law, but that this factor is in consideration to what form that could come from this, however in (Martinez 2012 US Lexis 17) this S.Ct Marks a key on this behalf however on this it's a giving that Coleman is a misleading case, less Coleman is fundamental on and to the ineffective assistance Post conviction which would be unconstitutional in Maryland if this S.Ct would govern Maryland Rules Post Conviction Mandatory governing for Post conviction to be met by Counsel on Post conviction. In general to Coleman on this, just's under good faith of judicial that if Coleman was on Appeal Coleman misses a point by that which set forth for the Martinez S.Ct to state what they find, Marks a key difference between initial-review collateral proceedings and other kinds of collateral proceedings. When an attorney errs in initial-review collateral proceedings, it is likely that no state court at any level will hear the prisoner's claim. This court on direct review of the state proceeding could not consider or adjudicate the claim. See e.g., Foxfl/m Corp Vs Muller 296 US 207, 56 S.Ct 183, 80 L.Ed 158 (1935); Murdock Vs Memphis 87 US 590, 20 Wall. 590, 22 L.Ed. 429 (1875); Cf. Coleman, supra, at 730-731, 115 S.Ct 2546, 115 L.Ed. 2d 640. And if Counsel's error in an initial-review collateral proceeding do not establish cause to excuse the procedural default in a Federal habeas proceeding, No court will review the prisoner's claims. (Martinez 182 L.Ed. 2d 284) the S.Ct held the same is not true when Counsel errs in other kinds of Post conviction proceedings. The reading further on give the reason to ineffective assistance of Post conviction Counsel, read to the end of this opinion which on reversed was held. In Martinez Vs Ryan (566 US 19) Dissent Justice Scalia with Justice Thomas joins proceeded on the Values of Federalism, and Justice, Jurisprudence, Constitutional right to Counsel in state collateral review, exercise of judicial restraint, these elements is in light to the justices of this S.Ct. In (Martinez 2012 US Lexis 31) both Justices under Strickland Standard give reason to constitutes of Post conviction, (Martinez 2012 US Lexis 32, 33) explain both the Direct Appeal and ineffective assistance of trial Counsel and collateral-review Counsel which is to that the Court's pretended avoidance of requiring states to appoint collateral-review Counsel is a sham. The reading in this case as above relate to reopen a direct Appeal process. In Reason to this with the point of granting this petition the state court and the Federal Division is subject to this on the Post conviction court actions within to Appeal issues, on Martinez 2012 US Lexis 32 Brady reading petitioner reason to the Post conviction court on the Discovery issue this follow to also on Jan 8, 2001 Sentencing page 6 to 11. Petitioner also reason this to the U.S. Dist Ct in 28 USC 2254 Petition. See Brady Vs Md 373 US 83, 87, 89, in the U.S. Dist Ct petitioner enforce the Discovery as a, in Post conviction petitioner. Proceeded on a reason to the Discovery and on Jan 8, 2001 Sentencing page 6 to 11. Petitioner reason to the Discovery asking these official the giving to me of the Discovery. See U.S. Dist Ct orders, the U.S. Dist Ct ordered the Attorney General to send all things related to the case the Attorney General failed to on it's First Notice of a filing delaying this process. In reason to this Petitioner claim on this is a assert in Reason to TI page 6 to 9 and other things. See Pindale Vs Nunn 284 F. Supp. 2d 361 (2003) and Thompson Vs Attorney General for the State of Maryland 427 F. 3d 263 in both these cases the Attorney General is subject to failing to send all copies of all relevant opinions, materials, and transcripts to the court with their answer and provide these materials to Petitioner, see U.S. Dist Ct Order 9-21-2017. The U.S. Dist Ct and the Attorney General (Daniel J. Jawor done this in the Error in general along to all others. Petitioner file this petition in Reasons to this of granting this petition and all orders to make the Solicitor - Solicitor General of the U.S. Dept. file and send all the Discovery and in this behalf Petitioner Putting a motion in this petition for the S.Ct and the Solicitor - U.S. Solicitor General for the related file to be the first's copie to send the Discovery and in about to explain what is in the Discovery. When the S.Ct get this Discovery it will be a doctor's Report stating that each victim as a claim of being shot that the Doctor under his fraction the Report say they all did not get shot this Report is for each parson, send all the pictures of the white Geo these pictures of this car show No Gun holes in the car, None. It is a Doctor Report on Tegan S. Peaker that speak about how high she was and all that she was on, it's also the same Report on Tonish a Smith of being High and all that is Reported.

Reasons For Granting the Petition

Page 38

Everything should be as stated it is no blood report to anyone being find in the car. Also send the claim of the picture of who claim to have get shot along to the Doctor Report stating blood was tested to ~~open~~ inside of them if's None, if any of this show up to be other it was put illegal and it's a lie. I'm filing in reason to this that the S.Ct grant this petition in all reasons the system officials been keeping this under the system for to long. the jury Trial Record have been change and more been added to the Record illegal I know my jury trial on what happen, I'm filing this petition under this S.Ct asking the S.Ct to Reason to this Petition and enforce ~~Supervisory~~ power. Petitioner petition to this S.Ct Reasons for Granting the petition - Jurisdiction on writ of Cert of Judicial discretion a petition will be granted only for compelling reasons, indicate the character of the reasons the Court considers sanctioned such a departure by a lower Court as to call for an exercise of this Court's supervisory power, see S.Ct Rule 10 (c). In all Reasons to and for the above petitioner petition to this S.Ct that the reasons in this the Discovery is a conflicting to the State's Court state and Federal exercise Material of a Amend Due-process. In general to this (Martinez 2012 U.S. Lexis 36) (132 S. Ct 1323) (566 US 22) (2012 U.S. Lexis 37) (182 L. Ed. 2d 291) (2012 US Lexis 38) (566 US 23) the S.Ct Reason to federal review and state-collateral-review Counsel (that as a consequence of today's decision the states will always be forced to litigate in Federal Habeas for all defaulted ineffective-assistance-of-trial-counsel claims and who knows what other claims. the reading go on this as to it is judicial S.Ct point (132 S. Ct 1324) (2012 US Lexis 39) (182 L. Ed. 2d 292) (2012 US Lexis 40) (566 US 24) (2012 US Lexis 41) (182 L. Ed. 2d 293) (566 US 26) (2012 US Lexis 44) (2012 US Lexis 45) this review constitute plain in Reasons to and for federal courts to adopt along to S.Ct on ineffective assistance of trial counsel and that claim that appointed counsel was ineffective in failing to make that claim was worked it's way through the Federal system. The Court would have us believe that today's holding is no more than a "limited qualification" to Coleman it's much more than that. The reading go on (2012 US Lexis 45) (182 L. Ed. 2d 294) (566 US 27) to the dissent, the reading is in a constitutional proceeding to in Reasons that the S.Ct constitute the in general point to Counsel and within to this stage petitioner present the petition constitutional Reason with reasoning to this Grant asking the S.Ct to grant this petition on the behalf of that the post conviction and after Remedys is in light to this reason among state and Federal to the question that is petition to this S.Ct of a assert. See S.Ct Rule 10 (c), in general to this petition. In this condition state and Federal is held on this petitioner proceed in Reasons to why petitioner lost's the constitutional treat to this Due-process state and Federal. Petitioner enter a Notice of Appeal to the 4th Cir on a reason that the U.S. Dist Ct unconstitutional would not fully clearly response on enforcing the 1h Reason constitutional to the U.S. Court of Appeals in general to 28 USC 2244(d)(1) and 28 USC 2254 (a). On this behalf the Court of Appeals default petitioner in a point that the Appeal could not be aid on and was dismiss, petitioner also asks the 4th U.S. Court of Appeals to grant counsel to file the COA this Court dismiss the full case that meet a low less term to law the 4th Cir Court Reason that the Appeal could not be Aid on and was done which petitioner reason to this that a aid of law be wide limit on proceeding the 4th had no reason in this the petition is in reason to aid a case on by counsel here the petitioner case have been abused by No counsel or counsel failing to act the 4th Cir this dismissal petition Reason that the 4th Cir is in a reason out of discretion to pick that type of Response on this type of case or in a discretion, this place the 4th Cir in practicing law before it's judicial constituting petitioner reasons to this that to present this Response is never consider to question a aid, as here petitioner is in a reason of a reasonable subject in this system which petitioner reason in this petition to the S.Ct and counsel could have aid this matter on petitioner is filing pro se the 4th Cir could have had a point to that to consider counsel in the 4th Cir discretion.

Reasons For Granting the Petition

Page 39

14

in *Piller vs Ford* 542 US 231 (2004) that S.Ct held Federal Dist judges are not required to give pro se litigants these (2) two warnings. Dist Judges have no obligation to act as counsel or paralegal to pro se litigants. The S.Ct held the Court is not under no duty to provide personal instruction on courtroom procedure or to perform any legal 'chores' for the defendant that counsel would normally carry out. Petitioner Remain on the dismissal then file for Petition for Panel Rehearing on a reasons that none is entitle to this Appeal for the 4th Cir to hear with Counsel that is subject to what no one can say would be in diff that happen petitioner reason to this with *Slack vs McDaniel* 549 US 485 (2000). It will be necessary to consider the matter upon any remand for further proceeding. Petitioner filed that part in the Rehearing Petition, on this behalf the 4th Cir use this same case *Slack* to dismiss my Appeal i'm reasoning as in the same why to the 4th Cir Court of Appeals as in the S.Ct that overall *Slack* did not attempt to make a showing of the denial of a Constitutional Right, here i'm petitioning to this Court on Rehearing for Counsel and tolling and my conviction which all adopt each in this, reason to the S.Ct that i'm trying to reach a grant from the US Court of Appeals on something within to this type of case on issues with ~~Teaching~~. Petitioner also filed a stay with the 4th Cir on this fully case for the S.Ct, on the Rehearing the 4th Cir Court of Appeals out of 3 on the panel did not poll the petition. I'm now filing a petition for the reasons by self and that *Slack* 549 US 485 (2000) overall when a case is without a reach, it will be necessary to consider the matter upon any remand for further proceedings. In reason to this petitioner asking in this reason to grant this petition. see S.Ct Rule 10. within to the Federal Division *Hohn vs US* 514 L Ed 2d pg 250 syllabus this reading is held on this Federalism consistent the S.Ct held: The fact that *Hohn's* application moved through the 8th Cir in the same manner as cases in general do, yielding a decision that has been regarded in that Court as precedential, suggests the application was as much a case in the Court of Appeals as ~~any other matter~~. This conclusion is also confirmed by the adoption by every Court of Appeals but one of rules governing the disposition of certificate applications; by the issuance of the order denying *Hohn's* certificate in the name of the Court and under its seal, by Federal Rule of Appellate Proc 22(b), which specifically provides for consideration of certificate applications by the entire Court of Appeals; by Federal Rule 27(c), which authorizes the Court of Appeals to review decisions that individual judges are authorized to make on their own; by 8th Cir Rule 27(b)(2), which lists grants of probable cause certificates by individual judges as reviewable decisions under Rule 27(c); and by the uniform practicing of the Court of Appeals, see *Lane Burwell* 350 US 521, 522, 100 L Ed 666, 76 S. Ct 539. This reading lend at the *Scott* case S.Ct. *Hohn vs US* 524 US 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 250, 251, 252, 253, 256. The notion that a request pertaining to a case constitutes its own "case" for purposes of 21254 is a law-dropper. To support that remarkable assertion, the Court relies upon circumstantial evidence - that the "application moved through the 8th Cir in the same manner as cases in general do". *Hohn vs US* 524 US 258, 259, 260, 261, 263-141 L Ed 2d pg 267. On the review of the *Hohn* S.Ct. petitioner reason to that point that petitioner filed a Rule 27(c) in the U.S. Court of Appeals with the Appeal the 4th Cir on that behalf held no discretion and in this reason petitioner Reason as to the *Hohn* S.Ct asking the S.Ct to set forth the 4th Cir Review in place of the *Hohn* S.Ct which the *Slack* S.Ct as above constituting to this condition. Petitioner petition to this S.Ct on the behalf that the 4th Cir on a conflict in general over past's this assert with petitioner also proceeding for Counsel with a Judicial aid on the constitution this is added, Court that also abuse's to support Counsel for this case or proceed to some form without coming to this S.Ct.

Reasons For Granting the Petition

Page 40

Petitioner petition to this S.Ct in Reasons, see Kuhlmann vs Wilson 477 US 664, 465, 466 (1986). The Kuhlmann S.Ct in reasons to the statute that petitioner in all reasons petition to this S.Ct for a grant to this full petition the S.Ct held in Kuhlman that by (Waley) and (Brown) habeas lies every constitutional defect in any Criminal-Trial, (Mackey) that has not been procedurally defaulted and Congress sought Federal Courts between the states and people as guardians of the people's Federal right-to protect the people from unconstitutional action. the general scope of writ this govern with assertions, interests of the prisoner and state, Federal collateral review of constitutional error, it speak on abuse if Federal Courts were too free to ignore procedure forfeitures in state court. The above S.Ct pages 15 a in point for this S.Ct to reasons to which petitioner petition to this Court in the reading of Kuhlmann S.Ct that petitioner reason with and to constituting for a grant of this petition. Petitioner on this behalf was subject abuse's of granting Counsel by the 4th Cir along with the dismissal of the In general process Filed Constitutional to the U.S. Court of Appeals. Ann Code of Md Criminal Proc 416-101(d)(e)(2), 416-210(a), 416-201(c), 416-206. This petitioning continue and under this review the State Federal adopt a Unconstitutional-collateral issue that is now also filed in this S.Ct which petitioner now petition this S.Ct to grant this petition on the level of the next is outcome that is in general to the State, Federalism, S.Ct, this also govern Congress, place's Congress 1st this is on the 14 Amendment Due-process. On the Great writ Habeas Corpus govern by (28 USC 2244(d) adopt 28 USC 2254(a) Rule (a) U.S. 14 Amend any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws), the U.S. Dist Ct Judge George J. Hazel question the Petition on the yearly of 28 USC 2244(d) petitioner filed back to the U.S. Dist Ct on a defense constituting to the State-Court that Division under Congress and Just's, the light into the Fact of Notice. Petitioner petition to this S.Ct for the Grant of and in Reasons within to this, the petitioner de Rense subjecting as the 28 USC 2244(a) say at the final of the State Judgment that's, T3p.12,13,14 which (Nov 1, 2000) the petitioner Related to that by evidence. In reason to this Petitioner Inform the U.S. Dist Ct on a defense that the State-Court and Counsel did not Inform petitioner of all State-Remedies or Federal of the above State-Res above that is in general which petitioner now enforce this in the S.Ct on a discrimination. Petitioner Inform the U.S. Dist Ct that relating to both Records the Nov 1, 2000 proceeding T3 page 13, 12, 14 and Jan 8, 2001 Proceeding sentencing page 24, 25. Petitioner was told about Modification by Trial-Court and the 3-Judge sentencing Review and that was it, on this also the Trial-Court tried to mislead Petitioner to file a Appeal personally in to trial-court this was the last's Remedy. Being so much on a life sentence of prisoner Inform me how to file the Direct Appeal and told me the Judge was wrong and trying to get you to lose your Appeal and held with Life on other violation things that was done, he then stated that the Public Defender do all Appeals Free be law and this is what everyone do and the Judge was to tell you that. My second Reach I was told by a second prisoner about my Post Conviction that I had 10 years. I then on time filed my modification Motion as the Trial-Court said and told the Public Defender Office to file my Appeal and Direct Appeal in Jan 2001. In reason to this, I followed the Trial-Court instructions on following Filings. Do to this I plan a reach to get a lawyer for Post conviction which that was with my family do to this that was not met the fee was too high this is why I held back on filing my Post conviction. When I first's filed my post conviction the Public Defender Inform me of post conviction and stated Post Conviction claims along with Md Health Gen 68-507 and federal Habeas Corpus this when I first's came to knowing about Federal Habeas Corpus which I came to being a lie because I was not a federal-Inmate so I filed a March 4, 2011 to file it a March 24, 2011 letter came from Chief Attorney Dr. Scott Whitney on a Response - See Ann Code of Md Crm Proc 416-101(d)(e)(i)(ii)(iii), 416-201(c)(2)(3), 416-204(a)(b)(i)(ii)(iv), 416-206(a)(b), 416-207(b)(3)(i)(ii)(iii)* (c)(i)(2)(3) services available to assist in the duties under this title 416-210(a).

Reasoning For Granting the Petition

Page 41

In the Federal Division ~~classified~~ In the U.S. Dist. Ct and strongly in the U.S. Court of Appeals
Petitioner proceeded to the U.S. Dist Ct on a defense for equitable tolling on a reason of that, 1.)
the issue is subject to the following of Hill vs Braxton a 4th Cir Jurisdiction Case Constituting and
2.) with this on a review on the final the Jury-Trial is subject to the Trial-Court and Trial-Counsel
being subject to continue No Relief to Remedy Notices of Filing, petitioner Reason to the U.S. Dist Ct
and in part the 4th Cir on this behalf, this was a defense and overall this process is a
treat by Congress Intent, petitioner constitute to the Trial-Court Record T3 page 13, 14
and Jan 6, 2001 sentencing page 24, 25 in proceeding. In reason to this petition maintain
on a giving of truth the Record is in light of. See the proceeding plain in light to the petition.
On this behalf this subject in all reasons to grant this petition on the behalf the laws is unconstitutional
In this case petitioner petition to this Section that Conflict Judicial-Reasoning Constituting
Constitutional Judiciary-Jural. In Harris vs Hutchinson 2000 US App Lexis 16, 17 applied to 2
generally distinct kinds of situations the plaintiff were prevented from asserting their claims
by some kind of wrong conduct on the part of the defendant and second extraordinary circumstances
beyond plaintiff's control made it impossible to file the claims on time. The reading go but on that
be half petitioner disagree with the next's reading this petition enforce on that meaning in reasons, the
2 reasons that the 4th Cir give petitioner is in reason that that apply here and caselaw explain this
petitioner continue this. The 4th Cir claim to hold types and point to it's term this go back to
the point on page 39 of this petition with Court subjecting filing over no limit the system is a Court
of a hi Court of Services to the Court the 4th Cir is trying to in general deprive a matter to the 8th Amend
level. This Court then said we believe, therefore, that any resort to equity must be reserved
for those rare instances where -- due to circumstances external to the party's own
conduct -- it would be unconscionable to enforce the limitation period against the party
and gross injustice would result. The 4th Cir Harris Court proceeded this statement. In a
reason to ("unconscionable") this would be a point to a event that place subject to a point of
what happen, this on the other hand is for the State of the Attorney General to enforce and on
this behalf petitioner reason to this of the above that the (AG) should argue the limit however
the meaning of ("unconscionable") and gross injustice would result is within all this being
what the system shall not be governing securing. This Court subject again in the proceeding to
Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1), see (Harris vs Hutchinson (209 F.3d 329) (2000) the Court subject a
(general matter, principles of equitable tolling may in the proper circumstances, apply to
excuse a plaintiff's failure to comply with the strict requirements of a statute of
limitations). this read into, English case, Vance case, a sentence, Shah case, Fed. R. App. P.
4(a)(1) - The 4th Cir use's they cases and subject this strongly well Fed App Rule 4(a)(1) using
(A) adopt Fed App Rule 3(a)(2) An appellants failure to take any step other than the
timely filing of Notice of Appeal does not affect the validity of the appeal, but is ground
only for the Court of Appeals to act as it considers appropriate, including dismissing.
the appeal. Here overall the 4th Cir is wrong that outcome is with discretion but on
equitable as here on petitioner Reason is a duty authorize the system secure this under
Due-process this is Congress Intent and the state in the U.S. Dist Ct failed to subject to
the Record on and of R petitioner defense as stated. In this petition, other Courts subject
others in Hill vs Braxton 277 F.3d 705 (2002) the 4th Cir cit Harris, 209 F.3d at 330 subjecting
A statement above that's underline, however past's the state's in Harris the provision is set in
Reason for equitable tolling subject to 28 USC § 2244(d)(1) sections, these sections is not made for
post conviction that's not Congress full Intent, the system under caselaw subject a making provision, in the
reason why the petitioner petition in this reason that one of these sections constitute for equitable
tolling and it's a for sure that Congress Intent subject 2 things 1.) a for sure notice 14 Amendment
Person within its Jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws, 28 USC § 2244(d)(1) 28 USC § 2254(a).
See (Harris vs Hutchinson 2000 U.S. App Lexis 19) this adopt (Hill vs Braxton 277 F.3d 707
(2002)) and both these Readings is rening apart for the reason to grant this petition on
this behalf. In Harris it subject to a Judge, and Hill subject for example, that
reading is in Reason to grant this petition in Hill the review reason to 28 USC § 2244
(d)(1)(B) the date on which the impediment to filing an application created
by state action in violation of the constitution or laws of the U.S. is removed
if the applicant was prevented from filing by such state action, e.g. Appendix A, D

Reasoning For Granting the Petition

Page 42

That reading in reason is maintain to the Trial-Court of a (Record) and Application. The meaning in law of the followings in the Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 2016 ed page 23 - Impediment n: something that prevents or interferes with a process, power, or right should have known of the Legal - 5 to the execution of any judgment against the police jury - Penalber vs Brount 550 So. 2d 577 (1989), specific bar to the formation of a valid contract. The reading give wide reach to the word with the case law in meaning. A notice is as well as a contract agreement when petitioner know is a constitutional agreement with the constitutional - Due Process.

Page 29 - Application - n: a request for action. Page 11 - action - n: legal proceeding from agent to do, carry out, initiate legal proceeding. 1: a judicial proceeding for the enforcement or protection of a right, the redress or prevention of a wrong, or 2: the right to bring or maintain such a legal or judicial proceeding. 2: an act or decision by an executive or legislative body of a government (as an administrative agency). Petitioner in reason asks the S.Ct to review other Law Dictionary.

The word (Application) would be a remedy and Remedy, Habeas Corpus would be in this term created by state action violation of the constitution, laws of congress is removed, if the applicant was prevented from filing by such state action. On a stress thinking or this it's no way this is not true in reason that congress is protecting the writ however the state on 28 USC 2244(d)(1) is only who is maintaining state-action. In this reason petitioner continue to reason for the S.Ct to grant this petition in Rouse vs Lee 339 F.3d 238, 246 (4th Cir 2003), 158 L. Ed 2d 248, 124 S.Ct 1605 (2004) the 4th Cir stated the same as on the other side of this paper but giving (3) equitable petitioner must present, petitioner petition in a defense in all of this on a reason to be held with all that is above and this petition: (1) extraordinary, (2) beyond his control or external to his own conduct, (3) that prevented him from filing on time. Petitioner petition to the S.Ct in petition-granting in the Reasons and in reason the Federal Division Federalism petitioner is asking the S.Ct to adopt this to Federalism-Service. In this behalf the constitute-Reasons: (Salvage vs Attorney General 2020 US Dist Lexis 3: "The 1 year limitation period is also subject to equitable tolling in these rare instances where due to circumstances external to the party's own conduct it would be unconscionable to enforce the limitation against the party."

Hill vs Braxton 277 F.3d 701, 704 (4th Cir. 2002), citing Harris vs Hutchinson 209 F.3d 325, 330 (4th Cir. 2000). To be entitled to equitable tolling, that circumstances that were beyond his control caused the delay. See Harris, 209 F.3d at 330. "Any resort to equity must be reserved for those rare instances where... it would be unconscionable to enforce the limitation period against the party and gross injustice would result." How and without misleading (Harris 209 F.3d 330) we therefore conclude that § 2244(d) is subject to equitable tolling, at least in principle. The state constitute this and the 4th Cir adopt this further on (Harris 2000 US App. Lexis 15) Conclusion is consistent with Calderon case, Davis case, Miller case, Calderon (Bretter case, Taliani case - Concluding that "the Judge-made doctrine of equitable tolling is available, in principle at least" although "it is unclear what norm remains for importing the Judge-made doctrine, give the express tolling provisions of the statute and Sandviks → Finding that § 2254 permits equitable tolling, relying on analyses of other circuits in case constructing § 2244(d)(1)(B); Cf Libby case → reserving the question whether equitable tolling might apply 172 F.3d 43, 48 n.2 (1st Cir. 1999). In Savage vs Attorney General 2020 US Dist. Lexis 7 held when a Dist Ct rejects constitutional claims on the merits, a petitioner satisfies the standard by demonstrating that "jurists of reason could disagree with the Dist Ct resolution of the constitutional claims or that jurists could conclude the issues presented are adequate to deserve encouragement. Buckley Miller - Elk when the petition is denied on procedural grounds, the petitioner may meet the standard by showing that reasonable jurists would find it debate whether the Petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right and whether the Dist Ct was correct in its procedural ruling. Petitioner petition in reason for the S.Ct to grant this petition in general the reason is stated above subject to jurists and now that reason is govern for the S.Ct to Reason.

Reasons For Granting the Petition

Page 43

16

In *Clay v. US* 537 US 522, 531, 123 S. Ct 1072, 155 L. Ed. 2d 88 (2003): Noting that, for AEDPA's purposes, "Finality... is to be determined by reference to a uniform Federal Rule" petitioner Petition to this S.Ct on legal allegation reason the Federalism and the Att. General have not met this therefore the U.S. Solicitor General shall not govern unreasonable legal Allegations the petitioner reasons that is filed is in light of the Grant for the petition equitable tolling. See *Rempersad v. U.S. Dist Ct* 2020 U.S. Dist Lexis 6 The court need not, however, accept unsupported legal allegations, see *Revere v. Charles City, Comm'r's* 882 F.2d 870, 873 (4th Cir. 1989), ~~Legal conclusions cannot be based on factual Allegations~~, see *Papasam v. Allain* 478 U.S. 268, 286, 106 S.Ct 2932, 92 L. Ed. 2d 209 (1986), or conclusory Factual Allegations devoid of any reference to actual events, see *United Black Fire Fighters of Norfolk v. Hirt* 604 F.2d 844, 847 (4th Cir. 1979). In *Rempersad v. U.S. Dist Ct* 2020 U.S. Dist Lexis 18: The burden of establishing a basis for equitable tolling a defendant from relying on a Statute of limitations rests with the Plaintiff. See 2019 U.S. Dist Lexis 116046 WL at 7. To rely upon equitable estoppel, a plaintiff must demonstrate that the defendant "engaged in affirmative misconduct intended to mislead, ~~and~~ *equitable tolling* *Rock v. McHugh* 919 F. Supp. 2d 456, 469 (D. Md. 2011) (internal quotation marks omitted). And "a statute can be equitably tolled only if a plaintiff shows that (1) he pursued his claim with reasonable diligence and (2) extraordinary circumstances prevented him from filing on time". *Lucas* 664 F. App'x at 335 (citing *Holland v. Florida* 560 U.S. 631, 649, 130 S. Ct 2549, 177 L. Ed. 2d 130 (2010)). "Equitable tolling is an extraordinary remedy limited to those occasions when it would be unconscionable to enforce the limitation against the party and gross injustice would result. Id. (quoting *Harris v. Hutchinson* 209 F.3d 325, 330 (4th Cir. 2000)). In this case petitioner constitute what *Harris* 209 F.3d, 330 is plainly the reporting page is 330 in that case. See page 41, 42 of this petition. In *Rempersad* however held that Plaintiff could not that burden because there is no evidence that or U.S. misled him or prevented him from timely filing this suit. T3 page 13, 14. In *Stone v. Attorney General* 2020 U.S. Dist Lexis 7 the Attorney General held petitioner Petition must fail and Respondents also assert that Stone's arguments it need not and does not address the remaining arguments, (*Stone* 2020 U.S. Dist Lexis 8) the caselaw govern legal standard on the writ may be granted only for violations of the Const or laws of the U.S. 28 USC § 2254(a) / § 2244(d). Specifically (1) (B). *Stone v. Attorney General* 2020 U.S. Dist Lexis 13 Under certain circumstances may be subject to equitable tolling, petitioner seeking equitable tolling must show that (1), (2), (3). *Rouse v. Lee* F.3d 238, 246 (4th Cir. 2003) Furthermore to be entitled to equitable tolling a petitioner must have been "pursuing his rights diligently" and if the person seeking equitable tolling has not exercised reasonable diligence in attempting to file after the extraordinary circumstances began, the link of causation between the extraordinary circumstances and failure to file is broken, and the extraordinary circumstances therefore did not prevent timely filing. *Valverde v. Stinson* 224 F.3d 129, 134 (2d Cir. 2000). The Application of equitable tolling must be guarded and infrequent and reserved for those rare instances where - due to circumstances external to the party's own conduct - it would be unconscionable to enforce the limitation period against the party and gross injustice would result. *Harris*, 2000 U.S. App Lexis 17. In *Davis v. U.S. Dist Ct* 2012 U.S. Dist Lexis 18 this case held Davis contends failure to timely file EDC Complaint Federal and should be excused according to Equitable Tolling principles and the 4th Cir has cautioned that equitable tolling is reserved for those rare instances where - due to circumstances external to the party's own conduct - it would be unconscionable to enforce the limitation period against the party and gross injustice would result. See *Kramer v. Bd. of Educ. of Baltimore Cnty* 788 F. Supp. 2d 425-26 (D. Md. 2011). It's that Statute charge is not a jurisdictional prerequisite to suit in Fed. Dist Ct and that it is subject to both waiver and equitable tolling. 2ip 455 US at 393. The 28 USC § 2244(d)(1) is the same for 9200 - Faith waiver to it § 2244(d)(1); however petitioner had No Law intent by Congress Notice which 28 USC § 2244(d)(1)(B) equitable tolling. In *Davis v. U.S. Dist Ct* 2012 U.S. Dist Lexis 19 Equitable tolling is typically reserved for situations when the claimant has diligently pursued her judicial remedies by filing a pleading, albeit defective, during the statutory period or where the claimant's failure to timely file was induced by the adversary's misconduct. Id. Courts are less forgiving when filings result from a failure to exercise due diligence in preserving one's legal rights. (e.g., "Appendix A, D, E, F 28 USC § 2244(d)(1)(B)"). *Hewitt v. Helms* 459 US at 471. A Liberty Interest deserving to the Procedural Protections of the Due-Process Clause may arise from 2 sources: (1) the Federal Constitution itself; (2) state statutes, regulations and practices

Reasons For Granting the Petition

Page 44

Baldwin Cnty. Welcome Ctr vs Brown 466 U.S. 147, 151, 104 S.Ct. 1723, 80 L.Ed.2d 196 (1984) ("Procedural requirements established by Congress for gaining access to the Federal Courts are not to be disregarded by courts out of a vague sympathy for particular litigants... Strict adherence to the procedural requirements specified by the legislature is the best guarantee of evenhanded administration of the law." (quoting *Mohasco* 447 U.S. at 826) (internal citations omitted)). The reading on this case as to Brown the reading would adopt T3 page 13, 14 and this petition for a grant of equitable tolling and petitioner asks this S.Ct. to govern the point Congress, in *Davis vs U.S. Dist Ct* (2012 US Dist Lex 521); Mere ignorance of a specific statutory provision, such as a limitations period, is not sufficient to invoke equitable tolling. See *Id.* at 754. Rather, ignorance in the context of equitable tolling... means ignorance of the unlawfulness of the defendant's conduct... Equity only requires that a plaintiff be aware that a statute has been passed that protects workers against... discrimination. Petitioner on reason of this petition would like to inform the S.Ct. on the lower federal courts that is proceeding these cases on and to the 28 USC § 2244(d)(1) in general to Congress be misleading and to the S.Ct. being the Court of the law of the land petitioner is asking this S.Ct. in reason to enforce the power constitutional of the misleading point of these federal courts. In *Davis* this court subject a ignorance statutory provision, in this case Just's said ignorance is not sufficient to invoke equitable tolling and then the reading go on placing ignorance in the context of equitable tolling... means ignorance of the unlawfulness of the defendant's conduct... Equity only requires that a plaintiff be aware that a statute has been passed that protects workers against... discrimination. It does not require that the plaintiff know of all the filing periods and technicalities contained in the law. This here as stated constitute a constitutional term of ignorance-equitable tolling. The constitution is govern by equity protection and here is arbitrary if equitable tolling apply to defendant's conduct ignorance it should apply to plaintiff. Also this is a public case which federal courts hold a discrimination on proceeding cases for equitable tolling when proceeding caselaw however these courts state of mind is to a lot of less discrimination to the public but here the public govern prisoner cases in they remedy. Petitioner Petition this court for the granting of equitable tolling and in reason on this petitioner petition this review on system-discrimination and it does not require that the petitioner know of all the filing periods and technicalities contain in the law. In light to this the state Division discriminated under the law of Congress 28 USC § 2244(d)(1) the finding is in this petition and petitioner is reason that the reason this happen was discrimination maintain to the § 2244(d)(1). In *Davis* 2012 U.S. Dist Lex 522 the court held that the record makes clear *Davis* was aware of statutory protections against discrimination, further more there is no evidence among petitioner *Davis* was preventing from asserting her claims by some kind of wrongful conduct on the part of the defendant or that extraordinary circumstances beyond *Davis*'s control made it impossible to file the claims on time. *Davis* 2012 U.S. Dist Lex 523; Finally, as to the untimely filing specifically, the S.Ct. considered and rejected an assertion like *Davis*'s that she should have acting without counsel. *Mohasco* 447 U.S. at 825. Conclusion: Congress must have determined that "most genuine claims of discrimination would be promptly asserted and that the costs associated with processing and defending stale or dormant claims outweigh the federal interest in guaranteeing a remedy to every very of discrimination." *Id.* at 820. See *Davis* 2012 U.S. Dist Lex 517; *Robertson vs Wegmann* 436 U.S. 584, 98 S.Ct. 1991, 56 L. Ed. 2d 554 (1978) *id.* at 593; the S.Ct. emphasized that a state statute cannot be considered "inconsistent with federal law merely because the statute causes the petitioner to lose the litigation 28 USC § 2254(a)", *Id.* otherwise there would be no reason at all to look to state law, for the appropriate rule would then always be the one favoring the plaintiff, and its source would be essentially irrelevant.

14 Amend Person within its Jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

(*Bald Cnty. Welcome Ctr vs Brown* 466 U.S. 147, 104 S.Ct. 1723 / *Robertson vs Wegmann* 436 U.S. at 593)

Reason For Granting the Petition

Page 45

see Harper vs Ercole 648 F.3d 140 (2011) the Supreme Court govern Congress with equitable tolling § 2254 consistent with the general Rule usually dictate that when time bar has been suspended and then begins to run again upon a later event the time remaining on the clock was stopp US vs Barra 502 US 402, 112 S. Ct 4, 116 L. Ed. 2d 1 (1991); see Haekal vs Refco, Inc 198 F.3d 37, 43 (2d Cir. 1999) (observing in context of Commodity Exchange Act filing that "when equitable tolling is applied, the limitations period is deemed interrupted, when the tolling condition or event has ended, the claimant is allowed the remainder of the limitations period in which to file his action"), see also Gonzalez vs Hast 651 F.3d 318, 2011 U.S. App Lex 1512805, 2011 WL 2463562 at 8 n.4 (2d Cir. June 22, 2011) (effectively apply same approach to equitable tolling under P.L.R.A. 42 USC § 1997e (a)). It further comports with our admonition that "State Prisoners should have the full year allowed them by Congress to consider to consider and prepare their federal habeas petitions." Zarvela vs Art 274 F.3d 374, 382 (2d Cir. 2001). Petitioner's petition this Review on the Reasons to grant this Petition on the following constitutional review that is constituting, see Dunlap vs US 2001 U.S. App Lex 15151; questions of statutory construction are also reviewed de novo, Dunlap 2001 US App Lex 1516; Although we have encountered this question before, we have yet to answer it definitively. See, Doran vs Birckett, Stubler vs US, we now join our sister circuits that have to date addressed this issue. Because there is a rebuttable presumption that equitable tolling applies to statute of limitation and there is no indication that Congress did not intend for equitable tolling to apply the limitation period in habeas cases, the 1 year statute of limitations § 2254 is subject to equitable tolling, see e.g. Irwin vs Dep't of Veterans Affairs 498 US 89, 95, 111 S. Ct 453, 112 L. Ed. 2d 435 (1990), 28 USC § 2244 (a)(1)(B). Dunlap 2001 US App Lex 1518 in Dunlap as there in both these boxed reading that the statute and legislative history and the statutory must consider the language other circuits have concluded and Congress intended operate. Petitioner adopt Harris in this case and conclude that the one year limitation period is a statute of limitation subject to the doctrine of equitable tolling. In Dunlap 2001 US App Lex 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 - 250 F.3d 1009 the case on standard both Petitioner and the arg 6th Cir held on Andrews are related to other circuits and the 6th Cir enforce the test the Attorney General subject it the 6th Cir force that it's guidance judging each case the test is (5) reaches that apply to rare and exceptional circumstances and extraordinary circumstances. This test is done in all cases in general and this test is what petitioner been reasoning to what is underline that meaning is here and this is as here the S.Ct must adopt this reason of this petition granting for the equitable Tolling. see Dunlap 2001 US App Lex 1518 Footnote 1. In Spottsville vs Terry 2007 US App Lex 1518 held that a Appeal Notice under state law was failed with instructions about the procedure of filing that court held in petitioner case US Dist Ct prejudice this application on any notice. In Spottsville 2007 US App Lex 1519, 10 this court held equitable Tolling can apply being, if application of AEDPA's statutory deadline on same as underline above and the burden rests on the petitioner establishing entitlement to this extraordinary Remedy plainly, Cafelaw Helton, Lawrence, Pliler these cases subject to this petition as the reading state. In the next case (Solomon vs US 2006 U.S. App Lex 15126) (2006 US App Lex 15127) in this held constitutional in reason that what Courts must maintain what legislature says in a statute what it mean this court stress this in reason to plain, the sole function of the Courts and the text is the law. The reading is box on the meaning in that Reason petition Reason ask the S.Ct on that reading to adopt this next's review that constitutional-reason, in Wainwright vs Sykes 433 US 107 (1977) the S.Ct held with respect to Federal Habeas Corpus Jurisdiction and Congress, Federal rights, litigation of constitutional claims and defenses, all state procedure through the expansion of existing federal removal statutes such as 28 USC § 1442 (a)(1) and 1443 (28 USC § 1442 (a)(1) and 1443) thereby authorizing the pretrial transfer of all state-criminal cases to the Federal Courts whenever Federal defenses or claims are in issue. The reading go on stop at (Congress), it stop at (Congress). Murray 477 US 500 safeguarding arbitrary and lawless; Congress gave Federal C's Power to grant writ in all cases where.

Reasons For Granting the Petition.

Page 46

See Fed Rule 8(c) in general, see 28 USC 2072(a)(b), see 28 USC 2071(a)(1)(2). Petitioner held for equitable tolling under a defense and petitioner petition to this S.Ct. In Reason the petitioner within to Caselaw the 28 USC 2244(d)(1) is subject to the removal and the petitioner maintain this petition in reason strongly that the review is in reason. See 28 USC 1331 holding the 14th Amendment as applied in this petition. 28 USC 1442(a)(1)(2). Prosecution affects the validity of any law of the U.S.; (3); (4); (d)(1). 28 USC 1443(1)(2). 28 USC 1404(b). These statutes is adopted by the S.Ct. on due-process the petitioner file this petition on this reason not just's for the point of the construction, but caselaw is on the reason but this is the due-process by the U.S. Amendments and due-process exist this is common law and authorize, the stage in this governing is constitutional - assert and the petitioner petition this U.S. S.Ct. For and to the Reasons in granting this petition. Constitutional Reasons. See 28 USC 1367(a) this full petition must be adopted by the reading, this petition is being filed in and on the reasons of granting and on this be the law to equitable tolling is in term or meaning in this petition petitioner ask's the S.Ct. in it's review to maintain clear understanding with a constitutional discretion Judicial Reason. Petitioner now file caselaw constituting reason to Wainwright vs Sykes S.Ct. it seem like this S.Ct. is not being constitutional took on it's reading of what petitioner reason to, Wainwright vs Sykes is the exist to 28 USC 2244(d)(1) which all this in the petition is in light to this caselaw. The United States is failing to have a exist on the 28 USC 2244(d)(1) petitioner petition in reason the system is misleading arbitrary to govern government - service the U.S. Court system is a service to services that's authorize the petitioner is being denied to no authorize but the case as here these authorizes these official's is using is arbitrary - authorizes lacking the constitution. Caselaw speak on the courts must following the right - constitutional intent. In Frinks et al vs State of North Carolina 488 F.2d 643 (1972) this case was on a state-process subject matter Federal-law to be move to the U.S. Dist Ct the same statute in Sykes S.Ct. case as in this petition and among this case the question is on exist expression of stat law adopting congress authorize 28 USC 2244(d)(1) and on the other end of a reason (Frinks 1972 US App. Lexis 19) under that Act of 1964 this reading adopt no person shall be punish or attempt to for exercising any right and (Frinks 1972 US App Lexis 25). It is true, as has been suggested, that he has other Federal including direct review by the S.Ct. or Habeas Corpus. In Muller vs Wilson 462 F. Supp. 2d 1214 Footnote 1, 3, 4 Footnote 4 should held with no fall along as the exist of 28 USC 2244(d)(1) is place on the final direct as to the conviction as the statute 28 USC 2244(d)(1) state this would place's 28 USC 2254 pending and within this exist of Notice no matter what by Record the 2254 is. In the U.S. Dist Ct authorize petitioner just's. get to follow the following standards - common law. See Black's Law Dictionary, 1367 (6th ed. 1990). "Vice versa" - vice versa literally means "conversely; in inverted order; in reverse manner". In this review which in reason to a statute 2244(d)(1) State/Federal the question of being as here in light to this reason of granting this petition. In these cases Smith vs University of Tennessee 300 F. Supp. 277; Kirwood vs Ellington 298 F. Supp. 461; Ex Parte Young 209 US 157-61; Will vs Michigan Dept of State Police 491 US 58, 109 S. Ct 2304 on page 2314 at Footnote 10; Wolf vs City of New Orleans 103 US 358, 13 Otto 358, 26 L. Ed 395; Georgia Power Co. vs City of Decatur 505 S. Ct 369, 281 US 505, 74 L. Ed 999. These cases all constitute to a Reasons of the Constitution and statute the review is on the petition within to the related - reason of Congress petitioner petition this petition in reason to and as a whole with the above to all be held in reason with all the Caselaw. See Jones vs Morton 195 F.3d 153, 159 (3d Cir. 1999) Equitable tolling is appropriate only when the principle of equity would make the rigid application of a limitation period unfair and occur when the petitioner has in some extraordinary may been prevented from asserting his or her Rights. The petitioner must show that he exercised reasonable diligence in investigating and bringing the claims. However this petition is petition to congress existing with Liberty on and to 2244(d)(1) conditions petitioner petition for this granting in reasons. See 28 USC 1733(a)(b) Minutes of Proceeding of any of the U.S. shall be admissible to prove the act transaction or occurrence as a memorandum of which the same were made or kept. (b) Properly authenticated copies, Records, papers or documents of any of the U.S. shall be admitted in evidence equally with the originals thereof.

Reasons For Granting the Petition

Page 47

On this petitioning in reason that set in light the word waiver would be governing, to that the government have not exist a untruthful claim of and to the petitioner reason and the waiver is subject to the system on Congress intent, the lower courts state and Federal is authorize to the governing Congress and Congress is governing authorize to them as well. The S. Ct is the Government the above is as a whole is the Government of and to authorizes of construction existing the waiver is subject to the time of the 2244(d)(1) out of petitioner consent petitioner is not in part this is a system outcome that further move to a assert 28 USC 2254(a) adopting 28 USC 2244(d)(1). See *Wood v. Milward* 162 L. Ed. pg 744 on (Waiver) with the first 3 cases. On this petition which petitioner petition to this S. Ct for a grant the writ of Habeas Corpus is protected by the Constitution, the (Const of the U.S. Art I, Section 9 The privilege of the writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, Art I. Section 8 to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing power, and all other power vested by this constitution in the government of the United States, or in any court or judicial officer thereof). In *Matter of Yamashita* 327 US 1 (1946) in a conditional-form of a operation of laws to the states stated: we do not make the laws of war but we respect them so far as they do not conflict with the commands of Congress or the constitution. In *Kuhlmann v. Wilson* 477 US 464, 91 L. Ed. pg 388 (1986): At least since the middle of this century, when we decided *Waley v. Johnson* 376 US 101, 86 L. Ed 1302, 62 S. Ct 964 (1942), and *Brown v. Allen* 344 US 443, 97 L. Ed 469, 73 S. Ct 397 (1953), it has been clear that "habeas lies to inquire into every constitutional defect in any criminal trial." *Mackey v. U.S.* 401 US 663, 685-686, 28 L. Ed 2d 404, 91 S. Ct 1160 (1971) (opinion of Harlan, J.), that has not been procedurally defaulted, with the narrow exception of 4th Amendment exclusivity rule claims. *Stone v. Powell* *supra*. As we stated just two terms ago, there is no doubt that in enacting 2254 Congress sought to interpose the federal courts between the states and the people, as guardians of the people's federal rights—to protect the people from unconstitutional action. The reading go on and stop at the Engle case. The Sykes S. Ct is constitutioning in this case's as in reason and petitioner use's all Sykes review in this on that Review in *Kuhlmann v. Wilson* S. Ct adopting it. On the other with a full point, of exercising *Martinez v.* (2012 U.S. Lexis 44) (132 S. Ct 1326) this case start off with (Noticeably) and end at (becoming worse), the Martinez subject federal review, states, and petitioner constitutional rights the case adopt it's point because in reason the conflict is to a outcome that is as he petitioner petition to this S. Ct for equitable tolling petitioner, proceeded in this Reason the Reason is here for the reason petitioner file this petition for the reasons in granting this petition. In *Isolomon v. U.S. Court of Appeals* 2006 App Lexis 23 held two judge majority a point subject to equitable tolling, the majority's conclusion with regard to this issue was not necessary for the disposition of the case. For this reason, the Dunlap "holding" is arguably obiter dictum; see *U.S. v. Yoon* 126 S. Ct 548, 163 L. Ed. 2d 460 (2005); *Black's Law Dictionary* 8th ed., *Pierre N. Leval*, Judging Under the Constitution: Dicta About Dicta, 81 N.Y. Univ. L. Rev 1249 (2006). See *Dunlap v. U.S.* 2001 U.S. App Lexis 25 (Concur by Cir. Judge Siler). In *Day v. McDonough* 547 US 213 (2006): *Granberry* 481 US at 130, 133; regime allows the forfeited procedural defense to be raised for first time on appeal, by the appellate process the state. On this petition in reason to granting the system is in general held on this reason which petitioner petition to this S. Ct on this reason, Justices Stevens and Souter have suggested that AEDPA's Statutes of limitation may be subject to equitable tolling, our task is to construe what Congress has enacted. We begin, as always with the language of the statute. *Duncan v. Walker* 553 U.S. 167, at 172, 182-84, 121 S. Ct 2120, 150 L. Ed 2d 251 (2001). However in *Hill v. Braxton* 277 F.3d 708 as to judicial the 4th Cir reasons and for the U.S. Dist Ct to give notice on the writ to explain for equitable tolling this is case law as well in a 28 USC 2254 Petition subject for the petition to be plain, specific and detailed about the 2244(d)(1), over this on any delay of the filing would call Congress for a second time and if Congress did not protect this the statute will show 28 USC 2244(d)(1) and that's it, but

Reason For Granting the Petition

Congress know it's state-Remedies but only speak on Post conviction in §2244(d) but Direct-Appeal on the State-law is a law that Process alone is running with the §2244(d)(1). and all the other Remedies ain't subject in the statute. IR reviewing the both §2244(d)(1) and the 28 USC §2254 statute it conflict with the §2244(d)(1) done by the courts because of the exhaustion-standard that's made Court-Man made but 28 USC §2254(c) subject over some exhaustion however holding Congress-Intent every statute protects it's self but the courts of the United States in general to some would unconstitutional proceed that 28 USC §2244(d)(1)(B) or the statute don't govern petitioner claim for the degree of this petition in Reason For granting and that's a giving-lie. The question to Congress in reason for §2244/2254(a) is constitutional to that and the Constitution shall stand but that is the governing service as underline for the petitioner liberty, now what cover, Padelay is done on the final of the petition as to when the time start. See U.S. Dist Ct Judge George J. Hazel Court order Oct 17, 2019 and all U.S. Dist Ct orders.

Congress statute 28 USC §2244(d)(1) run from section to section out of these sections one of these section protect the §2244(d)(1)/§2254(a) what other reason for them to be there: IR Congress subject the §2244(d)(1) to be it must's be a authorize for a Notice or Congress would be Arbitrary and on this would govern the 1st Amend Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment prohibiting the free exercise and the 11th Amendment. Petitioner reason to the federalism on §2244(d)(1)(B) govern Hill-case law. Petitioner is explaining reasoning petitioning to this s. Ct for a granting of this petition. See Solomon vs U.S. Court of Appeals 2006 U.S. App. Lexis 29 The taxpayers rest their claim for equitable tolling up to Irwin, a case in which this court considered the timeliness of an employee's charging his Government employer with discrimination, in violation of 28 USC §2244(d)(1) et seq. The court found the ~~un~~ untimely, but nevertheless tolled the limitations period. It held that the "rule of equitable tolling" applies to suits against the Government in the same way that it is applicable to suits against private employers, 498 U.S. at 94-95. The court went on to say that the same rebuttable presumption of equitable tolling applicable to suits against private defendants should also apply to suits against the United States. Id at 95-96. The taxpayers, point to Irwin, argue that principles of equitable tolling would have applied had they - see C. Keigwin, cases in Common Law Pleading 220 (2d ed. 1934). They add that given Irwin's language, there must be a "presumption" that limitations periods in tax refund against the Government can be equitably tolled. And, they say, that "presumption", while "rebuttable", has not been rebutted. George Moore Ice Cream Co. vs Rose 289 U.S. 373, 382-383, 53 S.Ct. 620, 77 L. Ed. 1265, 1933-1 C.B. 341 (1933); see also Plumb, Tax Refund Suits Against Collectors of Internal Revenue 60 Harv. L. Rev. 685 687 (1947) (describing collector suits as a fiction solely designed to bring the Government into court). WE CAN TRAVEL NO FURTHER, HOWEVER, ALONG IRWIN'S ROAD, FOR THERE ARE STRONG REASONS FOR ANSWERING IRWIN'S QUESTION IN THE GOVERNMENT'S FAVOR. Solomon 2006 U.S. App. Lexis 32, 33. Mohasco Corp vs Silver 447 U.S. 807, 826, 100 S.Ct. 2486, 65 L. Ed. 2d 532 (1980); in the long run, experience teaches that strict adherence to the procedural requirements specified by the legislature is the best guarantee of evenhanded administration of the law. Solomon 2006 U.S. App. Lexis 38, 39, 40 - Andrews vs Orr 851 F.2d 146 (6th Cir. 1988). We established a 5-factor test for judicial tolling in Civil cases. The other circuits that recognize some form of equitable tolling of 28 USC §2254 or 28 USC §2244 do so for that most part, only for "extraordinary circumstances" beyond the petitioner's control. See e.g., Satterfield vs Johnson 127 S.Ct. 198, 166 L. Ed. 2d 258, 2006 U.S. Lexis 7473, Cordle vs Guarino 428 F.3d 46 (1st Cir. 2005); David vs Johnson 158 F.3d 806, 811 (5th Cir. 1999) Our unique test balances the following considerations: (1) The petitioner's lack of actual notice of the filing requirement; (2) the petitioner's lack of constructive knowledge of the filing requirement; (3) the petitioner's diligence in pursuing his rights; (4) Absence of prejudice to the respondents; And (5) the petitioner's reasonableness in remaining ignorant of the legal requirement for filing his claim. On this behalf the standard is in full meaning in the test's of (5) requirement. See Md Code Ann State Govt §10-101(g)(1)(2). The test is (5) For Judicial-Tolling.

Reasoning For Granting the Petition

Page 49

S. Ct

In this review on the behalf of § 2244(d)(1)(B) in reason the 4th Cir U.S. Court of Appeals give No Jurisdiction operating reach just as what this petition say till the S. Ct can come to this Review on of Andrews vs Orr Test. However the point that petitioner do reason to is still at what little that the caselaw govern what is supporting but in reason the reviewer as to the test's is (5) - Judicial Tolling that's the Constitutional - Reason of Form that is subject which petitioner petition to this S. Ct that Number (1) in that test's petitioner reason this petition to govern § 2244(d)(1)(B), Number (2) adopt Number (1) and Number (2) adopt number (1). Number (3) petitioner have stated in and filed with the state moving to the federal, (4) Respondent is not prejudice by absence because all (3) test's already stated is effective and the First's is overall subject to abandonment which this petition reason to that. Respondent have a defense and petitioner have a reason to a (Judicial-Tolling defense) § 2244(d)(1)(B) - Constitutional Constitutioning Scheme - scrutiny which respondent is at scire facias defense, how and so on for the petitioner petitioner constitute with the statute § 2244(d)(1) when the conviction is final this govern the Record and petitioner reason to the record. Petitioner also reason that petitioner is under a life sentence why in any intent petitioner would pray with a sentence that's at that point, petitioner reason to this on this behalf also under all that is on a clear notice on a filing petitioner took that action, this is constituting the full Record, the Record above petitioner reason to is the Nov. 1, 2000, Jan 8, 2001 proceedings. The (5th) test is adopted to the (1) and (2) test's which the 5th test's constitute, Petitioner have a reason in a right to liberty to enjoy this Notice and maintain this process in petitioner reason which petitioner petition to this S. Ct for this Judicial-Tolling, for granting. Petitioner petition to this S. Ct in Reason of discrimination held to the writ of. Remedy and other remedies is subject to the event that abandonment and deprive this is in general to Post conviction, Direct Appeal, writ of cert to the Maryland Court and the 28 USC § 2244(d)(1) / § 2254(a). This is Judicial adopted under the 14 U.S. Amendment Nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of laws; Nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the § 2244(d)(1) / § 2254(a) laws. See S. Ct Rule 1D (b) (c) Analysis 2. Discretion of Court, 3. Conflicts of authority / opinions, 5. Federal question of Substance, Effect of grant, Other particular cases. Petitioner petition to this S. Ct reasoning to the above and holding system discrimination on the State Final of that condition subject to § 2244(d)(1) petitioner reason to the S. Ct respectfully that this is important to this matter the petitioner Reason in this petition that conflict that's Conflicts is all subject to Hill to the State-Court as in the same to all other laws petitioner maintain in this Petition reasoning for the grant of Judicial-Tolling, this petition on it's review as well must be adopted as state here that as places that the U.S. Dist Ct stage it's delay it's order state, the 4th Cir conflict on both it's order's in it's process within to this full in general petition. See U.S. Dist Ct order Oct 17, 2019 and both U.S. Court of Appeal order 3-29-2021 and June 1, 2021 order's, the first 4th Cir order held that No made aid can be effective in this cause of this case on state and federal, the second order exercising to this unconstitutional when the U.S. Dist Ct on some form stated what it stated in it order the outcome can be force with counsel a public office that can Shepardize and file Judicial. The U.S. Dist Ct took this claim to not push forward but the U.S. Dist Ct Order subject smethen to state in it for petitioner to act whatever that is the U.S. Dist Ct have a intent but failed to take it. Going back the U.S. Dist Ct tolled petitioner case than took it back in this reason petitioner petition to this S. Ct is asking the U.S. Dist Ct to review these order's. The U.S. Dist Ct waited to Toll this case and in general to this full case the U.S. Court of Appeals conflict with this petition under Hill and Wainwright vs Sykes S. Ct with the above test's that in a reason (Andrews vs Orr - caselaw). See Mohasco 447 U.S. at 820 Congress must have determined that dormant claims outweigh the federal interest in guaranteeing a remedy to every victim of discrimination. See all U.S. Dist Ct Review never Response to none of the motions.

Reasons For Granting the Petition

Page 50

In this petition and reason petitioner is petitioning to the S.Ct, here in reason to the Constitutional Petition and the depriving system that's lost's and found to a reason-complaint that is on the point that it is on and on this now that petitioner know about this writ of Habeas Corpus these U.S. Courts Cases proceed to 28 USC § 2244(d)(1) so effective but the point on Congress Nor in Court-discretion Show 14 Amend Notice on the Liberty that petitioner is constituting in general to the Judgment State And Federal Constitutional-service on on Filings in the petitioner state of mind reasoning to the full filing constitutional judicial without depriving actions off that process if the law is § 2244(d)(1) the Law should be securing the U.S. Courts is proceeding in cases and the State-Division ain't Suring the Notice the Constitution govern the writ shall Not be suspended and if so that reason as would be invasion the Public Safety may require it. As here the U.S. Dist Ct Order held the (Final by the Conclusion of direct review of the Judgment this is 73 page 13, 14 Nov 1, 2000) in Hill 277 R.3d 704. Explain § 2244(d)(1)(A) by Congress and Caselaw with the U.S. Dist Court Order by Subject Order 12-8-2017. The Record is a high Intent of a violation on Remedys of a § 2244(d)(1) the Federal under Judicial-Tolling could have tolled this and in reasons to the above petitioner reason for a granting Petition for Judicial-Tolling petitioner is petitioning for Judicial-Tolling. Judicial-Tolling is a standard under the Contact in reason of this petition and over this No Conflict shall be unconstitutional treated Unreason when the Petition govern this S.Ct to be in reason the Final-Conviction was on Nov 1, 2000 Congress did not govern a sentencing here the notice was as above deprived therefore the Congress law is to exist for a denial only if that Law show that the 1st Law Exist on 73 page 13, 14. See this petition on all Congress, the above must's be adopted to this petition in reason and in this reason this is a procedural-default, see Merriam-Webster Dictionary of Law 2016 ed page 383: Procedural-default: Sometimes in the absence of proof that the bar would result in a miscarriage of justice. In reason petitioner ask's this S.Ct to adopt that point Lawful and Constitutional as here in reason, a procedural Form is a and to proceed a law, Rule, Section, Article that's govern and procedural is the overall in general a Court on that Full point. Default is to blame, unconstitutional, Obstruction of Justice, omission, Malice, unconscionable, willful, Wrong, wrongful, 8th Amend cruel and unusual punishments inflicted. At these words is a Lawful words in the term-meaning of Law for m and this is what Default is adopting both words as Procedural-default is the unconstitutional-unreason this must's be adopted with (Judiciary: A system of court of law) the governing reason. This petition petitioner reasons on the granting of in the reason petitioner exist in and on petitioning reasoning that is explain, this petition also adopt S.Ct Petition for Writ of Cert that's also deprive of a notice by the system which been explain to me by a inmate and the S.Ct is the land of the land and the writ of Habeas Corpus is in the Constitution as stated in this petition. These Remedys on Nov 1, 2000 within to the proceeding Record above is not on a: Direct Appeal, Post conviction, Writ of Habeas Corpus, S.Ct Writ of Petition for Cert the system is govern by Common-law and authorize-statutes, laws, Rules, Sections and Section § 2244(d)(1) is a notice that is also in a procedural-default the meaning is above which as a whole on that point since that word is the overall and the writ of Habeas Corpus is attack to all other Remedys for a petitioner to maintain under his Liberty constituting to the Constitution. Reasons that constitutional petitioner petition the Notice is a signal procedure common-law. On this reason petitioner petition for this grant as all above petitioner been trying to file in this Court but did not know how to the Petition continue to be sent back till petitioner was instructed and help by a inmate on why and how Federal Habeas Corpus go and the S.Ct see all governing letters petitioner been exercising on filing this case it's just's No state Official never explain how the Federal-statute go i never seen 28 USC § 2244 | 28 USC § 2254 Hill 2017 and when i seen it it was in parts we had to order it the Jail don't have them statutes only Md Rules and Ann Codes this the Library. Systematicing this Petition that's under the Constitutional-construction reasoning and as govern See U.S. Vs Benidolph 547 US 1123, 126 S.Ct 1908, 164 L. Ed. 2d 685 (2007) Because there exist sound reasons to approach AEDPA limitations period same under both § 2254 and § 2255 and because to do so is faithful with both Congress intent and our habeas Jurisprudence, 28 USC § 2254 decisions in Robinson and Long apply to AEDPA limitations, issues arising under § 2255.

Reasons For Granting the Petition

Page 51

In U.S. Dist Court order the Court took actions of Equitable tolling that to Mitchell Vs Green 922 F.3d 187 (2019), see Mitchell 2019 US App Lexis 15 on Tasker See Mitchell 2019 US App Lexis 16, Mitchell 922 F.3d 198 - 2019 U.S. App Lexis 24. The reading on Tolling here took away for the Reasons on the Judicial-Tolling do to the State the U.S. Dist Ct held petitioner case on this review by a order the Attorney failed on the order to send all Related reviews, Inform the U.S. Dist Ct by motion when the Attorney filed it's First's Petition failing to send everything in that Sept 21, 2017 that order say, and complain to the U.S. Dist Ct that only Appeal brief was sent that's it the U.S. Dist Ct ain't Response and let the Attorney General proceed on Prejudicing the filing, the same 2 cases petitioner just proceed in Reason to Pindale Vs Nunn 248 F. Supp. 2d 861 and Thompson Vs Greene 427 F.3d 263, see all U.S. Dist Ct Order's all of them on Judicial-Reasons petitioner petition in reason to this. The U.S. Dist Ct held a order subject to what they send and a Sept 21, 2017 about what the Attorney General was to 3. Respondent shall Provide Copies of all relevant opinions, Materials and transcripts to the Court with their answer and provide these materials to Petitioner, this is a Court Order review also constitute the 4th Cir to petitioner filed to the full Judgment and the 4th Cir Court of Appeals Subject the whole case to a Ruling. In reason to this as above to caselaw Md Rule 4-345 on it's review is on a modification for Tolling the Attorney General file in Abuse is failing to file everything and also proceeded to State Remedies with sending this is prejudice to the Petitioner see the caselaw above this is active to the Attorney General duty under Federal Habeas Corpus and the U.S. Dist Ct prejudice and held last's on less to enforce the U.S. Dist Ct also block the Argument to the Judicial-Tolling on this proceeding of Reason that Petitioner petition for and on § 2244(d)(1) the U.S. Dist Ct failed to let Response's from the Attorney General who never prove this to be Not authorize under the Judicial Reasons petitioner held. The Mitchell from the U.S. Dist Ct stated Md Rule 4-345 petitioner reason to this to the Federal Division both Courts failed to grant tolling along with the Petitioning of the Notice § 2244(d)(1). With the above being a place's Tasker Court govern and expressed concern that Md Rule 4-345 contained no time limit for the granting of a sentence reduction and could toll AEDPA's limitations period indefinitely. Overall the Modification-Rule of Maryland and all other state's is held on this the federal is a all in general to Service Federalism is for the state govern off this explain is in a reason that is for Tolling the Rule time it's not a point to 5 years Direct Appeal take a year ~~about~~ to 2 years to be done, a Petition of writ of Cert on that can take a year, post conviction with Appeal can take 2 years and all this can become wait to wait. In each to complaint on the other under arguing issues by counsel like 30 days Appeals to the Direct Appeals Court and a 3 judge panel Sentence want to argue 3 Judge Sentence Panel on Direct Appeal before the Appeal-30 days is up to Renew any issues that counsel do on both of them this would force more time this overall the Md Rule 4-345 is not in any form to § 2244(d)(1) or § 2244(d)(2) No questions of collateral review and tolling would even exist. Filing time is the same 90 days to file for a modification under this petitioner is all adopting that Putting all this as one to the last's Notice petitioner Reasons For Granting the Petition also No law shall be treated by one way over a Constitutional Subject. The U.S. Dist Ct held the Mitchell-case on this process failing to let and govern the Attorney General on Subjecting the Judicial Tolling and all with a Construe-petition the Judicial-Tolling is the Notice's Remedy review the U.S. Dist Ct failed within to Hill 4th Cir Case the case's govern for the U.S. Dist Ct to let a petitioner explain the reason for equitable Tolling this constitute for the Attorney General to proceed Constitutional, construction, Jurisprudence, Jus ed-gens, Jus gen-ti-um the final will be U.S. Dist Ct Judicial activism and as in a U.S. Dist Ct Constituting Constitutional the Court would be governing all reviews on them meaning this as here is in the U.S. Dist Ct Constitutional-discretion this must also be constituting adopted within to the 4th Cir abuse's under a Appeal of Aid petition reason on this with a assert. The Federal-Division is in a Conflict with the state for Judicial-Tolling and Congress-Intent is in reason to this constituting for this S.Ct to authorize anticipation, Corpus Juris, Congress devolution in-gress. Petitioner reason to this is a congress-Plenary Case the S.Ct is in-g governing-reason for Judicial-Tolling assert Judicial-Tolling is a Administration-Justice of Const of the U.S. Art I Section 1, Article I V section 1. Petitioner Petition to this S.Ct for the granting of assert Judicial-Tolling these Federalism-adoptees Attorney General Daniel J. Javoy, Attorney General Edward J. Kelley (U.S. Dist Ct Judge George J. Hazel, U.S. Court of Appeals 4th Cir Judge Thacker, Judge Quattlebaum, Judge Rushing), the Federalism-Officials adopt the unconstitutional review done by the State-Division failing Congress-Intent this petition is filed in general to the case petitioning for the Reasons to grant the petition within to S.Ct Rule 10(a). The Attorney General never proceeded to Hill.

Reasoning for Granting the Petition to the S.Ct

Page 52

The 4th Cir is in conflict with all the court system in general, the U.S. Dist Ct is as the review state to the unconstitutional adopting proceeding, this petition for Reasons of granting is in general S.Ct 10(c)(a). Petitioner move this petition for the reasons to grant this petition at the starting review.

Under Martinez Vs Ryan 132 S.Ct 1309 as to Post-Conviction in reason petitioner ask's this S.Ct to adopt this case within to assert constitutional this is a review of a plain-Reason and Martinez is place's in this petition the petitioner is in a abuse's to Remedy-Counsel filings the Public-Act is constituting. Petitioner as here right Now reason-assert to this case, under the testimony of Deputy Christopher Gibbons on Page 12 of this petition petitioner assert-reason this claim could have been filed on Appeal and Post's conviction Counsel and held on Post conviction for Appeal Counsel No forcing Md Rule 4-325(f) → MPJ1-Cr 3, 00 what constitute Evidence this is a Plain Error and MPJ1-Cr 6.00 would also apply these is 2 issues held under Martinez. See Stovall Vs State 144 Md App at 721 and Crawford Vs supra 541 US at 51, 24 S.Ct at 1364 - Crawford 2d at 92, 867 A.2d at 330. See page 20, 36 of this petition. Petitioner also in reason for adopt this next assert on the other side of the Constitution, Petitioner Reason of the case being held on a Assert-Assault and this reason to Bird Vs State 231 Md 439 assault with Intent to Murder ending at Webb. See Cox Vs State 311 Md 330-534 A.2d 1335, See Cox on Attempt the reading Exist to Attempt and Bird constitute to this case this case's also constituting to a 1st Deg Assault. Petitioner reason to this the this case's is the overt all act of Intent with that is Assault with Intent to Murder the case's is held in general to this law keeping it's innocent to the verdict this is within the point of the state's Attorney on a case that explain the law, taking all in the Petitioner is Charge wrong and the other Reasons to this petition is under the conflict of the review that petitioner Reasons to Grant this petition. In general to this petition petitioner petition this S.Ct for the granting of this petition the petitioner in constitutional service that should be at all times within to this type of case's in general to all official's state Federal petitioner Reason under the U.S. Amendments of the petition adopt the reasons to all petitioner state Federal review's and the same constitute. The Legislature-Reason Construction, see Wheeler Vs U.S. 435 U.S. 497, 48 S.Ct 1559, 56 L.Ed. 2d 86 (1978), In Re Appeals Nos. 1022 & 1081, 278 Md 178, 359 A.2d 556 (1976), Fabritz Vs Superintendent 583 P.2d at 700 (1978) these cases reason to the statute and construction petitioner Reason this to all for the petition for the granting that the constitutional-duty's is conflicting, this case's in Reason is on it's Reason of the proceeding petitioner explain's the abuse's that's unconstitutional the U.S. Solicitor General in general to this petition in reason on it's duty with good-faith on all Remedys and all that is in Petitioner filings. Must Construction, systematic everything constituting to the limit on this case Petitioner Reason to counsel on filings of modification, New Trial, 3 Judge-Sentencing Panel, Notice of Appeal, Post conviction, Leave to Appeal, Writ of Cert, Discovery everything petitioner Reason that all this must's be held stated to the S.Ct that that authorize in general to everything is past's the conflict and the question of the Constitution. The verdict is not constitutional and authorize petitioner is still under innocent authorize the case's govern (Price Vs State 405 Md 10 Inconsistent Jury Verdict in md common law Criminal Case are Not acceptable). All witnesses is under the state of Mind with drugs and drinking, Victims Hires on a defense is subject to Many defenses under the condition he was on a Controlling drug the case's following to all witnesses is govern to a Drug test of the amount of Use's of function that is in a Form of Evidence. Petitioner Reasons that the U.S. Solicitor General Must's take everything in general and file in fundamental with showing all that Petition filed to petitioner reasons to this because the Respondent keep abusing this case injusticing to petitioner liberty with abuse of unjudicial-Unsecured, on this behalf petitioner file this with the Solicitor and the S.Ct in reason the S.Ct Must's grant all governing that the Solicitor in general govern the U.S. Construction that No interest is in this case under the S.Ct Rule, None, that's a high standard petitioner is govern to a defense entitle still to a Jury Trial and Petitioner constitutional-defense is filed on this Case of Liberty. State and Federal have took or held No Consideration or constitutional reach on this case, however the S.Ct held that Reasons of for granting the Petition and all caselaw, U.S. Construction, common-law, construe that on constitute constitutional and petitioner petitioning Reason-assert that all Remedys on it's reason should be adopted to Martinez-Procedural-Default standard under Counsel this petition is in Reason the U.S. Dist Ct is in light subject to this as well held the state done it's duty on Remedy under the Public Defender-Act this case's would have exist justice the system's a Justice services of duty Federal was to assert Federalism. Petitioner was told the wrong-law filing a Writ of cer to the md Court of Appeals i did not know it was 15 days the filing time i was showed was 30 days time had to be put on the \$5 dollar file to take the money out. Overall had the Public Defender filed like the Public Defender Act say this would never happen. Many Inmate got In Writ of Cert filed in the case by Public Defender, here it's None.

Out of Maryland-State on Remedy Filing done by the Public Defender Office among Post conviction, Writ of Cert, Modification, Application leave to Appeal. None of these Remedies are Filed effective Judicial on Post conviction. In most's to all cases the Public Defender File a petition for a Re-New Modification or argu for abate Modification this is the cover up the Public Defender have a low limit of Filing Judicial-effective Filing such as this petition here. In this cases of standard Filed under Post's conviction strickland standard all this is asking the Court, what about fundamental law the law that is in this petition the real common-law that show a Statute or Rule for the Court discretion which is upon a Exist without looking for a hand-out. Legislature-Intent the system should be upon the law this is why the standard is so plain when it should be with legislative Intent common-law exercise. In reason to this point is that the Public Defender Office in service don't govern the duty of service to the public and the Court's know this, the law don't come with a price duty to review is free to them it's more don't just's as well as a \$50,000 dollar lawyer and in this petitioner reason to this that the Public Defender still have a duty this is what the state pay them for and this is to be assert, it's a unreason to have a case as here this much of a less common-law operation under these Remedys. It would look or seem like a asking of a hand-out but to file take's search and duty with up limited cases, for a prisoner to assert somethen with caselaw can hurt without a Lexis Nexis system when the Response is do but if the Public Defender was on it's duty existing what is above this would be a 50% - 50% held before the Court. The law is made plain language it's not best's to file your life in the dark this violate the system 14 Amend system and to the petitioner liberty and this is why petitioner reason to counsel and a duty's of the Federalism and the state in general to all because the Unreasonable things that happen. The U.S. Constitution shall stand under the duties and services of the system Amendments and common-law construction. Petitioner can go to much in a Filing harming the Filing standard, in this case A Reason for this case's to what at have or what it have been for all this and life still to be. Petitioner petition to this S.Ct for the granting of this Petition system Amendments and the petitioner Rights of Amendments with the construction and all that is subject petitioner ask's this S.Ct to Review this case's and questioning should petitioner suffer the Exist to this case, the Solicitor should not Exist this, this would be system-constitutional Hate However Petitioner Petition in Reason to Grant this Petition. Respectfully Submitted.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted. The Petition should be granted by and on the Grants or what the law and Remedy govern, the granting is in a grant that all other Grants state and Federal is subject to the reason to grant constitutional.

Respectfully submitted,

Jerome McBride

Date: Aug 17, 2021

In the law term of Reasons the petitioner held this petition on, see Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 2016.ed page 402 - Reason n 1: an underlying ground, justification, Purpose, Motive, 2a: the Faculty of Comprehending, Understanding, or distinguishing esp. in a fair and orderly way b: the proper and sane exercise of the mind.

On this behalf the petitioner petition to that meaning for a granting from this S.Ct.

The last's question that's the 3th question is: HAVE in the ~~light~~ of the Petitioner S.Ct Petition For Writ of Cert Stake, govern's the Supreme Constitutional In the questions of the system abuse's that the Division of the State and the Federalism-Service is in general unconstitutional to? The question is limited for a S.Ct exercise-Constitutional Supreme assert.

See page 48,49 of this petition the petitioner is petitioning to that page and this petition is held to them questions State and Federalism petitioner is constituting to S.Ct Rule 10 (a) In general the Rule, the considerations is Constitutional Judicial-discretion. S.Ct Rule 10 (b), (c) these 2 sections also is compelling reasons the Petition is the supremacy clause. The Official's that's in a authority authorize is being petition on the Unauthorize that petitioner is petitioning on, a lot of injustice's have been done in this this and petitioner in Reason ask's this S.Ct to Maintain a review on that Discovery and the testimony and the law that is subject in this case. Never Forget this case and in Reason to this because too much ~~be~~ added to the testimony and to question these witness will not be hard for the truth, this ~~can~~ go bad if it's also a Reason to have No reason to this would be the only way but overall this Record is and has been strongly added to. I'm asking this S.Ct overall to Investigate and enforce all services on this. On the behalf of the petitioner proceed in Reason to the case being in all conflict petitioner ask's this S.Ct to hold a Reason Court's Supervisory power and the S.Ct can order a Investigation to question the witness to they testimony or the Solicited can file this in the Review questioning them it's all in Reason to Justice. The State have enforce so much Injustice petitioner is filing this petition in the S.Ct for Highes of Justice of a Discretion Is all in a question to these Witness how could this happen on the evidence that is in this ~~case~~ case. These witnesses is being told and the State is enforcing this case on it legal Evidence, being grace is the first lie to get a claim it's more to this case and petitioner is innocent in a continue. See all testes of the Gun and Doctor-Services No Doctor testimony Is in proceeding, Check the evidence of Discovery. Petitioner want to file a Evidence's Motion In this Petition that the Solicited prove with the petition it file the Related Constitutional Form of Review the motion is with this petition fundamental pointing to all this. The petitioner Is in a contact point to the constitution in Reason petition to this S.Ct for the compelling that is in this review the petition is overall Remaining On the S.Ct Rules. The petition is Filed on it's Limit and still can be held for more system-construction.

Internet Services of System Judicial Reported caselaw, with a grant of counsel could make this Petition constituted to the constitution. In reason petitioner want the S.Ct to know this petition was Filed with help and petitioner did not level this construction all alone it's in support of a Inmate 2 of them. Petitioner Submit this petition to the S.Ct for Review.