


No. 21-5734 ORIGINAL



IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

TONY LAMAR VANN — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

KEN PAXTON ET AL... — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

TONY L. VANN
(Your Name)

2717 CUSTER DRIVE

(Address)

DALLAS TEXAS 75216

(City, State, Zip Code)

214-270-5753

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

WHETHER A POLICE OFFICER CAN LEGALLY PLANT
DRUGS ON BLACK MEN, AND THE COURTS DISREGARD
ALL LEGAL PLEADINGS (AND VIDEOTAPED PROOF.)

CD.

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:

KEN PAXTON ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF TEXAS;
MELANIE WIESMAN, FELONY PROSECUTOR, COLLIN COUNTY, TX
ASHLEY KELLS, CHIEF FELONY PROSECUTOR, COLLIN COUNTY,
TX; RICHARD CHAMBERS, WYLIE POLICE DEPARTMENT,

DEFENDANTS-APPELLEES.

RELATED CASES

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 A to the petition and is

- reported at N/A; 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 is unpublished.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 B to the petition and is

- reported at N/A; 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 is unpublished.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 _____ to the petition and is

- reported at N/A; or,
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished.

The opinion of the N/A court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

- reported at _____; or,
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A *COURT ORDER FIFTH CIRCUIT*

APPENDIX B *COURT ORDER EASTERN DISTRICT (SHERMAN DIVISION)*

APPENDIX C *FIRST MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION (DENIED)*

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
HAINES VS. KERNER, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1971)	5.

STATUTES AND RULES

57TH CIR 27.1.6	5
FED R. APP 27(B).	5
FED R. APP. P. 40	5
RULE 27.2.1	5
FRAD 25 (4)	5

OTHER

14TH CONST AMENDMENT DUE PROCESS RIGHTS.	5.
--	----

JURISDICTION

For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was 07/30/2021.

No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case. AFTER ABOVE DATE.

A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: April 21, 2021, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix B.

An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. A.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was N/A. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix N/A.

A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: N/A, 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 N/A (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. A.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

THAT BOTH LOWER COURTS REFUSED TO ADDRESS THE ISSUE OF THE POLICE OFFICER RICHARD CHAMBERS PLANTING DRUGS ON PETITIONER, WHICH HIS BODY CAMERA CAUGHT ON VIDEO. IN VIOLATION OF HIS 14TH CONST AMENDMENT RIGHTS FOR DUE PROCESS.

THE COURT CLERKS DISMISSED HIS CASE BY FINDING PROBLEMS WITH HIS LEGAL BRIEFS WHICH IS PROHIBITED UNDER FRAP 25(4). AND HAINES VS. KERNER 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1971). SEE: ATTACHED.

ALSO SEE RULES;

57A CIR 27.1.6

FED R. APP. P. 27(B)

FED R. APP. P. 40

RULE 27.2.1

FRAP 25(4).


STATEMENT OF THE CASE

THE POLICE OFFICER RICHARD CHAMBERS PLANTED DRUGS ON THE PETITIONER. THE U.S. EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS REFUSED TO DESIGNATE THE RECORDS TO THE FIFTH COURT OF APPEALS. OR THE RECORD EXCERPTS. THE COURT CLERK OF THE FIFTH CIRUIT DISMISSED THE CASE FOR FAILURE TO FILE SUFFICIENT BRIEF AND RECORD EXCERPTS. THROUGH NO FAULT OF HIS OWN.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

DUE PROCESS WOULD REQUIRE THE OPPORTUNITY TO BE
HEARD AND A DECISION BY A NEUTRAL DECISIONMAKER. OF
ISSUE RAISED WITH MERIT POLICE OFFICER RICHARD CHAMBERS
PLANTING DRUGS ON THE PETITIONER.


Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mr. Tim Dorn". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large, stylized "D" at the beginning.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M. Tracy Norma". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a small oval flourish at the end.

Date: Sep 13, 2021

(8).