ORIGINAL

No. 21-5820

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

HECTOR M. BOSSIO JR. — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

UNITED STATES — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Hector M. Bossio Jr.
(Your Name)

P.O. Box 759
(Address)

Minersville, PA 17954
(City, State, Zip Code)

N/A
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1) Can the state government legally, lawfully, or constitutionally use an inappropriate relationship with the federal government in order to circumvent the 6th Amend. "Compulsory Clause" in order to hide armed robbery committed by Phenix City Police Officers. Is the above volative of the "Silver Platter Doctrine"; volative of "due Process" as guaranteed by the constitution; and is not the above a gross abuse of process.

2) Are federal District Courts bound by the constitution to investigate into complaints of witness intimidation, Armed robbery, evidence tampering, destruction of evidence when it is being done to the defendant the same way they do when it is being done to the governments witnesses and evidence? Does failure of the Court to investigate and penalize the above in fact facilitate and demostably condone the same; is not the above at the root of systematic injustice?

3) Is the federal district court by law supposed to give pro-se filings, when the defendant is exercising his right to self representation, the same concideration as licensed attorneys or is denial of equil concideration through completely ignoring the subject matter in those pro-se filings and summary denials without comming to conclusions of law or fact equil to denying pro-se defendants access to the court? and is the above not also at the root of systematic injustice?

4) If the state government destroys exculpatory evidence for the defendant and incriminating evidence against arresting officers, then hands the case over on a "silver platter" to the federal government. Does not that cause the case to be void of the possibility of "Due Process" ab initio?

LIST OF PARTIES

[X] 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:

NOTICE

The petitioner sincerely apologizes for not typing this petition and asks that this honorable court please accept the forgoing as is. Your petitioner is not able to type this because of the Covid-19 restrictions at this F.C.I (Schuylkill). Furthermore his covid experiences were agrivated by the F.C.I. he was originally at being struck by a tornado and all the complications that being emergency transferred around the B.O.P. added to an already complicated situation. So he was unable to present the forgoing the way a document going to the highest court in the world should be presented. Again he apologizes.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INDEX TO APPENDICES

Because appointed counsel, Preston Presley, will not respond to correspondences, or requests for necessary documents, your Petitioner does not have a copy of the opinion of the District Court.

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

[X] For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix D to the petition and is

[ ] reported at ______________________; or,
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[X] is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix B to the petition and is

[ ] reported at ______________________; or,
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[X] 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 ______________________; or,
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[ ] is unpublished.

The opinion of the ______________________ 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.

JURISDICTION

[X] For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was August 21, 2020.

a timely request to file a petition for rehearing /en banc rehearing was filed and granted, On about 9-2-2020. On or about 9-15-2020 a request to stay the tolling of the same was filed and granted because your petitioner did not have any of his legal documents. He was in FCI. Estill which was struck by a tornado, then emergency transferred. Petitioner was required to and did file monthly status reports on his situation. Then on 5-5-2021 the petitioner's conviction was affirmed and he was denied the chance to file for any type of rehearing without any explination out of the blue. He still hadn't recieved his legal materials and could not possibly have filed the above pro-se.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1). The United States supreme Court rules, rule 10(a) states that this honorable court can grant certiorari if a United States Court of Appeals; "has so far departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings, or sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of this Court's supervisory power". Such is the situation in the instant case.

The Eleventh Circuit Court of appeals granted and then without explination denied your petitioner the opportunity to file a petition for rehearing /en bank rehearing on 5-5-2021, and has overlooked armed robbery by arresting officers.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Amendment IV: purports that "The right of the people to be secure in thier persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizurs shall not be violated".

Amendment V: purports "No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law".

Amendment VI: purports that "In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy public trial, by an impartial jury of the state and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defense.

Amendment XIV: purports that "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny any person within its jurisdiction the equil protection of the laws.

The Silver Platter Doctrine; The principle that a federal court could admit evidence obtained illegally by a state police officer as long as federal officer did not participate in or request the search. Elkins v. U.S., 364 U.S. 206 (1960)

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Please take mandatory judicial notice that your Petitioner is willing and requesting that this honorable court order a polygraph test proformed on him if any members of this panel doubt any facts stated in this doc., or if the federal government, Federal District and circuit Courts, defense attorneys, attorneys for the city of Phenix City Alabama, employees of the city of Phenix City Alabama including police officers or anyone else mentioned denies any facts herein stated whatsoever.

The instant case began when Kimberly Shearers the owner of 1804 Timberland Dr. (the place of your Petitioner's arrest) went outside of her home to investigate the police presence in the back part of the property. See exhs. #1 a picture of the car, place, in real time of arrest. It should be noted that the picture was taken with the flash so none of it could be seen otherwise; #2, a daytime picture of the same driveway and an S.U.V. parked in the same spot; #3, an overhead Google Maps picture of the place of arrest; #4, a picture of the family area that was directly to the left of the vehicle (the area under the arrow in exhibit #3). Unknown to Kimberly Shearers ("Shearers"), she accidentally came upon officers Cpl. D. Bishop ("Bishop"), and Sgt. M. Cutt ("Cutt") of the Phenix City Alabama police in the act of armed robbery against your petitioner, violating his 4th Amend. Protections and local criminal laws.

In order to give the impression of being on "official police business" the armed robbers had no alternative other than to arrest your petitioner, invent a phoney 911 call and caller; destroy body worn camera audio and video ("BWC"); destroy patrol car dashboard camera video; destroy audio and video of the patrol car interior camera; omit facts from both police narratives like the facts that there were people home, and that they never attempted a knock and talk at any of the two doors they walked past to reach your petitioner's rental car, and more.

While in state custody your petitioner tried report the armed robbery to the local internal affairs to no avail. Please see exh. (8) + (5), which are two of many requests submitted on the Russell county Jail kiosk system. Your petitioner was taken to a preliminary hearing in the state court. Two days after said hearing Bishop was forced to resign from the police force due to an internal investigation. See exhs (18) and (19), (26) and (27). Shane Bishop persuant to theft said Cpl. Bishop, His wife, "was on meth and robbing people in uniform while on duty for years", when he was being interogated persuant to that investigation. A copy of said report is on file with the Dist. Ct. See exh (7) ref. to Doc 88. (3:16 cv 839).

Thereafter a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (case. no. 3:16-cv-839) against the arresting police officers. On the day after the complaint was served by Marshal Services on the defendants, by some strange "coincidence", the Graham Legal Firm ("G.L.F.") was appointed as counsel for your petitioner in the Alabama State criminal proceedings. See exh (6). The above is volative of the 14th Amend.

The fact should be noted by this hon. Court that G.L.F. are also the "defendant's" attorney of record in the § 1983 cited above. See exh (7). These Attys. work for Phenix City in many official capacities. Alabama law is clear. Under the Ala. Code 1975 § 13A-10-1 persons whom carry out governmental functions are, @ § 13A-10-1(3) those proforming "any activity which a public servant is legally authorized to undertake on behalf of the government", @ 13A-10-1(7) "any officer employee of the government (13A-10-1(2)), including legislators and judges and any person or agency participating as an advisor, consultant or otherwise proforming a government function". The G.L.F. function in the above capacity. For example the G.L.F. are also the custodian of records for the City of Phenix City Alabama.

Your petitioner hadn't noticed that the GLF was listed as attorney of record on the docket of 3:16-cv-839 until some time later. He did however write the GLF and inform them of the above case with all possible due diligence. See exh. 9 a copy of the letter from the state case docket "Doc. 57". When your petitioner did become aware of the above gross undisclosed conflict of interest he tried to fire the "GLF" to no avail. The "GLF" and court ignored your petitioner. Only when the "GLF" asked the court to withdraw, 2 months later, were they finally removed as defense counsel. Compare the dates on exhs. 6 9 10 & 11. Therefore "GLF" having the prior defense atty's case file and also as atty for defendants in above §1983 and also being custodian of records for Phenix City had ample time to ascertain, and destroy the files needed by your petitioner to defend himself in any way for any state or federal prosecution and to sabatoge any ability to prosecute the §1983. The above is volative of 14th Amend. Protections.

And that is exactly what the "GLF" did. It should be noted that your petitioner filed another §1983 against the "GLF". It was dismissed by the district court. See exh # 14.

Your petitioner wrote the U.S. Dept. of Justice about the police misconduct, robbery under color of law, and civil rights violations. See exhs. 12 and 13. They claim that they do not handle these type of crimes both times.

After all evidence which is exculpatory for your petitioner and inculpatory to the arresting officers was destroyed by the "G.L.F."

Only then did the Russell County prosecutor's office solicit the Federal governments assistance in prosecuting your petitioner. Because Cpl. Bishop's internal affairs investigation and your petitioners claims against both arresting officers would have a negative effect on the police department; Because the federal government would only have to use Sgt. Cutt's tesimony; because the state officials knew they could unermine your petitioner's efforts in locating Bishop in subpoenaing her as a witness to the trial and suppression, it was a decisive move but also an unethical abuse of process and a way to cover up armed robbery.

They left only the evidence needed by the federal government to convict and destroyed all evidence your petitioner needed to prove his innocence, gift wrapped that, and handed it over to the A.T.F. An investigation into the above was and is merited.

The instant federal case was void of any semblance of so called "due process" ab initio, and volative of the 14th Amend.

It became worse when the federal government and District court become involved. Your Petitioner brought the above issues to the attention of the appointed [counsels], the District Atty, To Both of the federal Judges, in 3 seperate cases, and to the 11th Circuit court... REPEATEDLY. Your petitioner brought up the FACTS that the case agent committed perjury and misrepresented material facts at suppression; the misconduct of the Attys employed by Phenix City; the armed robbery by the arresting officers; The magistrate completely denied your petitioner effective counsel for suppression then any counsel whatsoever thereafter, arbitrary denials without making findings of fact or law, ignoring the subjectmatter of all your petitioner's pro se filings; The district Judges vouching for 3rd parties as to compliance with subpoena orders and allowing the Phenix City police dept. to harrass defense witnesses with threats of more harrassment if the dare testify, knowingly abusing their discretion in bad faith; abusing the process of the court thereby assisting the prosecution in chipping away at your petitioner's ability to present a defense till there was nothing left, allowing standby counsel to nullify self representation and using him as an obstruction to self representation throughout all pretrial proceedings; by the District judges failure to enforce his and the magistrates own court order when it was clear such inaction would be benefitual to the prosecution.

The district court was placed on notice over 40 different times about the tactics used by the attys for Phenix City ("P.C."). Instead of investigating it the court turned a blind eye thereby condoning, covering up, and facilitating police misconduct, corruption and armed robbery. Your Petitioner brought it to the attention of the circuit court. See exh # 15 and 16. Your Petitioner even wrote the state judges about the above when it was happening in state court. See exh # 17. Your Petitioner also pleaded with the circuit court again through a petition for writ of mandamus. See exh 20. The circuit court ruled that because you petitioner can bring these grievances up on appeal later, after conviction, the petition was frivolous. So basically the court is saying that the district court can use any means to convict defendants thereby forcing them to go back to the courts without the presumption of innocence. Even when the above is brought to the circuit courts attention repeatedly. Is this what so called "due process" has come to in the United States? See exh 21 The Petition for Mandamus

Appointed counsel knowingly destroyed defense efforts and assisted the government. For example, never once did the government present any evidence or testimoney to the effect that 1804 Timberland dr. ("1804") was a high traffic drug house. Defense Atty. Andrew Skier and only Skier, against your Petitioner's express wishes, placed the investigator he hired on the stand at suppression hearing and asked her already rehearsed questions. Because of the above damaging testimony the court ruled that the protection of the 4th Amend. was extremely diminished. See Appx(A) Doc. 110

It should be noted that the government never had reason to suspect that there was any type of high traffic at "1804". Atty. Skier knowingly and in bad faith coached investigator Fritz into proffering that testimony in order to hurt your petitioners suppression and trial chances and to blatantly assist the government. See Suppression trans. Appx (A) Page 99 ¶'s 18 - 20; pgs 100, and 101. Skier never provided any real proof from any witnesses he interviewed saying that "1804" was a high traffic drug house. He fabricated it.

Skier refused to subpoena critical, and expressly requested evidence and witnesses. See Appx (F) ¶'s 65 through 88, and 89. Skier couldn't even file for subpoena duces tecum correctly and he had a year to do it while the Collins v. Virginia case was being heard by this honorable court. Your Petitioner told Atty Skier that it is his personal and constitutional right to witnesses for his suppression hearing. Your Petitioner insisted on the following witnesses: Kimberly Shearers, Jamie Lee McCrary (See exh. # 31 affidavit), Sheryl Hendrix, Phenix City Police Dept. ("PCPD") officers (dispatcher) Hutchins C. and officer employee #053 for whom no name was given in the responders details but he made the last entry. See exh # 25, someone cleared the entire responders details and radio log table. See exh # 32. Also witnesses from the Columbus Georgia Police Dept. Cpl. A. Benning and officer

Chris Coleman whom arrived at 1804 the night of arrest after the armed robbery took place to collect the rental car, Donavan Harrison, and Ralf Colon. Skler refused the above plus Cpl. Bishop to the Petitioner.

After the damage caused by court appointed Atty. Your petitioner tried to fire Atty Andrew Skler and get the court to appoint different counsel, and obtain a new suppression hearing to no avail.

Due to Skler's refusal to attempt to subpoena the above witnesses the federal case agent was able to misrepresent material facts without having to worry about any rebuttal witnesses. For example see pages 76 + 77 of the transcripts of the suppression hearing. Therein the case agent paints the Petitioner in the light of an unwelcomed, uninvited person at that residence (1804). Now please see exh 29 pg 24. The magistrate ruled that your Petitioner was more like a "trespasser" than an invited guest. Also see page 20. The magistrate focused on the testimony proffered by Skler and Fritz as to 1804 being a "dope house". The gov. never proffered that evidence.

Now look at the trial transcript pages 167 and 170. In both pages Shearers makes clear that she was not scared of your petitioner at the time of arrest in contradiction to the federal case agents misrepresentation at the suppression hearing. Also the claim that your petitioner was not an invited guest would have been disproven at suppression. Also see the affidavit of Jamie McCrary whom was never told about the suppression nor subpoenaed - exh 31 - notwithstanding numerous request by your petitioner, to Skler, for this witness. But the most sought witness was Cpl. D. Bishop. Skler refused.

It should be noted that the federal case agent was present for the entire trial. She was actually sitting at the prosecutors desk when Ms. Shearers gave the above testimony at the trial. The gov. had time to place the case agent on the stand to rebute defense witness testimony and did not. They could not.

Your petitioner tride to get Skier removed, at a different hearing. They gave two choices. The magistrate told your petitioner, "Since you continue to fire court appointed lawyers" he could "either keep Skier or represent himself." That made no sense whatsoever because prior to that hearing your petitioner NEVER FIRED ANY OTHER ATTORNEYS IN THE INSTANT CASE! (emphasis added). The above is volative of the 6th Amend.

No defendant in criminal proceedings should ever have to proceed with an attorney whom has so blatantly undermined the defendants case the way Skier did. So rather than proceed with Skier your petitioner was forced into representing himself. See exh. (25). Your Petitioner pleaded with the district court about the denial of counsel a vast number of times. Your petitioner went as far as filing a Complaint Of Judicial Misconduct. See exh. (15)¶(I). Also a Petition for Writ Of HABEAS Corpus. See exh. (16)¶(XII) and (XIII).

Because of the above your petitioner was forced not only to go to suppression hearing without any of the necessary evidence or witnesses but was forced into selfrepresentation. Skier's refusal to subpoena Cpl. G. Bishop was not disclosed to your Petitioner until the eve of the suppression hearing. Prior to that Skier had your Petitioner under the impression that he had Bishop subpoenaed already. Bishop is a witness that is a dirty cop and armed robber who should have been exposed on the stand in the instant case at every single opportunity. Skier's actions do not have the semblance of a strategy for the defendant and were only meant to assist in hiding police misconduct and armed robbery and to undermine your Petitioners chances.

Skier's actions created a toxic relationship between him and your petitioner. The court knew it but further confounded your Petitioner by placing Skier as standby counsel and keeping him there notwithstanding over 100 motions filed complaining about the situation, and how Skier was obstructing self representation. See exh. #30 throughout the entire docket.

Skier refused and never did provide the address HE INTERVIEWED SHANE BISHOP at, the home of Cpl. D. Bishop. It should be noted that Skier did make a show of providing a multatude of fake P.O. Boxes and random apartment addresses in bad faith. See exh. 30 ¶'s 152, 370 and 381. The court refused to order sanctions for him not providing the ADDRESS HE VISITED.

Investigator Fritz and her mother also went along with Atty. Skier and were present during his interview with Shane Bishop. Your Petitioner requested that address from the investigator when he was representing himself pro-se. Not only did she not provide the address but she didn't even bother to show up to the trial. Notwithstanding the fact that she was paid by the government for her services nor the fact that the court subpoenaed her twice. (emphasis added). See exhs. 22 and 23.

Skier and the Fritz family have a long time family friendship. Skier helped Ms. Fritz set up Legacy Investigations soley for the purposes of milking the government in this case and shut it down just prior to the instant trial. See the second page of exh. 23.

Skier obstructed self representation in every way. It became so extreme that your Petitioner had to file daily reports on Skier. See exh. 30 ¶'s 489, 494, 495, 475, 482. Skier obstructed Your Petitioners efforts even after he was removed as standbye counsel. See exh. 3

¶'s 568, 569, 570, 614, 674, 679. Also see exh. #33.

Most your petitioner's motions seem to have been completely ignored by the court when he was complaining about standby counsel. Other motions where summarily denied in bunches. Still others were completely misconstrued as if the court paid no attention to the subject matter whatsoever. See exh's 34 Doc 578; 35 Doc. 211; 36 Doc. 266; 37 Doc 566; 38 Doc 679. Even when the Phenix City Police Department used mafia style tactics, riding around threatening your petitioner's witnesses, the district court did nothing. See exh. 39 Doc. 279.

Your Petitioner asks that this hon. Court note that he filed all of the above many numerous times in many possible ways to no avail, changing the titles and the wording every time.

The above treatment was so blatant and vicious that your petitioner had to run an experiment in order to be able to prove the abuse to the higher courts. Your Petitioner found a motion filed by a federal District Atty, when he was a defense Atty in 2005. See exh. #40. The same defendant in exh. 40 was facing new charges at the same time your petitioner was facing these charges. He gave your petitioner a copy of exh 40, gave his own Atty a copy, had his Atty. file it in his current case, then your petitioner copied that motion verbatim, see exh 41, Doc 189, and submitted it to the district court. It should be noted that both your petitioner and Mr. Howard James Smith had the same magistrate judge. The results show your petitioners treatment clearly. The motion submitted by Mr. Howard James Smith's Atty. was refered to the prosecutor for comment. Your Petitioner's pro-se submittal, like 90% of all his other submittals was summarily denied without findings of fact or law. Thus not only was your petitioner denied any representation at all, but he was denied access to the court, and also denied full and fair consideration of his pro-se filings.

Your petitioner's docket has over 800 filings. More than are filed in your average conspiracy. Your petitioner has no co-defendants. The reason there are so many filings is because he refiled and rephrased the same motions repeatedly to try to get the district court judges to give his filings some kind of concideration other than compartmentalized findings, and summary denials. When he did get a response his pro se filings where held to the standards of licensed Attys. in order to deny them; completey misconstrued when expidient to make it easy to deny; when the court could find no error in form or when the law was correctly cited or when the facts were obvuouse or easily provable they would be summarily denied. These were completely unjust proceedings. The above is volative of the 5th and 6th Amends.

Had it been a government witness being threatened no judge in the country would have tolarated it. There would have been an investigation, hearing, and the culpable parties would have been prosecuted. The court, by purposely misconstruing your petitioners easily understood plain English filings (See exh. 39), Misapplying law in bad faith in order to take no action thereby facilitating the above police misconduct, you can see why courts have been at the center of all the protests about injustice. Exh. 39 is only one of several defense witnesses that were threatinned.

The court is the protection the public have against the above. The above shows that that being the case so far theres been no protection. Governmental misconduct is unchecked and carried out with impunity. There was no trial only a mockery day Alabama lynching, volative of the 5th and 6th Amends.

The double standard is clear. Do anything possible to pave the way for the government to convict quickly. Ignore all obstructions to defendants defense and if that defendant is pro se, all the better because he likely doesn't understand whats being done to him, or can be easily discouraged, ignored and railroaded.

It gets much worse in the instant case. The Petitioner demonstrated that as per P.C.P.D.'s own policy they are required to have recorded the entire arrest and search. See exh #42, the policy. He brought to the courts attention that the government was charging him with a mixture of ICE (the drug) erroneously. The sentencing guidlines quantity table (2D1.1)C: "for purposes of this guildline", Ice, "means a mixture or substance containing d-methamphetamine hydrochloride at least 80% purity". Meaning ice actual. This was ignored. see exh 35; and 43 the test preformed. You petitioner filed and was granted subpoena Ad testificandum but none of the employees of the P.C.P.D. bothered to come to the Trial. See exh #44 which was served on Cpl. Bishop's Atty of record, Nelson and Gamble because prior standby counsel was and is to this day still withholding Bishop's home address. Officer #053 whom last logged into the responders details and radio log table didn't show, see exh. 45; 32; and 25. Investigator Fritz did not show. See exh # 22 and 23. The case had taken so long and the P.C.P.D. did a thorough job of intimidating anyone in Phenix City who was going to testify on your petitioners behalf that Sheryl Grandon, Rolf Colon, Donavan Harrison, Ashley Story, and Jamie McCrary would not show or could not be located.

See exh. #(31). Prior to being threatened they were willing to come to trial. All where at "1804" when your petitioner was robbed then arrested. And to add insult to injury the government filed a motion in lemine to exclude things relitigated from suppression at the trial. Your petitioner's entire defense was police misconduct. The motion in lemine nullified your petitioners ability to expose the armed robbers. The above motion only served to cover up armed robbery. See exh. (45), doc 375. The prosecutions refusal to obtain and provide the E-911 District dispatch information only served to cover up armed robbery. See exh. (46), doc 503. The above witnesses being threatened and the court facilitating it by ignoring it also served to cover up armed robbery. The Columbus Georgia and P.C.P.D. personel whom did not show up to trial only did so to cover up armed robbery. Atty. Andrew Skler and the private investigator he hired not giving your Petitioner the home address of Cpl. Bishop only serve to cover up armed robbery. The actions taken by G.L.F. prior to Federal indictment only serve to cover up armed robbery. The destruction of body camera, and patrol car videos only serve to cover up the armed robbery, volative of 5th Amend. equal protection clause.

Since the federal prosecutor refused to provide the E-911 district records your petitioner had to subpoena them himself see exh. (47), doc 557. Due to noncompliance by respondants to subpoena duces tecum orders the court ordered them to submit all responses to the court as well as to your petitioner. On the eve of trial, Judge Watkins, issued an order vouching that the E-911 district submitted the requested materials sought and that the court was satisfied. Your Petitioner told the Judge in court before the commencement of the trial that, although the court recieved their copy, the defendant hadn't recieved anything. The court made it clear that it did not care and that trial was moving forward. Other evidence your petitioner had not recieved are shown in exhs. (48) and (49). But the E-911 District evidence is crutiele. All calls are first recieved by the E-911 district. As per Alabama law the custodian of records for the district is the personel whom is to respond to the subpoena and whom was in fact served. See exh (47). That is a very important fact because those records are to be certified by him or her under seal by law. See exh (50) pg 5 citing Title 47 U.S.C. 222, 615a, 615b; 47 C.F.R. 9.3; F.C.C. regulation 9.3; Alabama Code of 1975 Title 11-98-1 through 14. The transcripts of calls made to any Alabama E-911 District are deemed public records and available for public inspection. Documents provided to courts when subpoenaed are to be certified by the custodian of records. See exh. (51) which is an example of when a public servant certifys documents they are providing.

The above is crutiele for this hon. court to take judicial notice of. Your petitioner has already mentioned how the G.L.F. are atty's. of record for defendants in the §1983 brought up against the arresting officers, and also how they are employees of the City of Phenix City Alabama. In the §1983 there is another law firm as attorneys for the defendants. See exh. #(1) and notice the law firm of McKoon and Gamble. The attys for the defendants in case # 3:16cv839 do not work for the county of Russell Co. Alabama, were not privy to the ex parte subpoena duces tecum served on the county E-911 District but by some "coincidence" they were able to intercept the sought transcripts, remove what was needed by your petitioner to present at the trial, and insure that your petitioner recieved the spoliated subpoenaed documents after trial was already over. See exh (52), a copy of the envelope the above documents were recieved in, post marked 5/17/19 (on a friday) expected delivery 5/18/19 (on a saturday), the institutional mail would be closed on 5/18/19, and reopen 5/20/19. Your petitioners trial was over on 5/20/19 and he did not get the documents until after his return from court. These are the same documents that judge Watkins was satisfied as being already submitted to the court. Exhs # (53) and (54) are the totality of what your petitioner recieved. It should be noted that there is no certification from the E-911 custodian of record therefore the District Judges claim that respondants responded is erroneous. It should also be noted by this court that your petitioner asked new standby counsel after he became primary Atty. for appeal, for a copy of the E-911 submittle to the court which was placed and filed in the docket, to see if in fact there was any such submittal and if so was it the same material your petitioner recieved after the trial was over. Your petitioner asked the trial judge for a copy of the same and has been ignored by both. The above was also brought directly to the attention of the 11th Cir. Court. See exh. (55). Also see exh. (56) doc 152, in which your petitioner brought the above to the trial judge's attention. The lawfirm of McKoon and Gamble blatantly lied about the documents not being modified. See exh. (54), there are over 50 modifications. Then they sat in for the entirety of the trial and could have given your petitioner the documents they intercepted and spoliated there in court. At least you petitioner would have been able to use those spoliated documents. McKoon and Gamble's actions were meant to sabotage the trial and cause collateral estoppel or res judicata in their client's favor for case # 3:16cv839, and to cover up armed robbery by the Phenix City Police arresting officers against your Petitioner, volative of the "so called" 4^{th}, 5^{th}, 6^{th} and 14^{th} Amend. protections.

It gets worse. During the trial the Judge zealously and constantly stopped the trial, removed the jury and warned your petitioner about anything that touched base on suppression topics even when there was no objection by the government. but the court never once sua sponte interfered with the governments presentations even when their actions were obviously contrary to law. See exh. 56 + 65 line 755. Basically the court assisted the government by saving those trained Atty's when they missed something they should have objected to. but acted indifferent or deliberately ignorant when, your Petitioner, an untrained, uneducated, pro-se litigant missed anything. the court was therefore working with the prosecution. See exh 57 doc 801.

The court was so abnoxious to self representation that it would not even provide your petitioner with the trascripts of the hearings in which he tried to get Atty. Andrew skier removed as counsel and standby counsel. See exh. 58 a court order denying the above. It should be noted that Atty. Preston Presley became primary counsel of record for sentencing and direct appeal. Said Atty. refused to request and provide those transcripts your petitioner asked for in exh 58 doc 819. Nor did said atty. object to the drug quantity. See exhs. 35 and 43, Volative of the 6^{th} Amend.

It gets worse in direct appeal. Your petitioner specifically reserved issues he wanted presented to the circuit court on the docket. First your petitioner insisted that Atty presley appeal the fact that there was never any 911 call whatsoever. See exh 59 doc # 702 pgs 6 over to 7, which clearly states that the E-911 District never recieved a 911 call. If Russell county has no extant information about a 911 caller then the "anonymous 911 caller" was invented by Cpl. Bishop and Sgt. Cutt to cover up armed robbery. Also see exhs. 53 and 54, there is no record of any 911 call at 5:01 am as shown in exh. 25. The Russell county E-911 district is the first point of contact for all 911 calls in that area. No exceptions. They are who relay callers to the paramedics, fire dept, or police. Atty Preston Presley never presented the above to the circuit court. Mr. Presley also refused to consult with your petitioner at all.

Said atty. told your petitioner to file Doc 182 outlining the way the court treated him and preserving those issues for appeal. He promised that even if your petitioner failed to preserve the issues he wanted addressed correctly that by Doc. 182 he would know what he was to address in direct appeal and would do so. See exh. 60 pg 2 under "Law" and throughout the 99 page motion.

Not only did Preston Presley not bring up the issues your petitioner wanted addressed, he didn't even bother to file an Anders brief for two reasons. First he knew that those issues listed in exh 60 are not frivolous. And secondly he did not want to get on the bad side of the district court. Furthermore the Atty. would not reply to any of your petitioner's attempts to communicate with him.

The brief Mr. Preston submitted was so vague and insufficient that the circuit court couldn't even determine what relief was being requested for. See appeal brief, (Appendix (B)) supplemental appeal brief, and the ruling of the circuit court Appx (D) page 12, 2nd ¶. The circuit court affirmed your petitioner's conviction. See Appx (D).

Your petitioner filed for permission to submit a pro-se petition for rehearing and was granted the same. F.C.I. Estill was destroyed by a tornado. Your petitioner (along with the entire population of said FCI) was shipped to U.S.P. Lewisburg seperately from all personal and legal property.

Because of the above the Petitioner requested a "Stay of Tolling of DEADLine For Petition For Rehearing". See exh (66). The court granted it. See exh. (67) and (68). Your petitioner was ordered to file monthy status reports, because U.S.P. Lewisburg would not give him his personal property or legal materials. See exh. (69). In exh. (69) your Petitioner outlines of the issues and obstacles he is having with all parties.

The Atty. Mr. Presley was ordered to respond. Then your petitioner was allowed to make a reply. Afterwards Mr. Presley responded to the reply. Your Petitioner was never given a copy of either responses by Presley. Your petitioner brought the first occurance to the attention of the circuit court. Only then did said Atty. provide your Petitioner a copy of his first reply. Your Petitioner complained to the circuit that the Atty. did the exact same thing again RIGHT AFTER THE COURT ORDERED HIM TO PROVIDE HIS FIRST RESPONSE TO YOUR PETITIONER! (emphasis added). The second complaint fell on death ears. To this day your Petitioner has never recieved a copy. By the above inaction of the 11th Cir. court, is it to be understood that your Petitioner has no right to know what Presley's response was so that he couldn't dispute it? The court did make sure that Atty Presley recieved copies of all your petitioner's complaints against him. See exh (70). That, to your petitioners basic understanding contradicts the so called "adversarial system" the federal courts are supposed to be based on.

Your Petitioner continued to file his monthly status reports on time because he was only at U.S.P. Lewisburg on "emergency transfer" pending redesignation to an F.C.I. He never recieved his legal materials while there.

Thereafter he was transfered to F.C.I. Schuylkill. Then from nowhere and without any reason that was made known to Your Petitioner the court denied him the opportunity to file his "pro-se Petition for Rehearing". See exh. (71). The Petitioner filed a "Motion to Reopen the Appellant's Petition for Rehearing; En Banc Rehearing". The circuit Court denied said motion. See Appr. (E). At the point of that final denial Your Petitioner STILL hadn't recieved his legal docs.

Now your Petitioner is here in the instant court begging this honorable court to please correct the above injustices.

Your petitioner tried to obtain the original 911 transcripts from its source years prior to the instant federal indictment. See exh. (73), a motion for discovery docketed 11-6-16; (74), a motion to compel 911 transcripts dated 1-27-17; exh. (75), 2nd motion requesting authentication dated 2-26-17 (the first such filing was dated 1-26-17) filed in state court. Your Petitioner also tried to obtain the original 911 - everything - in case no. 3:16cv839 in the district court that prosecuted the instant case much prior to federal indictment. See exh (7) ¶ 10 a motion for injunction in which the court denied the same in ¶ 13 but ordered the sought files preserved, spicifically not modified on 11-17-16. It should be noted by this court that exh. (54) the E-911 System Log table shows that the defendants in case 3:16cv839 modified the files 8 times after ordered not to by the court but over 50 times total. That is spoilation of evidence / destruction of evidence needed for defense. Your petitioner was denied the above evidence to cover up the armed robbery. (emphasis added).

Your Petitioner was precluded from presenting a full defense at trial, See Kimmelman v. Morrison, 477 U.S. 365 (1986). Favorable, exculpatory, and impeaching evidence was destroyed by the Phenix City police, via ——— the Graham Legal Firm prior to Federal indictment. It was destroyed to create res judicata or collateral estoppel in the instant case and 3:16cv839. The above "crosscontaminated" the instant case. See Kimmelman at 477 U.S. 365, 375 (1986) It is immaterial that there may have been evidence to convict. The issues here are that the state government's misconduct has precluded your Petitioner from proving his innocence, armed robbery, and "denied his ability to present a defense". Brady v Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963); also see Exh. (16) pgs 15, 16, 17. The "District and Circuit court where made aware of the above, but facilitated it by doing nothing. When the federal prosecutor was asked in discovery motion for the original they claim to have searched for them and that what was being requested was already provided in full. They provided exhs. (25) and (32) that proved to be false because the requested docs. were delivered the day AFTER trial was over. See exhs. (52)(53)(54). The above contravenes many of the 5th, 6th and 14th amends. having to do with presenting a defense. In reality the Federal government was hiding the above in the hands of the E-911 district in bad faith.

Federal law is clear. All 911 callers are identified and located whether the caller uses a cell phone, computer, landline, or other electronic device. See 47 U.S.C. §§ 222(d), 332, 615(b), 615a; 18 U.S.C. §§ 2701 — 2710; The Net Act of 2008 (P.L. 110-283). Also The Russell Co. Emergency Communications District is bound by Alabama law to collect and store all the information your petitioner had been requesting for years. See Ala. Code 1975 title § 11-98-1 through 11-98-14. And a custodian of records must attest and certify the the 911 records. It violates Amends 5 and 6, pretending they do not.

Because the government denied existance of the original 911 call transcripts, and the courts acceptance of that claim, notwithstanding that said finding is contrary to established federal and state laws denied your petitioner of the sought evidence, in violation of Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963). The above only served to cover-up blatant armed robbery, knowingly and in bad faith. There was no fair, impartial pretrial proceedings.

There is no such thing as an anonymous 911 caller, especially when there is no record, whatever, of the caller requesting to remain anonymous.

The court created a labyrinth for your Petitioner in order to stop him from obtaining the requested evidence. It confounded the subpoena process and discovery process in order to discourage him in self representation. Along with what has already been stated, when your petitioner would not give up the court created new hybred rules from thin air. They attached the local rules of court for the Mid. Dist. of Ala. Rule 16 to FRCrP 17 requests. (emphasis added). The court granted and issued subpoena duces tecum. See Docket ¶, 310. The court denied the assistance in enforcing subpoena order it issued by adding the above local rule as a prerequisite. Judge Susan Walker states, "this is a discovery motion and does not meet the conferencing and certification requirements" which have nothing to do with Doc. 310 at all. See Appx F ¶, 311. The above is an abuse of discretion, plain error, and judicial misconduct. The District judge was made aware, the circuit court was also made aware, but facilitated the above by doing nothing. Your petitioner challages the District court to show any like

Treatment of a licensed Atty in thier court.

Your petitioner filed objections to the magistrate's misapplication/combination of Local rule 16 and FRCrP 17. See Appx F ¶¶'s 311, 312, 335, 337. The district judge ignored them and the magistrate is the judge that responded to the complaints agaist her herself. Your petitioner was thereby denied accesst to the District Judge, full and fair Concideration, and due process. See exh 60 pg 16 for many more examples of how the court blocked self representation by way of labyrinth created by them. Volative of Amend 5 and 6.

The same way a person subpoenaed to court cannot miss court after being served by claiming no one conferred with them, niether can respondants ignore subpoena duces tecum. The above only served to cover-up armed robbery, in bad faith. In order to Knowingly prevent your petitioner from obtaining the 911 detailes, instead of ruling my use of case law erroneous she used antiquated case law to counter your petitioner. 911 did not exist when Friend v Burnham and Morrill Co., 55 F.2d @ 151-52 (1st Cir 1932) was ruled on nor is the case precedent. See docket ¶546; also see exh 60 pg 19. The court allowed respondants across the board to ignore subpoena duces tecum orders for 5 months, see docket ¶'s 133, 134, 135, 137, 138, 154 filed Nov. of 2018, all the way till 10 days before the trial, and your petitioner still, to this day has not recieved many. Even if the court did get respondants to submit subpoena requests to the clerk, it was not recieved by the subpoena applicant, Your petitioner. Your petitioner went to trial with nothing because of the above in violation of Amends 5 and 6; also see exh. 60 pg 20 ¶ 78 and exh 59, a court order making the unsubstantiated presumption that your petitioner recieved subpoena materials because the court had thereby insured that he, a pro-se defendant, went to trial with nothing, in bad faith, knowingly disregarding the 5th and 6th supposed protections against this exact abuse of governmental power wielded by the courts and federal government. The "Ole Boy" system in Alabama is real not a myth and was the motive for the covering up armed robbery committed by Sgt. Cutt and Cpl. Bishop. See exh. 60 pg 20, in which your petitioner is asking the District Court for things not recieved by him months AFTER THE TRIAL.

Your Petitioner has a 6th Amend. right to the assistance of the court in the enforcement of subpoenas it orders without the above described, unduly prejudicial, egregious treatment. The courts show of enforcing subpoena orders at the 11th hour was a sham which produced nothing for the Petitioner to use at trial, which for the most part he has never recieved, or recieved after the trial, but allegedly the court has.

The record of this case shows only overt unfairness.

Court appointed Atty. Andrew Skier's refusal to subpoena witnesses expressly requested by your Petitioner (see pg 6 over to 7 above) for suppression is also volative of so called 6th Amend. "compulsory clause" guarantees. They were first hand witnesses. Insuring thier absence only served to cover up armed robbery.

The court knowingly facilitated the harrasment of defense witnesses by the P.C.P.D. by doing nothing. The court should have held a hearing into the matter. This is also volative of the so called 6th Amend "compulsory clause". The logic behind not having a hearing is obvious. A hearing would have required locating the witnesses and bringing them to court. If the court located them for a hearing they would also likely have come to trial. Many facts favorable to your petitioner would have come to light, possibly culpable information against Cutt and Bishop too. Therefore no hearing was held to cover up armed robbery. It should also be noted that no P.C.P.D. personel subpoenaed by the court for your Petitioner bothered to go to the trial. That is also volative of the so called "compulsory clause" of the 6th Ament; also see the courts denial of its assistance in protecting defense witnesses in Docket ¶'s 279 and 365; and exh. 39. Court order Doc. 365 is a blatant obvious gross abuse of discretion and facilitation of the intimidation of defense witnesses, knowingly and in bad faith. Can this court direct your petitioner as to any federal or state precidence for a member of the judiciary to, in his discretion, turn a blind eye to intimidation of trial and suppression witnesses? Also see Docket "Doc." ¶ 577, where, again, your petitioner brings to the court's attention P.C.P.D. witness intimidation.

See Exh 30 pg 49 @ ¶13 "the DOJ indicted me in this case but refuse to investigate the armed robbery of me by the Phenix City Police who arrested me. I still demand equal protection". To facilitate the cover up of the armed robbery the District court would not even take judicial notice, persuant to FRE 201(d)(a), of the fact that 911 centers identify the device and location of all 911 callers. See Docket ¶# 281.

The trial judge in Docket ¶ 487 stated "if new facts come to light, the trial judge in exercise of his discretion may concider anew the suppression issue". In his discretion when gross misrepresentations and perjury by the federal case agent at suppression painting your petitioner in the light of a tresspasser expressly told he was unwelcomed at 1804 timberland drive was disproven in trial by Kimberly Shearers, in person and no proof of any 911 call, was still not enough to revisit those issues but more likely it was expidient not to visit those issues in order to cover up armed robbery.

The above is plain error and gross abuse of discretion. Your Petitioner made many very specific discovery requests for the 911 information (he recieved the day after trial). See Docket #'s 597, 417, 503, 419, 420, 428, and 440 just to name a few of the governments denial of those E-911 records. The court accepted the governments excuses notwithstanding the fact that they are bound by law to exist. See 47 U.S.C. §222, 615a, 615b; and Ala. Code 1975 title § 11-98-1 through 14. The court rubber stamped all government assertions to knowingly block your petitioner from procuring any evidence lending weight to the armed robbery accusations against the P.C.P.D.

With the help of the court Standby Counsel created a tactical imparament to self representation. For example: Your Petitioner requested funds for an expert witness. The court tactically refered him to Standby counsel. Standby counsel doesnt bother to read the pro-se request. Instead of filing for an expert witness he requests an in vestigator. The petitioner also filed Doc. 187 on 12/18/18, pursuant to the same was defered to Skier by court on 2/4/19 and recieved no response from Skier, instead he filed Doc. 451 on 3/21/19, 3 months after Doc. 187, two weeks before trial. The "investigator" from the fly by night office created specifically for the instant case would not respond to your Petitioner. Your Petitioner brought it to the courts attention, the magistrate whom first defered him to Skier now tells your petitioner in Doc. 624, "Defendant is responsible for communicating with his own investigator". See Docket for above references. In the end they created an ingeneous way to deny your petitioner any expert witness or investigator at all, knowingly, in bad faith to cover-up armed robbery. It should be noted that your petitioner didnt ask Skier to file for the investigator in the first place.

The above was a blockade to your petitioner's ability to present a defense in violation of Faretta v. Cal, 422 U.S. 809 (1975).

Your petitioner filed over 100 complaints against Skier. In the end the way court appointed standby counsel completely refused to give your Petitioner the Columbus Georgia address to Cpl. D. Bishop was a complete denial of self representation in violation of the 5th and 6th Amends, and Faretta v. Cal, 422 U.S. 809 (1975). Skier refused to provide the requested address even after he was removed as standby counsel. Nor did the court order him to produce it, nor did the court sanction him. Instead the court facilitated the above to cover up armed robbery and long time Phenix City small town corruption.

The court covered up armed robbery and curruption stopped your petitioner from questioning Sgt. Cutt about planting drugs in the rental car, and issued him a warning, threatening your petitioner. The only reason for shutting down that line of questioning was to cover-up armed robbery and stop your Petitioner from attacking the credibility of government witnesses. In violation of Amends. 5 and 6.

It should be noted that Your Petitioner never once asked for anything from anyone that was unethical, illegal, or unreasonable. He only asked for things the U.S. Constitution purports to guarantee. The pretrial proceedings, suppression hearing, and trial have created a miscariege of justice.

For direct appeal your Petitione was represented by Atty. Preston Presley. Said Atty. would not consult or communicate with your Petitioner whatsoever. Niether did he reference exh. (30) which he told your Petitioner to draft and submit in the first place. Nor did he address the issues listed and preserved in pro-se post trial motions including exh (30). Nor did he file a brief claiming the issues are frivolous as required by Anders v Cal., 386 U.S. 738, and Chandler v. Fretage, 348 U.S. (1954).

Thus was your petitioner also denied effective counsel at the direct appeal stage of this case.

This case started out as an armed robbery. This court cain look at the way the government has been making it impossible for your petitioner to obtain the E-911 District transcripts. Your petitioner is the victim here. The meta data if provided will show there never was any 911 call or caller. If there is no 911 call then what where the police doing walking up that long steep dark driveway bypassing two doors they could have knocked on, walking to the back private part of the house at 5 am.... Robbing your petitioner.

Appeal Atty. appointed by the court filed a deficient appeal with the intent of causing the above issues to become procedurally default in order to cover up the armed robbery. See Anders v. Cal. 386 U.S. 738.

The above is ripe with many structural errors to due process. See McKaskle v Wiggins, 465 U.S. 168, wherein this court protected the right to self representation and ruled that obstruction of that right is a structural error. But that is just one of the many structural errors listed **herein.**

Furthermore the actual or constructive denial of counsel at pretrial, trial, post trial, or appeal stages is volative of Strickland v. Wash., 466 U.S. 668 (1984). Refusal to provide the E911 District transcripts are volative of the "Best evidence Rule". See FRE 1001 through 1004.

It is long standing Supreme Ct. Precedence that a pretextual arrest cannot be justified by the evidence it produces. How much less can an arrest based on an armed robbery be justified.

Lawlessness does not only consist of people who disregard the law by breaking it. It also encompasses the people who ignore the law by refusing to uphold it fairly. The State government "designingly utilized" state custody to destroy all exculpatory evidence to your petitioner and incriminating evidence to the Phenix City Police officers, packaged it, and handed it over to the ATF in order to circumvent the Petitioner's 5th Amend right to call Cpl. D. Bishop, (the original state case agent whom testified against your Petitioner at the state preliminary hearing,) to trial in violation of the "Silver Platter Doctrine", in order to cover up armed robbery, See Suppression transcripts page 65 paragraph 21 – 23; page 69 and 70 ¶ 19 – 25 and 1 – 8. The Federal government was not involved with the instant case until 13 months after his arrest. Also see Elkins v. U.S., 364 U.S. 206 (1960).

The above is a true and accurate statement of how your petitioner was convicted of 21§841(a)(1); 18§924(c)(1)(A); 18§922(g)(1); and enhanced persuant to §851.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

This Petition should be granted because the Statement of the case spells out how the court, arresting officer, Phenix City government, defense Attorneys, Federal Prosecutor and Circuit court acted in total disregard of the protections of the 1st, 2nd, 4th, 5th, 6th, and 14th Amendments.

There should have been an investigation into the destruction of Body Worn Camera, Patrol car interior and exterior camera footages; Armed Robbery; Destruction of and modification of E-911 District files and the authenticity of the alleged 911 call; the threatening and harrassment of witnesses for the defendant; Perjury and misrepresentations of material facts by the ATF Case agent; no motion in limine should have been allowed.

The proceeding and trial were violative of all laws cited in the Statement of case, listed in the Table of authorities. The instant case is void of due Process and only covers up armed robbery.

Fraus est celare fraudem

Through mass demonstrations it is obvious that many Americans have lost faith in the Federal court system. They feel that the root of injustice is at the front door of the courts that do nothing or little about it. This has caused a system that does not deter, but instead provides police misconduct and other abuses of governmental powers. The public feels that the court is knowingly creating structural errors to due process, acting under deliberate ignorance of easily provable police and prosecutorial misconduct in many cases.

The U.S. Fed. Courts have formalized and institutionalized certain characteristics and tendancies that intensified and have become an ever increasingly identifiable distortion of jurispudence. It has the germ of a model for social organization designed for the energetic desolving of American rights which were based on common sense by the founding fathers through the use of abstract rhetoric; abuses of process; willful misinterpretations of laws and fact; abuses of descretion; compartmentalized rulings on defense motions all of which were done throughout the instant case.

Public discontent with federal jurispudence is not a remote abstraction. all one has to do is turn on the news, go to You-tube, FB, twitter, tik tock or any other source of news to see it. the claim to justice whether made by politition or judge is now seen as an empty packaging device. the court should not think that by giving voice to this struggle the impression is conveyed of moral superiority. The court's cannot allow and cover-up curruption in thier courtrooms causing injustices as was done in this case to your petitioner.

The courts would like to be concidered the epitome of value on the scale of progress and thier own enterpretation and description of value is the abstraction to which the human endeavor is most properly committed. But it is becoming very easy to recognize instances in which Courts discribe themselves as fair and just, even when it appears to others that they are doing otherwise.

If there is to be justice in this case the government cannot, the court cannot allow armed robbers with badges to do so with impunity. There is no justice in that.

This Hon. Court should review the forgoing case because all herein presented is true, easily provable with minimal effort and will go far in promoting trust in the Federal Judiciary.

This court should order an investigation into the armed robbery of your Petitioner; a new trial; new suppression hearing; a change of venue; an investigation into destruction of exculpatory evidence and intimidation of defense witnesses by Phenix City Ala. agents; and an investigation into judicial misconduct. All of which only served to cover up armed robbery by Sgt. M. Cutt and Cpl. D. Bishop and hide small town corruption. Your Petitioner is entitled to equil protection of the law.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9-06-2021