

JUN 23 2021

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 21-5861

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20543

PRO SE BRADLEY GARRETT — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

LUMPKIN DIRECTOR TDCJ — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON & 5th cir.
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

BRADLEY GARRETT#2052570
(Your Name)

COFFIELD PRISON TDCJ 2661fm 2054
(Address)

tennessee colony, Tx, 75884
(City, State, Zip Code)

not known
(Phone Number)

ORIGINAL

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

THE QUESTION IS NOT MERELY THE WEIGHT OF LIBERTY OF PROPERTY WITHOUT LANGUAGE OF THE 14th AMENDMENT.. ONCE IT IS DETERMINED THAT DUE PROCESS APPLIES THE QUESTION REMAINS WHAT IS DUE PROCESS? IT HAS BEEN SAID BY YOUR COURTS THAT DUE PROCESS IS FLEXIBLE AND CALLES FOR SUCH PROCEDURAL PROTECTIONS AS THE PARTICULAR SITUATION DEMANDS

AT THE TIME OF TRAVEL THE DISTRICT COURT WAS OR HAD RULED IN THE FAVOR OF THE STATE DOES THE RULES APPLY TO THOSE WHO ARE BAR TIME IN TRANSFER AND UNIT MAIL NEVER REACHED PETITIONER UNTIL MONTH LATER AFTER THE THIRTY DAYS LAPSED?

PROPER ACCESS TO LEGAL MATERIAL WHILE INCARCERATED UNDER TWENTYFOUR HOUR LOCK DOWN IS TO THE STANDARD OF UNIT OR WHAT IS NEEDED TO PROPERLY RESPOND TO COURTS PROMPTLY?

UNDER LAW OF OATH WHAT IS CONSIDERED TRUE PURGURY?

CAN PURGERED TESTIMONY MAKE ANY WITNESS NON CREDIBLE?

CAN A MATERIAL ITEM STILL BE CONSIDERED ANY EVIDENCE IF IT HAS 1. BEEN CONTAMINATED? 2. HAS MORE THAN ONE DNA IN IT BUT NOT OF ANY TO THE VICTIM?

WHAT IS THE RULE ON DNA TRANSFER? IF A PERSON IS NOT PROVED TO BE AT THE SCENE OF A CRIME BUT DNA IS PRESENT IS HE STILL GUILTY?

WHAT IS THE RULING ON TRIPLE DNA MIX WITHIN CONTAMINATION OF WEATHER ELEMENT ?

IS EVIDENCE AFTER THE SEVAYOR HAS REVIEW THE CRIME SCENE THOROUGHLY POINTED OUT BY WITNES BUT NOT TESTIFIED TO OR DISCIBED?

IF A BATSON IS CALLED IN THE COURT AT THE FINISH OF THE VIDOR AND THE STANDARD OF RACE OR ETHNICITY HAS NOT BEEN REACHED BY VISABLE STANDARD IS THAT ENOUGH?

IN A JURY SHUFFLE CAN ONE JURIOR BE SKIPPED AND REPLACED WITH THE NEXT IN LINE? WITH NO CAUSE TO WHY?

WHAT IS THE STANDARD OF DUE PROSES DEPIVATION OF LIBERTY SUBSTANTIVE AS WELL AS PROCEDURAL?

HAS THE STANDER UNDER WINSHIP BEEN CHANGED OR IS THE SHADOW OF A DOUT A FLEXABLE ISSUE?

DNA WAS USED TO STRENGTHEN CASE AS TO PRESENTS AT THE SCENE BUT IT DOESNT PROVE EITHER PRESENTS OR CRIME IS DNA SUPORTED BY THE COURTS ILLIGALE SEARCH AND SEIZER OR TAINT OF TREE?

WAS MY COUNSEL INSUFICIENT IF THAT SAME DNA WAS NOT USE TO PROVE THAT TESTOMNEY OF A PHYSICAL ALTERCATION COULD NOT HAVE BEEN DO TO TRANSFER OF DNA? USED TO PROVE THE WAY THE MURDER ACCURED.

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:

RELATED CASES

GARRETT V.DAVIS 4:17-cv-03363 U.S.DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON AUGUST 31 2018 ruled dismiss without prejudice

GARRETT V.DAVIS et al., civil action H-18-3337 U.S.district COURTS FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON JUDGMENT ENTERED OCTOBER 18, 2018 JANUARY 26, 2021 MEMORANDUM AND JUDGMENT ORDER 4:18-cv-3337

GARRETT V.DAVIS H-18-3338 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION DECEMBER 4 2018 judgment

GARRETT V.HARRIS COUNTY JAIL, et al., H-19-1939 judgment entered August 9, 2019 4:19-cv-01939

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
crane v.kentucky 476u.s 683,690 106s.ct2142	3
medina v.barnes 71f.3d 363 - - - - -	11
huddleston v.u.s.686 99L.Ed 2d771 108s.ct 1496 R&R@1081 1080...	9
gentry v.sinclair693F.3d 867.	22
weaver 450 u.s@28-29 101S.ct 960	
UNITED STATES V.gaudin 515 u.s 506 510 115S.ct2310132	
winship 397u.s@361 90S.ct1068	
stone v. powell 428u.s 465 96 S.ct 2539 2600	
ex parte lange 18 wall 163 176 21 L.Ed 872	
ex parte siebold 100 u.s 371 376 25 L.Ed717	
wain wright v. sykes 433u.s 72 79 97 S.ct 2497 2502 53 L.Ed.2d 594	
morrissey v. brewer 408 u.s 484 32L.Ed 2d 484 92 sct 2539 2600	

STATUTES AND RULES

ER 404(11) under rule(404b).

9

violations of the 6th amedment and 14th amendment to
confront also resoable dout clause
5th amendment deprivation of life liberty or propertys with
out due process under federal authority
4th amendment violation of probable causes
illegal search and sezuir of dna
batson judged by a jury of peers and of ethnic statue
violation of the three step clause
jury shuffling

OTHER

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	
CONCLUSION.....	

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A IN THE FIRST COURT OF APPEALS OPINION ISSUED
MARCH 30, 2017 AFFIRMED PETITION FOR DISCRETIONARY REVIEW REFUSED
AUGUST 23, 2017

APPENDIX B DECISION OF TRAIL COURT VERDICT BY JURY GUILTY
FEBRUARY 12 2016 original verdict filed in the court

APPENDIX C DECISION OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF
TEXAS SOUTHERN HOUSTON FINAL JUDGMENT NOVEMBER 29, 2018
DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE DENIED APPEALABILITY

APPENDIX D UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEAL FOR THE FIFTH CIR.
panel DISMISS FOR LACK OF JURISDICTION MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
DENIED MAY 6, 2021

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

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 D to the petition and is

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

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

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

☒ For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix A 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 TRAIL COURT court appears at Appendix B to the petition and is

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

JURISDICTION

☒ For cases from federal courts:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was MAY 6 2021 -APRIL 5, 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: MAY 6, 2021, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix D.

☐ 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 AUGUST 23, 2017
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix A.

☒ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: SEPTEMBER 13 2017, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix A.

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

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

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

THE 14th amendment section #1. ALL PERSONS BORN OR NATURALIZED IN THE UNITED STATES AND SUBJECTED TO THE JURISDICTION THEREOF ARE CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES AND OF THE STATE WHEREIN THEY RESIDE. NO STATE SHALL MAKE OR ENFORCE ANY LAW WHICH SHALL ABRIDGE THE PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES OF CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES; nor any DEPRIVE ANY PERSON OF LIFE LIBERTY OR PROPERTY WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF LAW, NOR DENY ANY PERSON WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION THE EQUAL RIGHT OF PROTECTION OF LAWS

IF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT APPLYS TO ALL OF THE UNITED STATES THE QUESTION IS IS TEXAS APART OF THE STATES AND DOES THE RULES GIVE YOU A RIGHT TO TAKE AWAY MY PRIVILEGE TO ARGUE IN THE FIRST APPEAL MY ATTORNEY AGUED ABOUT THE FACT AND THE WAY IT WAS HANDLED AS THE LIGHT SHINES ON THE FOURTH AMENDMENT MORE THAN THE FOURTEENTH BUT THEY BOTH GO HAND AND HAND AS TO AFTER A ILLEGAL SEARCH AND SEIZURE OF DNA AS THOUGH YOU DIDN'T know more than ONE DNA WAS PRESENT FORCES ME TO TURN OVER PROPERTY THAT DOESN'T PROVE IN THIS CASE PRECEDES OR ACT OF SUCH ILLIGALITIES TOWARD TOWARD TEXAS OR THE UNITED STATES AS A WHOLE BUT DEPRIVES ME OF PROPERTY AND FREEDOM THAT THE CONSTITUTION STATES THAT I SHOULD BE ABLE TO ENJOY FREELY AS A CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN THE FIRST COURT OF APPEAL THERE DESIGN

TO AFFIRM WAS BASED ON THIS CASE THAT WAS NEITHER AGAIN PROFF BEYOND A REASON OF PRESENT OR CRIME THE CRIMINAL COURT OF APPEAL REFUSED BECAUSE OF FORM OF P.D.R OR NO REAL KNOWLEDGE OF FORMATE GOING PRO SE THEN DENIED ME REHEARING BECAUSE OF UNIT TRANSFER AND I WAS SUBJECTED TO DELAY EVEN WITH TIMELY INFORM OF ADDRESS CHANGE THE MAIL STILL DID NOT MAKE IT TO ME ON TIME FOR A BETTER RESULT HOW DO I PROVE THAT RULE 1998 sub(a) amendment rule 28(a)(D)(5)(6) the first is stated we are basically subjected to what ever the advisory committy states we have no other choicethen to use what is designed for us weather it fails us or not

in the same event this has accured several times this has accured in everyone of the appedix from A&D MAIL SEVED TIMLY HAS BEEN A ISSUE THE DISTRICT COURT BASED THERE OPPION ON LAYLA WUKKE TESTIMONY CALLEN IT COMPELING NOT GIVE LIGHT TO THE FACT THAT SHE TESTIFIED TWICE BOTH TIMES SHE TOLD A DIFFERENT STORY AND AGAIN SHE WAS THE ONLY ONE TO TESTIFY THAT PETIONER MURDERED SCOTT CLARK STILL THE COURT LEAN TOWARD TESTIMONY MARION SANDERS STATED THAT THE STATE VISITED HIM TO OFFER HIM A DEAL TO DO AWAY WITH A SETENCE OF FAMILY VIOLENCE THAT HE WAS STILL ON BAIL FOR PENDING THE TIME OF THE CASE EDWARD WOODROW THE OTHER VICTIM WAS IN TDCJ AT THE TIME AN WAS SHIPPED IN TO TESTIFY FOR POSSABIL RELIEF FOR WHAT HE WAS DOWN FOR AND AS HIS CRIMINAL HISTORY SHOWS HES A CONTENUED OFFENDER WHO AT THE TIME SHOULD HAVE BEEN FACEN MORE THAN TEN YEARS AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL THERE USING PAPER WORK NOT THE FACTS TO BE REVIEWED STATED A VIOLATION OF SUB C NONE EXHAUSTION OF STATE REMIDIES OR TIME BARES IMPROPER FILEN ECT. EVERY THING BUT THE FACTS THAT HAVE ALREADY BEEN STATED LEAVEN A VIOLATION OF THE FIFTH AMENDMENT UNDER THE TERM COMPULSORY SELF INCRIMINATION WITH THESE ISSUES YOU FOCEN ME UNDER THESE

WORD AS THOUGH THEY ARE UNBRELAS TO STOP THE RAN WHILE MY FEET ARE SOAKED

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

CONSTITUTIONAL ERROR TO ADMIT EVIDENCE THAT IS TOTALY
WITHOUT RELEVANCE TO THE CRIMINAL PROCEEDING DAWSON

V. DELAWARE 303 U.S. 139 165 112 S.Ct 1093 117 L.Ed.2d

309 evidence as the hat and perjured testimony is

introduced rendered the trial constitutional and not

fundamentally unfair the due process clause of the

14th amendment provides a mechanism for relief payne

v. tennessee 501 U.S. 808 825 111 S.Ct 2597 115 L.Ed.2

720 there are violations of the double blind citing

tegoseak v. state 221 p.3d 345 stephen being turned

around at the door

all found in the 22 pages of the threshold burden

file. ineffective assistance if our own forensic

37 specialist had been citing miller vanderson changed

petitioner again prays that you see what he sees and

grant this relief and writ of certiorari

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On or about the 22nd of June at a club petitioner was said to have worked a man was murdered by the name of Scott Clark he and two other guys fully intoxicated on PCP and alcohol created a disturbance at the club that involved the security of the club it was said that several fights broke out that night and morning and that petitioner was the one who was doing the fighting at some point it was testified that petitioner became so angry that he lifted Scott Clark up off his feet fully slamming him on the hood of a Tahoe truck belonging to a Layla Wutkee with one hand while brandishing a gun and firing one solid round in to the head of Scott Clark depriving him of life in the same movement it was testified that he also continued to kill one of the guys he arrived with causing also bodily harm to him as well as Edward Woodrow sustained four multiple gunshots to the legs crippling him for the rest of his life although it's not clear how all of this happened or precise time it all occurred or where the gun or guns came from or if he was even there to begin with even the lead homicide detective in collection of footage

testified he saw no crime being committed on tape there are no weapons found there are no finger prints there is only the testimony of one Layla Wutkee a hat that no one testifies to in description though the hat is very unique even presented in black and white photo it became the center of evidence to prove presents of petitioner that night at the club even though testimony says he was elsewhere and the DNA on the hat itself was testified to two other DNA's of two other people are in that hat the hat in question the one is said the shooter wore but no one described petitioner was found guilty of first degree murder and sentenced to 30 years in TDCJ CID with parole and this appeal since 2016 petitioner has been trying to with little knowledge complete the appeal process on February 12th 2016 the jury brought back the verdict of guilty petitioner explains it all in detail of all the issues in a 21 page breakdown of the case add to this petition he asks if you're willing to walk through it and the transcript I'm sure you will see enough.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Before I go and take a look at the rule ten and try to find where I fit in I would like to say this in why I pray you grant this writ because petitioner was never given a proper chance to do to handy caps of knowledge of law not only is this his first time seeing these things he's attempting it at his own risk to point out what even the jury looked over that the state allowed that the testimony doesn't even match the evidence presented petitioner has taken a beaten from unit mail rooms to staff to being transferred several times even placed in a 23-24 hour a day lockdown to discourage the use of the legal system the same one that turns him down and want listen to unit mailrooms doing what they fill with mail even though books say thirty days and he's received correspondence one week to days to return it to your courts with three shots a week to come up with the proper info to even know if he headed in the right direction several times even now mail is taken several more days then it should to get to him so that it can be properly answered he's left to choose to keep trying in an environment to stop his progress or become one of these mindless drug induced men who wear this incarceration as some kinda badge proud to be an inmate he would like to beg you to grant this writ to stop the deprivation of his due process and legal right to a fair trial without miss use of law tipped in the favor of prosecution trying to create truth truth is not as we see here bribes guides and coercion of witnesses we just need the facts and the facts should tell it all without a reasonable doubt as winship points out ANY reason to doubt is too much but when a case presents more than a reason then help is needed from the true fact finders to bring things back into the scope of justice

THE UNITED STATES
SUPREME COURT, SCOTUS

BRADLEY GARRETT

V.

LUMPKIN

NO.20-20561 USDC NO.4;17-c
v-3363

THRESHOLD BURDEN

petitioner believes that he
has been violated in several
ways that due process has
been one is notice and the
opportunity to be heard by
an unbiased judicial platform
and is aware that the state
of TEXAS located in the
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
UNDER THE full jurisdiction
of the SUPREME COURT
in a substantive and procedu-
ral manner in all forms and
rights we know the concept
of substantive is personal
liberty and is used to prote-
ct fundamental rights from
arbitrary deprivation by the
state and government
the story starts JUNE 22, 2014
on this date the petitioner was
accused of and indicted by a
grand jury in the city of Houston
Harris County located in TEXAS
OF first degree murder of a one
Scott Clark the prosecution
states that the petitioner with a
weapon did and knowingly cause bodily
harm to deprive life from Clark
Scott King and ask that the
jury find him guilty of murder
this occurred on the date of
February 9th 2016 to the date
of February 12th 2016 trial
jury ended in sentence 30
years with appeal
privilege petitioner acknow-
ledges that the privileges
given to him to attack the
collateral under initial appeal
PDR, 2254 and the 11.07 the
2255 gives rule of jurisdiction
as of this date in the above

style the petitioner was informed
that at this moment the fifth
circuit has NOT the jurisdiction
to pursue any further the grounds
or issues that could find relief
from this sentence
this threshold is to give full view
on the issues unheard by the
fact finders or trier of fact
the reason for this is that
the petitioner is sure that all
the facts are and have been
met so to avoid rejection and
another deprivation of due process
before reaching the proper parties
after the opening statement
the trial states with one
BILL FEATHERSON located in
transcript RRPP18 v3
in this witnesses questioning
by the state there's a video
being shown to the jury that
the state is claiming to be
real time footage of the murder after the fact
direct on top of the body
as Ms Baldwin calls it pg 31
14-18 line
exhibit no. 50 a dvd print out
of Bill Featherston's cell phone
of the scene of the crime even
with him filming the scene
he and his lieutenant Michael Jack
-son Bill states on pp26 v3
that he couldn't make out a
full description yet petitioner's
transcript index log states
that a 911 phone call was made
with description of suspect as
a white male was described
approx 6ft tall
please see the exhibit recorded
labeled s-1 admitted pp25 v3
the dvd taken by cell phone
labeled s-50 located pp28 v3
now again recall pp26 v3 lines
1-18 on pp34 v3 7-13 asked
again about the phone calls
to 911 yet he stated earlier
in testimony under oath that
he didn't get a good description
of the suspect but he saw again
listen to the 911 calls
petitioner fills that this along with
other testimony
that is very similar to this

kind of testimony all through
the states witnesses and formation
of the states plan to contradict
and under mind the laws and
rules set by the united states
legal system to keep up the
numbers of convictions more
wrongfully than right in the
state of TEXAS
deprived petitioners as my self
of due processprocedural or
substantive as I stated in
the intro or this threshold
petitioners attorney was incompatible
because of not bringing things
like this to light the fact finder
was at fault because these
things were over heard and

recorded in transcript yet
nothing was done about it to
bring light to the deprivation
citing crane v. kentucky 476 us
683 690 106 s. ct 2142 (1984)

several of these witnesses testimony
perjury even detectives as
well as so called eye-witness
accounts leads you not to
lean to the credibility of
any of the eye witness accounts
yet the state still calls it
compelling testimony for the
rest of what will be pointed
out we will cite

medina v. barnes 71f.3d 363

at this point you have to be
as I would and that understanding
say well this is a isolated
testimony that can be explained
via the fact that the 911
phone call says that of a white
male and the petitioner is a
black male about 5'9 5'10
230 to 275 in weight but lets
walk through more testimony
like this the next witness
the state calls is an officer
patrol by the name of harper who was the patrol
that answered the 911 phone
call

outside of somethings that
were out of his control
he did nothing but his job
but as we move to the head
~~homicide~~ detective we start

the head homicide detective
Mark Condon who is as he says
a homicide gang murder squad says he
was called about 8:15am now
may the courts be aware that
this lead detective testified not once but twice
found at 46 v3 73v3 66 v5 78 v5
and 97 v5 but first lets walk
though 46 v3 8:15 is when he
got the call he says on pp51v 3
that it takes him 45mins to
a crime scene who can for see
that but it is his truth so
he goes on about his partner
first he says they arrive together
then he says on pp52 I arrived first
he arrived after then he is
shown whats marked as exhibit 5-30
these are photos of the crime scene
fine rite but what strikes me as
strange is that although officer
harper the first patrol cop
after the two security guards on
the scene stated that he was not
able to secure the full scene
of the crime just the section
where the body lay now mark
condon gets on the stand an
under oath on pp54v3 and 55v3
states how important the tappen of the crime
scene is see harpers testimony on pp42v3
43v3 44v3 also notice that
on pp55v3 mark condon lead
homicide detective recalls
hat, blood ,shells and a twenty dollar bill
were is this going if you keep
reading to pp56v3 he speaks
on markers that patrol put down
as the conversation keeps going
he makes a comment about the
use of rocks to hold cups in
place he was asked was it windy
he says he doesnt recall when
asked if he remembers weather he states
he thinks it may have rained
what in the 45min it took you saw no rain
or the pictures of a wet boddy on the
ground wet vehicals condensation under the cups
does not tell the story it self
line 20 of pp56v3 tells of a erring
exhibit no.10 thers a shell
on the hood he mentions layla wuttke
the number one witness for the state
suposed on her vehical is wwer the
murder accured mark condon was asked

was there any evidence retrieved
from the vehical he said not
inside and what about the outside
all of which came up inconclusive
because what mark condon is not
saying and the state is dancing around is that
it rained for more than two
hours on the crime scene before
and while he was there
he showed up to a already contaminated
crime scene which started back
with the two security blue moon officers
prefilming the crime scene for themselves
were we will later find out that
mark condon did not discover
the cell phone footage till days
later even after the indictment was settled
see pp 66v3 here he states that
a Mr. Freeman gave him the information
to file murder charges but here
in pp 72v3 his report says he was
looking for a ricky never displayed
with short hair the photo array presents
long hair even dreadlocked men
then on the next pp 73 the
redirect by state asked one question
and again they go to layla's
testimony before she testifies to it
or anything as though state counsel is sure of
it before it happens as though some
sort of coercion or script was being
used to get to the conviction planned
he contradicts himself by stating in
pp 74 v3 that another officer put
together the spread first he said he did
from Freeman's video he further states
that he took the photo array to
Woodrow the other victim in the crime scene
who was shot at this point in the hospital
heavy sedated under what ever
PCP is still in him and hospital
given drugs to stop pain his bones
are broken from the bullets
Duy Nguyen testifies next to
the statement that Mark Condon
will be re-called Duy Nguyen is the
forensic science specialist
who surveyed the crime scene
the statement that makes this
interesting is that the evidence in
this case was a trainee's first day
as stated in pp 79v3 line 4-5 he
says I was still training
his next statement makes you
think a little more line 6-9 states that

that he usually talks
to a homicide detective to see
what he needs so as he states he needs the
homicide detectives there to
collect what they need in the
pp88v3 the state is asking about
the position of the hat and shoe
in pp89 the court over rules the objection
about the questioned crime scene items
the court allows Mr. Nguyen states
he may have been running away and he
ran so the shoe and the hat came off that's how
close in proximity the hat and the shoe
is he also states that it looks like the
shooting started from the door out to the parking
lot he also states he looked
like meaning Mr. Scott Clark victim
was trying to get to the car
if so were was his car because Woodrow
and Sanders both in their testimonies
state they had no car they were all on foot
all fifty of them but we will get to them
the forensic specialist or trainee
confirms that on pp97v3 line 2-8
that the crime scene was rained on
Ms. Baldwin continues to question him about
the contaminated scene he proceeds
as though he doesn't know or was
not that pp98 v3 line 14-20
my question is that okay to
still collect samples of contaminated
evidence if that's what it is
pp111v3 the admitted paper bag
exhibit no. 43, 42 and the center
item of evidence the supposed
worn baseball cap by the petitioner
at the time of the murder pp
114v3 line 4-25 asking how
far did he observe the crime
scene pp115 asking him about
surveillance equipment Ms. Baldwin
walks through his log making sure
he understands that the crime
scene is contaminated but he
continues as though he doesn't
know any better pp116-119 all
she even makes clear that there's no weapon
base to even say were the fragmented
projectiles could have come
from the question were they return fire
or from the gun that killed
Clark Scott he can't answer those
questions Baldwin recross pp120-121
v3 she backs and asks the question
are you not aware of the crime scene

He still doesnt understand but confirms that if there is any question to if the crime scene was contaminated we are sure to say this because of the addmitted statement of not one but two plus exhibites photo there was no crime in him training that day but could there have been various mistakes made that could have been avoided had a person with experiance work the scene but this is not the worst of it one of the main points that trail attorney baldwin touched on was these same items brought by analysis who did work on these items yet only one showed up which brought up a sixth amendment confrontation which still has not been explained aside them saying that clay davis was the over seer of the analysis so its okay for him to testify that it was all his work and marrie rumble and other analysis are just parts of the chain the supreme court ruled that that was fair to stand in as long as he did the work petitioner states it still does not answer what happen to it in the move in the chain while it was in the hands of these other analysis moving on to the next witness MAURIAN SANDERS he starts of with one contridiction after anotherhe first startes pp122 v3sayen that this pig guy is his uncle but some how only the state knows who pig is when asked if he knew pigs real namehis answer is no seepp123v3 line 1-25 he also was asked aboutlittle wood he called him again only the state knows who he is referen to befor you get pass pp124 you start to realize that the state is going to lead this testimony but he brings light to several points like the time they got to the club he says 4am layla says 2am or 6am woodrow the other victim that was shoot says other wise no one even knows when he explains that he and these guys he was with continually stepped out to get high off pcg cigarettes on pp

126v3 he as I said induced some information that no one else opened he states that there was trouble in the club on line 13-19 describes how he felt the continue of his statement confirms there was trouble in the club that lead out side lines 20-25 speaks of a altercation on pp127 he brings references to two other individual that are not named there with them he refers to them as homboys and explain there actions to leaven in and out of the club not once or twice now he says three times pp128v3 he brings out that the altercation was with females he states that on pp129 that the female(s) were with some dudes see lines 1-14 claims he never saw the person they were fighting pp130 v3 claims it was the first time he saw the guy butchages his story again and says the guy was all over inside and out again states a girl was involved guns were drawn as he fought them off pp 131v3 security became involed pp132v3 he states he step in to stop it and that mr sanders tried to fight the security as he admitted that he was still high from the pcp ciggeretts he says security passed his gun then he says gunbelt he states that he sees another person with a gun now if your folloen he has testified to now three diffrent guns on the scene pp133v3 we still know who this pig is now he claims he doesnt know woodrow or wood as he calls him I assume line 22-25 he states hes going to try to get more of the I assumed 50 homboys that they were with earlyer from the neighborhood so lets stop here to discuss that know theres fighten that is confimed the victims clothen was tested for traces of any other persons DNA but was not used as to proff of inocent citing toney v.gammon 79f.3d 693 a jones v.wood 114 f.3d 1002 the blood on clothen of clark scott and although to me would be really good points we have to under stand that there may have been lots of evidece lost yet nun of it was explored verbatim to whats not their fingerprints servalince camra fottage although there is some mark condon an the review of this fottage show that there is no sign of petitioner in or

around the crime scene so I assume
 that all of this falls under chain of
 custody as the challenge of such matter
 goes to the weight not the admissibility
 of despite the fact that DNA was not
 presented for review pertaining to
 presence at the scene versus use the
 hat that neither show presence or crime
 time frame or any other link to give
 truth to the conviction handed down by
 jury and judge
 these things in the scope of FR404(11)
under rule (404(b)) huddleston v. us 485
u.s. 686 99 1ed2d 771 108 s.ct. 1496,
R&R at 1081, 1080 although the first
 move for appeal was pointed at the
 DNA missing links there were other
 as petitioner shows her things that were
 gross negligent issues that just don't
 add up to law as shown all these double
 contradictions by important witnesses
 as we go further we even find that the
 line ups picks were done by the officers
 instead of the witnesses
 some by hand others by suggestion but
 not proper under the rules of blind line
 up so let's continue through mr sanders
 testimony to find out what else he reveals
 about this case petitioner calls it a coercion
 gone wrong
 pp133v3 line 20-25 says he was going to get
 homboys out the neighborhood pp134 line 1-2
 he changes the story in line 6-8 he describes
 a hat or the hat and clothes of the person
 with the gun line 10-25 he speaks about
 a hat describes it as a all black fitted
 baseball cap the hat in question is a
 black hat but not fitted it has a buckel
 back and has five point stars all over it
 the state asks the question was it turned
 in a specific direction left or right
 the hat is under states exhibit s-43
 see the picture compare it to the testimony
 see if this is the hat described I would
 assure its not
 he describes a 5'5 5'7 5'8 person thick
 not chubby or heavy build eyes and a
 big nose dark or brown skin pp135
 pp 136-137 he testifies he ran off
 and found the two blue moon security
bill featherson and michael jackson
 when he reaches them shoots rang out
 he says he didn't see who did the shooting
 pp139v3 he states that in line 10-12
 that the line up may have been suggestive

he chages his story again and states upon being shown his line up admonishment that the petitioner was the one given the gun this makes no scence he went from not known to now implcation of the petitioner with the gun as we move toward the ends of his testimony see pp and cross exam 145-147 he testifys here that he was visited by the state to testify in this case for mercy for a felony case pending out of the 178 distict court he even goes as far as tostate in line18-20 the month they came to visit him exactly 4months befor this trail accured now my thought is they let him sit he did and signed the admonishment for the state dated for the date of june 22 2014 as though he did it that day and they let go on bond just a guess pp148v3 retail a diffrent story now he states that they split up at the club and wood or little wood the other victim who was sho did not go in to the club which is significant because later woodrow tells the stoy that he wasnt allowed in the club with the wif beater a tank top under shirt on he says he bought a shirt to come in the club but on camra he was seen with the tank top wif beater on even after being shot when defence begans to qustion him about his statment of little wood woodrow he became angrey pp149v3 lines 1-8 and had to apologize about his mood swing the court informed him of the correction of his behavior pp150-151 re capesthe phisical altercation and again says it started with him but ealyer said it started with little wood filming and a female that is still unknown he goes in depth about the use and history of his use and the desesed clark scott use of pcp and how it was used abusivly that night she turns the attention to agin understand that the line up was suggjestive pp152-153 next it took several times to understand but with the same answer and qustion so you pick the one with the big nose I wonder was it that way for all the admonishments did every body have a thing you find out not quite but to get what they were looking for yes the use some tactic even mark condon testifying as I said befor that he did it for edward woodrow and let him sign it violation and still suggjestive layla wuttke is the next to testify she to testified twice see how her story changes over and over again

LAYLA WITTKE is the next to testify first she explains her positions as this finishes she starts to explain the story of the altercation that morning as the state implies pp155v3 she starts by page pp161 she starts to explain how the three gentlemen clark woodrow and sanders started to argue with the security guard then punches were thrown she says were thrown she indicates that stephen was the security in the fight with the three men but she states petitioner did not work at h20 that night but came there to get paid from another club pp163v3 she states that she first saw petitioner at the front of the bar bought 6am pp164v3 she states when the altercation happened he was in a vehicle say he exited the vehicle when the altercation escalated she states that in lines 12-25 they tried to separate first question who is they if petitioner and stephen were the only ones involved they can stop an altercation if one is in a fight or arguing she states in line 22-23 that the petitioner fought the older gentleman in pp165v3 she clears who the older gentleman was it's clark scott or as she puts it the one that was killed she again makes references to more than one security but she implied the petitioner was her security at least that's what sanders says and woodrow to once we get to him and his testimony she clarifies sanders ran she speaks of no guns drawn on the gentleman just fighting she states more than one fight occurred she identifies petitioner in the court room but if that's all it takes to convict in the state of TEXAS one person points and saying he did it jim crow is more successful than i thought i thought it took the

of at lease two or three
it states that even in the bible
pp167 she states that the older
gentelman now clear is scott
clark the deceased asumen still
high off pcporragenin lines 9-11
he states know one knows who
he is hes sceaming she got in
her vehical pictures of it in
exhibit no.5 a key pieace of
information in line 22-25 she
states I opened my car door and
I got in heres the key befor I
could close my door she says
the guy the older gentelman was
in front of my car still talking
still going on again she says
still going on now right here
is where we put on our thought
caps why did scott clark attack
her as she states what reason
would he have as she tells it
shes just some one viewing a
altercation heres somthing
else to think about recall
a exhibit with mes exhibit
marked 27 on the picture you
see a pearl like erring and a
shell casen the shell case is
on the drivers side of the car
so is the erring did scott clark
lose it then why is not other
jewlry on th ground or hood if
all this fighting accured more
over were is the DNA he is seen
in exhibit picture no.24 wearing
mutipul pieces of necklaces wrist bands
and a watch never got broke came
off nuthen with all this testified
phisical hard fighting slaming on
car hoods and no DNA transfer
sounds kinda unbelivable but
as I said for the lead homicide
detective it her story pp168v3
lines 4-12 she states tussle
then she states petitioner pulls
a weapon gun and shot him she
states that stephen was at the
left of the vehical now I am
not a genuis but I do know left
right everything I mean all of the
item are on the left side of
the truck now if as said in line
19-20 stephen was on the front
end left side that which is the

drivers side of the vehical pp
 169v3 she states he pulled th
 -e gun from behind then she sates
 for the first time stephen gave
 the petitioner a gun in the first
 tussle so why did he waite to
 use it sound like something is
 not being said or the full story
 is not being told or this story
 was referbus to look like the
 petitioner did it but its not adding
 up for the last few lines of pp169
 shes not sure or confused about
 the question did she see this
 through the front wind shield
 I assume the state is referencen
 the shooting
 pp170 v3 is a nother confus
 statement she now says they both
 have guns or both there arms
 are raised as though they both
 have gunns in line 19 if your
 not sure of one how can you be
 sure of to and why would a cop
 woker of a job runn from people
 who woul protect and why behind
 a concret pole and not inside
 then she refused to go inside
 even after the shooting stopped
 enough to know every one else
 left but how would you know others
 left out the back and if mr garrett
 left out the back where is the
 car he was in were did it go
 why was stephen so okay to stay there
 as she states it happen he a
 excecery to a murder here is
 another issue bill featherson
 said he and his partner saw
 some one but stated nuthen about
 a possible fire fight as layla
 states it as if they walked right
 up on the shooting couldnt have
 they had a cammara phone they
 would have caught that remeber
 it was in real time they break
 she is to return the next day
 to testify futher starteson
 pp7v4-pp51v4 at this poi on pp
 10 she indicates now she sitten
 her car with the door partly closed
 and somthing else has happen
 on pp11 now it the petitioner who
 is fighten with the deased
 and stephen is now with the bars

petitioner and stephen are now shooting at mr woodrow she states on pp15 the state is now leading again as he did with sanders cause he knows that the story she is telling is so well hopful you can see layla says she did not see stephen shoot but he looked like he was while she was crouched behind the cement pole; obviously watchen the action on pp16v4 she describes the deceased as high how did she know he was high did she know him does she get high and here is what blows me away on pp16 she is carrying a phone on while she is testifying in the court room during trail layla answers the question pp17 she says its normal for people to be high and aggressive she changes the story but her actions as she explains no she speaks volumes how do you call not aggressivesceaming and theats she had to know him heres another key point: pp19v4 line 7-16 she states woodrow was pat search but he said he couldnt put on the shirt to go into he didnt woodrow is going to state he went in the bar he bought a tee shirt from some one leaven and he went in to the club were he saw the petitioner working but we will get there the real fire startes on pp29v4 and pp30v4 defence baldwin catches the purgery then she catches something else I cant say what but it seems that the questions of her listen to recordings was one thing but when she was asked about meeting with the distic attorneys office she became nerves shock up line 7-25 on pp31v4 baldwin discusses when the incident happen between 7am and 6am she states then shes asked when did these men get there she states 6am now come on sanders said that they got there bout 4am she stated they were pat searched she also stated that she was outside when they walked up how

how shes not outside till after
 6am that means they were there
 two hours more purgry pp35v4
 statments made after sanders
 was hit or threats line 7-13
 threats made by the deseased
 clark scott pp36 yet she claim
 she was not afraid that would
 make any one believe she knew
 the deased or these guts period
 she was asked could they have
 gotten weapons she states possable
 so she knew they would be able
 to accses weapons lines 14-22
 scott clark breath threats line
 18
 "I'll have all of you killed
 line 19-20 layla agrees
 pp37-48v4 summerybalwin speakes
 to the witness about an the
 enital fight or fights that I
 still cant believe happen cause
 there is no proff. again where
 is the DNA from all the so call
 tussle
 brutal slamming on hoods if this
 happen I cant believe it happen
 without a fight we know frm pp38
 that shes say woodrow never went
 in the club so the lie hes about to
 tell under oath purgry to him
 as well baldwin trappes another
 lie about the hat but no one
 discribes the hat in evidece
 not one person pp41-42 is about the hats
 as well was the petitioner wearing
 the hat discribed the next pp
 45-46v4 was concer to who left
 how they left when they left
 and a little relationship humor
 but better on pp was the key given
 by defence attorney found on
 pp48v4 at the end of the testimony
 line 3-19 state piggy backs her
 hat qustioning now we know that
 the shooter didnt have that hat
 only la states she found the hat a
 hat the hat state has a evidence
 its interesting though no one
 discribes the hat not even layla
 and she found it while hidden
 from all the violince how quincidental
 on pp49-51v4 laylas asked 9-18
 about how many people were wearing
 hats she says to but funny she cant rember

what color the defendants hat
was again she said in the recording
black like sanders were they
reading from the same now she
doesn't know now in line 17-25, in
she reviles that she does know
these guys; she knew they had
no car she states they walked
up from bissonnet how did she
know that remember she could have seen them
arrive she was inside at 4am
if that when they got there a
phone perhaps the same phone
stephen took perhaps she end
with state saying that those guys
had been there before an started
no trouble baldwin recrosses
she ask layla about how she knew
about the walk on bissonnet
she replies yes I did baldwin
counters what direction you never
said baldwin asked you would
not know if they had a car
some were else or parked it in
the strip now baldwin makes
a back to the first statement
she made to detectives cegielski
on the june of the 22nd of 2014
she lied at trial during her
statement to the police detective
she never said a color hat yet
she pointed them to a hat
and she states at the end of
her court appearance I just said
baseball cap the only color I
remember

was the color the one that is
now deceased this is the last
of the witnesses that the state
brought to prove this charge so
far I may be wrong I don't see
anything that sustains the
conviction handed down by jury
trial of the 180th court
EDWARD WOODROW is that last w
-itness; it begins with state
state acknowledge that woodrow
was already in TDCJ for tamper
with evidence sentence out of
brazoria drugs he testifies of

at time at the club they arrived
he says 3:30am some time close to
4am he was asked where were you
~~before~~ prior to coming he

He stated he and pig were at dees a niger african club rihght across the street. When asked what time he and pig left the club to come over to h2o he states 2am. so he would have made it befor 3:30am but okay it his story but be mindful of three diffrent times of arrival none of which match the time layla would have been present to see them arrive or be search pp16v5line 9-10 as I said her it is on pp18v5 see line 1-20 woodrow white shirt not bought but some on gave him cause they were leaven the club after he got it he said he went in to play pool he describes how he had trouble in the club but only speakes of the phon call on the way out pp19v says he had two phones said he was beig accused of being the police security takes his phone pp20v5 find out him and the manager knew each other pp21 indicates petitioner as a bouncer and security guard says he seen petitioner a couple of times in the club -b pp22v5 he states he was told petitioner worked there called for hear say then said he saw petitioner two months straight he identifys petitioner again as the man in the courtroom he states when he came up that the petitioner and security was in the front at the door in the front pp23v5 says security asked him for the code to the phone he would not so they start to fight he and the security see pp24-25v5 he pig clark scott and the security are fighten pp26v5 he says pig scott clark stated that some one hit him in the face with a gun but he says he did not see that the gun and the belt was in the same place they went back to arguen about the phon dee the manager comes out tels the guard and petioer to go inside the comply pick up there thing and leave he said petitioner picked up the gun and go inside he states thats the last person he saw the gun with he was asked pp28v5 did you see the petitioner with a gun out side befor he pickup the gun to go inside no he say no sir pp29v5 says pis is still screaming threat assumed dees talken to him pp30v5 the door swings open and shotts go off he states he saw no one he took offc running

pp31v5 describes himself as shot four times he says he was hit with a glock 9mm he states he saw other security training dogs coming he speaks on his condition his bones are broken from the knees down with plates and screws pp33 states again after being asked who was last seen with the gun he states the petitioner pp35v5 says he had known clark scott 14 years says h2o opens at 2:00am the time they arrived or left dee's place say it closes at 7am 8am

now here is where this gets tricky

the woodrow has basically two broken legs screws and plates when did he have a chance between surgery, pain medication ect. not saying its not possible

but we will see what mark condon has to say about the line up state shows him a bullet fragment as thought as defense said he cant say whether that came out of him but he says yes anyway so state was allowed to admit the package pp40v5 ms baldwin goes over more prior conviction 6 counts of pcpos from 08-2013 she asked if that night all three were smoked pcpos he said yes from dee's to h2o he says yes he was asked to describe the two security guards this time he speaks of a female security not the petitioner he was asked did he go in the club again says yes did he recall interview with mark condon see pp41v5

pp42v5 asked if he just came from TDGJ last night he said yes he said that he did meet with state but just to ask what happen not to refresh his memory she said to him do you recall you never said anything about another shirt and going in the club he says no she says that's something you just remember today he says yes the next statement he makes takes it all and is later even asked to mark condon at his second testimony he says because I remember seeing the defendant petitioner on the balcony of the club you know he was sitting down watching around the I went in side the club to shoot pool you know just kinda hanging now wait at this point I have an exhibit #5 a picture of the whole front building from top to bottom wide range you can see the roof no balcony no ladder to climb mark condon is again going to be asked the same question concerning his investigation

he answers I dont know it could have been a balcony smug like with a grin defense attorney goes in to adresssing all the things he never said that hes saying now like he couldnt go in because of the wif beater he bought a shirt to go in the club or got ashirt from someone to go in to the club you never tol him you were inside playen pool that you saw petio=ner garret insid the club

she says you just recall all of this today he says yes he gave a discription of the clothen of the person with the gun

she ask now you believe to be the petitioner

she said he described a person in black shirt an pants he said yes she asked and to be clear you never saw petitioner garret shoot any one correct he states yes

and now some how she says that you believe petitioner garrett is the one is the one p picked up the gun correct he says yes see pp44v5 lines 1-25 in line 15-25 he starts t reveal the condition condon found him in when condon went to qustion him get state mente and to the photo array he states he had four bullets in his legs condon state that he found him to be in so much pain he used his reaction to th photo arry to pick the person for him he never told condon he had frecwent the club for two months you basicaly never made a statment at all at the time documented because with seguries to fix his legs pain the after pain medica-tion then he catches new charges along with failure to I.D as a sex offender its in the recordes check the criminal history he was facen muiltipul charges that some how vanished or vgot through out via tdc and his testimony at petitioners trail that the end of his testimony mark condons

second tstmony is last an final mark cond-on basicly answered qustions of how he got to the points of his investigation and basicly by the time he said he went home on the night of the 22nd of june he had his man weather truth or none I would like to start here first pp81v5 line 10-25 by the 23rd of june he filed murder charges with the DA got a warrent

all thats fine thats procedure but on line 18-25 so you didnt get the footage from them you say till after it went viral to tv

pp82v5 video suvalances line 5-19 line ninteen there is no crime captured

pp83v5 says you can not make out faces

no hieght no weight says he obtained the
footage on the 30th 8 to 9 days later :
the surveillance video is there fill free
to see it the exhibit 103 pp85v5 line 10-14
pp86v5 lines 1-15 he states that woodrow
was forthcoming with information I still
cant see how four bullets broken bones and
surgery I would belive he was sleep state
asked about layla he said she did not want
to talk there why thats the qustion why if
the petitioner the shooter is gone whats wrong
this on statement makes me fill unsettled
in line 17-18 she was coopertive so you mean
she:suplied you a suspect and you went with
that no real investigation just off her word
pp88v5defence is now qustioning condon bal-
dwin in lines12-21 ask about finger prints
he states nono on the path finder he wrestled
grappled picked up and slamed a man holden
him down with one hand an shooting but no
finger prints she didnt ask about DNA
transfer though ther should have been DNA
transfer finger nails clothen wristbands
knecklaces around his neck sence petitioner
was said to had held deased down by his
neck now in pp89v5 1-25 hes asked about
other h2o security guardes he said that on
that date only stephen was there and blue
moon security and you didnt check them for
footage or matrail from the crim scene until
it went viral or tv as he stated how many
other people had things as I stated earlye
in this threshold the scene was contaminat
when the security ran threw it he asked
about his walk through observation and
search of h2o he goes though back offices
doors as he states there wasnt a door lock
we did not open pp90v5 as they searched
there were no weapons found he states no
he admites that predudice just may have
made its way into this in vestgation by
not looking at the evidence in full scoop
pp91-92v5 both pages of qustions of eviden-
ce that something was not right he didnt
have the full story but who cares this
girl just gave me all I need someone to fall
guy even found out that stephen wasnt out
there at all that he did not participat
bor see the incident he said im not sure
how to answer that its easy yes or know
did you know these things befor you began
to file charges or to the work as he called
while he was peacock testifying for the
state as you vaule one life you vaule all

pp95this is were you know some underhand
 pp96v5 baldwin ask him were you here yeste
 rday in line 7-25 of pp95 fist he answered
 her yes i was in the witness room from 3:00pm
 to 5:00pm but why waiten on stephen she asked
 him did you see freeman come up to the court
 house he replyes I may have sceen come one
 he goes on to say but he didnt recogniz him
 its been a while he said he states futher
 that he belived it was a altercation and
 that the deasesed made some strong threats
 he agreed in pp96v5 she even ma the statment
 one of them that clark scott was qoted say
 -ing to people found in line 4-5 about ligh
 ten this m&#@** f###\$#up now I dont know
 after that he confirmed that clark in ded
 indeed made that statment then she asked
 him the guestion of woodrow I like to call
 it are there any balconies he said not that
 I recall the retracts I mean there could h
 have been what kinda answer is that the he
 goes on well I was only in there 45min
 well your honors I guses this guy is addic
 ted to the 45 min clause you can almost see
 that there is nuthen serious about this in
 -vestigation other than the day the petion
 -er recieved 30 years for a sarcatic misse
 aige of justice Im just trying to show you
 the honorable supreme cout that this was
 not a fair trail I will say that the
 batson that counsel called for was legal
 i you could see it you would be able to see
 that a jury of my peers of my race was not
 there yet the court said it was I assume
 now if you claim it then thats what you are
 these days in a day in time were a mans
 bathroom is t that any more and a women
 bathroom is no longer sacret its why it lea
 -ves no other choice other than to cite mil
 ler v. anderson as in miller petitioners
 only chance is to establish that there was no
 objective evidence placing him at the scene
 of the crime we see that this is the case
 I've been disagreed with told that these wi
 tnesses had compelling testimony I dont see
 it I know all the element are there citing
 ex post facto rules of evidence I'm asking
 you to at least take a look and see if you
 can see what I see there is no evidence to
 sustain this conviction gentry v. sinclair
693f.3d867(ca9 2012) weaver 450u.s@28-29
 101 8:ct960 other than analist and guy who
 did suggestive double bind broken rule
 line up that the hole case thank you for
 your time

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,


prose BRADLEY GARRETT INMATE 2052570

Date: July 29th 2021

July 29th 2021