

No. **21-5885**

1

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

FILED
SEP 22 2021
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

ORIGINAL

MICHAEL ALAN WEDD — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

COMMONWEALTH ATTORNEY
NATHAN B GREEN VS.
WILLIAMSBURG-JAMES CITY COUNTY
5201 MONTICELLO AVE SUITE 4
WILLIAMSBURG-VA 23188 — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

MICHAEL ALAN WEDD (087306)
(Your Name)

PRISON NORTH CORRECTIONAL CENTER
(Address)

329 DELLAROCK LANE
(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

REASONING FOR REVIEW 2

((DISCERNING GOVERNMENTAL ACTION OF WARRANTLESS HOMICIDE SEARCHES HERE FOUND IN CASE LAW FLIPPO VS WEST VA - USC))

This Motion For Writ Of CERTIORARI is predicated And Emphasises Upon The Lower Court Failure To Properly Discern Said Events And Acts Of Government Officials, Who UNLAWFULLY ENTERED AND SEARCHED SEIZED ITEMS IN MY HOME PRIOR TO A VALID HOMICIDE SEARCH WARRANT IN VIOLATION OF MY FOURTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS. ~~FLIPPO VS WEST VA~~ FURTHER

The Lower Courts Have Failed To Discern The Difference In A Valid Exception To A Proper Warrant Requirement For Search And Seizures. And They Has Here Allowed The Commonwealth To Unjustly Rely On The Warrant... HOWEVER As This Writ Does So VERIFY WITH FACT AND CASE TO ONE SPECIFIC EXIGENCY, EMERGENCY EXCEPTION PRIOR TO THEN ENTRY AND THEN AFTER UNLAWFUL WARRANTLESS HOMICIDE SEARCH...

As This Court Has Noted When The State Claims They Have A Claim OF EXIGENCY CIRCUMSTANCES TO WARRANTLESS ENTRY THE STATE MUST OFFER SOME FORM OF VALIDATION OF PROOF ON FACT PLEASE READ RENOLOS VS COMMONWEALTH 9 VA App 430-476-47-188-SE 20-634-663-64 (1990)...

MOREOVER

I Would Like To Share With This Court This Court That Of Front I + Should Be Admittedly Noted That There Are Literally A DOZEN PLUS COUNTS OF SAID VIOLATIONS TO MY FOURTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS ALONE IN MY CASE.

THEN ARE FURTHER A DOZEN PLUS PREESTABLISHED CASE LAWS CITED IN THIS WRIT THAT DERIVE FROM THIS HONORABLE COURT ROOM VERIFYING PREESTABLISHED SET PRECEDENT OF CONSTITUTIONAL LAW TREATY AND RIGHTS THAT WENT OVERLOOKED AND VIOLATED DUE TO THE LOWER COURTS FAILURE TO ACKNOWLEDGE AND APPRECIATE SAID PREESTABLISHED LAW OF THIS COURT...

AGAIN THERE A DOZEN PLUS COUNTS OF INFRINGEMENT TO MY 4TH AMENDMENT RIGHTS HERE IN MY CASE AND AS MENTIONED I HAVE KNOWLEDGE OF ALL SAID INFRINGEMENTS AND KNOWLEDGE AS WELL OF CASE LAW DIRECTLY DERIVED FROM THIS COURT OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT TO ILLEGITIMIZATIONS THAT I DO SO USE IN PARALLEL CITATION TO MY CASE...

HOWEVER FOR THE COURTS EASE AND CONVENIENCE I WILL ONLY BE ARGUING PARALLEL CITATION TO MY CASE AND THAT OF FLIPPO VS WEST VA DECIDED IN THIS HONORABLE COURT... ANY OTHER HERE MENTIONED CITATION OF FEDERAL LAW DERIVED AND PRE DECIDED IN THIS COURT IS SECONDARY TO MY REASONING AND GROUNDS FOR PRESENTING THIS WRIT WHICH IS SO PRESENTED ON PREESTABLISHED CASE LAW, PRIMARILY THAT OF FLIPPO VS WEST VA WHEN THIS GRAND COURT AGREED, DELIBERATED AND DECIDED THAT WARRANTLESS SEARCHES OF A HOMICIDE SCENE ARE TO BE HELD UNLAWFUL GOVERNMENTAL ACTIONS...

MOREOVER

AGAIN ALL SAID LOWER STATE COURTS FAILED TO ACKNOWLEDGE SET JURISPRUDENCE SO FOUND AND PARTICULARIZED IN FLIPPO VS WEST VA FURTHER THEY FAIL TO APPRECIATE THAT I DID SO OBJECT TO ALL INACTED SEARCHES, SEIZURES, STATEMENTS OF PERSON, PROPERTY IN A VALID TIMELY MANNER. DUE TO THEY SO ALL THE BYPRODUCTS OF A WARRANTLESS ENTRY AND WARRANTLESS HOMICIDE SEARCH... FURTHER MORE

THE LOWER COURTS FAIL TO ACKNOWLEDGE MULTIPLE SEARCHES THAT SO DID ACCURE PRIOR TO WARRANT WHEN USED I ONLY TO DRAFT INVALID STATE WARRANTS TO SEARCH I WAS SEIZED AND ARRESTED PRIOR TO ARREST WARRANTS AND I WAS SUBJECT TO SEARCH WITHOUT WARRANTS TO SEARCH...

THUS WITH THIS IN MIND I PETITIONER PRESENT GOOD FACTS REASONING WHY AS TO THIS WRIT SHOULD STERIL THIS HONORABLE COURT TO TAKE ACTION TO REVERSE THE LOWER COURTS JUDICIAL ERRORS AND REMAND MY CASE...

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME CONCERN HERE SHOWN

I DEF Michael Webb Would like To Direct This Honorable Court Room Attention To The Recorded Historical Facts Of My Case And Emphasize That All Said Evently Actl Allegations Here Mentioned Are Factual And Accurate... NONE OF THE FOLLOWING IS BASED ON MEER SPECULATION OR OPIN, MORESO THE FOLLOWING IS IN NO WAY MEER LEGAL JARGON FASHIONED AS A PROSE INMATE PRESENTING MISAPPLIED CASE LAW OR LITIGATION...
MOREOVER

THIS WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS IS PRESENTED UNDER THE PENALTY OF PERJURY IN GOOD FAITH TO ILLUMINATE SAID FINDINGS OF IMPROPER, INAPPROPRIATE, ERRONEOUS MISAPPLICATION OF THE LAW THAT WHEN EXERCISED IN MY CASE THAT LEAD TO A MISMANAGE OF JUSTICE UNLAWFUL CONVICTION IN A COURT OF LAW DUE TO THE LOWER COURT DEVIATING FROM US CONSTITUTIONAL LAW AND UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT PRECEDENT CASE LAW AND PRESENCE OF CONCURRING JURISPRUDENCE IN FLIPPO VS WEST VIRGINIA - U.S.C

I Petitioner Would Here Now Like To Present The Following Questions That Are Fundamentally And Inherently Relevant To Jurisprudence Of My Case --- And Also Provide Answers To My Case WHEN THE LOWER COURT TRONICLY DID NOT EVEN SEE THE SAID PROBLEM THEN. IN!!!

① WAS IT LAWFULL FOR POLICE TO MAKE USE OF A WARRANTLESS SEARCH OF ANY AND EVERYTHING IN MY HOME PRIOR TO A VALID HOMICIDE SEARCH WARRANT ???
SEE: FLIPPO VS WEST VA - USC

② DO THE LOWER COURT HOLD THAT WHEN POLICE DISCOVER A HOMICIDE IN ONE'S HOME THAT SAID HOMICIDE PROVIDED POLICE WITH EXZGNCY TO SEARCH ANY AND EVERYTHING FOUND IN ONE'S HOME OR ON ONE'S PERSON PRIOR TO VALID HOMICIDE SEARCH WARRANT ???
SEE: FLIPPO VS WEST VA - USC

③ WHY DID THE LOWER COURT FAIL TO ACKNOWLEDGE AND APPRECIATE THAT I HAD PERSONALLY OBJECTED TO ANY AFFIDAVITS OR WARRANTS THAT WHEN I INVALIDLY MADE DURING A ALREADY INACTIVE WARRANTLESS HOMICIDE SEARCH OF MY HOME ALSO A UNLAWFUL SEARCH SEIZURE OF MY PERSON, UNLAWFUL USE OF INADMISSABLE STATEMENTS IN A WARRANTLESS SEIZURE OF MY PERSON AND ALSO UNLAWFULLY SEIZED EVIDENCE (IE KAKZ PANTS ECT) ALL OF WHICH WAS UNLAWFULLY USED ON WARRANTS PRIOR TO SAID HOMICIDE SEARCH WARRANT ISSUED ???
SEE MENCEX VS ARIZONA USC AND USC CASE FLIPPO VS WEST VA

④ WHY DID THE LOWER COURTS FAIL TO GRANT ME A EVIDENTIARY HEARING (PLENARY) OR A "FRANKS HEARING" AFTER I PARTICULARLY SHOW FINDING OF FALSEHOOD, PERJURY, DANATRY ON WARRANTS BY AFFZANT OFFICER RB, PENEY OFF WHY WAS I AGAIN DENIED MY 4TH AMENDMENT RIGHTS TO CHALLENGE INVALID, FALSEIFIED, STALE, WARRANTS USED ON ME IN A COURT OF LAW TO INCERMINATE AND WRONGFULLY CONVICT ME ???

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:

INDEX OF APPENDICES

1 of 1

APPENDIX A The Trial Court Failed To Establish A Showing On Record Of A Valid Exigent Circumstance To A Warrant Needed In Their Unlawful Search, Seizure In A Entry Of My Home When They Thereafter Discover A Homicide Scene And Contrary To PRESTABLISHED CASE LAW OF FLIPPO VS WEST VA
Police Contingence To Make A Warrantless Search Of My Home Which Had Become A Homicide Crime Scene When PAPER WORKS, EFFETU CLOTHING, ETC WAS MOVED, PHOTO GRAPHED USED ON AFFIDAVIT, WARRANT PRIOR TO A VALID WARRANT FOR HOMICIDE IS A HOMICIDE SEARCH WARRANT

APPENDIX B THE COURT OF APPEALS OF VA Failed To Acknowledge, Inquire And CORRECT THE LOWER TRIAL COURT, They Here Failed To Acknowledge THAT ACCORDING TO CASE LAW OF FLIPPO VS WEST VA POLICE MAY MAKE WARRANTLESS ENTRY IN TO ONE HOME PRIOR TO A WARRANT IF THEY HAVE A EXIGENCY ON PROBABLE CAUSE HOWEVER THE COA FAILED TO APPRECIATE THE SET PRECEDENCE OF CASE LAW OF FLIPPO VS WEST VA: WHEN OFFICIAL MUST HAVE A VALID HOMICIDE WARRANT PRIOR TO USE ANY AND ALL SAID FINDINGS IN THEIR SEARCH OF A WARRANTLESS HOMICIDE SCENE ON AFFIDAVIT, WARRANT OR COURT OF LAW...

APPENDIX C THE SUPREME COURT OF VIRGINIA FAILED TO APPRECIATE CASE LAW SET IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT OF FLIPPO VS WEST VA WHEN THE GOVERNMENT IS TO BE HELD LIABLE FOR UNLAWFUL WARRANTLESS SEARCHES MADE PRIOR TO A VALID HOMICIDE SEARCH IN ONE HOME. MOREOVER THE COURT ALSO FAILED TO ACKNOWLEDGE THAT UNDER USC FEDERAL PROTECTIONS OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS FOUND UNDER THE CHARTER OF THE 4TH AMENDMENT IS RIGHTS TO EXPRITATZU OF PRIVACY AND NECESSITY FOR WARRANTS TO TAKE PRIOR TO SEARCHES AND SEIZURES OF PERSONAL PROPERTY, OR HERE EVIDENCE SEIZED PRIOR TO A VALID HOMICIDE SEARCH WARRANT MOREOVER: HERE IN PARTICULAR THE SCOA FAILED TO APPRECIATE, HONOR FLIPPO VS WEST VA: PRECEDENCE IS 4TH AMENDMENT PROTECTION'S WHEN NOT ONLY MY PERSONAL PROPERTY IS PROTECTED IN MY HOME IN WARRANTLESS HOMICIDE SEARCHES I THUS AM TO PROTECTED UNDER THE 4TH AMENDMENT FROM UNLAWFUL SEIZURES BY GOVERNMENTAL OFFICIALS DURING WARRANTLESS SEARCHES AND SEIZURES SIMPLY PUT I AM A PERSONAL PROPERTY OWN TO MYSELF PROTECTED UNDER THE 4TH AMENDMENT FROM UNLAWFUL WARRANTLESS SEIZURES OF EVIDENCE SEIZED IN WARRANTLESS HOMICIDE SEARCHES OF MY HOME OR SEIZURES OF MY PERSON MADE FROM THENAFTER

APPENDIX D THE SUPREME COURT OF VA FAILED TO ESTABLISH AT WHAT EXACT TIME DID POLICE PROVIDE A VALID HOMICIDE SEARCH WARRANT AFTER THEIR PRE ESTABLISHED SEARCH SEIZURE OF MY HOME AND PERSON PLEASE NOTE THEN IT TO BE NO FOUND ON RECORD OF EVIDENCE FOUND ON AFFIDAVIT OR WARRANT, REPORT PRIOR TO SAID NON-EXISTANT SEARCH WARRANT VERIFYING A NEXUS OF TIME IS AT SAID PRIOR TO THEIR HOMICIDE SEARCH WARRANT ALL EVIDENCE IS SEARCHED SEIZED UNLAWFULLY PLEASE NOTE ON DIRECT APPEAL THE SCOA DOES NOT HOLD A EVIDENTIARY HEARING OR A FRANK HEARING TO ESTABLISH THE VALIDNESS OF THE WARRANT TO SEARCH AND SEIZE MY PERSON AND PROPERTY PROTECTED BY THE 4TH AMENDMENT FROM UNLAWFUL SEIZURES SEARCHES IN INVITED WARRANTLESS HOMICIDE SEARCHES AS WE SEE IN FLIPPO VS WEST VA

INDEX TO TABLE OF EXHIBITS

PAGE #9

1 OF 2



PLEASE NOTE: First Arriving Officer BRANDON FRANTZ stated on Record of Transcripts that he, Police DID NOT HAVE PROBABLE CAUSE OR EXIGENT CIRCUMSTANCE TO ENTER PRISON TO WARRANT TO SEARCH STEVE A HOMICIDE CRIME SCENE PLEASE READ SUPPRESSION HEARING TRANSCRIPTS DATED 2/21/2018 - PAGE #13 - LINE 20-25

PLEASE NOTE: Second to arrive and first to enter my home OFFICER JASON, SIODYSKO also states on Record of Transcript that he, Police DID NOT HAVE PROBABLE CAUSE OR EXIGENT CIRCUMSTANCE TO ENTER PRISON TO A VALUED WARRANT TO SEARCH, STEVE A HOMICIDE SCENE PLEASE READ: Suppression Hearing DATED 3-5-2018 - PAGE 88 LINE 12-16

PLEASE NOTE: Police enter my home to SEARCH AND STEVE MY PERSON THEY THEREAFTER LOCATE A HOMICIDE SCENE AND CONTINUE TO SEARCH PRISON TO A VALUED HOMICIDE WARRANT REQUESTED UNDER USC CASE LAW OF FLIPP VS WATVA PLEASE NOTE POLICE OFFICER FRANTZ CAN BE SEEN ON RECORD OF POLICE BODY CAMERA SEARCHING THRU MY PERSONAL EFFECTS, LITTER, Note Said LITTER WAS UNLAWFULLY USED ON AFFIDAVIT AND WARRANTS PLEASE SEE EXHIBITS OF OFFICER B. FRANTZ BODY CAMERA VIDEO

PLEASE NOTE: Police State They Use A 911 CALLERS CLAIMS OF HEARSAY TO EFFECT A WARRANTLESS SEIZURE, SEARCH, ARREST OF MY PERSON PLEASE READ TRANSCRIPTS OF SUPPRESSION HEARING DATED 2/21/2018 - PAGE 14 - LINE 6 TO 24

PLEASE NOTE: I WAS UNLAWFULLY TRANSPORTED PRIOR TO A VALUED SEARCH AND SEIZURE WARRANT OR A VALUED ARREST WARRANT OR PROBABLE CAUSE IN VIOLATION OF USC CASE LAW OF KAUPP VS TEXAS PLEASE READ Suppression Hearing Transcripts DATED 2/21/2018 - PAGE 95 - LINE 17-25

PLEASE NOTE: Police Simultaneously SEARCH STEVE MY PERSON AND PROPERTY AS WELL MY HOME AND CAR WHILE I NOT PRESENT PRIOR TO A VALUED HOMICIDE SEARCH WARRANT IN VIOLATION OF BAXLEY VS US PLEASE READ: Suppression Hearing Transcript DATED 3/5/18 - PAGE 480 LINE 21-23

PLEASE NOTE: I WAS UNLAWFULLY ARRESTED, SEIZED AND SUBJECT TO A FALSE IMPRISONMENT OF FREE TO TERMINATE AND FORCED TO A INTERROGATION PLEASE READ Suppression Hearing DATED 3/5/18 - PAGE 46 - LINE 10 TO 18 NOTE I WAS NOT READ MY MIRANDA RIGHTS

PLEASE NOTE: AFFZANT P. PENNYCOFF DOES USE UNLAWFULLY SEIZED STATEMENTS FROM MY UNLAWFUL IMPRISONMENT AND SEIZURE OF MY PERSON ON AFFIDAVITS AND WARRANTS PLEASE READ WARRANT EXHIBIT

PLEASE NOTE: As Can Be Seen On Record Of Police Reports, AFFIDAVITS AND WARRANTS THAT POLICE IS AFFZANT P. PENNYCOFF FURTHER USES UNLAWFULLY SEIZED EVIDENCE FROM MY HOME TO SO DRAFT A NON VALUED SEARCH WARRANT FOR A HOMICIDE SEARCH THAT WAS ALREADY PREMATURELY INACTED FURTHER AFFZANT P. PENNYCOFF USED UNLAWFULLY SEIZED EVIDENCE TO SO DRAFT NONE VALUED ARREST WARRANT AFTER I WAS ALREADY UNDER A FALSE ARREST IN HIS PERSONAL INTERROGATION OF ME NOTE HE, POLICE STATE THEY FEND CLOTHING THAT THEY CONTRIBUTE TO MY INTERROGATION WARRANTLESS HOMICIDE SEARCH READ POLICE INTERROGATION TRANSCRIPTS DATE 5/17/17 (PAGE 84 TO 85)) ALSO VERIFY...

PLEASE NOTE: There Was A UNLAWFUL USE OF INADMISSIBLE EVIDENCE GARNISHED FROM A UNLAWFUL WARRANTLESS HOMICIDE SCENE SEARCH IN MY HOME !!! AS CAN BE NOTED ON TRANSCRIPT A CRIME SCENE INVESTIGATOR BY THE NAME OF OFFICER JAKE RICE WHOM WAS UNLAWFULLY IN MY HOME SEARCHING THRU MY PERSONAL BELONGINGS AND EFFECTS WITH OTHER OFFICERS PRIOR TO WARRANT FOR A HOMICIDE SEARCH. NOTE THAT JAKE RICE STATES THAT OFFICERS PRIOR TO HIS ARRIVAL HAD MOVED ITEMS IN THIS CRIME SCENE PRIOR TO WARRANT. MOREOVER MR JAKE RICE INVESTIGATING OFFICER ALSO STATED THAT (HE HAD PERSONALLY MANUFACTURED EVIDENCE) FROM SAID CRIME SCENE. NOTE HE STATED THAT HE WAS PERSONALLY INSTRUCTED BY OTHER WARRANTLESS OFFICERS PREMATURELY SEARCHING FOR EVIDENCE IN MY HOME AS WHAT TO PHOTOGRAPH AND HOW TO PHOTOGRAPH IT SO TO BE ABLE TO ASSEMBLE A PRESENTATION. NOTE THIS EVIDENCE WAS THEN AFTER FABRICATED AND FORGED BY MR JAKE RICE OPIV AS NOTED SAID INSTRUCTION OF WARRANTLESS OFFICERS WHOM HAD SEARCHED MY HOME. MR RICE INDEED HAD IN PARTICULAR MOVED CLOTHING IN MY HOME AND PLACED IN PARTICULAR A JACKET RED, WHITE, BLUE IN COLOR WITH A KAKI PAIR OF PANTS AND BLACK PAIR OF SHOES. NOTE HE STATED ON RECORD HE ASSEMBLED SAID CLOTHING AND PLACED THEM TOGETHER TO SO ASSEMBLE A OUTFIT FOR PRESENTATION FOR THE STATE PROSECUTION.

PLEASE READ TRANSCRIPTS OF MR JAKE RICE DATED AUGUST - 2018 PAGES 427 TO 429

PLEASE NOTE: POLICE PERFORM A WARRANTLESS SEARCH PRIOR TO WARRANT OR A HOMICIDE SCENE JUST AS WE SAW IN THE CASE OF FLIPPO VS. WEST VA WHEN IT WAS PROVEN TO BE UNLAWFUL FOR POLICE TO PERFORM WARRANTLESS HOMICIDE SEARCHES. AS WE SAW IN FLIPPO THE USE OF THE PROVERBIAL BRUIT OF THE POISONOUS TREE, I.E. WHEN POLICE USED UNLAWFULLY SEIZED PHOTOS FROM HIS HOME IN A WARRANTLESS HOMICIDE SCENE SEARCH !!! PLEASE NOTE HERE IN MY CASE WHEN POLICE USE THE PROVERBIAL BRUIT OF THE POISONOUS TREE AS WELL WHEN THEY FOR EXAMPLE VERIFY A SEARCH IN MY HOME PRIOR TO WARRANT WHEN THEY UNLAWFULLY USE THE PROVERBIAL PAIR OF KAKI PANTS THEY DO SO TO CLAIM ARE MINE. SEE INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT EXHIBITS PAGE # 84 TO 85. MORE SO POLICE PERFORM VARIOUS WARRANTLESS SEARCHES AND SEIZURES OF MY HOME, LITERATURE, PHONE, PERSONAL EFFECTS. AS WELL THEY UNLAWFULLY SEIZE MY PERSON AND PERFORM A WARRANTLESS UNLAWFUL TRANSPORTATION OF ME TO A POLICE STATION WHEN I AM INTERVIEWED WITH SAID UNLAWFULLY SEIZED EVIDENCE FROM THE SEARCH OF HOMICIDE SCENE PRIOR TO HOMICIDE WARRANT. AND THEY FURTHER GARNISH ADMISSIBLE STATEMENTS FROM ME IN A FALSE ARREST. SAID STATEMENTS WHEN USED AS EVIDENCE TO DRAFT INVALID WARRANTS FOR ARREST AND SEARCH WARRANTS OF MY HOME I AM ALREADY SUBJECT TO WARRANTLESS SEARCH AND SEIZURES.

PLEASE NOTE: THE TARDY INVALID WARRANT DRAFTED AND EXECUTED AT 1:30 BY R. PENNYCUFF AND EXECUTED BY JAKE RICE THE INVESTIGATOR CAME THEN AFTER ALL SAID VARIOUS WARRANTLESS SEARCHES AND SEIZURES OF MY HOME, PHONE, LITERATURE, PERSONAL EFFECTS AND SEIZURE OF MY PERSON AND USE OF INADMISSIBLE STATEMENTS IN A FALSE ARREST. PLEASE TRANSCRIPT OF SUPPRESSION HEARING DATED 3/5/18 PAGE 14 LINE # 18: ALSO TO VERIFY TIME OF INVALID SEARCH WARRANT READ PAGES 18 TO 19 (LINE 19 TO 21)

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES 4058

PAGE 4

PAGE 5 KIRK-VS-LOUISIANA 536-US-638-122-SCt 2458-153-LED 2J-574 (2002)
RULE: POLICE MUST HAVE BOTH PROBABLE CAUSE AND EXCECUTY TO MAKE WARRANTLESS ENTR

PAGE 6 KAUPPI-VS-TEXAS 538-US-626-155-LED-2J-814-123-SCt 1843 (2003)
RULE: POLICE MAY NOT WARRANTLESSLY ARREST AND TRANSPORT YOU PRIOR TO PROBABLE CAU

PAGE 6 BAILEY-VS-US-568-US 113-SCt-1031-185-LED-2J-19, 2013 (US 2012)
RULE: POLICE MAY NOT WARRANTLESSLY ARREST YOU AND SEARCH YOUR HOME PRIOR TO WARRANT

PAGE 6 COMMONWEALTH-VS-WHITE 6-VA Cir 46-48 (1983)
RULE: POLICE CAN NOT USE STATEMENTS MADE IN A WARRANTLESS FALSE ARREST

PAGE 6 US-VS-PLA 462-US-646-710-103, SCt 2637-637-77 LED 2J-605-1985
RULE: POLICE MAY NOT PROLONG A WARRANTLESS ARREST, DETAINED LONGER THAN 90 MIN

PAGE 6 WONG SUN-VS-US-371-US-471-487-88-9 LED 2J-441, 83, SCt 407 (1963)
RULE: POLICE MAY NOT USE A PERSON'S UNLAWFUL STATEMENTS AS EVIDENCE AGAINST THEM

PAGE 7 RILEY-VS-CALIFORNIA 573-US-184-LED-2J-430-20014
RULE: POLICE MUST HAVE WARRANT OR PROBABLE CAUSE TO SEARCH YOUR PHONE

PAGE 7 STANFORD-VS-TEX 374-US-476-485-86-1965
RULE: POLICE MUST HAVE SPECIFIC WARRANTS TO SEIZE PAPERWORK, LETTERS
BASED ON THEIR IDEALS OR MORALS THEY REFLECT

PAGE 7 WONG SUN-VS-US ALSO BROWN-VS-ILLINOIS
RULE: POLICE MAY NOT USE A UNLAWFUL SEIZURE'S FINDINGS ON WARRANTS

PAGE 7 ELT PRO-VS-WEST VA-528-US-11-145-LED-2J-16-120-SCt 7
RULE: POLICE MAY NOT SEARCH, SEIZE EVERYTHING IN A WARRANTLESS HOME/COOR SEARCH

PAGE 7 UNITED STATES-VS-COIKLEY 899-F2d-297-300-4th Cir (1990)
RULE: POLICE CANNOT MAKE WILLFULL FALSE STATEMENTS ON AFFIDAVITS

PAGE 8 FRANKS-VS-DELEWANE 438-US-154-98-SCt-2674-57 LED-2J-667 (1978)
RULE: DEF MAY CHALLENGE PERJURY, FALSEHOOD ON AFFIDAVITS MADE BY POLICE

PAGE 8 ALABAMA-VS-WHITE 496-US-325-110-LED-2J-361-(1990)
POLICE MAY NOT USE A 911 CALLERS HEARSAY TO EFFECT A WARRANTLESS ARREST

PAGE 8 FLORIDA-VS-JL 529-US-266-146-LED 2J-254-(2000)
POLICE MAY NOT USE A UNLAWFUL SEIZURE'S FINDINGS ON CITIZENS

EXHIBITS

- EXHIBIT A = VERIFY A ARREST SEIZURE, SEARCH PRIOR TO WARRANT
- EXHIBIT B = VERIFY I SUBJECT TO SEIZURE SEARCH WHILE IN FALSE ARREST
- EXHIBIT C = VERIFY MY UNLAWFUL CONDUCT PRIOR TO WARRANT, INDICTMENT,
- EXHIBIT D = VERIFY AFFIDAVIT FALSIIFIED FINDINGS ON SEARCH WARRANTS
- EXHIBIT E = VERIFY OFFICIALS USED INFO IN A WARRANTLESS HOME/COOR SEARCH
- EXHIBIT F = VERIFY THEN WAS A COURT ORDER FOR STENOGRAPHER AT MY
PRELIMINARY TO RECORD EVIDENCE AND PROBABLE CAUSE NOTE I WAS DENYED
MY COURT ORDER TO RECORD OBJECTION TO INVALID SEARCH, ARREST PRIOR TO WARRANT
THUS VERIFYING I SHOULD OF BEEN AFORDED A FRANKS HEARING TO CHALLENGE
AFFIDAVIT FOR MY SEARCH, SEIZURE ARREST PRIOR TO WARRANTS

JURISDICTION

1 of 1

TRIAL COURT VERDICT OF GUILTY 8-17-18

APPEALS COURT OF VA: DENY APPEAL ~~ON~~ 11-27-19

SUPREME COURT OF VA DENY DIRECT APPEAL 7-28-21

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY
PROVISIONS INVOLVED 5080

ON 5/17/17 Police Officer Brandon Francis And Officer Jason Siodysko Respond To A 911 Call From A Ms Walker In Concern Of Her Fellow Coworker Being Late To Work By 45 MIN... Police Claim She Was In Fear That I Was A Fellow Resident Of Her Coworker WAS THE SAID CAUSE OF HER BEING LATE TO WORK DUE TO THE STATE, POLICE, MS WALKER CLAIMING AS WELL THAT I WAS MENTALLY DISTURBED, AND NOT TAKING A UNMENTIONED MEDICATION. Both OFFICERS USE SAID STATEMENTS HERE BY MS WALKER TO PROVIDE REASON TO ARRIVE AT MY HOME. TO INVESTIGATE THIS MATTER FURTHER... WHEN POLICE ARRIVE THEY BOTH REPORT NO SIGN OF DISTRESS, FORCED ENTRY TO HOME, NO IN PLAIN VIEW FINDINGS ect ect TO THAT OF A EMERGENCY OR CRIME ect ect...

THE OFFICERS FURTHER GO ON TO SAY THAT THEY HAD NO NOTED PROBABLE CAUSE TO THEN AFTER ENTER AFTER THEY KNOCKED TO THE FRONT DOOR... NOTE THAT AT THIS TIME SECOND TO ARRIVE OFFICER JASON SLODYNSKI WHO ARRIVES AS VERIFIED ON RECORD 4 MIN AFTER OFFICER BRANDON FRANTZ WHO WAS FIRST TO ARRIVE AT THE MY FRONT DOOR KNOCKING) NOTE SECOND TO ARRIVE OFFICER SLODYNSKI GOES DIRECTLY TO THE BACK OF MY HOUSE WITHOUT KNOCKING ON THE FRONT OR BACK DOOR... AT THIS TIME BOTH SAID OFFICERS MEET AT BACK DOOR WHEN IT CAN BE SEEN ON POLICE BODY+CAM VIDEO MR JASON SLODYNSKI PULL OUT HIS HAND GUN ALONG WITH MR BRANDON FRANTZ THEN PROCEEDING WITH HAND GUN TO ENTER MY HOME. I WOULD EMPHASIZE THAT MR SLODYNSKI CAN BE SEEN AND HEARD YELLING OUT MY NAME SPECIFICALLY TO COME OUT AND SHOW MYSELF PRIOR TO ENTRY.

Again Note Police Claim They Had No Probable Cause or A EXIGENCY PRIOR TO THEIR (A) WARRANTLESS ENTRY. NOTE DID THEY HAVE ANY OF THE 5 SO THEN RECOGNIZED PREESTABLISHED EXCEPTION TO A WARRANT REQUIREMENT SUCH AS A HOT PURSUIT, IN PLAIN VIEW FINDINGS, TERRY STOP, CONSENT, OR A ACTUAL EXIGENCY IS EMERGENCY FIRE, FLOOD, SIGNS OF THREAT TO HUMAN LIFE...

I RONCE BOTH POLICE ENTER WITH THEIR GUNS DRAWN YELLING MY NAME WITH GUNS DRAWN AND THEN AFTER CLAIM THEY WERE MERELY PERFORMING A ROUTINE COMMUNITY CARE TAKEN CHECK IN MY HOME.

Again Note Police Enter Prior To Having PROBABLE CAUSE OR A VALID EXIGENCY CIRCUMSTANCES... PLEASE NOTE THAT BOTH ARE SO RECOGNIZED AS THIS HONORABLE COURT PRIOR HAS VERIFIED IN PREESTABLISHED CASE LAW AND SET PRECEDENCE = READ KIRK VS LOUISIANA 536 US 635 638 122 S CT 2458 153 ED 2d 599 (2002) NOTE POLICE THEN ENTER MY HOME AND DISCOVER A HOMICIDE CRIME SCENE ON MY KITCHEN FLOOR. A SECURITY CHECK FOR POSSIBLE SUSPECTS AND OTHER VICTIMS IS THEN PERFORMED, A SWAT TEAM IS CALLED TO CHECK THE SECOND FLOOR BEFORE THEY ARE TOLD THEY CAN LEAVE AS SEEN ON VIDEO BODY+CAM... PLEASE NOTE AS POLICE BODY+CAM WILL VERIFY THAT INDEED OFFICER BRANDON FRANTZ CAN BE SEEN SEARCHING THROUGH PAPERWORKS EFFECTS ON VIDEO PRIOR TO A VALID HONORABLE SEARCH WARRANT...

CONTINUE

At The Same Time This Unlawful Warrantless Homeless Search Is Performed I Def Am Located At A Gas Station Store When I Am Confronted By Officer Lt Humpierrez Whom Unlawfully Detain Me Prison To Probable Cause arrest I AM THEN QUESTIONED AND UNLAWFULLY SEIZED AND ARRESTED... I AM HANDCUFFED AND PLACED IN A POLICE CAR AND FURTHER UNLAWFULLY SEIZED AND TRANSPORTED PRISON TO A SEARCH WARRANT IN VIOLATION OF FURTHER MORE OF MY 4TH AMENDMENT PROTECTION FROM UNLAWFUL GOVERNMENTAL SEIZURE READ KAUPP VS TEXAS 538-US-626-155-LED 2014-12-5-CT 1843 (2003).

PLEASE NOTE THAT DURING THE UNLAWFUL TRANSPORT AND SEIZURE OF MY PERSON THEN I STILL A ONGOING WARRANTLESS SEARCH OF A HOMELESS CRIME SCENE BY POLICE HOWEVER ACCORDING TO YET ANOTHER US SUPREME COURT CASE LAW OF SET PRECEDENCE I WAS YET AGAIN VIOLATED OF MY 4TH AMENDMENT PROTECTED READ BAZLEY VS US 568-US-133-SC 1031, 185-LED-20-19, 2013-US (2013)...

I Will Also Mention That Police Also Fail To Read Me My Rights i.e. MEMORANIZE MY RIGHTS IN VIOLATION OF US CONSTITUTION RIGHTS READ COMMONWEALTH VS WHITE 6-VA CIR 46-48 (1983)...

I AM Then Drove To Police Head Quarters, Police Present To Be SO INTERROGATED WITHOUT MY CONSENT OR SEARCH SEIZURE WARRANT(S) AS VIDEO FROM INTERROGATION WILL VERIFY... NOTE HERE THAT AFFRANT AND INVESTIGATION PENNYCUFF TELLS ME HE HAS NO WARRANT BUT MEMORANIZED ME (READS MY RIGHTS) YET DOES NOT STATE I AM UNDER SEIZURE i.e. ARREST. AGAIN AT SAME TIME A UNLAWFUL HOMELESS SEARCH IS STILL TRANSPORTING.

IT IS AT THIS TIME THAT OFFICER PENNYCUFF AND OFFICER JASON SLOPINSKI (FIRST TO ENTER MY HOME WITH GUN POINTED) BEGINS TO QUESTION ME NOTE THIS WAS IN VIOLATION OF MY 4TH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO SEARCH AND SEIZURE WARRANT YET AGAIN DUE TO I WARRANTLESS HELD LONGER THAN 40 MIN IN A SEIZURE OF MY PERSON READ US VS PLACIE 462-US-696 710, 103, SC 2637-637-77 LED 20-605-1985...

During Questioning By Both Officers I Am Asked WHERE I WAS THE PREVIOUS DAY. AT THIS TIME MR JASON SLOPINSKI LEAVES THE INTERROGATION ROOM RETURNS TO MY HOME PRISON TO A VALID HOMELESS SEARCH WARRANT AND THIS BEING UNLAWFUL YET AGAIN TO SEARCH THRU MY DIRTY LAUNDRY BOX. MR SLOPINSKI TAKES PHOTO OF A PAIR OF KANIS THAT HE FINDS IN MY LAUNDRY BOX. SLOPINSKI THEN GOES TO A 7-11 STORE TO ASK FOR SURVILLANCE VIDEO TO TRY MATCHING ME ON VIDEO IN SAID PANTS. MR SLOPINSKI THEN RETURNS TO THE INTERROGATION ROOM WITH SAID UNLAWFUL EVIDENCE TO USE IN A INTERROGATION.

NOTE I AM NOT FREE TO LEAVE, AND SAID EVIDENCE i.e. KANIS PANTS FOUND BY J. SLOPINSKI ARE GIVE ALONG WITH UNLAWFULLY GARNISHED STATEMENT MADE BY ME IN A WARRANTLESS UNLAWFUL SEIZURE IN VIOLATION OF YET ANOTHER 4TH AMENDMENT RIGHT READ

WONG SUN VS US, 371-US-471-487-88-9 LED 20 441, 83, S. CT 407 (1963)...

CONTINUED

I Would like To Further Direct The Court's Attention To The Fact That During A CONTINUED UNLAWFUL SEIZURE OF MY PERSON POLICE ALSO UNLAWFULLY PERFORM A WARRANTLESS SEARCH OF MY ~~CELL~~ CELL PHONE PRIOR TO VALID WARRANT READ CASE LAW OF RILEY VS CALIFORNIA 573-US 189 LED-20-430-2014.

POLICE AS NOTED HERE AS WELL HAD UNLAWFULLY USED A WARRANTLESS SEARCH OF MY HOME TO PARTICULARLY STEVE PAPPENWORTH, LITTONS & THAT THEY CAN BE SEEN AS POLICE CLAIM ON AFFIDAVIT TO DETECT ME IN A CRIME AS BY ALLEGING THEY FOUND A CONFESSION LETTER. ALSO THE POLICE ALSO CLAIM HERE THEY FOUND IN MY WRITING, LITTONS PERTAINING TO HUMAN SACRIFICES. NOTE THIS ALLEGED LITTONS WAS UNLAWFULLY SEIZED PRIOR TO VALID HOMICIDE SEARCH WARRANT AND THEN AFTER USED ON A INVALID WARRANT TO SEARCH IN YET FURTHER VIOLATION TO MY 4TH AND 1ST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO PROTECTION OF GOVERNMENTAL ABUSE READ: STANFORD VS TEX 379-US-476-485-86-1965. AS CAN BE SEEN ON AFFIDAVIT MY LITTONS WAS INDEED SEIZED UNLAWFULLY DUE TO THE MORAL AND IDEAL THEY REFLECTED HOWEVER THERE WAS NO REFERENCE TO "HUMAN SACRIFICE" ON THEM NONE ANY SAID CONFESSION LETTER FOUND FOR BOTH ALLEGATIONS WHEN FALSIIFIED TO SO I INCORPORATE ME ON AFFIDAVIT AND WARRANTS.

MOREOVER

I WAS INTERROGATED FOR 2 HOURS WHILE POLICE SEARCHED MY HOME PRIOR TO A VALID HOMICIDE WARRANT. POLICE HERE USED BOTH SAID SEARCH OF MY HOME, PHONE LITTONS, EVIDENCE IS KANSAS PAINTS, AND STATEMENTS TO SO NOW DRAFT AFFIDAVIT FOR WARRANTS TO SEARCH, SEIZE, ARREST HOWEVER AS WE SEE IN CASE LAW OF WONG SUN VS US ALSO BROWN VS ILLINOIS I WAS UNLAWFULLY SEIZED AS A BY PRODUCT OF A UNLAWFUL SEARCH AND SEIZURE OF A HOMICIDE SCENE PRIOR TO WARRANT IN VIOLATION TO CASE LAW OF FLIPPO VS WEST VA 528-US-11-145 L ED 20-16-120, 5 CT 7.

PLEASE NOTE AS CAN BE VERIFIED ON MY OBJECTIONS IN ALL SAID LOWER COURTS & AS WELL ON AFFIDAVIT, REPORTS, WARRANTS, THAT I WAS SUBJECT TO PERJURY AND FALSEHOOD UPON WARRANTS MADE BY AFFIZANT PENNYCOFF THE SAID INTERVIEWER. NOTE THAT MR PENNYCOFF WILLFULLY TRIED TO INCORPORATE ME BY ① USING A UNLAWFUL SEIZURE TO FALSELY IMPRISON ME ② FALSIFY STATEING ON HIS SAID AFFIDAVIT THAT I WAS SEEN PEER OUT A WINDOW OF CRIME SCENE IN MY HOME ③ OFFICER PENNYCOFF STATED FALSELY THAT I WAS SEEN IN A ROBBERY AT SAID TIME OF HOMICIDE AND THAT WITNESSES HAD SEEN ME WALKING FROM SAID ROBBERY SCENE ④ NOTE I CAN ALSO BE SEEN ON RECORD THAT MR PENNYCOFF FURTHER STATED ON HIS AFFIDAVIT AND IN INTERVIEW THAT HE HAD FOUND A CONFESSION LETTER ADMITTING GUILT TO SAID HOMICIDE. NOTE ALL OF THIS WAS Meticulously DONE DURING A CONTINUED UNLAWFUL SEIZURE OF MY PERSON. MORE SO NOTE THAT SAID FALSEHOOD, PERJURY, BARBARITY IS USED TO GALVANIZE PROBABLE CAUSE ON ME TO USE ON INVALID WARRANTS UNLAWFULLY, READ CASE OF UNITED STATES VS COCKLEY 899 F2d 297 100 4th CIR (1990).

CONTINUED

PLEASE NOTE THE LOWER COURTS ALL FAIL TO APPREZATE AND KNOWLEDGE THE FACT THAT I SHOULD OF BEEN AFFORDED A FRANKS HEARING TO CHALLENGE A AFFIANTS FALSEHOOD, WILLFULLY PERJURY AND MISSTATEMENTS USED BY MATISTATE ON PROSECUTION ON WARRANTS ON USED IN A COURT OF LAW. PLEAD FRANKS VS DELAWARE 438-US, 154, 98 SCT 2674 571 ED, 20667 (1978).

MOREOVER

NOTE I DID SO TIMELY MAKE A PRELIMINARY SHOWING AND OBJECTION TO SAID INVALID WARRANTS (OR LACK THERE OF WARRANTS) HOWEVER AS NOTED IN MY FILE I WAS UNLAWFULLY DENY A SIGNED COURT ORDER FOR MY SAID PRELIMINARY TO BE RECORDED ON TRANSCRIPT THUS NO RECORD OF SUPPRESSION WAS RECORDED AND THE COURT FAILED TO COFF ITS CIVIL ORDERS.

PLEASE NOTE THE LOWER COURTS FURTHER FAIL TO SO APPREZATE THE FACT THAT I DEF HAD MADE A VALID SHOWING ON REQUESTED OFFERING OF PROFF AND VALID FINDINGS OF BARATRY AND PERJURY MADE ON AFFIANT PENNYCOFFS AFFIDAVIT AND WARRANTS THEY CAN BE VERIFIED AT SUPPRESSION HEARINGS, AS WELL AT MY TRIAL ITSELF. PLEASE NOTE DUE TO PROSECUTORIAL SUPPRESSION THERE WAS NO SAID PREKNOWLEDGE THAT AFFIANT PENNYCOFF WAS THE TRULY ARTHUR TO SAID AFFIDAVIT AND WARRANTS UNTILL MY LAST DAY IN A 2 DAY TRIAL. NOTE THIS WAS WILLFULLY DONE TO SO SUPPRESS (HIDE) HIS IDENTITY AS SAID AFFIANT HOWEVER ON TRANSCRIPT AT TRIAL IN CONEXANTINATION DOES SO VERIFY HE HAD MADE ALL SAID FALSE REPORTS.

PLEAD TRANSCRIPT DATED 8/17/18 PAGE # 534 LINES 9 TO 17...

MOREOVER

WE CLEARLY SEE THAT MR PENNYCOFFS ACTION WHEN WILLFULLY INACTED TO INCERPERATE ME IS FABRICATE PROBABLE CAUSE ON WARRANT DRAFTED UNLAWFULLY THEN AFTER BOTH A WARRANTLESS HOMICIDE SEARCH AND SEIZURE OF MY HOME AND PERSON...

FURTHER MORE

I SHOULD NOT FAIL TO MENTION THAT FROM THE INCEPTION OF MY CASE SHOULD OF BY LAW NEVER USED A RANDOM 911 CALLERS HERE SAY TO EFFECT A ARREST AND SEIZURE OF MY PERSON WITH THEY STATE JUSTIFIED THEM TO ENTER MY HOME YELLING MY NAME WITH THEN GUNS POINTED OUT FOR ME. IT IS A 4TH AMENDMENT VIOLATION TO USE A 911 CALLERS HERE SAY THAT DID NOT HEAR SEE WITHIN A SAID CRIME AS PROBABLE CAUSE TO SEIZE, DETAIN AND THEN ARREST, THEN AND SEARCH THEN HOME PRIOR TO A VALID WARRANT. PLEAD CASE OF ALABAMA VS WHITE 496 US-325-110 LEJ-20-361. I CLEARLY WAS UNLAWFULLY HERE SUBJECT TO A FALSE AND MISSTOCK ARREST. PLEAD FLORIDA VS J L ATE 524-US-266-146-LEJ-20-254-(2000)...

STATEMENT OF CASE

PAGE 10

BASED ON PRECEDENCE
OF

FLIPPO VS WEST VA (USSC) WARRANTLESS HOMICIDE SEARCHS

Please Note That All Said Lower Courts Have Held That Police Had Not Violated My 4th Amendment And The Commonwealth Was Not At Fault Or In Error For USING ANY AND EVERYTHING FOUND IN PERFORMING A WARRANTLESS HOMICIDE SEARCH OF MY HOME, PERSON, EFFECT PRISON TO A VALUED HOMICIDE WARRANT...

PLEASE NOTE: The Commonwealth Claim Police Enter AN WHAT THEY DEFINE, CALL A Community Care Taken Due To EXIGENT CIRCUMSTANCES READ TRANSCRIPT DATED 8/16/18 PAGE # 60 LINE # 5

HOWEVER There Was NO EXIGENT CIRCUMSTANCES FOR POLICE TO WARRANTLESSLY SEARCH FOR EVIDENCE, SUSPECTS, CRIMES OR IN THIS CASE A VICTIM IN NEED OF EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE PRISON TO THEN SAID WARRANTLESS ENTRY AND LACK OF PROBABLE CAUSE ect ect...

MOREOVER For The Police To Claim They Had EXIGENT CIRCUMSTANCES TO JUSTIFY Their Warrantless Entry And Thereafter Search and Seizure Is A COMPLETE AND TOTAL ABUSE OF GOVERNMENTAL POWER AND AUTHORITY AND A MORE SO PERSONAL ABUSE OF MY 4TH AMENDMENT RIGHT PROTECTED UNDER THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION... For Police To Validate Their Claim Of A EXIGENCY For Their Community Care Taken Claim They Would Need To SO OFFER OR BE REQUIRED TO VERIFY A PERCEIVED THREAT TO HUMAN LIFE SUCH AS A FIRE, FLOOD, SIGNS OF DISTRESS PRIOR TO THEIR ENTRY... HOWEVER PLEASE NOTE IN SURPRISSION HEARING POLICE CAN NOT PRISON TO ENTRY...

POINT TO NOT ONE VALUED EXIGENCY OR HERE RATHER STATED EMERGENCY FURTHER MORE

I DEF WOULD LIKE TO EMPHASIZE AND ILLUMINATE THE FACT THAT THE LOWER COURTS ALL FAIL TO ACKNOWLEDGE AND APPRECIATE THE SAME GROUNDS HELD UNDER THE 4TH AMENDMENT'S PROTECTION CONCERNING PREREQUISITE WARRANTS TO HOMICIDE SEARCHES AND SEIZURES...

NOT ONLY DID THE LOWER COURTS FAIL TO ACKNOWLEDGE AND APPRECIATE THE SAID PRESTABLISHED CASE LAW OF FLIPPO VS WEST VA (US) AND MINCEY VS ARIZONA (US) THAT ARE CONTROLLING AND PARALLEL TO MY CASE THE LOWER COURTS UTTERLY FAIL TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE JURISPRUDENCE OF THE ((REQUIRED)) "HOMICIDE DOCTRINE" MORE SO IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT NONE OF THE SAID LOWER COURTS EVEN ACKNOWLEDGE STATE, REFER TO THE TERM KNOWLEDGE OF THE HOMICIDE SEARCH WARRANT PLEASE NOTE IT WAS NEVER USED IN ANY OF THE LOWER COURTS ARGUMENT(S)...

MOREOVER IN RETROSPECT Due To The Lower Courts Failing To Acknowledge The HOMICIDE SEARCH WARRANT DOCTRINE THEN WE CAN OBVIOUSLY SEE THEY WILL HERE TO FAIL TO APPRECIATE SAID JURISPRUDENCE FROM MY CASE. MOREOVER The Lower Courts Fail To Acknowledge That FOR OVER 4 DECADES NEARLY HALF A CENTURY THAT IT HAS BEEN UNLAWFUL FOR POLICE TO MAKE A SEARCH OF ANY AND EVERYTHING IN A WARRANTLESS HOMICIDE SEARCH OF A CRIME SCENE OHIO VS MAPP... FURTHER

Due To SAID BREACHES TO MY 4TH AMENDMENT RIGHTS AS WELL OTHERS HERE BRIEFLY MENTIONED THAT DERIVED FROM THE GOVERNMENTAL ABUSE OF POWER BY POLICE WHEN SUBJECTED TO A UNLAWFUL WARRANTLESS SEARCH AND SEIZURE THAT AGAIN ONLY LED TO MORE COMPROMISING OF MY 4TH AMENDMENT RIGHTS ON VARIOUS LEVELS

THUS I PRAY THIS HONORABLE COURT OVERTURN ALL SAID LOWER COURT RULINGS AND DEMAND MY CASE BACK TO TRIAL COURT, ON TO DENY MY INDICTMENT...

REASONS FOR GRANTING PETITION

PAGE 11

THE SAID CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS OF THIS CASE ARE IN REGARD TO THE DESCRIBING OF JURISDICTIONS CONCERNING THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE'S EXPECTATION OF PRIVACY AS WELL EXPECTATION TO PRIVACY AND WARRANTS, SAID EXPECTATION IS WELL PROTECTED UNDER THE UMBRELLA OF THE FOURTH AMENDMENT OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND US SUPREME COURT...

IN PARTICULAR THE CONSTITUTION PROVISIONS OF THIS CASE ARE, I MAKE VALUED EXAMPLIFICATION OF JUST HOW IMPERATIVE THE PEOPLE'S RIGHTS TO SAFETY ARE FROM VIOLATIONS OF THEIR FOURTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS NOT JUST ON A PERSONAL LEVEL BUT AS WELL ON A NATIONAL LEVEL FOR ALL CITIZENS IN THE UNITED STATES TO EXERCISE AND ADMIRE THAT DO SO PROTECT THE PEOPLE AT LARGE FROM UNLAWFUL ABUSE OF GOVERNMENTAL POWER CONCERNING WARRANTLESS, UNVALUED, FORCED SEARCHES AND SEIZURES OF THEIR PERSON, HOME, PROPERTY.

THERE WOULD BE ABSOLUTE CORRUPTION WITHOUT SAID PRIVILEGES AND RIGHTS PROTECTED UNDER THE FOURTH AMENDMENT AS WELL WITHOUT THE JUDGES AND OFFICERS OF THIS COURT TO STEADY MONITOR THAT THE US CITIZEN BE PROTECTED UNDER THE FOURTH AMENDMENT'S RIGHTS. MOREOVER THE ADMIRABLE JUDGES AND OFFICERS OF THIS HONORABLE COURT MUST STEADY FIGHT FOR THE INTEGRITY OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, SO THAT IT IS PROTECTED, UPHOLD AND NEVER ABUSED, FURTHER SO THAT THE U.S. CONSTITUTION CAN TRULY EMULATE AND REFLECT THE SPLENDOR AND GLORY OF THE HUMANITY OF ARE FOR FORTHCOMING WITH SO CRAFTED IT AND THE GREATEST NATION ON EARTH AMERICA...

MOREOVER

I WOULD FURTHER EMPHASIZE THAT THIS GRAND COURT OF THIS GREAT NATION MUST FURTHER INSURE THAT GOVERNMENTAL, POLICE ACTIVITY IS IN LAWFULL REGULARITY. MOREOVER THAT THIS COURT ROOM BE STRIVEN TO ACTION WHEN POLICE BREACH THE TRUST IN RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE'S EXPECTATION TO PRIVACY. . . . FURTHER THERE MAY BE PLENTY OF CASES THAT MAY CROSS THIS COURT'S TABLE CONCERNING GOVERNMENT ABUSE OF POWER BY POLICE WITH GOOD INTENTIONS. HOWEVER PLEASE NOTE THIS IS A CASE CONCERNING A WILLFULL MALICIOUS ABUSE OF GOVERNMENTAL POWER AND UTTER MOLESTATION OF MY EXPECTATION RIGHTS TO PRIVACY THAT WHEN EXPLOITED BY POLICE, GOVERNMENT. . . . THIS IS VERY MUCH A CASE THAT CALL FOR THIS HONORABLE COURT TO TAKE ACTION AND RESTORE JUSTICE TO INSURE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE GOVERNMENTAL ABUSE OF THIS MAGNITUDE DOES NOT SO BECOME A FASHIONABLE NORM OF SOCIETY IN AMERICA...

MOREOVER

THE STATUTORY PROVISIONS OF MY CASE ARE BASED ON PREESTABLISHED USC LAW. PARTICULARLY TO POLICE REGULATION, MONITORIZATION, RECOGNIZING HERE IN MY CASE TO HAVE A HOMELESS SEARCH WARRANT PRIOR TO A WARRANTLESS SEARCH OF A HOMELESS SCENE FOUND IN UNLAWFUL, WARRANTLESS ENTRY OF HOME. THIS PRECEDENCE WOULD BE HELD IN THIS US SUPREME COURT IN PREESTABLISHED LAW (CASE LAW) SINCE 1978 (MAPP VS OHIO) VERIFYING CONSTITUTIONAL STANDARDS OF TREATIES AND STATUTES THAT POLICE BY LAW MUST HAVE A HOMELESS SEARCH WARRANT PRIOR TO A SEARCH OF ANY AND EVERYTHING THEY FIND AT A HOMELESS SCENE IN A HOME...

DUE TO THE LOWER COURTS FAILING TO PROPERLY DESCRIBE SAID STATUTE TREATIES, CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS I WOULD ASK THIS COURT TO BE STRIVEN AND MOVED TO TAKE ACTION TO RECTIFY JUSTICE AND OVERTURN MY UNLAWFUL CONVICTION...

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Date: 4/22/21

MAZL DATE 9/7/21

State of Virginia
 County of Garrison
 On this 22 day of April 2021
 before me personally appeared Shane De Lee
 to me known to be the person who executed the foregoing instrument, and acknowledged that the execution was of his/her free act and deed.
 SEAL (signed) *[Signature]*
 NOTARY PUBLIC

I certify that this notary is
 not a party to this action.
[Signature] (Offender)

AMBER CROY STANLEY
 NOTARY PUBLIC
 Commonwealth of Virginia
 Reg. #7570946
 My Commission Expires 2/3/2021