

(A)

To The Supreme Court of The United States

Docket No: 21-2169

Certificate of Intervening Circumstances
of Substantial and Controlling Effect, and
substantial grounds not previously presented.

The petitioner, John Rabin, swears to the most fundamental intervening circumstance of his (Actual Innocence). He invokes his (Actual) and (Legal) innocence because liberty is ruled by this court to take precedent to comply. The United States Constitution's Fourteenth (14th) Amendment guards against a deprivation of liberty, without the state meeting the burden to prove (every fact) beyond a reasonable doubt and it has the controlling effect of In Re Winship 397 US 358 (1970) Constitutional grounds not previously presented as proof for the pleadings are the court has authority to issue an injunction to stop enforcement of orders that are contrary to controlling Federal laws as established with the relevant decision of Verizon v. Maryland Inc. vs. Public Service Comm of Maryland 535 US 635 (2002) Two treaties made by the United States authority create the interests of

(B)

a public hearing, impartial tribunal, and an effective remedy by a higher court for deprivations of rights, by unlawful state actions. The United States Constitution's Article One (1), Section Nine (9) entitlement to Habeas Corpus. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights Articles Eight (8) and Ten (10), and The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights Article Fourteen (14), Sections One (1), Two (2), and Five (5). The elements of harassment, delays in the MAIL by prison officials, suffering assaults, and the more recent attack by several individuals, for defending my Innocence constitutes interfering circumstances based on Mitchum vs. Foster 407 US 225 (1972)

Which also held, the Federal courts are guardians of our Federal Rights, when state courts refuse to acknowledge and enforce them. All the facts and laws are true to substantiate this certificate on the 15th day of February, 2022

John Ragan #1855505 B-4-443
Green Mountain Correctional Center
P.O. Box 86p
Oak Wood, VA 24681

TONY H. CORDLE
NOTARY-PUBLIC
Commonwealth of Virginia
Registration No. 351445
My Commission Expires July 31, 2025

My Commission Expires: 7-31-25

Sworn and subscribed before
me this 15 day of February, 2022 An Accurate
and true legal document (Affidavit) of facts, to
support relief for claims. Tony H. Cordle
Notary Public

In The Supreme Court of The United States
John Regin, Petitioner
vs.

Melissa Layman, Douglas Robelen
via The Supreme Court of Virginia
Timothy Fisher, via. Newport News Circuit Court order

Docket No: 21-2169

Certificate to certify The petition
is an Act of Good Faith

The petitioner submits this 15th day of February, 2022
the complaint and petition to the court is an act of good
faith and not for delay. The Supreme Court of The
United States is authorized by The United States
Constitution's Article Three(1), Section Two(2), judicial power
to review the claims of Federal question by Appellate
jurisdiction, to effectuate the judgements of relevance
decisions from The Supreme Court of The United
States. When the case of controversy originates in
the states highest court. Acts of Congress 28 U.S.C.S
1257(a) and 28 U.S.C.S 1651(a) enforces the constitutional
power to aid in the courts jurisdiction, when the highest
state court orders are contrary to controlling Federal
laws. Both treaties made under the United States
Authority declare the right to the equal protection of
laws.

(B)

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights Article Seven(1),
and The International Covenant on Civil and Political
Rights Article Fourteen(1), Section One(1)

The relevant decisions of The Supreme Court of
The United States has already decided the Federal
question: Public officers are bound to obey the laws. There
is no authority, to deprive liberty, without due process. The
United States Constitution's Fourteenth(14th) Amendment is
a law against, the deprivation of liberty, without due process
as enforced with United States vs. Lee 106 U.S. 196(1882)

An effective remedy, will provide petitioner with a full
and fair opportunity, to demonstrate his right to testify
and advocate innocence was denied as an act of bad faith,
contrary to Virginia Code (19.2-265). The relevant decision
of Gallego vs. United States already decided it constitutes
due process violations and is ineffective assistance of
counsel to overrule the right. Conforming to 28 U.S.C. 455(b)(1)
and 455(b)(3) would have provided an impartial tribunal,
instead of the biases of Timothy Fisher pursuant 28 U.S.C.
144. The impartial tribunal, would practically enforce
28 U.S.C. 2243 and issued constitutional orders for prospective
relief. Fulfilling the obligations of 28 U.S.C. 453, and
consistent with the Fourteenth(14th) Amendment. Heshy,
swearing this is an act of good faith on the 15th day of
February, 2022 to recover the right to liberty, secured
by the United States Constitution's Fourteenth(14th)
Amendment.