

No. _____

21 - 6516

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

MARTIN ROBINSON — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

SEAN BAILEY — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

ORIGINAL

FILED
NOV 24 2021
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

LORAIN COUNTY COMMON PLEAS, NINTH DIST. COURT OF APPEALS
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

REDACT: FED. CIV. R. 5, 2

MARTIN ROBINSON
(Your Name)

PO. BOX 80033
(Address)

TOLEDO, OH. 43608
(City, State, Zip Code)

N/A
(Phone Number)

MOTION TO APPOINT COUNSEL; FOR ORAL ARGUMENT

RECEIVED
DEC 1 - 2021
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- DID PLAINT. BAILEY FAIL TO SERVE DEFT. ROBINSON THE COMPLAINT PER CIV. R.? YES, HE DID.
- WAS THE TRIAL DOCKET FALSIFIED? POSSIBLE.
20 CV 201293 LORAIN COUNTY COMMON PLEAS.
- WAS TRIAL HELD? NO; WAS ROBINSON ABLE TO GIVE ANSWER? NO; WAS ROBINSON PRESENT FOR ANY PROCEEDINGS? NO?
- DID ROBINSON HAVE AN ATTORNEY APPEAR ON HIS BEHALF? YES
- DID THAT ATTORNEY ANSWER THE COMPLAINT? NOT TO ROBINSON'S KNOWLEDGE.
- WAS HIS DUE PROCESS VIOLATED? YES - SHOULD THE TRIAL COURT HAVE RULED AGAINST ROBINSON AND AWARDED MONETARY TO PLAINT.? NO.
- DID THE 9TH DIST. COURT OF APPEALS FAIL TO REVIEW THE TRIAL COURT 20 CA 011708 9TH DIST.? YES - DID ROBINSON FILE A BRIEF? YES; WAS THE BRIEF REPLIED TO? NO
- WAS A MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF JURISDICTION FILED TO SUPREME COURT OF OHIO? YES
- HAS THE STATE OF OHIO IGNORED MY ARGUMENTS? YES.
- HAS THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ^{REVIEWED} ~~REVIEWED~~ MY ARGUMENTS? YES
- WHAT'S THE POINT OF RECONSIDERATION S.C.T. PRAC. R. 1802 AND ORAL ARGUMENT IF IT IS SELDOM TO NEVER GRANTED? FORMER S. CO. JUSTICE HERBERT BROWN 11/17/21 SPOKE AT COLUMBUS METROPOLITAN CLUB AROUND 0500 PBS 11/23/21. HE MADE LIGHT OF IMPORTANT ISSUES SUCH AS THESE, IN MY OPINION.

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

Cuyahoga County 18CR62778A, 17CR622901A; LORAIN County 18CR099209; 9TH DIST. COURT OF APPEALS 19CA011495, 20CA011689, 20CA011706, 789, 11, 20CA011624; 21CA011756; 12TH DIST. COURT OF APPEALS CA 20210015, OR CA 2021-08-015; S.C.O. 2021-0421, 0598, 0686, 0688, 0775; SOUTH U.S. DIST. 2:21CV0774; NORTH U.S. DIST. 1:11CV01609, 1:20CV2489; U.S. 6TH CIR. 19-4036, 20-4232, 21-3019, 3887; STATE V. BRADLEY, 2005 OH-6533; ESTELLE V. WILLIAMS, 1976, 425 U.S. 501, 4, 5; HOLBROOK V. FLYNN, 1986, 475 U.S. 560, 67; TAYLOR V. KENTUCKY, 1978, 436 U.S. 478, 85; TM THREE ADVER. LLC V. RODRIGUEZ V, 2021-OH-2759; MUSTIN V. GUILLER, 21 U.S. DIST. LEXIS 184963; BROWN V. VORITIES, 2009 U.S. DIST. LEXIS 76351; GRIFFIN V. YARBROUGH, 1987 U.S. DIST. LEXIS 15530

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	5
CONCLUSION.....	6
PROOF OF SERVICE.....	7

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A NOT AVAILABLE DECISION OF STATE LORAIN COUNTY TRIAL COURT
20 CV 201293

APPENDIX B DECISION OF STATE COURT OF APPEALS 9TH DIST.: MAY 03, 2021
HEREIN 20CA 011708

APPENDIX C DECISION OF STATE OF OH. SUPREME COURT DENYING REVIEW:
NO COPY NOT AVAILABLE.

APPENDIX D DECISION OF STATE OF OH. SUPREME COURT DENYING REHEARING
HEREIN OCTOBER 26, 2021, 2021-0686 RECEIVED 11/01/21

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
MARTIN ROBINSON V. JUDGE S.S. SAFFOLD, 21-3019 6TH CIR	4
ROBINSON V. STATE OF OHIO, 9TH DIST. 21 CA 011756	4
LAVADO V. KEOHANE, 992 F.2D 601 6TH CIR 4/22/1993	4
FARMER V. BRENNAN, 510 U.S. 811, 941, 511 U.S. 825	5
ROBINSON V. BARROW ET AL, 2012 U.S. DIST. LEXIS 33141, 38896; 2011 U.S. DIST. LEXIS 113671	4

STATUTES AND RULES	
U.S. CONST. AMEND. 6, 14	3
OH. CONST. ART. 1 SEC. 10	3
OAC 120-1-03	3
CIV. R. 4, 9	3
28 USC 1915 D 1988	4
28 USCS 1331	3, 4
42 USCS 2000E-5	3, 4
28 U.S.C. 1257A	2, 3
OTHER	4
ANY AND ALL RIGHTS	
AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT	3, 4

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 _____ 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 _____ 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. I THINK

The opinion of the 9th DIST COURT OF APPEALS 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. I THINK

JURISDICTION

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was _____.

☐ 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: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (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 12/22/21.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix A. NOT PROVIDED

☒ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date:
OCTOBER 26, 2021, and a copy of the order denying rehearing
appears at Appendix D. I DIDN'T RECEIVE MY COPY UNTIL NOV. 01, 2021

☐ 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

U.S. AMEND. CONST 6 AND 14 ; OT CONST ART. 1 SEC. 10. ;

OAC. 120-1-03 ; CIV. R. 4, 9 ; AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

28 USCS 1331; 42 USCS 2000E-5

28 USC 1257A

NOT THE FIRST TIME

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

11/23/21 I BECAME VERY CONFUSED YESTERDAY. MY CONFUSION IS KEEPING FROM COMPLETEING BASIC NEEDS LET ALONE THIS IN A TIMELY FASHION. WHAT DOES IT ALL MATTER ANYHOW. YOU HAVE REFUSED TO FILE THREE PRIOR ATTEMPTED WRIT OF CERTS BY ME. IT IS CLEAR I AM UNABLE TO MEET YOUR STANDARDS AND REQUIRE ASSISTANCE. I AM PERMANENTLY DISABLED. EVEN IF I WAS NOT, IT IS MY OPINION THAT "NORMAL" OR EVEN PROFESSIONALS WOULD HAVE/D HAVE DIFFICULTY. I AM PRESERVING ANY AND ALL RIGHTS. I HAVE MORE WRIT OF CERTS TO SUBMIT TO YOU. THIS APPEARS TO BE A WASTE OF TIME, AND PAPER. MOTION FOR APPOINT COUNSEL. SEE 6TH CIR. 21-3019, NEWTRIAL 9TH DIST. MANY OF MY OTHER ATTEMPTS AT ARGUING "EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES" LAVADO V. KEDHANE 992 F.2D 601 6th CIR 4/22/1993; 28 USC 1915D/1988;.. MY NOT BEING ABLE TO PROVIDE COPIES OF DECISIONS, CAN IT YOU LOOK AT IT ONLINE (PACER), OR EMAIL, OR FAX, IN TODAY'S PAPERLESS SOCIETY. THE FACTS OF THIS CASE ARE THAT I WASN'T SERVED, INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL, FAILURE TO REVIEW BY SCO. AND 6L AND 9TH DIST. COURT OF APPEALS. REVIEW QUESTION SECTION AND MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF JURISDICTION SCO 2021-0686, DUE PROCESS... APPOINT COUNSEL, AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT; 42 USC 2000e-5; 28 USC 1331... POLICE HAVE A STRONG ANIMUS AGAINST ROBINSON, ROBINSON V. BARROW, ET AL, 2012 U.S. DIST. LEXIS 33141, 38896; 2011 U.S. DIST. LEXIS 113671.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

OHIO AND U.S. CONST. VIOLATIONS; OHIO'S FAILURE TO
ALLOW INMATES ORAL ARGUMENT, APPOINT COUNSEL FARMER
V. BRENNAN, 510 U.S. 811, 941, 511 U.S. 825, YOU APPOINTED
FARMER COUNSEL; LACK OF OVERSIGHT OF LOWER COURTS;
CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM; REFUSAL OF THIS COURT TO
REVIEW CASES; GREAT INTEREST OF PUBLIC.


CONCLUSION

I NEED ASSISTANCE.
APPOINT COUNSEL IF NEEDED AND ORAL ARGUMENT.

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted, I NEED AT LEAST SIX MORE
BLANK PETITIONS.

WRONGFULLY IMPRISONED

Respectfully submitted,


MARTIN ROBINSON

Date: NOVEMBER 01, 2021