

NO: 21-6913

①

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Timothy Littlejohn

- Petitioner

VS

Bowman et al.

- Respondent

ORIGINAL

FILED

MAR 18 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

ON Petition for Rehearing to
Supreme Court of The UNITED STATES

U.S. Court of Appeal for the Northern District of Georgia 11th Circuit

Petition for Rehearing

Timothy Littlejohn

1825 County Service PKWY S.W.

Marietta, GA 30008

[Signature]
4/14/2022

M. Lawson
Notary 4/14/2022





Table of Contents

3

0

- 1) State of facts, authority and citations, Constitution provision
conclusion of rehearing 3 of 3 pages 1-3
- 2) Certificate of counsel 1 of 1 pages 4
- 3) Exhibit A 1 (5) Appendix A shows i was shot without a hearing
- 4) Table of Authorities Cited (6) pages


4/14/2022

M. Lawson
Notary 4/14/2022




Table of Authorities Cited

- 1) Estate of Shabazz, 482 U.S. at 349 107 S.Ct. at 2404 p. 3
- 2) Turner v. Gafley, *supra*, 482 U.S. at 89, 107 S.Ct. at 2261 p. 3
- 3) Winston v. Lee, 410 U.S. 753 105 S.Ct. 1611 84 LEd 2d 662 (1985) p. 4
- 4) Youngblood v. Romeo, 457 U.S. 307 102 S.Ct. 2452 73 LEd 2d 98 (1982) p. 4
- 5) Schmeidler v. California, 384 U.S. 757, 172 86 S.Ct 1826, 1836-37, 16 LEd, 2d 908 (1966) p. 4
- 6) Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438, 478, 48 S.Ct. 564, 572, 72 LEd 944 (1928) p. 4
- 7) Washington v. Harper 494 U.S. 20 (1990) p. 2, 3, 4
- 8) Vitek v. Jones, 445, U.S. 480 (1980) p. 2, 3, 4

Petition for Rehearing Rule 44.

④ ④

1). Pursuant to Rule 44, Petitioner file this rehearing on the merits worth evaluating of defendant's conduct that goes against the controlling effect of this court's precedent in Vitek v. Jones, 445, U.S. 480 (1980) which clearly established procedural due process under the 14th Amendment and how to apply it. Before you deprive of liberty from someone; and Washington v. Harper 494 U.S. 20 (1990). Which follow that same process under Vitek supra, of giving a hearing which is required before you involuntarily medicate someone with anti-psychotic medicine "Haldol" like they did me without such process or hearing which wasn't properly previously present that are intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect that it's the court's duty and authority to govern, regulate, and manage, and exercise its power to hear why defendant aren't going by these precedent that is clearly established over 40 years now, and request a response from the respondent/defendant who's going against this authority !!!:

* Or to repeal Both precedent clearly established *

* UNANIMOUSLY By this court *

Statement of fact not previously properly presented

2). Before May 27, 2020 I never in my life was diagnosed for having any mental disorder or have I ever taken any anti-psychotic drug ever, nor have I ever had a hearing to decide if I can be involuntarily medicated, by no-one including this Jail or nor was I given a hearing before defendant injected me with the "Haldol shot" against my will, On May 27, 2020 as exhibit A-1 will show at 1:54 respondent enter that I was fully restrain in a padded cell which I told them over 7 times that I don't wanna be injected with that medicine to no prevail, When I told nurse Dargel I'm going to sue you and file charges she handed the needle to Nurse Muhammad who told me it was order by a doctor Hindash on the 26th of May without given me process or hearing under Vitek, Harper, supra it's strictly arbitrary, and was use as a form of punishment because I wanted to press charges for excessive force just one day prior exhibit A-1 clearly shows that shot was not only unlawful it was order on the 26th of May, so it was also void, and nowhere on exhibit A-1 does it say it gave me a process under Vitek, supra, and a hearing under Harper, supra defendant agree there's no process for this shot Dr. Hindash told me that if

② ④

a). Ask him to order the shot then he orders it without a hearing and this is how the sheriff runs his jail and he apologize after i told him that shot could've kill me, I was held down injected and i can't remember from there i was out like a light, I now have side effects from the shot and its been over two years now, Whats worse is there's a new sheriff and there's still no policy so it the cant duty, and authority to stop this arbitrary conduct of blatant violation of due process of a pretrial detainees house in this jail and Blatant disregard of the precedent clearly establish unanimously by this court which give authority to compel defendant to respond as to why that they are injecting pretrial detainees without process or given a hearing knowing this medicine can kill or permanent damage like they did me once i refused and admitted to it

Authority and citation to support rehearing and authorize this court to compel a response to this controlling effect

- A). Exhibit A-1 shows substantial grounds that was previously presented but overlooked that defendants involuntarily medicate me after being told over 7 times i refuse taking away my liberty under the 14th Amendment, and without given me procedural due process under Vitek, Harper, supra which conflict with relevant decisions of this court, to authorize a response by respondent from this court authority?!
- B). Respondent never denied they shot me, and they admitted there's no procedure its all arbitrary which Vitek, supra forbids and no procedure in place for anti-psychotic medication under Harper, supra which conflicts with relevant decision of this court, and authorize a response by respondents to this courts as why?!.
- C). This inaction of not having a policy is arbitrary and not related to a legitimate penological interests Estate of Shabazz, 482 U.S. at 349 107 S.Ct., at 2404 and is in conflict with relevant decision of this court which authorize controls to compel a response as to why they're not adhering to this authority and to grant this hearing?!
- d). Respondent injected a competent pretrial inmate, "myself", against my will before and without giving a hearing, and admitted to it there's no policy it makes this action invalid and there no government interest put forward to justify it which is why they waive their rights to respond Turner v. Safley, supra, 482 U.S. at 89, 107 S.Ct., at 2261 and conflicts with this courts decision precedent

e). This drug was injected and prescribed for reasons unrelated to any medical need. It was arbitrary and erroneous under standards of this court precedents which was totally ignored by respondents and unlawful with clear, cogent, convincing substantial evidence in Exhibit _____. This was a clear invasion unlawful of my body that violated my liberty to be free from arbitrary unwanted administration of anti-psychotic drugs especially since it left side effects and could've caused death Winston v. Lee 470 U.S. 753, 105 S.Ct. 1611 84 L.Ed. 2d 662 (1985) (surgery); Young Blood v. Roman, 457 U.S. 307 102 S.Ct. 2452 73 L.Ed. 2d 98 (1982) (use of physical "soft" restraints for arms and neck for hands, my interest in avoiding the unwanted administration of anti-psychotic drugs is not insubstantial and the forcible injections of medication into a non-consenting person's body represent a substantial interference with that person's liberty Winston v. Lee, supra; Schmcken v. California, 384 U.S. 757, 72 S.Ct. 1826, 1836-37, 16 L.Ed. 2d 908 (1966). and violation of integrity of my body, Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438, 478, 48 S.Ct. 564, 572, 72 L.Ed. 944 (1928) (makers of the constitution undertook to secure, against the government the right to be left alone. Force administration of anti-psychotic shot may not be use as punishment. This conclusion follows inexorably from this court's holding in Vitek, supra. Vitek, supra give me the right to have procedural protection such as a hearing which was decided in Harper, supra.

f) The central question before this court is whether a judicial hearing is required once I invoke my right to a hearing before they arbitrarily injected me with "Haldol" and against my will set in precedent in Vitek, Harper, supra which is controlling in this court on the merits from substantial evidence which compel a response to and on the merit because respondent's action conflicts with relevant decision in this court.

g). On the merits, the threshold question in this case is whether respondent supposed to have given me a judicial hearing once I refuse to be involuntarily medicated with "Haldol" without a hearing and against my will. Since respondent agrees they shot me against my will and without a hearing even when I refuse, and both district and magistrate court allowed it to proceed and never dismiss it on technicalities and not merits, did they violate my liberty to be free and why, since this arbitrary policy conflicts with relevant decision of this court.

Constitutional provisions

3) Harper, supra says defendants suppose to give me a hearing before they injected me when I refuse before they did it over 7 times violating, depriving me of my right to liberty, Vitek, supra says this procedural hearing is suppose to be in place before they involuntarily injected me which deprive of my due process, and liberty to be free from administration of anti-psychotic medication that could've killed me, and now have left me with side effect that I haven't got threat yet.

Conclusion for rehearing

4) Since respondent shot me and are continuing to do so without policy and procedure under Vitek, and Harper, supra these are intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect which wasn't properly previous presented on these substantial grounds on the merits to authorize this court to grant this rehearing and writ to certiorari and request a response as to the merits of whether and why they are not adhering to the precedent clearly established, I move this court to grant this rehearing and response and writ of certiorari because of invasion policy conflicts with relevant decisions of this court. . . .

Certificate of Counsel

⑦

I Timothy Littlejohn pro-se petitioner and party unrepresented by counsel present this petition for a, and present this to respondent Bowman et al. in good faith and not for delay. The petition for Renewing this case by the courts, under Rule 44. and to guide this court decision by its own precedent in Harper, Riggins, Vitek, supra, which is clearly authority and Substantial Law of the Land that has been blatantly disregarded by respondents intentionally over 30 years plus and still has no policy putting me in imminent danger

Timothy Littlejohn

March 18, 2022

Sergeant Bowman et al

P.O. Box 100110

Monetta, CA 90061

⑥ cc
⑦