


No. 21-712



IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JOSEPH LAMONT WILSON — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

PHOENIX POLICE DEPT., et al. — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

"U.S. Court of Appeals (9th Circuit)"
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

JOSEPH LAMONT WILSON
(Your Name)

201 W. JEFFERSON AVE
(Address)

PHOENIX, AZ 85004
(City, State, Zip Code)

N/A (INMATE)
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1) WHY IS THE STATE OF ARIZONA SEEKING TO INTERRUPT & DESTROY THE WORKS OF MY RESISTANCE PRACTICES BECAUSE I AM AUTHENTIC & CAN DO WORKS GREATER THAN JESUS? (QUESTIONS PROVIDED).

2) WHY ARE THE GOVERNING AUTHORITIES FAUSLY INCARCERATING ME TO PERFORM CLAUDESTINE OPERATIONS TO NURTURE FIRES ON THEIR OWN BEHALF - AGAINST MY RIGHT TO FAUSLY EXERCISE RESISTANCE? (EVERY 8 TIMES JESUS TOLD THE PEOPLE WHO I AM DISSEMINATING 648 W/ PRISON ON FAUSL CHARGES).

3.) WHY IS JUDGE DIANE J. HUMPHREY ON ALL THINGS OF MY COMPLAINTS FROM THIS YEAR 2016-18 & THIS YEAR 2021? 3) WHY IS ALL HER (JUDGE) VERDICTS THAT MY CLAIMS ARE UNBROKEN & FOLLOW TECHNICAL PLAYS WHILE I PROVIDE TYPE OF EVIDENCE TO PRODUCE A TRIAL WHOSE JUDGE SPONSORS CASE LAW IN DEPENDS OF DEFENDANT IN ALL CASES WITH COMMON SENSE TESTIMONY THAT THESE ARE GOING AHEAD OF HARASSMENT FROM LAW ENFORCEMENT / CIV. OFFICIALS?

4) WHY ARE THESE CLAUDESTINE OPERATIONS CONDUCTED (W/ MY APPROVAL) SUPPOSED TO MIND GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS HAVE THE RIGHT TO JUDICIALIZE MY LIFE, MY FAMILY, & ALL OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES & GOVERNMENTAL OFFICIALS BECAUSE THEY SOUGHT TO CURSE ME BECAUSE I AM TRUTH OF "600"? 5) WHY AM I TO BE INCARCERATED AS TO COVER UP FOR MURDERS COMMITTED

KNOWN BY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS TO HAVE OCCURRED BY OTHERS & BY THEM SET ME UP WITH FAUSL CRIMES TO INVICULATE DOE TO THESE CLAUDESTINE OPS?

6.) WHY AM I BEING DENIED FAIR HONORS BY THE COURT THING I HAD TO BLANKET ISSUES WITH SUNDRIES & CIVIL VIOLATIONS? TECHNICAL PERMS BY MISUSE OF CASE LAW TO SUPPRESS EVIDENCE & A BLANKET DISREGARD FOR THE PROCESS BY JUDGES (U.S. DISTRICT COURT OF ARIZONA) & PROSECUTIONS IS VIOLATED BY (U.S. COURT OF APPEALS) WITH ALL CHARGES COULD BE PROVEN & THE NATURE OF TYPE OF EVIDENCE (HOW IT IS TO BE PRESENTED TO COURT) IS PROVIDED TO U.S. DISTRICT COURT OF ARIZONA & IT IS BLANKETLY OVERLOOKED!

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:

LEGAL LIAISON OF PHOENIX POLICE DEPARTMENT (#0723), OFC. ANTHONY PINK (#09703); DET. NELUPOO (#09582); OFC. MUNDY SIKOR (#10234); OFC. BRIAN JONES (#10198); SGT. MISCOUTA (#8502); OFC. DUSTIN VEGESSA (#07287); OFC. JUSTIN PADUTER (#10600)

RELATED CASES

(9th Cir.) 121-16293 / D.C. NO. 2:21-CV-00038-DJH-JFM

/ D.C. NO. (2:26-28)-CV-?????-BSB-DJH

(9th Cir.) 21-15981 / D.C. NO. 2:21-CV-00038-DJH-JFM

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	"ORDER OF WRIT" (U.S. Court of Appeals - 9th Circuit)
APPENDIX B	"JUDGMENT OF DISMISSAL" (U.S. Court of Appeals - 9th Circuit)
APPENDIX C	"ORDER OF MANDATE" (U.S. Court of Appeals - 9th Circuit)
APPENDIX D	"JUDGMENT OF DISMISSAL OR ORDER TO PROCEED TO TRIAL" (U.S.D.C. #CV-2:21-00464-DJT-JFM)
APPENDIX E	"ORDER TO PROCEED TO TRIAL" (U.S.D.C. #CV-2:21-00464-DJT-JFM)
APPENDIX F	"JUDGMENT OF DISMISSAL OR MOTION TO RECONSIDER DENYING ORDER TO PROCEED TO TRIAL" (U.S.D.C. #CV-2:21-00464-DJT-JFM)

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

AS CASE NUMBER DID GO TO TRIAL, NO RELEVANT CASE LAW WAS NAMED BY ANY PARTIES TOWARD THE OUTCOME OF TRUE VERDICT OF HAUBURG-WEBER'S TESTIMONIES & EVIDENCES (MANU COVERS) - PURELY BLANKET!

STATUTES AND RULES

AS CASE NUMBER WENT TO TRIAL, ALSO N/A!

OTHER

N/A

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 B 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 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 _____ 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.

JURISDICTION

☒ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was 12/09/21 (JUDGMENT); 12/01/22 (MORRIS)

☐ 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: 12/09/21, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix B.

☐ 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 _____.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix _____.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied 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. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

- 1.) FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO "EXERCISE FREEDOM OF RELIGION".
- 2.) ARS. CONST. ART 2 § 36 (A) (... STATES SHALL NOT GRANT PREFERENTIAL RIGHTS AGAINST ANY BASED ON RACE IN OPERATION OF PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT/CONTRACTING.
- 3.) U.S.C.A. CONST. AMEND IV (SEIZURES BASED UPON OATH) AFTER MATION OF "PROBABLE CAUSE".
- 4.) U.S.C.A. CONST. AMEND XIV ("DUE PROCESS; EQUAL PROTECTION UNDER THE LAWS").
- 5.) U.S.C.A. CONST. AMEND V (DUE PROCESS OF LAW; TAKINGS WITHOUT JUST COMPENSATION; ... NO SHALL BE PLACED IN JEOPARDY OF LIFE & LIMB)

PROVISIONS VIOLATED BY PHOENIX POLICE DEPARTMENT.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

EMULI APRIL 26th 2020 - I KNOW ON A STUNNING COMPLAINT IN THE
ADJUTMENT OF LOS ANGELES OF PROBATE, MARIANA CANTY. THE MAN - FIND MY STOLEN PHONES
FROM A WOMAN I MET THAT PREVIOUS DAY ENLIGHT (APRIL 15th). AS I AM LOOKING FOR
THIS WOMAN, I FIND SIGNS THAT SHE (STRANGE WOMAN) HAS BEEN MURDERED BUT BECAUSE
I AM NEW TO THIS TYPE OF GLORIFICATION OF UNDERSTANDING I RECOVER ON W SEARCH MY
PHONE NOT SENSING A HOSTILE ENVIRONMENT,

ONCE I APPROACH STORAGE DOOR, A PALLY CLOTHED DIFFERENT WOMAN ANSWERS
THIS DOOR. THIS WOMAN (CAUCASIAN WITH THE LOOK TO HAVE A SMALL SPANISH INHERITANCE)
COMES TO THE DOOR ON US I WOULD, THIS ORANGEISH BLOONED WOMAN IN MY BLIND "SUMMER
SUN" IS NOT THE WOMAN I AM LOOKING FOR BUT SHE (NEW WOMAN) OPENS THE DOOR,
I ASK IF SHE'S (NEW WOMAN) SEEN THE OTHER WOMAN (BRUNETTE, HEAVYWEIGHT, ESPECIALLY
OF HEIGHT) WHO HAD TALKED MY PHONES, THERE IS A MAN AT THE TIME NAMED ON THE BED
(MEXICAN LATE 80S) BUT I DO NOT SEE him (MAN) AS OF YET BECAUSE THE BED IS (MAN) IS ON AS
TO THE LEFT ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE WALL ADJACENT TO THE DOOR OF THE OVER ROOM STORAGE,
BUT I CAN SEE AS THE WALL BEHIND THE WOMAN WHICH IS NO MORE THAN 5 FT. BEHIND HER.

NOT HAVING HEARD NOT OF THE STORY OF FORMER WOMAN'S MURDER, I PRETTY
NEARLY THIS (NEW) WOMAN HAS SEEN MY PHONES & SHE (NEW WOMAN) TELLS THAT INTERLOCUT
THE FICK AWAY FROM THAT DOOR. I TRY TO PARDON MYSELF BECAUSE I AM LOOKING FOR
FORMER WOMAN WITH MY PHONES BUTS (NEW) WOMAN PICKS UP A STICK (BROOM STICK
WITH 8 FEET LONG) & STRUCKS ME ON THE TOP OF THE HEAD, INSTANTLY DROW-
ING BLOOD! I IMMEDIATELY GRAB THE STICK FROM THE (NEW) WOMAN & BEAT HER (NEW
WOMAN) INTO A SPLITTING POSITION! THE MAN (WHICH NAMED JUMPS UP CHAOTICALLY) ONLY TO GET
LAP ACROSS HER (NEW WOMAN) LAP LIKE "ANOTHER SPANNING HER CIRCLES" - HIS (MAN) HEAD FALLS
DOWN TO THE GROUND, CHIN ON HER (NEW WOMAN) OUTSTRETCH FEET, HEAD PARTS FACING THE
CEILING! I BREAK THE STICK ON HIS (MAN) BACK, TO HIS SCREAMING AT THE WOMAN, TO HIS
(MAN) NEW FRAME OF MIND, TO LEAVE ME ALONE & STOP PROSECUTING ME! I LOOSE WHILE EXPLAIN-
ING WOMAN STRUCK ME IN THE HEAD WHILE I AM LOOKING FOR MY PHONES - WOMAN COMES OUT YELLING
"I'M GOING TO GET YOUR BLACKNESS LOCKED UP!" & SINCE I DID NOT KNOW THAT 2 SHIPS OF (ALL CHURCHES)
BOPOLICE (LITERALLY) WOULD SHOW, NOT INVESTIGATE IF WHAT SHE (NEW WOMAN) SAYS IS TRUE, I MUST
TALK WITHOUT TAKING A TEST UNWY FROM ME, FORGE A CROWN SCENE (GET IT TO SHOW) - I TELL HER
TO CALL POLICE! I AM WOULD STILL.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

THERES AN OPEN & SHUT CASE, I CAN PROVE ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THE POLICE -
THEYRE ABOUT MY NOT OBTAINING A TESTIMONY ON MY BEHALF (MY SIDE OF THE STORY), THE FORECAST
OF A CRIME SCENE, THE TAMPERING WITH EVIDENCE, SO OBVIOUSLY THE PAIR'S MISTAKE SEIZURE,
VIOLATION OF MURDER LAWS, THE OBSTRUCTION OF COURSE BUT ON PERSONS WHO CALLED THE POLICE
& THE POLICE VIOLATION MOTIVES! THERES A COMMON ROUTINE, WITNESSES, POLICE PAPERWORK, ETC.

TOGETHER WITH THE SUPREME COURT BECOMING INVOLVED IN A REVELATION OF
PROGRESS ADDED TO THE DOCUMENTS THAT BURTON SPENT CONSIDERABLE EFFORTS IN THE
LIFE OF THE 1960'S. NEW EVENTS HAVE OCCURRED IN THE LIFE OF '60'S & THE SUPREME
COURT CAN BECOME PART OF THE EXPOSURE OF THE SCOPE OF ATTENTION OF THESE AFFAIRS & CAUSE
CONSTITUTIONAL & LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS TO CONSIDER THEMSELVES PROBABLY INVOLVED
TO THE EXTENT OF THE ENDURANCE & AUTHORITY OF THESE THINGS! THE SUPREME COURT
CAN ALSO PLAY A ROLE IN UPHOLDING PROTECTION OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT "TO
FREEDOM OF SPEECH OR RELIGION".

THERES THE LAST ATTEMPT FOR THE COUNTRY'S GOVERNMENT TO THIS BRANCH TO SHOW
INTEGRITY & COURAGE OR IN THESE ISSUES!

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph Lamont Wilson

Date: 1/20/2022