

21-7165

ORIGINAL

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

JAN 10 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

BERNARD MIDDLETON — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

PEOPLE OF STATE OF ILLINOIS — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

U.S. DISTRICT OF NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Bernard Middleton
(Your Name)

2800 ROUTE 99 SOUTH
(Address)

MOUNT STERLING ILLINOIS 62353
(City, State, Zip Code)

N/A
(Phone Number)

RECEIVED

JAN 19 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

INDEX

COURTS BELOW DENIED DISCRETIONARY REVIEW

1. QUESTION PRESENTED : WHY WAS MY CLAIMS IGNORED ? MY COMPLAINT IS ABOUT DUE PROCESS VIOLATIONS/NO PRELIMINARY HEARING AND DISMISSALS WITHOUT NOTIFICATIONS . WHY DID THE FEDERAL COURT CHANGE THE NARATIVE TO DENY THE PETITION . IS'NT THAT PREJUDICE ?
2. LIST OF PARTIES : CASE NO. 21-2070, IS PERTAINNING TO ME AND ONLY ME THAT WAS FALSELY ACCUSED,
3. INDEX OF APPENDICES : A.B.C. SHOWS PROOF THAT MY PETITIONS FILED FOR RELIEF WERE ALL DISMISSED WITHOUT NOTIFICATION D.E.F.G. SHOWS THE FEDERAL COURTS APPROVES THE 651(b) UNLAWFUL BEHAVIOR..... AND THEY DENIED TO RECONSIDER .
4. TABLES OF AUTHORITIES : ^{SEE PETITION ON} PAGE NO. 2, SHOWS LAND MARK CASE LAWS NEVER OVERTURN. 4TH AMENDMENT VIOLATIONS. E.G. VS- DIDISIO 410, U.S. 1, (1975)..... E.G. U.S. 6- KINCAD 345, F. 3d, 1095 * 1096..... E.G. SCHERBER VS- CALIFORNIA 384, U.S. 757 (1963) MAPP VS- OHIO 367, U.S. 643, 81, S. CT. 1684, 6, L. ED, 2d, 1081, 86..... FAHY VS- CONN. 375, U.S. 85, 84, S. CT. 229, 11, L. 2d, 171 (1963)..... PEOPLE VS- CASTREE 311, ILL. 392, 143 N.E. 2d, 112, 34, ALR, 357. SUPPORTING CASE LAWS ON FORCE BLOOD EXTRACTION. PAGE #2+3 FEDERAL CASE LAWS AGAINST 4TH AMEND. VIOLATIONS
5. OPINION BELOW : THEY GAVE NO RESPONSE TOWARDS MY CLAIMS, NO OPINIONS. ONLY DISMISSALS OF MY PETITIONS WITHOUT ANY NOTIFICATIONSTHE FEDERAL COURTS AGREED WITH THE ILLEGAL BEHAVIARS. RECONSIDERATION IS DENIED.
UNPUBLISHED ORDER. ^{SEE PG. A.B.C.D.E.F.G.}
NO RESOLUTION
6. JURISDICTION : THE COURTS BELOW HAS NO JURISDICTION TO INCARCERATE. THE CHARGING INSTRUMENTS ON ALL CLASS X'S IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL FOR VIOLATING THE SINGLE SUBJECT REQUIREMENTS OF ILL. CONST. OF ARTICLE (4) SECT. 8(b) IT IS UNENFORCEABLE IN ITS ENTIRETY.... THERES NO ARRAIGNMENT/INDICTMENT AND PERMANANTLY ENJOINED ITS ENFORCEMENTS . SEE PAGE 31.
7. STATUTORY INVOLVE : ILL. SUP. CT. RULE 730 ILLCS 5/5-4-3 ⁽²⁰⁰²⁾ / 730 ILLCS 5/12-14, A-1. ⁽²⁰⁰²⁾ PG. 30-34
8. REASON TO GRANT PETITION.: VIOLATION OF 4TH 5TH 8TH 14TH AMEND. OF U.S. CONSTITUTION AND THE ARTICLE 1, SECT. 2, 7, 8, 11, 13, 16, 20, 23, AND 24, OF ILL. CONSTITUTION .
9. STATEMENT OF THE CASE : NO ARRAIGNMENT, NO INDICTMENT AND THERE WERE NO PRELIMINARY HEARINGS.... ON SEXUAL ASSAULT AND IGNORED INNOCENTS.
PG. 30-35... 23-24... 36-40
INDICTMENT..... 4TH AMEND... INNOCENTS...
PETITIONER Bernard Middleton
DATE . JANUARY 9, 2022

X