

No. 21-7338

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OF GEORGIA

FILED
FEB 23 2022
ORIGINAL

Chandler Saxton — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

VS.

STATE OF GEORGIA ET AL., — RESPONDENT(S)
JUDGE MAUREEN GOTTFRIED, ANTHONY JOHNSON, ROBIN KING / FRED LEWIS

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

Superior Court of Columbus, GA P.O. BOX 2145 (31902) SUP FARETTA HEARING #106001517
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Chandler Saxton
(Your Name)

HAYS STATE PRISON P.O. BOX 668 TRION, GA 30753
(Address)

TRION, GA 30753
(City, State, Zip Code)

NOT AVAILABLE DUE TO PRISON CONFINEMENT.
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

AS A TOTALITY OF CUMULATIVE ERRORS INCLUDING
IGNORED MEDICAL ISSUES. THE CUMULATIVE ERROR DOCTRINE SAYS
IT WILL REVERSE A CONVICTION WHEN AN AGGREGATION OF NONE REVERSIBLE
ERRORS YIELDS A DENIAL OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL. ALL
I AM ASKING IS FOR THIS COURT TO HEAR MY GROUNDS AS THIS COURT HOLDS THAT
IT WILL EXERCISE ITS SUPERVISORY POWER AND LISTEN WHEN NO ONE ELSE WILL.
AS STATED IN NAGEL VS. THE STATE 442 SE. 20446

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW 1. A

JURISDICTION..... 2. B

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED 3. C

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 4. D

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT 5. E

CONCLUSION..... 6. F

INDEX TO APPENDICES

- [APPENDIX A - OPINIONS OF STATE COURTS : PRELIMINARY HEARING, TRIAL DATE AND VERDICT, TRIAL SENTENCING DATE, MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL DATE, FARETTA HEARING, ALL STATE COURT HEARINGS, ETC
- [APPENDIX B - OPINIONS OF DISTRICT COURTS - (ALL)
OPINIONS OF SUPREME COURT NOTICES - (ALL)
- [APPENDIX C - CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED
- [APPENDIX D - STATEMENT OF THE CASE - SUMMARY OF THE CASE
- [APPENDIX E - REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT - GROUNDS AND ERROR
- [APPENDIX F - CONCLUSION DATE AND CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
N NAGEL VS THE STATE	264 GA 150
R ROYALS VS. THE STATE	268 GA 78 (2) 81
R ROQUIARO VS. THE UNITED STATES	353 U.S. 53
S SANCHEZ VS. SEC Y, FLA, DEPT OF CORR.	US. APP LEX IS 28916
S SPIVEY VS. SPIVEY	202 GA. 644
T TAYLOR VS. THE STATE	305 GA. APP 748
V UNITED STATES VS. HASTING	461 U.S. 499
V UNITED STATES VS. JEAN-CHARLES	696 FED APP X. 405
V UNITED STATES VS. LEICHTNAM	948 F.2d 370
V UNITED STATES VS. WADDELL	840 FED APP X. 421
W WHITE VS. THE STATE	287 GA. 713

STATUTES AND RULES

- N NAGEL VS. THE STATE - SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA - IT IS THE DUTY OF THE REVIEWING COURT TO CONSIDER THE TRIAL RECORD AS A WHOLE.
- R ROYALS VS. THE STATE - SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA - CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITATIONS ON NOTE PASSING LIMIT FAIR TRIAL.
- R ROQUIARO VS. THE UNITED STATES - SUPREME COURT OF THE US - INTRODUCTION TO JURY AND DEFENDANT CONTRIBUTE TRIAL RETROACTIVE
- S SANCHEZ VS. SEC Y, FLA, DEPT OF CORR - US COURTS OF APPEALS - FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND RIGHTS FAIRLY RELATE HAS LONG BEEN ADMISSIBLE AND IMPORTANT AS A RIGHT TO THE JUSTICE OF EQUITY IN THE COURT ROOM.
- S SPIVEY VS. SPIVEY - SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA - TO DETER ILLEGAL CONDUCT DISCIPLINE OF MONG-LY AND UNJUSTIFIED PROSECUTION OR COUNSEL, IS THE COURTS SUPERVISORY POWER TO LISTEN TO SUCH VIOLATIONS.
- T TAYLOR VS. THE STATE - COURT OF APPEALS - EXERCISING A COURTS POWERS AND LIMITATIONS CONCLUDE ALL KNOWN ERRORS THAT ARE HARMLESS, INCLUDING MOST CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS.
- V UNITED STATES VS. HASTING - IT IS THE DUTY OF A REVIEWING COURT TO CONSIDER THE TRIAL RECORD AS A WHOLE AND TO IGNORE errors that are harmless, including most constitutional violations.
- V UNITED STATES VS. JEAN-CHARLES - U.S. COURT OF APPEALS - COURT ROOM ERROR HAS HAD A NEW VOICE A HUMAN RIGHTS cannot be ignore cumulative errors point out such fairness as a whole.

OTHER

- V UNITED STATES VS. LEICHTNAM - U.S. COURT OF APPEALS - THE OPINION OF THE COURT OF APPEALS DOES NOT MAKE ENTIRELY CLEAR ITS BASIS FOR REVERSING CONVICTIONS WHEN EVIDENCE OF SUCH IS NOT OBTAINABLE.
- V. UNITED STATES VS. WADDELL - U.S. COURTS OF APPEALS - CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS INVOLVING VIDEO HAVE SINCE CREATED A WELLNESS CHECK OF THE COURT TO REVIEW FAIRNESS OF EVIDENT ERROR THAN ASSERTED AND AVAILABLE VIDEO.
- W WHITE VS. THE STATE - SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA - ANY COURT HELD HELD TO A HIGHER DEGREE OF JUSTICE WHERE AS EVIDENCE IS CLEARLY SHOWN CANNOT IGNORE ANY HIDDEN OR UNOPENED VIOLATIONS TO LAW.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
B- <u>BLY VS. THE STATE</u>	283 GA 453
C- <u>CHANDLER SAXTON VS. JUDGE MAUREEN GOTTFRIED</u>	NO. 4:16-CV-320-CDL-MSM
D- <u>DANIELS VS THE STATE</u>	133 S.E. 866
D- <u>DUSKY VS. THE UNITED STATES</u>	US. 402, 80 S.C.T. 788 4L ED 20 824
E- <u>ESTES VS. TEX</u>	381 U.S. 532
G- <u>GUZMAN VS. THE STATE COURT OF APPEALS OF GEORGIA SECOND DIVISION</u>	260 GA. APP 681 260 GA. APP 689; 58 S.E. 20654
H- <u>HEAD VS. THE STATE</u>	253 GA. 429 322 S.E. 20 228
J- <u>JEAN DENIS VS. MASON</u>	2021 U.S. APP. LEX 15 15081
M- <u>MAURICE MAYO VS. ROBERT J. HENDERSON</u>	13 F 3d 528 13 F. 3d 528
M- <u>MCKEE VS. COSBY</u>	139. S.C.T. 675

STATUTES AND RULES

- B- BLY VS. THE STATE - SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA - A LAY PERSON CANNOT OPINIONATE ON OR GIVE TESTIMONY TO THINGS UNKNOWN.
- C- CHANDLER SAXTON VS. JUDGE MAUREEN GOTTFRIED - MALICIOUS PROSECUTION VIOLATES DUE PROCESS
- D- DANIELS VS THE STATE SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA - ANY ERROR INVOLVING DUE PROCESS OF LAW MUST BE CONSIDERED.
- D- DUSKY VS. THE UNITED STATES - INEFFECTIVE COUNSEL AS A WHOLE IMPAIR A DEFENDANT TO RECEIVE A FAIR TRIAL.
- E- ESTES VS. TEX - SUPREME COURT OF THE U.S. - SUCH VIOLATES AS THE 14TH AMENDMENT UPHOLD INEFFECTIVE COUNSEL VIOLATION
- G- GUZMAN VS. THE STATE - THE STATE COURT OF APPEALS OF GEORGIA - GEORGIA COURT OF APPEALS MANDATES A DEFENDANT RECEIVES DUE PROCESS
- H- HEAD VS THE STATE - SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA - THE LANGUAGE OF THE COURT IS TO CREATE A RULE OF INCLUSION.
- J- JEAN DENIS VS. MASON - COURT OF APPEALS - THIS COURT HAS LONG HELD THAT OPINIONATED TESTIMONY IS UNFAIR.
- M- MAURICE MAYO VS. ROBERT J. HENDERSON - U.S. COURT OF APPEALS. REVERSAL OF CONVICTIONS UNDER A COURT'S SUPERVISORY POWER MUST BE APPROACHED WITH SOME CAUTION, AND WITH A VIEW TOWARD BALANCING THE INTERESTS INVOLVED.
- M- MCKEE VS. COSBY - SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA - SUPERVISORY POWER TO REVERSE A CONVICTION IS NOT NEEDED AS A REMEDY WHEN THE ERROR TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED IS HARMLESS.

OTHER

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: MY CASE HAS NOT BEEN BROUGHT UP IN A FEDERAL COURT FOR HABEAS PETITION. ONLY 1983 FILING PETITIONS

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix 2.B to the petition and is

- [] reported at reporting is unknown to me; 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 2.B to the petition and is

- [] reported at reporting is unknown to me; 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 I HAVE NO KNOWLEDGE OF THIS PUBLICATION; or,
[] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[] is unpublished.

The opinion of the Paretta Hearing Superior Court AND OR STATE COURT court appears at Appendix 1.A to the petition and is

- [] reported at unknown to me but may be published; or,
[] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[] is unpublished.

RECORDER'S COURT PRELIMINARY HEARING TRANSCRIPT

DATED 8-5-2014 5th day of August 2014

JURISDICTION

[] For cases from federal courts:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was January 10, 2022.

[☒] 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 60 days (date) on January 10th, 2022 (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 4-26-2021.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix 1.A.

[] 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 60 days (date) on January 10th 2022 (date) in Application No. A.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

• UNITED STATES VS. JEAN CHARLES, 696 FED APP X. 405	CUMULATIVE ERROR
UNITED STATES COURTS OF APPEAL FOR THE 11TH CIRCUIT	APPENDIX 5.1
JUNE 7, 2017 DECIDED JUDGEMENT AFFIRMED IN PART AND REMANDED IN PART	PAGE
• TAYLOR VS. STATE, 305 GA. APP. 748 COURT OF APPEALS OF GEORGIA THIRD DIVISION	DUE PROCESS VIOLATION
AUGUST 30, 2010 DECIDED JUDGEMENT AFFIRMED	
• ROUIARO VS. UNITED STATES 353 U.S. 53 SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA	
UNITED STATES 1956 DECEMBER 11, 1956 ARGUED MARCH 25, 1957 DECIDED	APPENDIX 5.2
JUDGEMENT REVERSED AND REMANDED	PAGE
• MCKEE VS. COSBY 139, S. CT. 675 PENNSYLVANIA SUPREME COURT	FOURTEENTH
FEBRUARY 19, 2011 ARGUED JUNE 30, 2011 DECIDED JUDGEMENT REVERSED	AMENDMENT
• WHITE VS. THE STATE, 287 GA. 713 SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA JUNE 28, 2010 DECIDED	VIOLATION
JUDGEMENT AFFIRMED AND REMANDED FOR RE-SENTENCING	
• DANIELS VS. THE STATE (GA. 1926) 133 S.E. 866 SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA	APPENDIX 5.3
JUNE 11, 1926 DECIDED JUDGEMENT REVERSED DEFENDANT GRANTED A NEW TRIAL	PAGE
• GUEMAN VS. THE STATE COURT OF APPEALS OF GEORGIA SECOND DIVISION	INEFFECTIVE
200 GA. APP 689260 GA. APP 689; 580 S.E. 2d 659 (2003, GA) DECIDED MARCH 31 2003	COUNSEL CLAIM
JUDGEMENT REVERSED.	DUE PROCESS
• NAGEL VS. STATE 204 GA 150 (GA 1994) SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA	VIOLATION
DECIDED MAY 2, 1994 JUDGEMENT AFFIRMED	
• DUBRY VS. U.S. 362 U.S. 362 U.S. 402, 80 SCT. 788 41 ED 20 824 (1960)	APPENDIX 5.4
DECIDED APRIL 18, 1960 JUDGEMENT REVERSED	PAGE
• SPIVEY VS. SPIVEY 202 GA 644 (GA. 1947 SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA	
SEPTEMBER 6, 1947 DECIDED JUDGEMENT REVERSED	
• HEAD VS. THE STATE 253 GA. 429 322 S.E. 2D 228 SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA	
• ESTES VS. TEX, 381 U.S. 532 SUPREME COURT OF U.S. APRIL 1965 ARGUED	INEFFECTIVE
JUNE 7, 1965 DECIDED JUDGEMENT REVERSED	COUNSEL CLAIM
• MAURICE MAYO VS ROBERT J. HENDERSON UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEAL	DUE PROCESS
SECOND CIRCUIT 13 F3D 52813 F.3D 528; 1994	VIOLATION
ARGUED NOVEMBER 1, 1993 JANUARY 3, 1994 DECIDED	
• UNITED STATES VS. JEAN CHARLES, 696 FED. APPX 405 UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS	APPENDIX 5.1
3.1	PAGE
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT JUNE 7, 2017 DECIDED	
JUDGEMENT AFFIRMED IN PART AND REMANDED IN PART	
OC. GA. 24-6-615 EXCLUSION OF WITNESSES	
OC. GA. 24-6-43 PRIOR STATEMENTS OF WITNESSES	

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

• <u>RODIAO VS. UNITED STATES 353 U.S. 53 SUPREME COURT OF U.S. DECEMBER 11, 1956 ARGUED</u>	DUE PROCESS
<u>DEC 10 60 MARCH 25, 1957 JUDGEMENT REVERSED AND REMANDED</u>	VIOLATION
• <u>TAYLOR VS. THE STATE 305 GA. APP 718 COURT OF APPEALS GEORGIA THIRD DIVISION</u>	APPENDIX 5.6
<u>AUGUST 30, 2010 DECIDED JUDGEMENT AFFIRMED</u>	PAGE
• <u>O.C.G.A. 17-16-8 STATEMENTS OF WITNESSES LIST OF NAMES AND INFORMATION</u>	
• <u>BLY VS. THE STATE 283 GA. 453 SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA 2008 DECIDED</u>	DUE PROCESS
<u>JUDGEMENT REVERSED</u>	VIOLATION
• <u>JEAN DENIS VS. MASON 2021 U.S. APP. LEXIS 15081 UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS</u>	APPENDIX 5.7
<u>ELEVENTH CIRCUIT MAY 20, 2021 DECIDED JUDGEMENT CASE VACATED AND REMANDED</u>	PAGE
• <u>O.C.G.A. 24-7-701</u>	
• <u>O.C.G.A. 24-7-702</u>	
• <u>DANIELS VS. THE STATE 133 S.E. 366 (GA. 1926), SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA</u>	DUE PROCESS
<u>JUNE 19, 1926 DECIDED JUDGEMENT REVERSED DEFENDANT GRANTED A NEW TRIAL</u>	VIOLATION OF
	APPENDIX 5.8
	PAGE
• <u>UNITED STATES VS. WADDELL 840 F.2D APP X. 421 UNITED STATES COURTS OF APPEAL FOR</u>	FOURTEENTH
<u>THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT DECEMBER 23, 2020 DECIDED JUDGEMENT AFFIRMED IN PART</u>	AMENDMENT
<u>(AND REVERSED IN PART AND REMANDED)</u>	VIOLATION
• <u>O.C.G.A. 16-10-94 TAMPERING WITH EVIDENCE</u>	APPENDIX 5.9
• <u>O.C.G.A. 24-6-602</u>	PAGE
• <u>ROYALS VS. STATE 208 GA (78) 281 SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA</u>	FOURTEENTH
<u>APRIL 9, 1951 ARGUED MAY 15, 1951 DECIDED JUDGEMENT REVERSED</u>	AMENDMENT
• <u>WHITE VS. THE STATE 287 GA. 713 (GA 2010) SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA</u>	VIOLATION
<u>JUNE 28, 2010 DECIDED JUDGEMENT AFFIRMED AND REMANDED FOR RE-SENTENCING</u>	APPENDIX 5.10
	PAGE
• <u>UNITED STATES VS. LEIGHTNAM, 948 F.2D 370 (7TH CIRCUIT) 1991</u>	FREEDOM OF
<u>UNITED STATES COURTS OF APPEAL FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT</u>	INFORMATION
<u>APRIL 9, 1991 ARGUED NOVEMBER 21, 1991 DECIDED</u>	VIOLATION
<u>JUDGEMENT REVERSED</u>	APPENDIX 5.11
• <u>SANCHEZ VS. SEC Y. FLA, DEPT OF CORR 2019</u>	PAGE
<u>U.S.A PP LEXIS 28416 UNITED STATES COURTS OF APPEAL FOR THE</u>	
<u>ELEVENTH CIRCUIT</u>	
<u>SEPTEMBER 18, 2019 DECIDED</u>	

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

BEFORE TRIAL, I CHANDLER SAXTON WAS OFFERED 30 YEARS PROBATION WITH 20 YEARS TO SERVE. I WAS DEFENDING MYSELF AGAINST THE VICTIM IN THIS CASE WHICH IS WHY I DECLINED THE PLEA. TWO CONVICTED FELONS WERE TALKING TO EACH FOR ALMOST TWENTY SECONDS AS MENTIONED IN THE PRELIMINARY HEARING. BOTH MEN WERE ARMED AND KNEW EACH OTHER AS WELL. THE VICTIM IS SHOWN ON CAMERA PUTTING DOWN HIS GAS CAN AND APPROACHING THE DEFENDANT WHILE THREATENING HIM. DEFENDANT THEN FIRED FOUR SHOTS NOT WANTING TO BE SHOT BY THE VICTIM. THE VICTIM WAS SHOT TWICE AS HE RETURNED FIRE AND EMPTIED HIS CLIP. AS HE FELL TO THE GROUND THE PERSON WHO BROUGHT HIM TO THE STORE PICKED UP HIS GUN FROM HIS PERSONS. THE GUN WAS REMOVED TO MAKE THE DEFENDANT LOOK LIKE THE ONLY SHOOTER. FURTHER CREDIBILITY AND STATEMENTS SHOULD HAVE BEEN CONSIDERED INADMISSIBLE FROM THE WITNESS AS A CONFLICT OF INTEREST. HE WAS QUESTIONED AND INTERROGATED FOR WHAT HE MIGHT HAVE KNOWN, BUT NOT ARRESTED FOR TAMPERING WITH EVIDENCE. HE MADE A STATEMENT ABOUT WHAT HE KNEW AND WAS RELEASED. THERE WAS A VIDEO RECORDING OF WHAT HAPPENED BUT NO AUDIO. DEFENDANT TURNED HIMSELF IN A FEW DAYS LATER AND WAS INTERROGATED BY A DETECTIVE MURRAY GUNDERSON. DEFENDANT PLED THE FIFTH AMENDMENT AND TOLD THE DETECTIVE HE DID NOT WANT TO FURTHER INCARCERATE HIMSELF. AS DEFENDANT DECLINED THE DETECTIVE'S CONSTANT INTERROGATION ELEVEN TIMES HIS CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RIGHTS WERE VIOLATED. AS THIS WAS BROUGHT UP IN TRIAL THE INTERROGATION TAPE WAS CONSIDERED INADMISSIBLE. DEFENDANT WAS OFFERED LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE AND THEN OFFERED LIFE WITH 40 YEARS BY DEFENDANT'S LAWYER. THE FINAL OFFER WAS 30 YEARS ~~SEE~~ SERVE TWENTY YEARS. DEFENDANT WENT TO TRIAL WITH NO WITNESSES BEING SUBPOENED OR HIS GRAVES DISEASE BEING BROUGHT UP BY DEFENDANT'S LAWYER.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

DEFENDANT ALSO SUFFERED A CONCUSSION AT THE JAIL IN 2010 WHICH DEFENDANT WAS TRAUMATISED EVER SINCE. IN TRIAL, THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY AND DETECTIVE MURRAY GUNDERSON DID NOT SUBPOENA OR PRODUCE 2 WITNESSES MENTIONED IN DETECTIVE MURRAY GUNDERSON'S TESTIMONY. DETECTIVE MURRAY GUNDERSON CLAIMED AN OFFICER HELPED IDENTIFY THE DEFENDANT THROUGH A WITNESS TREMAINE BROWN WHO WAS NOT IN COURT ALONG WITH THE OFFICER. DETECTIVE GUNDERSON TESTIFIED AS A LAYPERSON OPINIONATING WHAT WAS SEEN ON CAMERA IN HIS POINT OF VIEW, WITH NO AUDIO IN THIS CASE SUCH A TESTIMONY WAS DAMAGING NOT TO THE STATE BUT TO THE DEFENDANT. THE WITNESS WHO REMOVED THE GUN FROM THE SCENE WAS NOT CHARGED WITH TAMPERING WITH EVIDENCE. IN THE PRELIMINARY HEARING DETECTIVE MURRAY GUNDERSON STATED THAT HE DID NOT KNOW WHAT WAS SAID IN THE VIDEO AS HE HAD TIME TO QUESTION WITNESSES PRIOR TO THE HEARING. THE WITNESS WHO REMOVED THE GUN FROM THE SCENE WAS INTERVIEWED MORE THAN ONCE. AT TRIAL HE WAS CROSS EXAMINED AND ADMITTED HE WANTED TO GET A GOOD DEAL FROM THE STATE. WITNESS CROCKER WAS ARRESTED ON CHARGES HE HAD PENDING FROM THE STATE. THE VICTIM'S MOTHER TESTIFIED AND WAS NOT ON THE WITNESS LIST. BEFORE THE JURY DELIBERATED THEY WANTED TO KNOW WHAT TATTOOS THE DEFENDANT HAD ALONG WITH EVIDENCE THEY WANTED TO SEE SUCH AS GUNS. THIS REQUEST WAS DENIED BY THE STATE BUT IMPORTANT TO THE DEFENDANT. NO MEDICAL HISTORY WAS BROUGHT UP FOR AN INSANITY PLEA ALONG WITH TWO CONTRADICTING STATEMENTS MADE BY THE VICTIM'S BABY MOTHER AND HER BROTHER. SAMANTHA VEASLEY THE VICTIM'S BABY MOTHER, GAVE A STATEMENT SAYING SHE DID TELL DEFENDANT THAT JOHN JONES THE VICTIM SAID THAT HE WAS GOING TO SHOOT DEFENDANT THE NEXT TIME HE SAW THE DEFENDANT EVEN IF IT BE AT GUNTER. THE BROTHER WHO TOLD HIS SISTER SAMANTHA WHAT THE VICTIM JOHN JONES SAID TURNED IT AROUND AND CLAIMED THE DEFENDANT THREATENED THE VICTIM. PARTIES TO A CRIME WAS NOT BROUGHT UP BY DEFENDANT'S COUNSEL. THE PROVOCATION IN THIS CASE WAS IGNORED AS THROUGH VIDEO AND TESTIMONY BY STATES WITNESSES, THERE WAS A CONVERSATION HAD BY DEFENDANT AND THE VICTIM BEFORE THE SHOOTING.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

DEFENDANT WAS LATER FOUND GUILTY OF MURDER BY THE JURY. AT TRIAL
SENTENCING DEFENDANTS MEDICAL HISTORY WAS BROUGHT UP AFTER IT WAS TOO
LATE TO BE CONSIDERED BY A JURY. THIS SHOWED THE COUNSEL INTENTIONS
AND KNOWLEDGE OF THE FACT THAT THE DEFENDANTS MEDICAL HISTORY
SHOULD HAVE BEEN BROUGHT UP. AT DEFENDANTS MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL
DEFENDANT HAD NEW COUNSEL WHICH WAS INEFFECTIVE IN RAISING
PROPER GROUNDS. INEFFECTIVE COUNSEL ON TRIAL LAWYER NOR DEFENDANTS
MEDICAL HISTORY WAS MOVED IN MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL LAWYERS GROUNDS.
THERE WERE A TOTAL OF THREE LAWYERS IN THE SEXTON VS. STATE
CASE. RACHELLE HUNTER FROM THE PUBLIC DEFENDERS OFFICE, WAS
INEFFECTIVE IN THE BEGINNING OF THE DEFENDANTS CASE. SHE WAS
THEN REMOVED AS ROBIN KING TOOK OVER BEING FROM THE SAME OFFICE
AND CIRCUIT THERE WAS A CONFLICT OF INTEREST. THE SECOND LAWYER
WAS GOING TO DO THE SAME AS THE LAST. DEFENDANT CONTINUES
HIS APPEAL PROCESS AS FURTHERING NOTICES OF APPEALS TO OPPOSING
PARTIES IS UNJUSTLY UNFAIR. MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL LAWYER (ANTHONY
JOHNSON) TOLD DEFENDANT THAT MIKE MORRILLS AND ROBIN KING
WERE NO LONGER IN THE CIRCUIT. AS FILED GROUNDS AND UNJUST
VIOLATIONS THAT TOOK PLACE THROUGH INEFFECTIVE COUNSEL AND
DISTRICT COURT VIOLATIONS BY STATE D.A., IF THE PEOPLE WHO
VIOLATED DEFENDANTS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS AND DUE PROCESS
RIGHTS CANNOT BE FACED. HOW THEN CAN FRED LEWIS TAKE
MIKE MORRILLS POSITION AS D.A. WHEN THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY
AT DEFENDANTS TRIAL VIOLATED DEFENDANTS RIGHTS. IN AN UNFAIR
AND MALICIOUS JUSTICE SYSTEM. THE DEFENDANT NOT BEING ^{ABLE} ~~ABLE~~ TO FACE
HIS RIGHTFUL RESPONDANTS, IS LIKE GETTING AWAY WITH MURDER.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

REASON: CUMULATIVE ERRORS

IT WAS CLEAR AND APPROPRIATE ERROR WHEN DETECTIVE MURRAY GUNDERSON FILED HIS REPORT AND STATED THAT THE VICTIM'S HAND GUN (JOHN JONES) WAS FOUND IN HIS POSSESSION. THE GUN WAS PICKED UP FROM THE SCENE AND REMOVED BY A JACQUANE MARQUISE CROCKER. MR. CROCKER ALSO MADE AND OR GAVE A STATEMENT SAYING HE HEARD ONLY WHEN THE VICTIM PUT DOWN THE GUN BECAUSE THAT WAS THE CLIMAX OF THE VIDEO IN THE SAXTON VS. THE STATE CASE. WHAT HE SAID DOES NOT COMPENSATE FOR 18 SECONDS AND NOT EVEN 5 SECONDS OF THE DIALOGUE BETWEEN VICTIM AND DEFENDANT. SIGNIFICANCE: DETECTIVES CREDIBILITY AND WITNESS CROCKER BOTH WERE SHOWN FAULTY AND NOT CREDIBLE AS CROCKER HAD AN IMPEACHMENT IN TRIAL ON HIS CREDIBILITY AND DETECTIVE GUNDERSON'S INTERROGATION VIDEO WAS CONSIDERED INADMISSIBLE AT TRIAL DUE TO HIS OBVIOUS AND UNDERHAND MOTIVES. ALL TOGETHER WITH IGNORED MEDICAL ISSUES, FALSE WITNESS TESTIMONY, VIDEO EDITING AND FALSE REPORTS WRITTEN. DEFENDANT'S 14TH ~~AMENDMENT~~ AMENDMENT RIGHTS TO A FAIR TRIAL WERE CLEARLY VIOLATED. CUMULATIVE ERRORS DOCTRINE AS IN STATED CASE BELOW.

- UNITED STATES VS. JEAN-CHARLES, 696 FED APP X. 405
UNITED STATES COURTS OF APPEAL FOR THE 11TH CIRCUIT
JUNE 7, 2017 DECIDED JUDGEMENT AFFIRMED IN PART
REMANDED IN PART

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

REASON: WITNESSES NOT PERSONALLY INTRODUCED IN
BILL OF INDICTMENT

THE COURT WAS IN ERROR AS IT FAILED TO ^{Confront} FACE TO FACE
THE GRAND JURORS CHOSE AND SWORN IN BY MUSCOGEE
COUNTY OF COLUMBUS GEORGIA. ALL DEFENDANTS HAVE A RIGHT
TO FACE THEIR ACCUSERS BY LAW. NAMES COULD HAVE
BEEN FALSIFIED AS THE MEN TO WOMEN RATIO WAS OFF AS
WOMEN WERE CHOSEN BY AT LEAST 75 TO 80 PERCENT IN
THE CHOSEN JURORS, BILL OF INDICTMENT INCLUDED,

- TAYLOR VS. STATE, 305 GA. APP. 748 COURT OF APPEALS OF
GEORGIA THIRD DIVISION

AUGUST 30, 2010 DECIDED

JUDGEMENT AFFIRMED

- ROUIARO VS. UNITED STATES 353 U.S. 53 SUPREME COURT OF
US. DECEMBER 11, 1956 ARGUED MARCH 25, 1957 DECIDED
JUDGEMENT REVERSED AND REMANDED.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

REASON: PROVOCATION IGNORED

DEFENDANTS DEFENSE ERRORED AS IT DID NOT INTRODUCE THE TWENTY SECONDS OF PROVOCATION TALKED ABOUT IN THE PRELIMINARY HEARING TO THE JURY. JUDGE MICHAEL JOYNER ASKED "WAS THERE A CONVERSATION BETWEEN THE TWO AT THE TIME? THE RESPONSE WAS "YES, SIR A VERY SHORT CONVERSATION, APPROXIMATELY TWENTY SECONDS." THIS MALICE MURDER IS SHOWN WITH A DELIBERATE INTENT AND WHERE NO CONSIDERABLE PROVOCATION APPEARS ARGUED IN WHITE VS. STATE. THE JURY SHOULD HAVE BEEN PERMITTED TO CONSIDER ALL THE FACTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES IN DETERMINING WHETHER THE DEFENDANT ACTED UNDER A SUDDEN AND IRRESISTABLE HEAT OF PASSION. (AS ARGUED IN DANIELS VS. THE STATE). EVEN IF ONLY ONE ERROR IS RAISED THAT ONE ERROR CAN AND SHOULD BE LOOKED AT AS ONE ERROR WAS OVERWHELMING IN MCKEE VS. COSBY.

- MCKEE VS. COSBY 139, S CT. 675 PENNSYLVANIA SUPREME COURT
FEBRUARY 19, 2019 ARGUED
JUDGEMENT REVERSED AND OVERTURNED
- WHITE VS. THE STATE, 287 GA 713 SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA
JUNE 28, 2010 DECIDED JUDGEMENT AFFIRMED AND REMANDED
FOR RESENTENCING
- DANIELS VS. THE STATE (GA. 1926) 133 S.E. 266
SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA JUNE 19, 1926 DECIDED
JUDGEMENT REVERSED DEFENDANT GRANTED A NEW TRIAL

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

REASON : INEFFECTIVE COUNSEL

NO LAWYER DURING TRIAL OR MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL BROUGHT UP DEFENDANTS
MEDICAL PAST OR MENTAL HEALTH CONDITION. DEFENDANTS TRIAL LAWYER
BROUGHT UP DEFENDANTS GRAVES DISEASE ONLY AT TRIAL SENTENCING WHICH
GAVE THE DEFENDANT NO CHANCE TO HAVE AN INSANITY PLEA. DEFENDANT ALSO
SUFFERED A BAD CONCUSSION BEING JUMPED ON IN THE COLUMBUS COUNTY
JAIL IN 2010 WHICH HAD DEFENDANT HIGHLY ALERT AND TRAMATISED.
NEITHER TRIAL LAWYER NOR MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL LAWYER FILED FOR A
COMPETENCY HEARING DENYING THE DEFENDANTS DUE PROCESS RIGHTS
AS WELL AS HIS RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL, GUARANTEE BY THE FOURTEENTH
AMENDMENT.

- GILMAN VS. THE STATE COURT OF APPEALS OF GEORGIA SECOND DIVISION
260 GA. APP 689 260 GA. APP 689; 580 S.E. 2D 654 (2003 GA.) DECIDED MARCH 31 2003
JUDGEMENT REVERSED

- NABEL VS. STATE 264 GA 150 (GA. 1994) SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA
DECIDED MAY 2, 1994 JUDGEMENT AFFIRMED.

- DUSKY VS. U.S. 362 U.S. 402, 80 S.Ct. 789 41 L.ED 2D 824 (1960)
DECIDED APRIL 18, 1960 JUDGEMENT REVERSED

- SPIVEY VS. SPIVEY 222 GA. 644 (GA. 1947) SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA
SEPTEMBER 6, 1947 DECIDED JUDGEMENT REVERSED

- HEARD VS. THE STATE 253 GA. 424 322 S.E. 2D 228
SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

REASON: INEFFECTIVE COUNSEL

TRIAL COUNSEL ERRORED AS SHE KNOWINGLY ALLOWED A VELMA B JONES TO TESTIFY WITHOUT BEING INTERVIEWED OR ON THE STATES WITNESS LIST. TRIAL COUNSEL FAILED TO SUBPOENA ANY WITNESSES AS NEITHER TRIAL LAWYER NOR MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL LAWYER MENTIONED THE 18 SECONDS OF DIALOGUE FOR PROVOCATION. THIS WAS BROUGHT UP IN THE PRELIMINARY HEARING TO JUDGE MICHAEL JOYNER. MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL COUNSEL FILED GROUNDS WITH WEAK AND LITTLE DETAILS AS ARGUED IN MAURICE MAYO VS. ROBERT J. HENDERSON. ALL TOGETHER DEFENDANTS SIX AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS TO A FAIR TRIAL WERE VIOLATED, THUS THE CUMULATIVE ERRORS DOCTRINE WARRANTS AND BACKS THIS MANY VIOLATIONS AS A WHOLE.

- ESTES V. TEX, 381 U.S. 572 SUPREME COURT OF U.S.

APRIL 1965 ARGUED JUNE 7, 1965 DECIDED JUDGEMENT REVERSED

- MAURICE MAYO VS. ROBERT J. HENDERSON UNITED STATES COURTS OF APPEAL

SECOND CIRCUIT 13 F3d 52813 F3d 528; 1994

ARGUED NOVEMBER 1, 1993 DECIDED JANUARY 3, 1994

- UNITED STATES VS. JEROME CHARLES, 696 FED. APPX 405 UNITED STATES COURTS OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT JUNE 7, 2017 DECIDED JUDGEMENT AFFIRMED IN PART AND REMANDED IN PART

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

REASON: IDENTITY NOT UPHOLD

DISTRICT ATTORNEY MIKE MORRIS AND WITNESS SERGEANT GUNDERSON ERRORED AS THEY DID NOT PROPERLY IDENTIFY THE DEFENDANT AT TRIAL. GUNDERSON CLAIMED AN OFFICER ASSISTING HIM BY THE NAME OF CPL MICHAEL GREEN FOUND A PERSON DURING A PHOTO SHOWING OF THE DEFENDANT NAMED TREMAINE BROWN WHO CLAIMED HE KNEW THE DEFENDANT AS "TWIN". NEITHER MICHAEL GREEN NOR TREMAINE BROWN WERE PRESENT AT TRIAL. WITNESS JACQUANE CROCKER STATED IN A INTERVIEW WITH DETECTIVE GUNDERSON THAT "HE DID NOT GET A GOOD LOOK AT THE SUSPECT OR DEFENDANT AND THAT HE WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO ~~IDENTIFY~~ IDENTIFY THE SUSPECT IF HE WAS GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY.

- ROVIARO VS. UNITED STATES 353 U.S. 53 SUPREME COURT OF U.S. DECEMBER 11, 1956 DECIDED MARCH 25, 1957 JUDGEMENT REVERSED AND REMANDED

- TAYLOR VS. THE STATE 305 GA. APP 748 COURT OF APPEALS OF GEORGIA THIRD DIVISION AUGUST 30, 2010 DECIDED JUDGEMENT AFFIRMED

- O.C.G.A. 17-16-8

5.6

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

LAY PERSON ERROR

THE COURT WAS IN ERROR AS IT ALLOWED STATES WITNESS
SARGEANT GUNDERSON ALL THROUGH HIS TESTIMONY TO OPINIONATE
AS A MEDICAL EXAMINER. (AS PER PAGES 107 THRU 153 OF THE
TRIAL TRANSCRIPT). GUNDERSON SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN ALLOWED
TO TESTIFY AS TO THE ENTRY AND EXIT WOUNDS OF THE VICTIM,
AS THE AUTOPSY REPORT WAS CREATED BY DR. STACEY DESAMOURS
ASSOCIATE MEDICAL EXAMINER FOR THE STATE OF GEORGIA. AS BLY
VS. THE STATE ARGUED THAT THE ADMISSION OF OPINIONATED
TESTIMONY BY A WITNESS WHO DID NOT PERSONALLY OBSERVE
THE EVENTS IN QUESTION.

- BLY VS. THE STATE 283 GA.453 SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA DECIDED
IN 2008 JUDGEMENT REVERSED

- NO 4:16 - CV-082- CDL -MSH - 1983 FORN FILED DUE TO MALICIOUS
PROSECUTION

- NO 4:16 - CV-320- CDL -MSH 1983 FOR FILED DUE TO MALICIOUS
PROSECUTION

- O.C.G.A. 24-7-701

- O.C.G.A. 24-7-702

- JEAN DENIS VS. AMASON 2021 U.S. APP. LEXIS 15081 UNITED STATES COURT OF
APPEALS ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

- MAY 20, 2021 DECIDED JUDGEMENT CASE VACATED AND REMANDED

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

REASON

JURY NOT PROPERLY INSTRUCTED

THE COURT WAS IN ERROR AS THE JURY DID NOT KNOW
THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MURDER AND FELONY MURDER, AS THE
D.A. ASKED THE JUDGE IN LINES 19-24 OF PAGE 198 OF THE
TRIAL TRANSCRIPT "DID YOU GIVE THEM THE CHARGES?" THE
JUDGE REPLIES "I DID NOT SEND THEM OUT WITH A COPY."
MY PRACTICE IS GENERALLY IF THEY ASK FOR ONE I SEND IT.

- DANIELS VS. THE STATE NO. 608 (GA. 1926). 133 SE. 866
SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA JUNE 19, 1926 DECIDED
JUDGEMENT REVERSED DEFENDANT GRANTED A NEW TRIAL
• [133 S.E. 869]

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

REASON VIDEO EDITING ERROR

DEFENSE COUNSEL WAS IN ERROR AS WELL AS THE JUDGE AS IT

ALLOWED STATES WITNESS SPAGEANT GUNDERSON TO SHOW AN EDITED VIDEO.

(AS PER LINES M-16 OF PAGE 113 OF THE TRIAL TRANSCRIPT) GUNDERSON

MENTIONS HOW THE VIDEO IN THE SAXTON VS. STATE TRIAL WAS "EDITED FOR

SIMPLICITY'S SAKE". DEFENDANT AND COUNSEL SHOULD HAVE HAD AN

OPPORTUNITY TO FACE THE PERSON WHO EDITED THE VIDEO. EDITING THE

VIDEO THINGS COULD HAVE BEEN REMOVED OR PAUSED AS ARGUED IN

UNITED STATES VS. WHODELL 840 FED APPX 421. WITH AN EDITED

VIDEO THE VIDEO COULD HAVE BEEN CONSIDERED INADMISSIBLE AND

A FORM OF TAMPERING WITH EVIDENCE.

- UNITED STATES VS. WHODELL 840 FED APPX. 421

UNITED STATES COURTS OF APPEAL FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

DECEMBER, 23 2020 DECIDED JUDGEMENT AFFIRMED IN PART

AND REVERSED IN PART AND REMANDED

- O.C.G.A. 16-10-94 - A PERSON COMMITS THE OFFENSE OF TAMPERING

WITH EVIDENCE WHEN, WITH THE INTENT TO ~~ARREST~~ PREVENT THE

APPREHENSION OF ANY PERSON OR TO OBSTACUL THE PROSECUTION OF ANY

PERSON HE KNOWINGLY DESTROYS, CONCEALS OR DISGUISES PHYSICAL EVIDENCE.

- O.C.G.A. 24-6-602

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

REASON: NOTE PASSING ERROR

THE COURT WAS IN ERROR WHEN DEFENDANT DID NOT KNOW AT ANY POINTS

THE CONTENT OF EACH NOTE THAT WERE PASSED DURING TRIAL AND

DELIBERATIONS. AS PURSUANT TO [310 S.E. 2D 763] THE JURY SHOULD

NOT BE PERMITTED TO TAKE WITH THEM FOR CONSIDERATION IN THE

JURY ROOM, DEPOSITIONS, DYING DECLARATIONS, CONFESSIONS OR

WRITTEN STATEMENTS OF THE DEFENDANT OR OTHER INSTRUMENTS OF

EVIDENCE DEPENDING FOR THEIR VALUE ON THE CREDIBILITY OF THE

MAKER SUCH WRITTEN TESTIMONY MAY HAVE AN UNFAIR ADVANTAGE

OVER ORAL TESTIMONY BY SPEAKING TO THE JURY MORE THAN ONCE.

- ROYALS VS. STATE 208 GA 78 (8) SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA

APRIL 9, 1951 ARGUED MAY 15, 1951 DECIDED

JUDGEMENT ABUSED

- WHITE VS. THE STATE 287 GA. 713 (GA 2010) SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA

JUNE 28, 2010 DECIDED JUDGEMENT AFFIRMED AND REMANDED

FOR RESENTENCING

S. 10

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

REASONS: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION DENIED

THE COURT WAS IN ERROR AS IT DENIED THE JURY THROUGH DELIBERATIONS TO KNOW A SERIES OF QUESTIONS AND TO SEE VERY IMPORTANT ITEMS ASKED FOR IN DEFENDANTS TRIAL. THE JURY ASKED ON PAGES 192 AND 193 OF THE TRIAL TRANSCRIPT "WHAT TATTOOS DID THE DEFENDANT HAVE, WHAT KIND OF GUN WAS USED BY THE DEFENDANT, WHAT KIND OF GUN WAS IN THE BUSHES, HOW MANY SHELLS FROM EACH GUN? DID THE POLICE EVER RECOVER A GUN FROM THE DEFENDANT. WHY WERE GUNS OR SHELLS NOT PRESENTED AS EVIDENCE? FAILURE TO ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS AND SHOW THE ITEMS REQUESTED BY THE JURY ~~WAS~~ VIOLATED THE DEFENDANT AND THE JURYS RIGHTS. IT IS NOT ILLEGAL TO SHOW HAND GUNS OR TATTOOS AS THEY WERE SHOWN IN VARIOUS TRIALS SUCH AS THE FOLLOWING QUOTED CASES.

• UNITED STATES VS. LEICHTNAM, 998 F.2d 370 (7th CIRCUIT) 1991

UNITED STATES COURTS OF APPEAL FOR THE 7th CIRCUIT

APRIL, 9, 1991 ARGUED NOVEMBER 21, 1991 DECIDED

JUDGEMENT REVERSED

• SANCHEZ VS. SEC 4, FLA. DEPT OF CORR., 2019

U.S. APP LEXIS 28916 UNITED STATES COURTS OF APPEAL FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

SEPTEMBER 18, 2019 DECIDED

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

MALICIOUS PROSECUTION / INEFFECTIVE COUNSEL AOM ITTED:

NEW TRIAL REASON IMPLICATED:

DURING CHANDLER SAXTON'S MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL ON FEBRUARY 16TH 2021 AROUND 8:30 AM. DISTRICT ATTORNEY FAEO LEWIS ANNOUNCED AND SAID THAT I DID NOT HAVE ANY DEFENSE THE FIRST TIME I WENT TO COURT SPEAKING ON DEFENDANTS (CHANDLER SAXTON'S TRIAL). THIS ALONE WAS REASON FOR THE MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL TO BE GRANTED. AS THE JUDGE IN THE SAXTON VS. THE STATE INTENTIONALLY MALICIOUS AS STATED IN SATONVS SAXTON VS. JUDGE MAUREEN GOTTFRIED CIVIL CLAIM FILED ON JANUARY 13TH 2017. ANY SUCH STATEMENTS MADE BY PROSECUTION MUST BE ADOPTED RECOGNIZED IF DEFENDANT IS TRYING TO GO PRO SE OR IS AS IS UNITED STATES VS. HASTING. THIS CONSTITUTES DENIAL OF A FAIR TRIAL.

• CHANDLER SAXTON VS. JUDGE MAUREEN GOTTFRIED.

CASE NO. 4:16-CV-320-COL-MSH

• UNITED STATES VS. HASTING 461 U.S. 499

DECEMBER 7, 1982 ARGUED; MAY 23, 1983 DECIDED JUDGEMENT REVERSED

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

INSINUATING AND MANIPULATING TACTICS:

AS THE JUDGE READ OUT THE INSTRUCTIONS OF
LAW TO THE JURY. THE JUDGE EXPLAINED THE INSTRUCTIONS OF LAW
INVOLVING MALICE MURDER AND FELONY MURDER AND QUOTED AN EXAMPLE
TO THE JURY. IN THE EXAMPLE THE JUDGE SAID THE FORM OF WOULD
BE WE THE JURY FIND THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF MALICE AND ALSO THE
SAME ON FELONY MURDER. HEATING AT HOW THESE TWO SHOULD BE DONE
IF DECIDED UPON IS UNFAIR TO QUOTE THESE TWO AND NOT
VOLUNTARY MANSLAUGHTER. AS THINGS THE JUDGE AND PROSECUTOR
SAYS CAN BE MANIPULATING AND PERSUASIVE TO AN UNTRAINED JRY.

• CHANDLER SEXTON VS. JUDGE MAUREEN GOTTFRIED

CASE NO 4:10-CV-320-CDL-MSH

• UNITED STATES VS. HASTING 461 U.S. 499

DECEMBER 7, 1982 ARGUED: MAY 23, 1983 DECIDED JUDGEMENT REVERSED

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles S. Smith

Date: 7/12/2021