

21-7523

No. _____

FILED

MAR 16 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ORIGINAL

MARTIN ROBINSON — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

STATE OF OHIO — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL AND ORAL ARGUMENT

MARTIN ROBINSON
(Your Name)

PO BOX 80033
(Address)

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

N/A
(Phone Number)

REDACT.

RECEIVED

MAR 22 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

PLEASE REMIT COPY WITH CASE NO. TO PETITIONER
AND DOCKET UPDATES.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

WHY DOES THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM LACK COMMON SENSE?

SHOULD THE TRIAL COURT 18CR099209 GRANTED A CONTINUANCE, AN ACQUITTAL, A MISTRIAL, SPEEDY TRIAL VIOLATION, INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL ... ? R.C. 3.22, 23 TRIAL JUDGE VIOLATED, APPEALS JUDGES VIOLATED. POST CONVICTION RELIEF, AFFIDAVIT BY ATTY. YODER AND WITNESS MAMA MCCOY, 20CA011689, 9TH D.

DID 9TH DIST. COURT OF APPEALS, 19CA011495 FAIL TO REMAND, ACQUIT, GRANT MISTRIAL, GRANT ENBANC, INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE?

DID, 20CA11709, 9TH DIST. FAIL TO APPOINT COUNSEL, ALLOW ORAL ARGUMENT, GRANT IMMEDIATE RELEASE, ACQUIT, MISTRIAL ... ?

DID S.C.D. 2021-0421 FAIL TO APPOINT COUNSEL, ALLOW ORAL ARGUMENT, REMAND, GRANT IMMEDIATE RELEASE, ACQUIT, MISTRIAL, SENTENCE REDUCTION ... ?

DID PETITIONER ATTEMPT TO ADDRESS ANY DEFICIENCIES? YES

WHY WERE RECONSIDERATIONS DENIED?

19CA011495, ALL FIVE ASSIGNMENT OF ERRORS WERE AFFIRMED, WHICH CONSTITUTES AN AUTOMATIC INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL AND AN AUTOMATIC GRANTING OF AN ENBANC. ^{IT} SHOULD RESULT IN DISQUALIFICATION OF APPEALS JUDGES AS

IT ^{IS} PROOF OF THEIR BIAS AGAINST THE DEFENDANT IN A CRIMINAL CASE.

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 Ohio

LISTED IN APPENDIX G AND I; CUYA HOGA COUNTY 18CR62778A, 17CR622901A; Lorain County 18CR099209; 9TH DIST. COURT OF APPEALS 19CA011495, 20CA011689, 20CA11706, 7, 8, 9, 11, 20CA011624, 21CA011756; 12TH DIST. COURT OF APPEALS CA 20210015 CA 2021-08-015 HABEAS CORPUS; SUPREME COURT OF OH. 2021-0421, 0598, 0686, 0688, 0775; SOUTH U.S.D. 2:21CV774; NORTH U.S.D. 1:11CV1609, 1:20CV2489; SMALL COURT OF CLAIMS 2022-OHIO-313; U.S. 6TH CIR. 19-4036, 20-4232, 21-3019, 3887; STATE V. BRADLEY, 2005-OH-6533; ESTELLE V. WILLIAMS 1978; HOLBROOK V. FLYNN 1986; TAYLOR V. KENTUCKY 1978; STATE EX REL JACKSON V. DALLMAN AND McFALL (1994, 95) S.C.O. GRANTED HABEAS BECAUSE THERE WAS NOT A SIGNED WAIVER IN THE RECORD, THERE'S NO SIGNED WAIVER IN CASE MINE 18CR099209 AS TO THE JAIL UNIFORM I WAS FORCED TO WEAR DURING JURY TRIAL. CLEAR DISCRIMINATION BY STATE OF OHIO, AND DISPARATE TREATMENT.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4, 5
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	6
CONCLUSION.....	7
PROOF OF SERVICE	8

INDEX TO APPENDICES

2021-OH-634 APPENDIX A MARCH 8, 2021 DECISION PER CURIAM COURT OF APPEALS OH. 9TH DIST., ORIGINAL ACTION HABEAS CORPUS, 2 PAGES, 20CA11709	3
APPENDIX B ADD LORAIN COUNTY MARCH 11, 2019 18CR99209. OR 2021-OH-634	
APPENDIX C NOV. 3, 2021 DECISION OF OHIO STATE SUPREME COURT DENYING REVIEW (AFFIRMING), DENYING "BRADY" MOTION, 2021-OH-3865, 2021-0421 OR APPENDIX A	
APPENDIX D DEC. 28, 2021 ORDER OF OHIO STATE SUPREME COURT 2021-OH-4515 DENYING RECONSIDERATION FOR 2021-0421.	
APPENDIX E JULY 13, 2021 DECISION OF OHIO STATE SUPREME COURT 2021-OH-10151375 DENYING APPELLANT'S MOTION TO APPOINT COUNSEL, 2021-0421	
APPENDIX F NOV. 08, 2021 APPELLANT S.C.T. PRAC. R. 18.02, 21.01 MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION; LEAVE TO APPEAL, ATTACHED 6 MONTH CASHIER DEMAND STATEMENT	
APPENDIX G JUNE 24, 2021 APPELLANT REPLY BRIEF; ... 3 PAGES	
APPENDIX H JUNE 10, 2021 APPELLEE COVER PAGE BRIEF: CAPTIONED IN WRONG COURT	
APPENDIX I MAY 24, 2021 APPELLANT MERIT BRIEF, 8 PAGES	
APPENDIX J APRIL 05, 2021, NOTICE OF APPEAL, APPELLANT, "NOTARIZED" AFFIDAVIT OF INDIGENCE	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
ESTELLE V. WILLIAMS 1976	5
FARMER V. BRENNAN, 114 S. CT 56 (1993), 1993 U.S. LEXIS 6937, 510 U.S. 811, 941, 511 U.S. 825 - 5, 6	5, 6
HAINES V. KERNER, 404 U.S. 519, 20	5
HOLBROOK V. FLYNN 1986	5
LAVADO V. KEDHANE, 992 F.2D 601 6TH CIR 1993	5
ROBINSON V. BARROW, 2012 USD LEXIS 38896, 33141, 2011 USD LEXIS 113671	4
STATE EX REL JACKSON V. DALLMAN AND MCFALL 1994, 1995	5
STATE V. BAILEY, 2005-OA 10-6533	5
TAYLOR V. KENTUCKY 1978	5

STATUTES AND RULES	
U.S. CONST. AMEND. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 14, 4	3, 5
OH. CONST. ART. 1 SEC 1, 4, 10, 14	3, 5
OAC 120-1-03	3, 5
CRIM R CIV R 4, 9	3, 5
R.C. 3, 22, 23, 2941.25, 25(A), 2945.79, 2953.08, 2725...	3, 5
S. CT. PRAC. R. 17.02, 18.02, 21.01, 15.03(A/B)	3, 5
FURPA § 701B, 7.2, 7.1A	3, 5
5 USC 552 (2006)	3, 5
42 USCS 12132 (DISCRIMINATION)	3, 5
28 USC 1257(A)	3, 5
28 USC 1455 REMOVAL OF CRIM. PROSECUTION	3, 5
(D) WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS	

OTHER

AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT 5

ANY AND ALL RIGHTS 4

APPENDIX G AND I 3

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.

MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL AND ORAL ARGUMENT
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 C to the petition and is

☒ reported at 2021-OHIO-3865 LEXIS NEXIS; or,

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☒ is unpublished.

The opinion of the OHIO COURT OF APPEALS 9TH DIST. court appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

☒ reported at 2021-OHIO-634 LEXIS NEXIS; 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 _____.

☐ 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 NOV. 03, 2021
DEC. 28, 2021 and a copy of that decision appears at Appendix C.

☒ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: DEC. 28, 2021, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix D.

☐ 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).

2



CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

OAC 120-1-03

R.E. 3.22, .23; 2941.25, .25(A); 2945.79; 2953.08

2725...

U.S. CONST. AMEND. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 14, 4

OHIO CONST. ART. 1, SEC. 1, 4, 10, 14

S.C.T. PRAC. R. 17.02, 18.02, 21.01, 15.03 (A, B)

CRIM. R. 4, 9 CIV. R. 4

SUPRA § 7.1B, 7.2, 7.1A.

5 U.S.C. 552(2006), 42 USC § 12132 (DISCRIMINATION)

28 USC 1257(A)

28 USC § 1455 REMOVAL OF CRIM. PROSECUTION (C)

(C) WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

APPENDIX G AND I

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

GOD FIRST, ABOVE ALL ELSE. A MAN'S HOME IS HIS CASTLE.

PETITIONER, MARTIN ROBINSON PRESERVES ANY AND ALL RIGHTS, HE IS WRONGFULLY IMPRISONED, ACTUALLY INNOCENT, AND SUFFERED A (SEVERAL) MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE. HE SHOULD'VE NEVER BEEN ^{FALSELY} ARRESTED, SECRETLY INDICTED, ISSUED FALSE WARRANTS, FALSELY CONVICTED. HE SUFFERED A MISTRIAL AND AT THIS POINT, SHOULD'VE RECEIVED ACQUITTAL, EXONERATION, AND EXPUNGEMENT. I FORGOT ABOUT THE CRUEL AND UNUSUAL AND CORPORAL PUNISHMENT. ALL OF WHICH, THE STATE OF OHIO, REFUSES TO RECTIFY, AFTER I'VE PROVIDED THEM WITH AMPLE OPPORTUNITIES. CORPORAL PUNISHMENT OCCURRED PRIOR TO CUSTODY, WHILE IN CONTINUED CUSTODY, IN THE COURT ROOM (LORAIN COUNTY 18CR099209) LEADING UP TO TRIAL, AND AFTER WRONGFUL CONVICTION WHILE STILL IN STATE CUSTODY, BY STATE OFFICIALS. ALL OF WHICH, HE REPORTED TIMELY AND PROPERLY. ALL OF WHICH, IN MY TRAINING, EXPERIENCE, AND EDUCATION OPINION, HAS TO DATE, NOT BEEN PROPERLY INVESTIGATED, TO PUT IT MILDLY. WHY? HOW CAN THIS BE, IN TODAYS SUPPOSED CIVILIZED SOCIETY? I WAS TAKEN TO TRIAL IN THE "DARK" AS IT WAS HAPPENING, I OBJECTED TO IT. DID IT MAKE A DIFFERENCE? NO, THE TRIAL JUDGE ABUSED HIS DISCRETION. THE PROSECUTION COMMITTED MISCONDUCT ON MORE THAN ONE OCCASION. YET THEY CLAIM I OWE 60+K.?! FOR GOD'S SAKE, A "DEATH SQUAD" WAS SENT TO MY HOME, 778 OLIVER ST. SHEPHERD LAKE OH 44054 ON OR ABOUT MAY 31, 2018! AND FOR WHAT?!

NORTHERN U.S. DIST. OH 1:11cv01609, RETALIATION... THAT FAILURE TO INVESTIGATE LEADS TO FAILURE TO PROSECUTE BY THE STATE OF OHIO, WHICH ALLOWED ILLEGAL GUNS TO BE RETURNED TO THE "DEATH SQUAD" CRIMINALS SUSPECTS (BECAUSE THEY WERE NEVER PROPERLY BROUGHT TO JUSTICE, BUT INSTEAD REMAIN BADGED AND ARMED). LORAIN COUNTY CR1899209. ROBINSON V. BARROW, 2012 U.S. DIST. LEXIS 35896, 33141

(UNLESS OFFICIALS ARE NOT AFRAID OF ANY REPRISALS, CORRUPTION AT EVERY LEVEL).

2011 U.S.D. LEXIS 113671

PETITIONER, MARTIN ROBINSON IS AND HAS BEEN PERMANENTLY
DISABLED SINCE JULY 10, 2009, WHICH BOTH THE STATE OF OHIO AND
THE U.S. GOVERNMENT ARE AWARE OF BUT IGNORE THE AMERICANS WITH
DISABILITIES ACT. HE, PETITIONER, IS NOT AN ATTORNEY OR LAWYER, PLEASE
CONSIDER THIS PETITION LIBERAL, APPOINT HIM COUNSEL PER "EXCEPTIONAL
CIRCUMSTANCES," ALLOW ORAL ARGUMENT, ^{OAC 120-1-03} HAINES V. KERNER, 404 U.S. 519, 20
(1972); FERMER V. BRENNAN, 114 S. CT. 56 (1993), 1993 U.S. LEXIS 6937 COUNSEL
GRANTED; LAVADO V. KEDHANE, 992 F2D 601 6TH CIR 1993. HE SUFFERED
HARRASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION, AND UNWARRANTED PUBLIC EMBARRASSMENT AND HUMILIATION.
THE TRIAL COURT APPENDIX A, B ERRORED BY NOT APPOINTING COUNSEL, ALLOWING
ORAL ARGUMENT, ALLOWING PETITIONER TO PRESENT EVIDENCE, GRANTING THE
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS. 2021-OH-634, PRODUCE THE BODY... R.C. 2725... PRODUCING
COMMITMENT PAPERS OR EXPLAINING WHAT THEY ARE... FAILED TO HEAR THE MERITS.

PETITIONER TIMELY FILED APPENDICES J, I, G, AND F, PLEASE REVIEW, TO SUPREME
COURT OF OHIO (S.C.O.). S.C.O. ERRORED IN NOT APPOINTING ^(APPENDIX E) COUNSEL, ALLOWING ORAL ARGUMENT,
APPENDIX C NOV. 03, 2021 DENIED REVIEW AND "BRADY MOTION", ^{AND} APPENDIX D DEC 28, 2021 DENIED
RECONSIDERATION, AND ACCEPTED APPENDIX H JUNE 10, 2021 APPELLATE'S BRIEF, SHOULD BE BEEN STRIKEN
DUE TO CAPTION IN THE WRONG COURT BECAUSE I RAISED IT ON REPLY BRIEF (APPENDIX G).

APPENDIX A MARCH 8, 2021, 2021-OH-634, 20 CALL 709 9TH D. COURT OF APPEALS ERRORED
BY NOT ALLOWING RECONSIDERATION ^{NOT ALLOWING RECONSIDERATION} NOT APPOINTING COUNSEL, GRANTING ORAL ARGUMENT, AND PER CURIAM DISMISSING PETITIONER'S
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS. THEY ALSO FAILED TO PRODUCE THE BODY. THEY FAILED TO HEAR
THE CASE BASED ON ITS MERITS JUST AS ^{FALSE TO WORK} LORAIN COUNTY COMMON PLEAS

18CR099209. ENTRAPMENT. I GNORED JAIL UNIFORM ID JURY TRIAL 18CR699209
SPYER V. BARRELY 2006 OH 6533; ESTELLE V. WILLIAMS 1976; HOUBERT V. FLYNN 1986;
TAYLOR V. KENTUCKY 1978; SPADE EX REL JACKSON V. DALLMAN AND McFALL 1994, 95.

4, 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 14 US AMONG, OH. COUNCIL APP 1, 4, 10, 14 R.C. 3.22, 23;
2941.25, 256A; 2945.79, 2953.08, 2725...; OAC 120-1-03; S. CT. PRAC. R.; CIR. R. 4.9.
CIV. R. 4; § 7.1A, 2.2, 7.1A; 5 USC 552 (2006) ... AND MORE...

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

LACK OF OVERSIGHT OF OHIO LOWER COURTS; CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM;
REFUSAL OF THIS COURT TO REVIEW CASES; GREAT PUBLIC INTEREST; OHIO
AND U.S. CONST. VIOLATIONS; R.C. VIOLATIONS BY JUDGES, PROSECUTORS, AND
POLICE; INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL; OHIO'S FAILURE TO APPOINT
COUNSEL IN CIVIL/CRIMINAL RELATED MATTERS, ALLOW ORAL ARGUMENT,
FARMER V. BRENNAN, 510 U.S. 811, 941, 511 U.S. 825, FARMER WAS
APPOINTED COUNSEL.

RELEASE PETITIONER MARTIN ROBINSON IMMEDIATELY FROM WRONGFUL
IMPRISONMENT, SEND HIM BACK FOR NEW TRIAL, OR ANY AND ALL
RELIEF THAT THIS COURT HAS THE AUTHORITY TO GRANT.

(DOUBLE STANDARDS)

... AND MORE

CONCLUSION

APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL AND ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted. I STILL NEED ADDITIONAL
BLANK PETITIONS, AT LEAST
SEVEN, NOW.

WRONGFULLY IMPRISONED
Respectfully submitted,



Date: 03/14/2022