


21-7591 ORIGINAL

IN THE



SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Donald Morris Lee — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

Washington State — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Donald Lee 356696

(Your Name)

HIAWATHA, 191 Constantine Way
(Address)

Aberdeen WA 98520-9504
(City, State, Zip Code)

n/a

(Phone Number)

Questions

I

Background

State action violated RCWS and Haymond(Aileyne).

Amended Judgment and Sentence to add time to Lee, resentencing him ten years later.

Query

1

Can the court void the illegally obtained J&S?

2

Can the court reverse and dismiss the conviction?

3

Can the court order Lee released?

4

Can the court dissolve the ISRB?

LIST OF PARTIES

[] All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

X] 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

PARTIES:

Washington Department of Corrections

Snohomish County Prosecutor

Judge Bruce Weiss

ISRR Board; JP, TD, SR; LRC, KLR.

Related Cases:

Lee	100000-6	WA Sup	11/3/2021
Lee	100093-6	WA Sup	12/1/2021
Lee	82771-5-I	ODA	6/28/2021
Lee	99887-6	WA Sup	1/15/2021
Lee	77181--7-I	ODA	1/15/2021
Lee	82689-1-I	ODA	7/30/2021
Lee	11-1-01772-3	Sno. Cty.	3/12/2012
Lee	3175A-11F	Everett Muni.	7/19/2011
Lee	oc11-1954	Everett Muni.	7/17/2011

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

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

JURISDICTION

- U.S. Supreme Ct. reviews state decisions under 28 USC § 1257. THIS WAS DONE UNDER U.S. v. HAYMOND, et al. (EE SUPPLIES STATES' REJECTION IN THIS RULING, 1988-6, 1989-6, BLANKET DENIALS).
- GUILTY IS UP TO THE TOTAL DISCRETION OF THE U.S. SUPREME CT. 28 USC § 1254, RE HAYMOND, 17-1672.

AUTHORITY

- DIRECT AUTHORITY

WASHINGTON CONTRAVENES U.S. SUPREME COURT AUTHORITY BY 'RELABELING' UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTIONS AND RULES. WE IGNORE "HAYMOND" COMPLAINT AND DISMISSED WITHOUT REVIEW.

- ABSURDITY

STRICT ACTIONS AND DISMISSEALS ARE PATENTLY ABSURD, USE OF STRAWMAN, AD HOCINISM, AND INJECTIVE IN FILINGS. 'LOG IS GUILTY BECAUSE HE PLEASED GUILTY'S ARGUE WHERE THE PLEA ITSELF IS BREACHED OR EVEN CHALLENGED.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

U.S. v Haymond 204 LEd2d 897; 2019 US LEXIS 4398
Robinson 810 S.E.2d 32. 2018
Alston 434 P3d 1066; 7 WnApp 2d 462
Hill v U.S. 368 U.S.424,428; 82 S.Ct. 468
U.S. v Williams 46 F3d 57 1995
U.S. v Dawson 587 F3d640,45 2009
U.S. v Harper 643 F3d 135,143 2011
State v Hale 907 NW2d 56 2018
U.S. v Lopez-Pastrana 889 F3d13 2018
Arizona 11-182 2012
Arrango 10-15821
in re Caldellis 87 Wn2d 127 2016

XXXXXX

Rules

18 USC&S 3161 Speedy Trial

XXXXX

SS 323 US 17 Abuse of writ, denial of H.C.

FRCP 11(4)(2) conditional pleas/

CRR 4.2 Grounds

RCW 10.101.005 Right to an appeal

RCW 10.73.090 Direct Appeal

RCW 9.94A.507 (Haymond)

RCW 9.94A.701 (Alston)

Sentencing Reform Act

RAP 12.1 "only on issues set forth"

CRR 4.4(b) 'in re' Barr is not supported.

CRR 29 Acquittal motions (Fuller)

CRR 4.2 Voluntariness

CRR 5(g)(3) stand in representation only with "written agreement"

RAP 17.7 objection to ruling

CRR 4.2 grounds

lcr 16 objections and discovery

lcr 26 mandatory discovery

WAC 137-08-105 mandates ~~as~~ review

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 _____ 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 A to the petition and is WASHINGTON SUPREME CT.

reported at 1001006, 10493-6; or,
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished.

The opinion of the DIVISION ONE court appears at Appendix A to the petition and is WASHINGTON CO. T.

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 _____.

[] 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 _____.
12/10/2011

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 11/3/2011.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix B.

A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: 12/10/2011, 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 _____.
12/10/2011

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

Constitutional and statutory Provisions

- 1 Speedy Trial Right
- 2 Right to effective counsel
- 3 Right to due process 8th, 14th Amend.
- 4 Statutory violations

Right to speedy trial is violated by 1. failure of state to notify LEE of ~~imper-~~ impending legal action, motion, and an opportunity to object.

2. Right to speedy trial is violated by resentencing ten years late.

Effective counsel is violated by having ex-Attorney that LEE ~~was~~ denied ~~at~~ attempts to fire her previously, representing without consultation or permission.

Due Process is innately violated where the state acts outside its own laws.

/Statutory violations are numerous, blank denials of appeals, ignoring evidences subbed, ignoring motions, and various stated regulatory violations of Judge Weiss, prosecutor(s), and COAs.

Statement of case

DOC moved without notice to LEE to amend judgment and sentence nine+ years late. LEE discovered /Haymond/ in law library, which ruled that ISRB HAS BEEN unconstitutional since Alleyne, and the SRA.

Nonetheless, all state reviews were baldly denied even upon submission of stipulated evidence re: states own documents.

Judges on appeals raised strawmen arguments, false grounds not raised by LEE. LEE still has a valid alibi from original charges which has been summarily dismissed in all attempts to appeal. LEEs pleas were submitted to obvious bait and switch tactics, (re: transcript) NO illegal data was ever found on any of LEEs computers or devices. Yet, this absurd and unreasoned series of decisions acted to constantly prevent any sort of appeal. LEE has never had any appeal lawyer representing him. Allegations against lee are patently questionable if not ridiculous given that (original) information contradicted by the fact that LEE wasn't in the state of Washington at the time.


REASONS TO GRANT PETITION

1. State continues to thwart and ignore prior US Sup. Ct. decisions. State rewards, mischaracterizes, and disingenuously acts with malice to retain convictions that violated the US Constitution.
2. State is adhering to an unconstitutional practice. (*Joint filing*)
3. State's revolving door of "Information" used to indict in series and multiples until jailed inmates capitulate and accept a plea.
4. LEE has passed beyond the only rightful and correct release date of 4/19/2021. Sans ~~18~~⁶²8, Lee has an effective 'max date' of 3/14/2022.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Donald C. Lee". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large, stylized "D" at the beginning.

Date: 28 DEC 2021