

21-7820

ORIGINAL

FROM: 67090509
TO: Cita, Carmen; Third Circuit, Submission
SUBJECT: SCOTUS IFP For Certiorari
DATE: 04/05/2022 02:19:25 PM

Supreme Court, U.S. FILED APR 06 2022 OFFICE OF THE CLERK

Docket Number:

In the United States Supreme Court (SCOTUS)

In Re Darron Thomas

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Federal Third Circuit Court of Appeals (CA3) [and the Federal District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania (EDPa)]; And Independently & Separately For Habeas Corpus and Extraordinary Writ To The CA3 & EDPa

1. This is a motion to proceed Informa Pauperis (IFP), pursuant to the Supreme Court of the United States (SCOTUS) Rule 39. Due to restrictions at the Federal Detention Center (FDC) Philadelphia the only resource available for typing is a highly restrictive/limited email service. Restrictions include a lack of "copy" and "paste" functions which means that each message must be typed from scratch, and details within a message cannot be shifted around for the purposes of reorganizing the contents of a document. This submission is one a message from within said restrictive email arrangement. The restrictions have forced me to place the Table of Contents (ToC) on page 3 of this certiorari submission. For the same reasons, despite this petition being submitted independent of any petitions for original writs or habeas corpus relief from SCOTUS, this motion is to be used for the purposes of (i) Darron Thomas' petition for Certiorari to the Federal Third Circuit Court of Appeals (CA3) regarding cases 21-3072, 22-1367, 22-1386 and/or 21-3072, and the associated cases in the EDPa; (ii) Darron Thomas' petition for habeas corpus relief, mandamus, prohibition and/or an injunction in respect of the same case and the underlying cases in the Federal District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania (EDPa) -- cases 21-00416 and Case: 2:21-cv-03683-GJP Thomas v June et al (hereafter, Case 03683).

2. DT filed to proceed IFP in both the EDPa and the CA3. In each instance DT was granted permission to proceed IFP. Appointment was under both 18 USC section 3006A and sections 20 and 30 of the CJA. See Exhibits 409-411 in Appendix C. Rule 39.1 trumps Rule 29.2, thereby providing that no notarized affidavit be submitted accompanying this pro se submission from a (falsely arrested and falsely imprisoned) inmate confined in a Federal Bureau of Prisons (FBOP) prison facility. The facts relevant to certiorari (filed independently of habeas corpus or original writ) are contained in the certiorari petition as explicitly listed. The facts applying to habeas corpus or extraordinary writ, pursuant to original jurisdiction, are similarly listed in the independently filed habeas corpus petition. The relief sought is indisputably clear, see Communist Party, as referenced therein. It is also the case that the relief is not otherwise available given the conduct of the EDPa and the CA3, as outlined in the petition for certiorari and the habeas corpus petition. Circumstances are also extraordinary because DT's civil case has been subjected to a "chilling effect" by arresting and subjecting DT to criminal proceedings and trial without probable cause.

3. For the purposes of the 28 USC 2255 or 2241; and/or original extraordinary writ from SCOTUS, this is also a motion for leave to file, pursuant to SCOTUS Rules 17, 20 & 21. Pursuant to Rules 20 and/or 21 indicating that a motion for extraordinary writ should be filed with similar particulars as under Rule 14, for certiorari, for the purposes of DT's petition for extraordinary writ and habeas corpus relief sections "A" through "I" should be read as if fully and explicitly incorporated after the Rule 34 headings in the petition for extraordinary writ and habeas corpus, with "certiorari" substituted for by "mandamus, prohibition, an injunction and/or habeas corpus relief." That is, the main text of item 1 in the "certiorari petition" should be substituted with: "with respect to the appeal associated with case 2:21-cv-03683-GJP Thomas v. June et.al., and U.S. v. Darron Thomas, Crim. No: 21-416, should a writ of mandamus, prohibition, an injunction, and/or habeas corpus relief be issued against the (Federal) Third Circuit Court of Appeals (Ca3) ...". It is the restrictions on the law library computer which compels this arrangement which is tethered to the economy, least cost and efficiency requirements of litigation, as, for example, set out under Fed. R. Civ. P. 1.

4. Limitations confining law library access to federal statutes and authorities on the FDC law library computer prevents DT from presenting the text of any statute which is not a federal statute.

Table of Authorities:

5. For the purposes of SCOTUS certiorari to the CA3 (&/or EDPa) the full citation of the cases listed in this Table of Authorities (ToA) is given in the main text of the petition for certiorari. These Cases are:

(a)Colorado River ... v. United States

RECEIVED APR 12 2022 OFFICE OF THE CLERK SUPREME COURT, U.S.

- (b) Daimler Chrysler Corp. v Cuno
- (c) Gerstein v. Pugh
- (d) NLRB v. Pittsburg
- (e) Steel Co. v. Citizens for Better Environment
- (e) Reyes Mata v. Lynch

Certificate of Service

This document has been served to the parties in the proceeding in like fashion to service as set out in the attached petition for writ for certiorari (or, as appropriate, extraordinary writ and/or habeas corpus relief).

Yours Sincerely,
/s/Darron Thomas
Darron Thomas
April 5, 2022.