

NO 22-20055

IN THE

21-7854

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ORIGINAL

MICHAEL GREGORY PETERS - PETITIONER

VS.

DAVID MITTNER- RESPONDENT

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

THE UNITED STATES FIFTH CIRCUIT COURT

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI


MICHAEL G. PETERS # 2019150

STRINGFELLOW UNIT

1200 PM 655

ROSHARON, TEXAS 77583

(281) 595-3413



QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. SHOULD THE RESPONDENT BE ALLOWED TO USE HIS STANDING AS A U.S. FEDERAL SENIOR JUDGE, TO PROFIT BY PROTECTING HOUSTON, TEXAS BILLION DOLLAR CORPORATIONS FROM THEIR CRIMES AND LIABILITIES?
2. SHOULD THE RESPONDENT BE ALLOWED TO ABUSE HIS STANDING AS A SENIOR FEDERAL JUDGE TO SUPPRESS THE ACTUAL INNOCENCE OF THE PETITIONER TO SILENCE HIM BY INTENTIONAL WRONGFUL IMPRISONMENT FOR EXPOSING GOVERNMENT POLITICAL CRIMES?
3. SHOULD THE RESPONDENT BE ALLOWED TO SUPPRESS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS DEPRIVATIONS TO OBTAIN CORPORATE BRIBES?
4. SHOULD THE RESPONDENT BE ALLOWED TO USE THE FEDERAL COURTS TO IMPOSE THE REPUBLICAN PARTY'S AGENDA TO COVER-UP

GOVERNMENT POLITICAL CRIMES JUST TO STOP
GOV. RICK PERRY BEING INVESTIGATED DURING
HIS 2012 POLITICAL CAMPAIGN TO BECOME UNITED
STATES PRESIDENT?

5. SHOULD THE RESPONDENT BE INVOLVED IN
EITHER POLITICAL OR CORPORATE CRIMES?
6. WHETHER OR NOT THE RESPONDENT COVERED-
UP PETITIONERS ACTUAL INNOCENCE IN CASE
NO. 4:18-CV-645 TO PROTECT THE TEXAS
REPUBLICAN PARTY AND HOUSTON, TEXAS
BILLION DOLLAR CORPORATIONS CRIMES FUNDING
THEM?
7. HAS THE RESPONDENT BEEN USING HIS
STANDING AS A FEDERAL JUDGE TO DISMISS
ALL RELATED CIVIL ACTIONS IN THE PUR-
SUANCE OF HIS COVER-UPS IN CASE NO.
NOW ALSO IN THE SUPREME COURT

LIST OF PARTIES

All Parties are.

1. Michael G. Peter, #2019190
Springfellow Unit
1200 PM 655
Rosharon, Texas 77583
2. David Hottner
U.S. Southern District Court
P.O. Box 61016
Houston, Texas 77208
3. Kenneth M. Hoyt
U.S. Southern District Court
P.O. Box 61016
Houston, Texas 77208
4. Andrew S. Menen
U.S. Southern District Court
P.O. Box 61016
Houston, Texas 77208

5. Gary Miller
U.S. Southern District Court
P.O. Box 61010
Houston, Texas 77208
6. Gov. Greg Abbott
7. Gov. Rick Perry
8. Texas Attorney General, Ken Paxton
Capitol Building
Austin, Texas

RELATED CASES

original (19-20717) F. FBI (cr.)

4:22-cv-00584 Petrus vs. H. H. H.

4:22-cv-00668 Petrus vs. H. H. H.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3-4
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	5- ¹⁹ 21
REASONS FOR GRANTING WRIT.	20-23
CONCLUSION	24

Index to Appendices

Appendix "A" Fifth Circuit decision

Appendix "B" U.S. Southern District decision

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED PAGE
No.

CASES:

Marshall vs. Service Inc., 446 U.S. 238 64
L.Ed 182 100 S.Ct. 1610 (1980) 10.

Mathew vs. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319, 344 96
S.Ct. 893, 907 (1976) 10

Hurles vs. Ryan, 706, F.3d 1021 (CA9 2013) 10-11

Bracy vs. Gramley, 520 U.S. 899, 904, 117
S.Ct. 1793, 138 L.Ed. 2d 97 (1997) 11

Withrow vs. Larkin, 421 U.S. 35, 46, 95
S.Ct. 1456, 43 L.Ed. 2d (1975) 11

Withrow, 421 U.S. at 47, 95 S.Ct. 1456 11

Boland vs Holder, 682 F.2d 531 (2012 CA6
Ohio). 11

Beto vs. Gomez, 462 F.2d 596, 597 (5th
Cir. 1972). 11

United States vs Scheffer, 523 U.S. 303, 308,
118 S.Ct. 1261, 140 L.Ed 2d 413 (1998). 13

CASES:

PASA

Thompson v. Louisville, 362 U.S. 199 L. Ed

2d 654, 80 S. Ct. 624, 80 ALR 2d 1

1355. See All

Overall

In re Winship, 397 U.S. 358, 25 L. Ed

368, 90 S. Ct. 1068 51 Ohio Ops 2d

323. (Essential to due process guaranteed by

the Fourteenth Amend, no person may

suffer imprisonment except proof of

every element of the offense.

Overall

Schlup v. Delo, 513 U.S. 298, and House

vs. Bell, 547 U.S. 518

Overall

Mc Quiggin v. Perkins 569 U.S. 135

L. Ed 2d 1019 (2013) Actual Innocence

Overall

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS

Petitioner respectfully prays a writ of certiorari
issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

Federal courts:

1. The opinion of the U.S. Fifth Circuit
Court can be found in Appendix "A"
2. The opinion of the U.S. Southern District
Court can be found in Appendix "B".

Due to cover-ups no reports were made.

JURISDICTION

Federal cases;

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was March 23, 2022.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. Section 1254(1).

Seen in Appendix "A".

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

THE SIXTH AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION GUARANTEES THE RIGHT OF THE ACCUSED IN A CRIMINAL PROSECUTION TO BE CONFRONTED WITH THE WITNESSES AGAINST HIM AND ALSO GIVES THE DEFENDANT THE RIGHT TO CALL HIS OWN WITNESSES IN SUPPORT OF HIS DEFENSE.

IT ALSO ALLOWS A DEFENDANT TO PRESENT HIS DEFENSE AND BRING FORTH THE EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF THAT DEFENSE. ALL DENIED BY THE REPUBLICANS COVERING-UP THEIR CRIMES GIVING THESE BILLION DOLLAR CORPORATIONS PROTECTION THROUGH CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND COVER-UPS.

THE FIFTH AMENDMENT: RIGHT GUARANTEES THAT A PERSON SHALL NOT BE DEPRIVED OF LIFE, LIBERTY AND PROPERTY WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF THE LAWS, YET THEY DID!

THE EIGHTH AMENDMENT, FORBIDS EXCESSIVE BAIL, BUT Z WAS DENIED BAIL TO CONTROL ME AND STOP MY SEEKING LEGAL HELP.

THE FIRST AMENDMENT, GUARANTEES FREEDOM OF SPEECH, YET THEY IMPRISONED ME FOR EXPOSING THEM.

THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT STATES THAT A STATE SHALL NOT DEPRIVE ANY PERSON OF LIFE, LIBERTY OR PROPERTY WITHOUT DUE PROCESS AND THE FAIR PROTECTION OF THE LAWS. YET Z'VE BEEN DENIED EVERY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT, MADE A POLITICAL PRISONER FOR PROTECTING MY SON.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

DAVID MITTNE PRESIDED OVER MY ACTUAL INNOCENT CASE NO. 4:18-CV-645. HE'S A FEDERAL JUDGE IN HOUSTON, TEXAS WHERE THE BILLION DOLLAR CORPORATIONS OF TEXAS CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL AND BAYLOR COLLEGE OF MEDICINE.

I.

THE BEST EXAMPLE AND PREPARED CASE THAT I PUT TOGETHER IS FIFTH CIRCUIT NO. 19-20717 BUT SINCE WE'RE DECIDING THIS CASE EITHER IS ADEQUATE IT'S ALL THE SAME CASE.

II.

EVIDENCE PROVES MY ACTUAL INNOCENCE, IT PROVES CORPORATE CONSPIRACY AND CRIMES, THUS PROVING THEIR LIABILITIES. LIABILITIES CAUSED BY THE FABRICATION OF THE TEXAS CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL BY TWO (2) BAYLOR COLLEGE OF MEDICINE EMPLOYEES; DR. ZORAN

ECKERT DREYER AND HER CO-CONSPIRATOR;
MITAL K. BRAHMBHATT (SOCIAL WORKER). THE
EVIDENCE OF (DR. DREYER) STATES IN WITNESS
PROVES THAT AFTER THREE (3) PRIOR FAILED
ATTEMPTS TO UNLAWFULLY GAIN MY EX-
WIFE CHILD CUSTODY, THEY FABRICATED
THE TEXAS CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL'S MEDICAL
RECORDS AND AFTER PRIOR CONSPIRATO-
RIAL COMMUNICATIONS WITH MY EX-WIFE'S
COUNSELERS TO GAIN MY EX CHILD CUSTODY
FABRICATED AND FORGED SAID COUNSELERS
SAID FABRICATED PHYSICAL EVIDENCE AND
SAID COUNSELERS DID PRESENT IT TO JUDGE;
JENNIFER ROBIN'S ~~HE~~ ON THE MORNING OF
THE CUSTODY HEARINGS TO DECEIVE HER
INTO BELIEVING I'D MEDICALLY NEGLECTED
MY SON TO ILLEGALLY GAIN THEIR

OBJECTIVE.

IV.

EVIDENCE PROVES THAT I THE PROTEST-
ED THE TEXAS CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL ~~ONCE~~
ONCE BOTH BAYLOR AND TEXAS CHILD-
REN'S COVERED-UP.

V.

EVIDENCE PROVES JUDGE TRACY ALLEN GILBERT
OF THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY 414TH DISTRICT
COURT IN CASE NO. 12-08-09259-CR DID
ENTER INTO UNEITHERAL COMMUNICATIONS
WITH JUDGE GILBERT (BAYLOR) GRADUATE.
AND AFTER SAID MEETING REFUSED TO
ALLOW ME EITHER EVIDENCE SUBMITTED
OR WITNESSES CORROBORATING THE CONSPIRA-
TOR'S CRIMES.

VI.

AFTER FINDING OUT THE TEXAS MEDICAL
BOARD ALSO COVERED-UP DR. DREYER'S CRIMES,

I DID REARCH AND FOUND OUT GOV. RICK
PERRY APPOINTED AT HIS "DISCRETION" THE
DIRECTOR OF THE TEXAS MEDICAL BOARD;
DR. IRVIN ZETTLER. FURTHER INVESTIGATION
FOUND ZETTLER DIVORCED HIS LONG TIME
WIFE TO MARRY HIS NURSE, SHOWING
A MAN OF LOW CHARACTER, AFTER HE TOO
~~COVERED UP~~ COVERED-UP.
VII.

I PROTESTED ON YOUTUBE MEDIAS

1. DR. ZODNY DREXER
2. MITAL K. BRAHMBHATT
3. TEXAS CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL
4. BAYLOR COLLEGE OF MEDICINE
5. TEXAS MEDICAL BOARD
6. JUDGE; TRACY ALLEN GILBERT
7. GOV. RICK PERRY

BOTH JUDGE GILBERT AND RICK PERRY WERE

RUNNING FOR ELECTIONS. LOU. PERRY FOR
UNITED STATES PRESIDENT.

VIII.

I WAS CALLING GOV. PERRY A ("CHILD
MOLESTER") BEFORE HE WAS CAUGHT WITH
THE UNDER AGED PROSTITUTE IN HIS CAR.
I WAS CALLING HIM OUT FOR MOLESTING
MY SON BY COVERING-UP FOR THESE
BILLION DOLLAR CORPORATIONS LIABILITIES,
AND FOR TAKING BRIBES ETC.

IX.

HIS ATTORNEY GENERAL AT THE TIME
WAS GREG ABBOTT. MY YOUTHERS WERE
HARMING THE REPUBLICAN PARTY SO
ABBOTT CALLED THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY
COURTHOUSE, KNOWING I HAD TWO (2) OLD
PRIORS AND WENT TO PRISON AND TOLD

THEM TO SILENCE ME. JUDGE GILBERT (DANIEL
GROD) WHO Z WAS EXPOSING AND HAD A HIS-
TORY AND PATTERN OF MAKING FALSE ACCO-
GATIONS AGAINST LAWYERS EITHER RUNNING
AGAINST HIM FOR THE JUDGE'S SEDT OR FILL-
ING A PATERNITY SUIT AGAINST HIM USING
HIS FRIENDS IN THE D.A.'S OFFICE TO SILENCE
THEM. HE FILES THREE (3) COUNTS OF
RETRIBUTION AGAINST ME IN RETRIBUTION.

X.

HIS COURTHOUSE FRIENDS ALL PRESIDED, INCLUD-
ING MY DEFENSE APPOINTED COUNSEL. SEE
CASE NO. 14-0708207-CR. AGAIN Z WAS RE-
FUSED ALL MY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO
WITNESSES. (Marshall vs. Service Inc., 446 US 238
64 L. Ed 182 100 S. Ct. 1610 (1980) Impediment
Tribunal). Mathews vs. Eldridge, 424 US 319, 344.
96 S. Ct. 893, 907 (1976). Hurles vs. Ryan, 706

HAVING ME SILENCED BY INTENTIONAL
FALSE IMPRISONMENT AND THE DEPRIVA-
TIONS OF ALL MY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS
TO PUT ON MY ~~THE~~ ONLY REAL DEFENSE
APPEARS TO BE THE AMERICAN WAY. BRIBES
ARE THE NORM AND IMPRISONMENT FOR
THE INNOCENT VICTIMS WHEN THEY
ATTEMPT TO EXPOSE THEIR CORRUPTION.

XIV.

See United States vs. Schaffer, 523 U.S. 303,
308, ~~30~~ 118 S. Ct. 1261, 140 L. Ed. 2d 413
(1998) (Whether rooted directly in the due
process clause or in the compulsory process
or confrontation clause of the Sixth Amend-
ment, the "government guarantees criminal
defendants meaningful opportunity to present

a complete defense. CONSIDERING THE FACT
THAT Z WAS DENIED;

- A. ALL DEFENSE WITNESSES
- B. ALL EVIDENCE SUBMITTALS
- C. ALL DISCOVERY
- D. EFFECTIVE ASST. OF COUNSEL
- E. DENIED AND OPEN DOOR TRIAL
- F. JURY SELECTIONS
- G. CHANGE OF VENUE
- H. BAIL
- I. AND THEY WITHHELD THE BRADY EVIDENCE IN COUNT NO. 1 (THE ADDITIONAL PHONE CALL EVIDENCE) ALL BLANK!

XV.

THE FACT THAT ALL THE JUDGE'S MISSED
THIS SPELLS OUT CORRUPTION, RACKETEER-
ING AND OBSCURITY.

XVI.

THE RESPONDENT THEN ABUSES HIS POSITION FURTHER BY DISMISSING ALL RELATED CIVIL ACTIONS TO COVER UP THEIR JUDICIAL RACKETEERING ENTERPRISES.

XVII.

NO FEDERAL INVESTIGATION CAN BE ORDERED BECAUSE THOSE WHO WOULD ORDER THEM ARE CORRUPTED.

XVIII.

THE SUPREME COURT CLERK, SCOTT HARRIS DISMISSED MY CASE AND TOOK BRIBES BY THIS CORPORATION, WITHHOLDING THE INFORMATION OF HIS DISMISSAL FOR SIX(6) MONTHS WHEREIN I COULD NOT APPEAL. I HAD TO FILE A CIVIL ACTION ~~AGAINST~~

STAMPED BY THE POST OFFICE IN THE PRISON
MEDIC ROOM STAFF TRAINED, BUT NEVER
ARRIVED. TO TEST A THEORY IN MARCH
2021, I RE-FILED, "ONE-WEEK" LATER I
GOT A PRISON CATHY TO APPEAR FOR A
ATTORNEY PHONE CALL IN THE PRISON
LAW LIBRARY. IT WAS THE STATES ATTOR-
NEY GENERAL'S OFFICE, WHO TOLD ME:
("WE WANT YOU TO DROP YOUR COMPLAINT")

XX.

HENCE KIM GOS CALLED HER BOSS; KEN PAX-
TON, TEXAS ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR GOV.
GREG ABBOTT. THE COVER-UP CONTINUES
THROUGH GOV. GREG ABBOTT WHO DOES NOT
WANT A FEDERAL INVESTIGATION TO
UNCOVER HIS AND PERRY'S POLITICAL CRIMES.

XVI.

IT WAS GOV. RICK PERRY WHO SIGNED THE
BILL, THE ("TEXAS INNOCENT PRISONERS COMP-
ENSATION BILL") NO GOVERNOR IN TEXAS HIS-
TORY EVER SIGNED SUCH A BILL. PERRY FELT
"GUILTY" FOR WHAT HE AND GREG ABRAHAM HAD
DONE. THE BILL HOWEVER HAD A CLAUSE
THAT IT EXCEPTED (\$80,000.00) PER YEAR OF
HOUSE IMPRISONMENT, I'D ALSO ASK NOT
TO SUB. THIS IS ALL ABOUT MONEY, POWER
AND GREED. SEE AND APPLY ALL EVIDENCE
FROM COURT CASE NO. 19-20717, FIFTH CIRCUIT.
RELIEF

RELIEF IS SOUGHT AGAINST THE RESPONDENT
FOR TEN (10) MILLION DOLLARS AND A FEDERAL
INVESTIGATION INTO THIS CORRUPTION, SHOULD
BE ORDERED TO CLEAN-UP THIS CORRUPTION.

IT'S DUE TO THIS JUDGE'S CORRUPTION, SELL-
ING OUT INNOCENT AMERICANS EXPOSING
THE CORPORATE CRIMES THAT STOLE HIS
ONLY SON FROM HIM AND FORCED HIM
INTO POVERTY, HAD ME IMPRISONED,
RUINED MY MARRIAGE AND STOLE ALL
MY PROPERTY TO PUNISH ME. ZRE-
MIND A REPUBLICAN PARTY POLITICAL
PRISON ON U.S. SOIL.

Respectfully submitted

Michael L. Petri

PETITIONER - VICTIM

MAY 3RD, 2022

CC: RESUMPTENT
FILE

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

1. Evidence in Case No. 4:18-CV-645, Appended 19-20717 Fifth Cir. Appended, Supreme Court No. 21-5439 proves the Respondent covered-up:

- A. Actual Innocence
- B. Denial of All Defense witnesses
- C. Denial of All Defense evidence
- D. Covered-up the State's witness crimes to protect the billion dollar corporations.
- E. Ignored refusal to obtain Discovery
- F. Ignored Conspiracies making All Defense Jury Selections
- G. Ignored the bias remark of the presiding judge.