

No. 21-8164

RECORDED
RECORDED

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

JUN 08 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

Michael L. Pinkney — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

Kenneth Black — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Michael L. Pinkney

(Your Name)

P.O. Box 8107

(Address)

Mansfield, Ohio 44901

(City, State, Zip Code)

(419) 526-2100

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- ① United States. Deborah S. Hunt violated 2253 (c) And illegally dismissed the Appeal without it going in front of a Judge, in violation of DUE PROCESS of LAW.
- ② Chief Clerk Sandy Opacich forged a Judge's name as to cover up her FRAUDENT denial, in The Federal District Court of Ohio Northern District
- ③ 241 - CONSPIRACY AGAINST RIGHTS
- ④ 242 Deprivation of Rights done under the COLOR OF LAW
- ⑤ FRAUD UPON the Court And FRAUD done by The Court (Case never heard on its Merits in STATE AND FEDERAL Court.)
- ⑥ Sixth Circuit And U.S. Supreme Court CASE PRECEDENT NOT FOLLOWED
- ⑦ Sham Legal Process, And FRAUDULENT Opposition on Appeal
- ⑧ Why a Evidentiary Hearing WASN'T granted?

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:

Sixth Circuit Chief Clerk Deborah S. Hunt
Federal District Chief Clerk Sandy OPACICH
Ohio Attorney General DAVE YOST

RELATED CASES

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	Fraudulent Judgement by Clerk Deborah S. Hunt A-2 Unsigned WAIVER
APPENDIX B	Ohio Supreme Court JOURNAL Entries And B-2
APPENDIX C	C.O. A Exhibit
APPENDIX D	Duties of The Clerk Rule Case Proving that The Federal Courts Are AWARE of The Clerk CRIMES. Exhibit D
APPENDIX E	Duties of The Clerk Rule Exhibit E
APPENDIX F	

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 A-1 to the petition and is

[] reported at Never Ruled on the Merits; 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 Never Ruled on the Merits; 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 _____ to the petition and is

[] reported at Never Ruled on the Merits; or,
[] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[] is unpublished.

The opinion of the 9th District Court of Appeals court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

[] reported at Never Ruled on the Merits; 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 Never decided by a 3 Judge Panel.

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 Never Ruled on the Merit. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix _____.

[] 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 _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. ___ A _____.

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

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

MR. PINKNEY HAS APPEALED HIS CASE AT ALL LEVELS IN THE OHIO STATE COURTS, INCLUDING OHIO'S SUPREME COURT. ALL DENIALS DID NOT INCLUDE FACT FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION OF LAW. MR. PINKNEY APPEALED TO THE FEDERAL NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO, WHERE THE CHIEF CLERK FORGED THE JUDGE'S NAME. MR. PINKNEY'S CASE IS IN LINE WITH SIXTH CIRCUIT AND U.S. SUPREME COURT PRECEDENTS, AND SHOULD HAVE BEEN GRANTED RELIEF. THE SAME IS TRUE OF THE SIXTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEAL WHERE THE CHIEF CLERK FRAUDULENTLY DENIED MR. PINKNEY'S C.O.A. IN VIOLATION OF 2253 (C) AND SIXTH CIRCUIT AND U.S. SUPREME COURT PRECEDENTS. ALSO THE CASE WAS NEVER HEARD ON ITS MERITS. MR. PINKNEY HAS NEVER BEEN GRANTED A STATE OR FEDERAL EVIDENTIARY HEARING, IN VIOLATION DUE PROCESS OF LAW, WHICH MAKES HIS ENTIRE APPEAL PROCESS A SHAM LEGAL PROCESS, OR FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND FRAUD DONE BY THE COURTS AND THE STATE OF OHIO. THIS CASE MUST BE HEARD ON ITS MERITS.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

This Petition must be granted in the interest of Justice and Due Process of Law. Also Sixth Circuit and United States Supreme Courts precedents demands that MR. Pinkney should be granted Relief. MR. Pinkney has proven that he has been a victim of a SHAM Legal Process. The Unsigned Waiver proves this point. All of MR. Pinkney's Exhibits proves Fraud upon the Court. The innocent standard applies to MR. Pinkney's case, as well as Miscarriage of Justice standard.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Hanley

Date: 5-26-22