

APR 13 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 21-8170

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

____ — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

____ — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

(Your Name)

(Address)

(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

ORIGINAL

QUESTION PRESENTED

1. It's A willful disrespect of United States District Court Chief Judge J. Randal Hall's order, "For not considering the merits of my case."
2. It's A "willful disrespect" of Superior Court of Mitchell County Chief Judge A. Wallace Cato's similar Transaction Court order, by prosecuting on case No. 14-R-109
3. It's a violation of state and federal "criminal law", for "disobeying valid court orders."
4. It's obstruction of justice by interfering with the administration of justice.
5. It's "Fraud" on the ~~court~~ courts when a case is not filed.
6. It's A malicious prosecution when a prosecutor had (ZERO-0) evidence to use.
7. It's surely a "conspiracy" when "NO" court in this state are willing to address the merits in my case.
8. It's A conflict of interest when four attorneys help the prosecutor to convict me.

Cases to consider; U.S. v. Straub, 508 F.3d 1003, 1010-11 (11th Cir. 2007),
U.S. v. Russell, 411 U.S. 423, 432 (1973), Sibbach v. Wilson & Co., 312
U.S. 1, 41 S. Ct. 422, 85 L. Ed. 479 (1941), Young v. U.S. 481 U.S. 787, 798
(1987), Chamber v. NASCO, Inc., 501 U.S. 32, 44 (1991), FTC v. Leshin
618 F.3d 1221, 1239 (11th Cir. 2010).

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:

JUSTICE OF THE 11th CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS,
THE MITCHELL COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT'S, BOTH FEDERAL DISTRICT CASES FROM
THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA, AND THE HIGHEST STATE COURT IN GEORGIA,
WHICH IS THE GEORGIA SUPREME COURT, PLUS THE GEORGIA COURT OF APPEALS,
AND ALSO THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT
OF GEORGIA.

RELATED CASES cited

U.S. V. STRAUB, 508 F.3d 1003, 1010-11 (11th Cir. 2007)
↓
Sibbach v. Wilson & Co., 312 U.S. 1, 61 S.Ct. 422, (1941)
Young v. U.S. 481 U.S. 787, 798 (1987)
U.S. V. RUSSELL, 411 U.S. 423, 432 (1973)
Chamber v. Nasco, Inc., 501 U.S. 32, 44 (1991)
FTC V. LESHIN 618 F.3d 1221, 1236 (11th Cir. 2010)
WALKER V. CITY OF BIRMINGHAM, 388 U.S. 307, 320-21 (1967)
BATSON V. KY., 476 U.S. 79, 96-98 (1986)
MILLER-EL V. DRETKE, 545 U.S. 231, 240-41 (2005)
MARON V. U.S., 275 U.S. 192, 196 (1927)
MD. V. GARRISON, 480 U.S. 79, 84 (1987)
AVERY V. GA. 345 U.S. 559, 561 (1953)
FULMINANTE, 499 U.S. At 309-10, ALSO CHAPMAN, 386 U.S. At 23+n8
WALLER V. GA., 467 U.S. 39, 49 (1984)
BOUNDS V. SMITH 430 U.S. At 827

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

INDEX TO APPENDICES

SEE ATTACHMENT

APPENDIX A	THE COURT HAS CONSIDERED THE MATTER AND HAS REACHED THE FOLLOWING CONCLUSION:
APPENDIX B	THE COURT HAS CONSIDERED THE MATTER AND HAS REACHED THE FOLLOWING CONCLUSION:
APPENDIX C	THE COURT HAS CONSIDERED THE MATTER AND HAS REACHED THE FOLLOWING CONCLUSION:
APPENDIX D	THE COURT HAS CONSIDERED THE MATTER AND HAS REACHED THE FOLLOWING CONCLUSION:
APPENDIX E	THE COURT HAS CONSIDERED THE MATTER AND HAS REACHED THE FOLLOWING CONCLUSION:
APPENDIX F	ORDER OF THE COURT NOTING THE MATTER AND REACHING THE FOLLOWING CONCLUSION:
APPENDIX G	ORDER OF THE COURT NOTING THE MATTER AND REACHING THE FOLLOWING CONCLUSION:
APPENDIX H	REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE JUDGE AND THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT NOTING THE MATTER AND REACHING THE FOLLOWING CONCLUSION:
APPENDIX I	ORDER FROM THE 11th CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
<u>Banks v. Dretke</u> , 540 U.S. 668, 698 (2004)	(Pg. 9)
<u>Co Field v. Alabama Public Service Commission</u> 926 F.2d 512, 517, 11th Cir. 1991)	
<u>Johnson v. Avery</u> 393 U.S. 483, 485 (1969)	
<u>Murray v. Giarattano</u> , 492 U.S. 1, 1166, 109 S.Ct. 2765 (1989)	(Pg. 14)
<u>Strickland v. Washington</u> , 466 U.S. 668, 104 S.Ct. 2052 (1984)	(Pg. 5)
<u>PELTON V. Ohio</u> , 488 U.S. 75, 85 (1988)	(Pg. 4)
<u>Walker v. City of Birmingham</u> , 388 U.S. 307, 320-21 (1967)	(Pg. 6)
<u>Evitts v. Lucey</u> , 469 U.S. 387, 396 (1984)	(Pg. 4)

STATUTES AND RULES	PAGE
<u>Judicial Canon 3(B)(2)</u> , <u>Federal Rule 60(b)(2)-(3)</u> , <u>Federal Rule 23(g)</u> , <u>18-U.S.C. 401-402</u> , <u>Superior Court Rule 31.3</u> , <u>O.C.G.A. 15-12-63</u> , <u>O.C.G.A. 15-12-42(b)(1)(2)</u>	Pg. 15
<u>Federal Rule 60(b)(4)</u> , <u>O.C.G.A. 17-9-4</u> , <u>RELEVANT EVIDENCE Rule 24-4-402</u> , <u>15-12-40</u> , <u>16-10-46</u> , <u>16-5-42</u> , <u>28 U.S.C. 2254 (b)(6) and (c)</u> , <u>STATE BAR Rule 1.3</u>	Pg. 17
<u>O.C.G.A. 16-10-20</u> , <u>Collateral Bar Rule</u> , <u>A.B.A. Model Rule 3.8</u> , <u>O.C.G.A. 5-6-31</u>	Pg. 18

OTHER	PAGE
<u>First Amendment</u> , <u>and the "Privilege and Immunities Clause" of Article IV of the United States Constitution</u> , <u>Georgia's Constitution of 1983 Article I, Section 1, Paragraph XII</u> , <u>Federal Rule 4(a)(4)(A)(i)</u> , <u>Thompson v. Church</u> , <u>1 Root 312 (1791)</u> , <u>LEE v. Washington</u> , <u>390 U.S. 333, 333-34 (1968)</u>	Pg. 16

RECEIVED

APR 19 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

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 E to the petition and is

☐ reported at 44 No. 21-11346; 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 C to the petition and is

☒ reported at CV 119-028; 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

☒ reported at A-17-A 0070; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☒ is unpublished.

The opinion of the _____ 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.

JURISDICTION

☒ For cases from federal courts:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was 3-4-22

~~Noted that the petition for writ of certiorari was refused to hear the case.~~

☐ No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case. by not repanding

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: 3-04-22 FAKE ORDER, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix E.

☐ 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).

~~BARNES JR. V. MOYNIER, NO. 17-119-028, U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA - JUDGEMENT ENTERED MARCH 8th, 2019~~
BARNES JR. V. MOYNIER, NO. 17-119-028 U.S. DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA - JUDGEMENT ENTERED AUGUST 30th, 2021, UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS 11th CIRCUIT "FAKE" - JUDGEMENT ENTERED ON 3-04-22

☐ For cases from state courts:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was 4-27-2017
10-2-2017
10-16-2017
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix A. Noted, that the case was NEVER FILED PER THE JUSTICES, FACTS!!

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix A.

☐ 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).

S. BARNES JR. V. THE STATE, NOS. 517C1730, 517C1813 - "JUDGEMENTS"
ENTERED, OCT. 2, 2017 - OCT. 16-2017

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Georgia's - O.C.G.A. 15-1-4, O.C.G.A. 17-9-4, O.C.G.A. 24-1-1001
O.C.G.A. 16-5-42, O.C.G.A. 16-10-70, O.C.G.A. 16-10-96
State Bar Rule 1.3, CANON 3 B(2), CANON(11) C.(1)(2) and
(3), Georgia's Constitution of 1983 Article 1, Section 1,
Paragraph XII, Georgia's Constitution of 1983 Article 1,
Section 1. Paragraph 1., A.B.A. Model Rule 3.8
O.C.G.A. 15-12-165, O.C.G.A. 15-6-3, O.C.G.A. 15-12-42(b)(1)(2)
O.C.G.A. 16-10-20
~~IN RE Jones, 292 Ga. 310, 310, 734 S.E.2d 432 2013~~

Federal's - 28 U.S.C. 2254(e)(4), 18 U.S.C. 401, U.S. Constitution Amend
ments 1st, 4th, 5th, 6th, 8th and 14th, plus Congressional Legislation
141 Cong. REC. 5 14627, 142 Cong. REC. 5 2297, 28 U.S.C.
2254 E (1)(6) and (7)

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner says that the trial court grossly ERRED in trying him on indictment No. 14-R-109, Also the petitioner says that the trial court ERRED by withholding exculpatory evidence from the jury, the trial court ERRED by using knowingly perjured testimony from its primary witness, the trial court ERRED by tampering with the allege stole property, the trial court ERRED by not selecting the jurors in open court for which the state selects all 12 jurors, Also the prosecutor with the aid of the trial judge and trial attorney allowed for the prosecutor to systematically strike all black jurors, the trial court ERRED by deliberately disobeying a valid court order, Also again two more valid court orders of the Federal District Court's Judge have been deliberately violated for not "addressing the merits" of my case. ~~in~~ In conjunction to the above errors a public defender "forger" the Judge's signature upon a \$80,000.00 bond order, only to keep me in jail. Also the public defender upgraded the charge in ct. 1 case no. 14-R-109 from a 2nd degree burglary to a 1st degree burglary where this upgrader doing added (20) additional years. Also as I further explains; saying that there same state superior court judicial officials done the same identical thing back in 2013.. There individuals are, (A. ^{Judge} Wallace Crisp), Judge J. Kevin Chason, Public Defenders - TRE MCLENDIN, ERINE Sheffield, and Patrick Chirholm, Investigator (City) Sheila Adkins, and Robert Carterline and Magistrate Judge E.P. Bubba Lamb.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

It is because at this point the integrity of the courts in this state are in question, plus the Equal protection and DUE PROCESS of the FOURTEENTH Amendment saying in the FIRST YEARS in the LIFE OF OUR NEW COUNTRY, OUR Founding Fathers feared the power of the FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO DEPRIVE ANYONE OF life, liberty, or property "without" "DUE PROCESS OF LAW". EXPERIENCE later showed that the states CAN ALSO ACT tyrannically in depriving A PERSON OF these rights. "Also the job of the courts is "not" to dispose of cases but to decide them justly." plus the ENTIRE MATTER WAS PERPETRATED by "FRAUD". And last, saying that RACIAL Injustice in our court system should not and must not be tolerated. end.

CONCLUSION

SAMUEL GAINES JR.,

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted. BECAUSE OF THE EGREGIOUS MAINTENANCE CONDUCT^{ACTS} COMING FROM MULTIPLE JUDICIAL OFFICIALS THAT ARE SUPPOSE TO KNOW AND HONOR THE LAW, BUT IN THIS CASE THEY HAVE FAILED..

Respectfully submitted, by

SAMUEL GAINES JR.
Samuel Gaines Jr.

Date: 15 February 2022