

MAY 17 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No.

21-8265

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Tsunami Rttan -
-(chief) Col. Michael S. Owl Feather - Gorbey — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

United States of America — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

District of Columbia State Appeal Court
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Tsunami Rttan (chief) Col. Michael S. Owl Feather - Gorbey
(Your Name) D.C. Doc 317611 Fed. 33405-013

USP Thompson Po Box 1002
(Address)

Thompson, Illinois 61285
(City, State, Zip Code)

N/A
(Phone Number)

ORIGINAL

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- (1) Does D.C. Code 11-2503, Due Process, Equal Protection or the interest of Justice Require OWL Feather-Gorhey to be Afforded Appointment of Co-Counsel in His D.C. State Superior Court Covid-19 4 or § 24-403.04 Compassionate Release motion?
- (2) Does D.C. Code 11-2506 or other D.C. state codes, Due Process, Equal Protection or the interest of Justice Require OWL Feather-Gorhey be Afforded ophthalmology, neurology, & orthopedic examinations & evaluations to report on His present medical conditions & needs in furtherance of His pending motion for Covid-19 4 or § 24-403.04 Compassionate Release in D.C. state Superior Court?
- (3) Does D.C. Code 11-2503 or other D.C. state codes, Due Process, Equal Protection or the interest of Justice Require OWL Feather-Gorhey be Afforded Appointment of Co-Counsel ~~in~~ furtherance of Appeals 4 or mandamus proceedings in relation to His Covid-19 or § 24-403.04 Compassionate Release motion?

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:

DISTRICT OF Columbia State Appeal Court.

F. Bop

owl Feather - Gorkhey

superior Court District of Columbia

united States

RELATED CASES

D.C. superior Court 2008-CF2-1552

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

APPENDIX A	D.C. State Court of Appeals Feb. 4. 2022 order Per Curiam Case 22-OA-1
APPENDIX B	D.C. State Superior Court September 24. 2021 order Removing Counsel ordering Gorky Pro-se
APPENDIX C	D.C. State Court of Appeals April 22. 2022 order Denying Denying En banc Rehearing Case 22-OA-1
APPENDIX D	
APPENDIX E	
APPENDIX F	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
Boddie vs. Connecticut 401 US 371 (1971)	10
Doer vs. United States 583 A.2d 670, 672 (D.C. 1990)	10
Estelle vs. Gamble 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976)	10
Ferrelle vs. California 422 US 806, 95, S.Ct. 2525 (1975)	10
Jenkins vs. United States 548 A.2d 102, 105 (D.C. 1988)	
Lomax vs. Ortiz-Marquez - US - 140 S.Ct. 1721, 1723 (2020)	10
Reaves vs. United States 694 A.2d 52, 59 (1997)	
Strickland vs. Washington 466 US 668 (1984)	
United States vs. Cronin 466 US 648 (1984)	
United States vs. Recoster (unknown)	

STATUTES AND RULES

D.C. Code 11-2503 to 2506 or 2603 to 2606
D.C. Code 24-403.04
28 USC § 2243

OTHER

U.S. Constitution Amendments
1, 5, 6, 8 & 14.

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

- ☒ reported at 22-0A-1; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the D.C. State Superior Court court appears at Appendix B to the petition and is

- ☒ reported at 2008-CF2-1552; 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 ____.

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 2-4-2022.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix A.

☒ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: 4-22-2022, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix C.

☐ 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

6th Amendment Right to Counsel.

6th Amendment Right to due Process, Equal protection
5th & 14th Amendments & Right to Fair Trial.

D.C. Code 11-2503 - 2506 is a statutory provision that requires appointment of Counsel & services other than Counsel such as medical examinations to inform the Court of Petitioners Health & Health needs in matters ancillary to the proceedings being a post conviction motion for Early Release through lawful & just cause.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

owl Feather-Gorby is A D.C. state superior Court Defendant
unconstitutionally housed in Federal custody through
forcible abduction in an Asylum state. While has evidence
to prove his actual innocence of any alleged explosive
charges & D.C. CSOSA Admitted 4-3-2017 they Error Reported
his criminal history 2008 causing an Error Excessive
sentence. under the wrong guidelines. While is being
continuously exposed to Covid-19. Physical Assaults &
serious bodily injuries & denials of medical for those
serious physical injuries. While FBCP denials of proper
timely glaucoma treatment & medical marijuana has damage
owl Feather-Gorby's Eyes 90+% l-eye & 50+% R-eye new
subjecting him to a snuff-out-syndrome to where
any physical treatment could destroy remaining good
retina cells & blind Gorby even faster while it's been
noted they alternative meds. Eye drops & pills do not assist
(Gorby's) advanced condition & themselves cause other
serious damages to bodily organs qualifying as imminent
dangers while Federal Courts abuse use of 1915(g) deny Gorby
access to court but debit his account for filing fees keeping
him indigent & unable to redress his issues (adding to) the
damages & dangers Gorby faces, while originally the court
appointed attorney Isbeth Sapirstein who was hostile & ineffective
& who Gorby had to discharge & yet Sapirstein & superior
ct. Judge Winge colluding remove. Sapirstein & order Gorby
indigent. in special housing & suffering adverse conditions
to proceed pro-se while failing to provide a hearing on
any medical services to report on Gorby's health & health
needs. violating the 5th, 6th & 14th Amendments while
subjecting Gorby to 8th Amendment violations &
4 damages.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

- (1) D.C. Superior Court & its State Court of Appeals
Have decided the matters in ways that conflict
With D.C. State Codes 11-2803 To 11-2806 As well
AS Relevant D.C. State laws. JENKINS VS. USA, 548
A.2d. 102. 105 (D.C. 1988) Counsel ~~see~~ Also. DOE VS. USA, 583.
A.2d. 670. 672 (D.C. 1990)
- (2) D.C. Superior Court & its State Court of Appeals
Have decided the matters in ways that conflict
With this U.S. Supreme Court laws. & U.S.
CONSTITUTIONS. 5th. 6th & 14th Amendments.
STRICTLAND VS. WASHINGTON 466 US 668 (1984)
UNITED STATES VS. CRONIC 466 US 648 (1984)
UNITED STATES VS. DECASTER
FERRELLA VS. CALIFORNIA 422 U.S. 806, 95 S.Ct. 2525 (1975)
LOMAX VS. ORTIZ-MARQUEZ — US — 140 S.Ct. 1721,
1723, 207 Fed. 2d. 132 (2020)
BODDIE VS. CONNECTICUT 401 U.S. 371 (1971)
ESTELLE VS. GARMBLE 429 U.S. 97. 106 (1976)
REAVES VS. UNITED STATES 694 A.2d. 52. 59 (1997)
- (3) Because law & the interest of Justice Requires it.
28 USC § 2243
1st. 5th. 6th. 8th & 14th Amendments
BODDIE VS. CONNECTICUT 401 U.S. 371 (1971)

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

TSUNAMI KHAN (chief) Col. Michael S. CWI Feather Gorky

Date: 5-13-2022