

22-5208

CASE NO.

- CAPITAL CASE -

IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

ORIGINAL

PAUL C. BOLIN - PETITIONER

- VS -


NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS NO. 1699009

ROBERT BACON, CA. BAR # 73297, APPEAL COUNSEL

BRIAN ABBINGTON TX. BAR # 00740500 APPEAL COUNSEL

MOLLY COWYER CLERK OF NINTH CIRCUIT COURT

ALLISON FONG CLERK OF NINTH CIRCUIT COURT



- WRIT OF MANDAMUS -

Pursuant to, 28 USC § 1651(a) - § 2403 (a)(1)

NOTE: SHARON MAMORY GRAPHICS LLC, 659 F3d 1336 (FAD. CA. 2011)

"Remedy OF MANDAMUS IS AVAILABLE IN EXTRAORDINARY SITUATION TO CORRECT A
CLEAR ABUSE OF DISCRETION OR, USURPATION OF JUDICIAL POWER"

NOTE: Lynch - v - DICE 789 F3d 303 (2ND CIR. 2015) 6TH AMEND.


GUARANTEES RIGHT TO EFFECTIVE REPRESENTATION OR DIRECT APPEAL, APPROPRIATE
REMEDY IN EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF APPELLATE COUNSEL, GRANT A NEW APPEAL

PAUL C. BOLIN, CALIFORNIA MEDICAL FACILITY

E-88100 T-221-L

P.O. Box 2000

VACAVILLE, CA. 95696 - 2000



- QUESTIONS PRESENTED -

"CAPITAL CASE"

1) DOES THE GUARANTEED CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO PETITION GOVERNMENT FOR REDRESS OF GRIEVANCE EXTEND TO ALL U.S. CITIZENS, SUCH AS PETITIONER BOLIN, A CITIZEN FROM BIRTH, BORN AND RAISED, WHO SERVED IN OUR MILITARY FAITHFULLY AND HONORABLY DURING 3 ENLISTMENTS AND WHO IS A 10 POINT PREFERENCE DISABLED VIETNAM VETERAN. OR, IS THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND ITS COURTS UNDER FALSE CONSTRUCT, EXEMPT FROM THE CLEAR DEMANDS OF OUR U.S. CONSTITUTION, WHICH DISFRANCHISES PRO. SE. PRISONER LITIGANTS FROM SUCH RIGHTS?

2) DOES PETITIONER BOLIN, A U.S. CITIZEN BY BIRTH, A INDIGENT PRISONER, MINORITY CLASS CITIZEN, UNABLE TO AFFORD REPRESENTATION IN THIS INSTANT, ENJOY THE ENTITLEMENT OF SUBMITTING LITIGATION, HAVE IT FILED, AND THEN HAVE THE SUBMISSION PROCESSED TO COMPLETION. OR, DOES THIS ENTITLED RIGHT STOP AT THE PRISON'S GATES, AS SUPPOSED AND SUPPORTED BY THE CALIFORNIA COURT CLERK'S OFFICE OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, WHO SET FORTH SUCH SUPPOSITIONS DENYING ACCESS TO THE COURTS, IN WHAT CLEARLY APPEARS AS ATTORNEY POLICY?

3) DOES THE CLERK'S OFFICE OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, WHO ONLY HAVE A LIMITED AUTHORITY UNDER, FRCP 45 CLERK'S DUTIES, HAVE SUCH AUTHORITY TO REFUSE FILINGS OF SUBMISSIONS, ROLK ON MANDAMUS MOTIONS, WHICH AUTOMATICALLY TRIGGERS HEARING BY A JUDGE ON THE MERITS OF SUCH SUBMISSIONS, AND REFUSE TO SUBMIT SUCH MANDAMUS MOTIONS (3) FOR PROPER HEARING PURSUANT TO MANDAMUS. OR, DOES THE CLERK'S OFFICE HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO USURP A JUDGE'S AUTHORITY, PRACTICE LAW WITHOUT A LICENSE, AND STATE ON/IN THEIR RULINGS OF DISMISSALS/DENIALS, "ONLY COUNSEL MAY SUBMIT MOTIONS TO THEIR COURTS", BLATANTLY VIOLATING LAW, STATING ON RESPONSE/DENIALS, NO LAW SUPPORTING THEIR DENIAL DECISIONS, NOR ANY COURT RULES, NOR POLICIES, WITH WHAT CAN ONLY BE CONSIDERED AS PERSONAL AGENDA, BIAS AND PREJUDICE UNLAWFUL ACTS? ALL SUPPORTING A CLAIM OF ATTORNEY AGAINST PETITIONER.

4) DOES PETITIONER BOLIN ENJOY THE ENTITLEMENT OF CONFLICT FREE REPRESENTATION BY COUNSEL?

5) DOES PETITIONER BOLIN HAVE THE ENTITLEMENT TO TERMINATE COUNSEL AFTER A DECADE OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST WITH ROGUE COUNSEL, PROVEN BY VERIFIED DOCUMENTS, TO BE

- QUESTIONS PRESENTED -

1 IN EFFECTIVE, INCOMPETENT, CRIMINALLY NEGLIGENT, WHO FILE KNOWN PERFUNCTIONARY
2 SUBMISSIONS TO DRAG OUT APPELLANT'S APPEALS FOR DECADDES; IN ORDER TO DRAW A PAY CHECK
3 AND BECOME MAJOR PAY CHECK ADVERSARIES. WHO, REFUSE TO SUBMIT ISSUES OF OTHER CAPITAL
4 CASE APPEALS, PROVEN TO HAVE MERIT, AND RECEIVED FAVORABLE DECISIONS. AND, WHO REFUSE TO
5 SUBMIT ISSUE OF FRAUDULENT CERTIFICATION OF TRIAL RECORD, AND CRIMINAL ALTERING OF THE TRIAL
6 RECORD MANY YEARS AFTER CONVICTION, AT (3) SEPARATE EX PARTE HEARINGS, WHICH TOOK AWAY
7 APPEAL ISSUES. DOES PETITIONER BOLIN HAVE A RIGHT TO TERMINATE COUNSEL'S REPRESENTATION
8 AFTER FILING - SUBMITTING CONFLICT OF INTEREST TO DISTRICT COURTS, MANDAMUS MOTIONS TO DISTRICT COURT,
9 NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, COMPLAINTS TO CALIF. BAR ASSOCIATION, U.S. BAR ASSOCIATION, CALIF.
10 FBI OFFICE, AND FBI OFFICE IN WASHINGTON D.C., AND CORRESPONDENCE DEMANDING THEM TO
11 WITHDRAW DUE TO IRREPARABLE HARM CAUSED BY THEM TO MY MYSTERY CASE DECADDES (32 1/2 YEARS)?
12 6). DOES PETITIONER BOLIN HAVE A RIGHT AND ENTITLEMENT TO SUBMIT TO THE COURTS, BY VARIOUS
13 DOCUMENTS, BONIFIED PROOF, OF, AND BYWAY A PRIMA FACIE SHOWING THAT, PURSUANT TO LAW, AS A
14 MATTER OF WELL ESTABLISHED LAW, PETITIONER'S RECORD IN NUMEROUS WAYS, BY AND AND UNLAWFUL
15 ACTS, HAS IMPEACHED ITSELF, AND IS NULL AND VOID. AN INSPECTION OF THE JUDGMENT ROLL ON
16 RECORD WOULD CLARIFY PETITIONER'S ALLEGATIONS OF KNOWN BAD/UNLAWFUL ACTS TO IMPEACH THE
17 RECORD AND FULFILLMENT OF SUBJECT MATTER, AS WELL AS PERSONAL JURISDICTION?
18 7). DOES PETITIONER BOLIN HAVE AN ENTITLEMENT PURSUANT TO AND ENFORCEABLE BY, PROFESSIONAL
19 BUSINESS CODES 6068, DUTIES OF ATTORNEY, TO REQUEST COUNSEL TO ADHERE TO PETITIONER'S
20 6TH AMENDMENT RIGHT PERTAINING TO [CLIENT] AND ATTORNEY IS MASTER OF HIS OWN OFFICE,
21 WHICH INCLUDES APPEAL? COUNSEL HAS AND CONTINUES TO COMPLETELY DISFRANCHISE PETITIONER
22 FROM HIS OWN APPEAL, REFUSING TO SUBMIT ISSUES WHICH HAVE MERIT AND WHICH HAVE BEEN GIVEN
23 FAVORABLE DECISIONS BY OTHER COURTS. THIS IS MOST PARALLEL WITH COUNSEL BACON, WHO CONTINUALLY
24 STATES, "WHO'S GOING TO PAY ME FOR THAT?" OR "I WON'T GET PAID FOR THAT!" SHOWING A COMPLETE LACK OF
25 FIDELITY TO CLIENT'S BEST INTEREST AND BELISTERING A CONTINUATION OF, PAY CHECK ADVERSARY, AND
26 NOT A ADVOCATE OF PETITIONER. AGAIN DOES PETITIONER HAVE A RIGHT BY LAW TO HAVE COUNSEL
27 SUBMIT MERITORIOUS ISSUES TO THE COURT, AND NOT ATTORNEY'S PERSONAL AGENDA OF DRAGGING ON
28 APPEAL FOR DECADDES, BY AND THROUGH THE USE OF SUBJECT FUGS AND PERFUNCTIONARY SUBMISSIONS?

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

8). AS PROVEN BY VERIFIED DOCUMENTS, AND CRIMINAL ACTS BY CALIFORNIA ALTERNATIVES, WITH ASSISTANCE/IN CONCERT WITH TRIAL CLERK T. FALKENBERG, FORFEITED SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION AND PERSONAL JURISDICTION, BY AND THROUGH ACTS OF FRAUD AND EXTRINSIC FRAUD, RENDERING THE JUDGMENT VOID UPON ITS FACE. DOES PETITIONER HAVE A RIGHT AND AUTHORITY GRANTED BY LAW, TO ATTACK JUDGMENT AS VOID, WHEN COUNSEL REFUSES TO DO SO, EITHER DIRECTLY OR COLLATERALLY TO ANY COURT, AND AT ANY TIME. THIS DUE TO THE FACT THAT, THE PRINCIPLE OF RES JUDICATA IS INAPPLICABLE?

9). WHEN PETITIONER'S COUNSEL REFUSES TO SUBMIT MATERIAL ISSUES, BY STATEMENTS OF, "WHO'S GOING TO PAY ME FOR THAT?" DOES PETITIONER BELIEVE HAVE A RIGHT/ENTITLEMENT OF, WITHIN ANY COURT IS PRESENTED WITH A CHALLENGE ATTACKING THE COURT'S JURISDICTION, FOR THAT COURT HAVE A MANDATORY DUTY OWED TO PETITIONER TO PERFORM ITS DUTY TO RESOLVE THE ISSUE OF JURISDICTION BEFORE PROCESSING FORWARD AND RENDERING DECISIONS? OR, AS PREVIOUSLY STATED, IS CALIFORNIA COURTS EXEMPT FROM FOLLOWING THE LAW AS THEY DEMAND IN RESPONSES? AND WHEN PETITIONER, PURSUANTS AN ISSUE REFUSED BY COUNSEL, SUCH AS ATTACKING THE COURT'S JURISDICTION PURSUANT TO 28 USC § 2243, AND, OR, CAL. PENAL CODE § 1746, DOES A CALIFORNIA COURT HAVE A MANDATE TO ISSUE AN ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR THAT/ WITHOUT DELAY FOR RESOLUTION?

10). DOES PETITIONER BELIEVE ENJOY THE PROTECTIONS OF STATUTORY PROVISIONS WHICH ARE CLEARLY CONSIDERED TO MEAN AND AFFORD A SUFFICIENT AND IMPARTIAL REMEDY IN ALL CASES OF ILLEGAL DETENTION OR CONFINEMENT, WHICH, CALCULATED/PLANNED DELAYS BY COUNSEL WOULD VIOLATE DUE PROCESS. AND, IF THE IMPRISONMENT CANNOT BE SHOWN TO CONFORM WITH THE FUNDAMENTAL REQUIREMENTS OF LAW, IS PETITIONER BELIEVE AFTER 32 1/2 YEARS, ENTITLED TO HIS IMMEDIATE RELEASE FOR CRIMES THAT WOULD REMAIN PHYSICALLY IMPOSSIBLE TO COMMIT?

11). DOES PETITIONER BELIEVE A PRO. SE. PRISONER LITIGANT HAVE A REASONABLE EXPECTATION OF LAW TO BE FREE FROM BIAS AND FOR JUSTICE CALIFORNIA COURTS, WHO ALLOW THEIR CLERKS TO ACT AND USURP A JUDGE'S AUTHORITY, PRACTICE LAW WITHOUT ALCORNS, AND USE PERSONAL AGENDAS OF BIAS TO DENY RIGHTS? AND, WHO CLAIM, WITHIN CAUGHT VIOLATING LAW - RIGHTS, THE FALSE PROMISES AND FALSE CONSTRUCT OF TOTAL AND ABSOLUTE IMMUNITY FROM PROVEN WRONG DOING, AS COUNCIL ABBINGTON STATED, "I CAN'T BE TOUCHED, TEXAS BAR WON'T DO A THING TO ME!"

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

THE FACTS OF THIS ENTITLED CASE AND ISSUE AT BAR HAVE BEEN PRESENTED TO BOTH CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT, NORTHERN DISTRICT COURT, EASTERN DISTRICT COURTS, AS WELL AS THE NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, (3) SEPARATE SUBMISSIONS. ALL WITH FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS SUPPORTED BY VERIFIED EXHIBITS. PRESENTATION WAS IN ACCORDANCE AND PURSUANT TO TITLE 18 CRIMINAL CODES, 04 AND PEOPLE - V - MANSOON, 2 CAL. 3d 118, 465, P. 2d 44, VOIT - V - SUPERIOR COURT 201 CAL APP 4TH 1285, 1287, AS WELL AS CALIF. BAR ASSOCIATION, U.S. BAR ASSOCIATION, TEXAS BAR ASSOCIATION, FBI, BOTH CALIF. AND U.S. OFFICE WASHINGTON D.C. AND, THE RECORD WILL REFLECT, PETITIONER BOLIN, SOUGHT DILIGENTLY FOR LEGAL COUNSEL MANY TIMES, BUT TO NO AVAL. THUS, THIS HONORABLE U.S. SUPREME COURT IS NOT ONLY ORIGINAL JURISDICTION, BUT ALSO PURSUANT TO ORDERS, THE FOUNDATION TO LOWER COURTS RESPONSES, JURISDICTION IS PROPERLY BEFORE THIS HONORABLE COURT.

PETITIONER BOLIN SEEKS MANDAMUS, EXTRAORDINARY WRIT WITH EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES OF, (4) MANSOON MOTIONS, (3) REFUSAL TO FILE AND PROCESS - REFUSALS BY, CLERK'S OFFICE TO PRESENT THE MANSOON COMPLAINTS FOR HEARING ON THE MERITS. NUMEROUS COMPLAINTS AGAINST COUNSEL, WHO REFUSE TO WITHDRAW AFTER YEARS OF BONIFIED COMPLAINTS AGAINST THEM AND COMPLETELY DISFRANCHISING PETITIONER FROM HIS OWN APPEAL, AND COUNSEL BECOMING NO MORE THAN PAY CHECK ADVISORIES, INEFFECTIVE, INCOMPETENT, CRIMINALLY NEGLIGENT, REFUSING TO SUBMIT ISSUES HAVING MERIT SHOWN/PROVEN IN OTHER CAPITAL CASES IN RECENT YEARS. COUNSEL PRESENTING FRAUDULENT RECORD, FRAUDULENT CERTIFICATION OF TRIAL, AND FAILURE/REFUSALS TO PURSUE CRIMINAL HEARING OF TRIAL RECORD ON (3) SEPARATE OCCASIONS, AT EXPANSIVE HEARINGS IN THE CALIF. SUPREME COURT, WHICH UNLAWFULLY TOOK AWAY APPEAL ISSUES.

HENCE, PETITIONER BOLIN SEEKS WRIT OF MANDAMUS TO EITHER TERMINATE COUNSEL, OR TERMINATE APPEAL IN ORDER TO FIRE COUNSEL, AND TO ADMONISH/PUNISH THE 9TH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEAL CLERK'S DWYER AND FONG, FOR BLATANT ABUSE OF AUTHORITY, USURPING JUDGES AUTHORITY, PRACTICING LAW WITHOUT A LICENSE, VIOLATING THE LAW AND

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT:

VIOLATING PETITIONER'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS WITH PROMULGATING AND ENFORCING A UNLAW-
GROWN POLICY OF ATTEMPTING TO DEPRIVE PRO. SEC. LITIGANT PRISONER OF RIGHT TO FILE
PETITION FOR GRIEVANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT FOR REDRESS, ALL FOR ASSISTANCE OF AIDING
AND ABETTING FRIENDLY COUNCIL TO THEM, IN VIOLATION OF PETITIONER'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.
PETITIONER SEEKS WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS PURSUANT TO 28 USC § 1651(e) AND 28 USC § 2403
(a)(b) Having Jurisdiction placed properly Before This Honorable Court.

Respectfully Submitted

Paul C. Bolin

PETITIONER PRO. SEC.

- DECLARATION IN Support OF WRIT OF MANDAMUS -
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

I PAUL C. BOLIN, AM COMPETENT TO TESTIFY SHOULD THIS HONORABLE COURT DEEM IT NECESSARY. FURTHERMORE, I AM AWARE THAT THE STATEMENTS MADE WITHIN THIS DECLARATION ARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY. HAVING BEEN DULY SWORN UPON MY OATH; THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS ARE TRUE AND CORRECT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, AND ALL ATTACHED EXHIBITS IN EVIDENCE ARE TRUE AND CORRECT COPIES.

- I -

AS SOON AS PETITIONER BECAME AWARE AND OBTAINED KNOWLEDGE OF THE UNLAWFUL CRIMINAL AND NEGLIGENT ACTS PERTAINING TO COUNSEL'S ABERANT REPRESENTATION, PERFECTED HEAVEN, I GAVE LEGAL NOTICE TO THE COURTS PURSUANT TO TITLE 18 CRIMINAL CODES § 04 AND HAVE SUBMITTED NUMEROUS COMPLAINTS PERTAINING TO CONFLICT OF INTEREST, AND MANDAMUS MOTIONS/ COMPLAINTS; HOWEVER TO NO AVAIL. NINTH CIRCUIT COURT CLERK'S OFFICE REFUSED TO FILE AND PROCESS MY MANDAMUS COMPLAINTS.

- II -

PETITIONER SUBMITTED 4 MANDAMUS COMPLAINTS FOR, BREACH OF CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN CLIENT AND ATTORNEY, INEFFECTUENESS, INCOMPETENCE, CRIMINAL NEGLIGENCE LEGAL MALPRACTICE, MALFEASANCE, MALCONDUCT, MISREPRESENTATION, FAILURE - REFUSALS TO PERFORM, VIOLATIONS OF PROFESSIONAL BUSINESS CODE § 6068 DUTIES OF ATTORNEY, VIOLATION'S OF CLIENT'S 6TH AMENDMENT RIGHT PERTAINING TO [CLIENT], NOT ATTORNEY IS MASTER OF HIS OWN DEFENCE, WHICH INCLUDES APPEAL. COMPLAINT OF, DISFRANCHISEMENT OF PETITIONER FROM HIS OWN APPEAL, NO CONTACT - CORRESPONDENCE FOR 5-6 YEARS, NO VISITS TO DISCUSS MATTERS, AND IN COLLUSION - IN CONCERT WITH COURT CLERKS OF 9TH CIRCUIT COURT, DWYER/ FONG, IN NOT FILING - PROCESSING PETITIONER'S 3 MANDAMUS COMPLAINTS TO BE HEARD BY A JUDGE, MANDATORY PURSUANT TO, PEOPLE - V - MANDAMUS 2 CAL 3d, 118, 46 S P. 2d 44, HEARING BY [JUDGE] ON MERITS OF SUBMISSION, NOT ADJUDICATED BY CLERK'S OFFICE. WHETHER MOTION HAS AND LEGAL MERIT IN DETERMINATION MADE BY JUDGE, VOIT - V - SUPERIOR COURT, 201 CAL APP. 4TH 1285, 1287, NOT CLERK'S OFFICE, ALL TO NO AVAIL.

- III -

ALL SAID BAD ACTS - CRIMINAL ACTS BY COUNSEL IN COLLUSION WITH CLERK'S OFFICE, IN THAT CLERK'S VIOLATED FRAP § 45, CLERK'S DUTIES, AND HAVE ACTED IN USURPATION OF JUDGE'S AUTHORITY AND HAVE ACTED AS ATTORNEYS/ JURIST, UNLAWFULLY WITHOUT A LICENSE TO PRACTICE LAW. ALL SAID ACTS TAKEN UNDER COLOR OF AUTHORITY TO DEPRIVE PETITIONER OF HIS GUARANTEED CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO FILE - SUBMIT AND HAVE PROCESS OF, GRIEVANCE TO GOVERNMENT FOR RENDERS, RACE PROCESS, EQUAL PROTECTION OF LAW AND MEANINGFUL ACCESS TO THE COURTS, AND ESTABLISHING - PROMULGATING AND ENFORCING UNLAWFUL, UNDERGROUND POLICY OF ATTAINMENT, AGAINST PETITIONER, A PRO-SE LITIGANT PRISONER, INDIGENT, UNABLE TO AFFORD REPRESENTATION BY COUNSEL IN ANCILLIARY MATTERS, A MEMBER OF MINORITY CLASS CITIZEN.

TO

MY UNDERSTANDING OF THE ABOVE CLAIMS ARE BASED ON SUCH UNDERSTANDING AND
- (DIA10F2) -

BRIEF PURSUANT TO LAW AND UNDISPUTABLE EXHIBITS PROFFERED AS EVIDENCE OF PROOF TO ALL FACTUAL CLAIMS TO BE TRUE AND CORRECT. FOR, EITHER TERMINATION OF PRESENT COUNSEL, OR TERMINATION OF APPEAL, THE SAME AS HAVING SUCH COUNSEL, INCOMPETENT, CRIMINALLY NEGLIGENT, AND CALLING FOR REMOVAL FROM CLARK'S OFFICE OF, CLARK'S, DWYER AND FONG. IN ANYWAY, AND PURSUANT TO THE 6TH AMENDMENT, ORDER NEW APPEAL FOR REASONS CLARIFIED IN THIS SUBMISSION.

- VERIFICATION -

I PAUL C. BOLIN, PETITIONER, CAN AND WILL ATTEST THAT ALL ISSUES/CLAIMS STATED HEREIN ARE TRUE AND CORRECT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, AND AM MADE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY AND IF CALLED UPON TO DO SO, STAND READY AND WILLING TO TESTIFY AND PRESENT MY CLAIMS BEFORE THIS HONORABLE COURT, AND ALL ATTACHED DOCUMENTS ARE TRUE AND CORRECT COPIES, PURSUANT TO 28 USC § 1746

ON THIS DAY OF 6/26/22, AT CMF
VACAVILLE, CA. 95696 - 2000

Respectfully SUBMITTED

Paul C Bolin

PETITIONER PRO, SE.

- TABLE OF CONTENTS -

1) COURT SHEET

2) QUESTIONS PRESENTED

3) JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

4) DECLARATION

5) TABLE OF CONTENTS

6) TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

7) STATEMENT OF CASE

8) FACTS AND ISSUES OF CASE

9) RELIEF REQUESTED

10) INDEX OF EXHIBITS

11) DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF INFELMA PROPERD'S REQUEST AND

CERTIFIED TRUST ACCOUNT READ OUT, SIGNED BY TRUST OFFICER STAFF

- TABLE OF AUTHORITIES -

CASES

-(Page Numbers)-

1		
2		
3		
4		
5	SHARED MEMORY GRAPHICS LLC, 659 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cal. 2011)	1, 19
6	People-v-mansoen 2 Cal. 3d. 118, 465 P.2d 44	11 / DECLARATION OF 2/3, 9
7	VOIT-V- Superior Court 201 Cal App 4th 1285, 1287	17, 18 DECLARATION OF 2/3, 9
8	WIN HOUAN -V- U.S. 201 F.2d 174 (1952) U.S. App LAXIS 2388	14, 18, 19
9	PEOPLE-V- ROMERO 8 CAL 4th 728	18
10	CROSS-V- TUSTIN (1951) 37 CAL 2d. 921	18
11	MCCOY-V- LOUISIANA US Supreme Court NO. 16-8255	19
12	MAPLES-V- THOMAS -US-6-132 SCI, 912, 992 (2010)	19
13	COLEMAN-V- THOMAS 501 US 722, 754 (1991)	19
14	LUCKY-V- CALDERON 86 F3d 925 (9th Cir 1996)	19
15	LYNCH-V- DOLCE 789 F.3d 303 (2nd Cir 2015)	20
16	33 CAL 505	16
17	47 CAL App 2d. 207	16
18	505 F.2d 207 / 505 F.2d 1026	16
19	21 Howard 506	17
20	479 F2d 215	17
21	94 CAL 2d 751	17
22	102 F 2d 88	17
23	37 F. Supp 150	17
24	<u>U.S. STATUTES: TITLE 18</u>	
25	18 USC § 04	3, 11
26	18 USC § 1512 (b) (3) (1)	15
27	18 USC § 241	15, DECLARATION Page 10 of 2/10
28	18 USC § 242	15, DECLARATION 10 of 2/10
	<u>U.S. STATUTES TITLE 28:</u>	

-TABLE OF AUTHORITIES-

-(Page Numbers)-

28 USC § 1651(a)

1, 4

28 USC § 2403(a)(b)

1, 4

28 USC § 1746

22 / DECLARATION pages 2 OF 2 / 8

28 USC § 2243

8, 18

28 USC § 2254(a)(b)

19

CALIFORNIA PENAL CODES

§ 190.8, .9

14, 18, 19

§ 182

15

§ 3517

15

§ 1746

18

CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

§ 1916

14

§ 1917

14, 16

§ 3517

15

PROFESSIONAL BUSINESS CODES

§ 6068

DECLARATION 1 OF 2 / 7

F.R.A.P. FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE

§ 45

DECLARATION 1 OF 2 / 10

U.S CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

1ST AMEND.

18

8TH AMEND.

21

13TH AMEND.

20

6TH AMEND.

19, 20

4TH AMEND.

19

CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I § 3

18

1		
2		
3	<u>STATUTES TITLE 42:</u>	
4	42 USC § 1983	15
5	42 USC § 1985	15
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

STATEMENT OF CASE:

PETITIONER'S ENTITLED CASE AND CAUSE BEFORE THIS HONORABLE U.S. SUPREME COURT IS
FUNDAMENTAL, AND IS SUPPORTED WITH INDISPUTABLE EVIDENCE IN THE FORM OF SWORN AFFIDAVIT,
AS WELL AS VERIFIED EXHIBITS. SOME EXHIBITS WERE GENERATED BY PETITIONER, WHILE OTHERS
WERE GENERATED BY CALIFORNIA COURTS, APPELLATE COUNSEL, CLERK'S OFFICE, HALL & HALL, TRIAL
COURT CLERK FALKENBERG. ALL VERIFIED EXHIBITS, AFFIDAVITS, CLARIFY ALL OF PETITIONER
BALDWIN'S FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS WITHIN HIS SUBMISSION TO THIS HONORABLE COURT, TO BE TRUE
AND CORRECT, BEYOND ANY DOUBT.

VERIFIED EXHIBITS ENTERED IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER, AND CONTAIN A SHORT SYNOPSIS
OF, BAD/CRIMINAL ACTS, VIOLATIONS OF LAW, U.S. CONSTITUTION, CODES, PENAL CODES, OATH OF OFFICE,
AND CLARIFY WILLFUL ACTS OF BACKLASH DISPARAGEMENT OF LAW BY STATED PERSONS/ENTITIES HAD BEEN
MENTIONED BY PETITIONER, WHILE ACTING UNDER COLOR OF AUTHORITY TO DEPRIVE, INTENTIONALLY THE
RIGHTS OF PETITIONER, "INTENT OF ACTIONS CLARIFIED".

1) [EXHIBIT (A), (A-1) (A-2) PACKAGE] SHOWS FROM A FACT, CLERK'S MOLLY C. DWYER AND
ALLISON FUNG DEPUTY, VIOLATED PETITIONER'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO FILE FOR ADDRESS OF BELONGING TO
THE GOVERNMENT. AND TO BE FREE OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN MATTERS CONCERNING APPOINTED COUNSEL,
VIA COMPLAINT, PEOPLE-V-MANSON 2 CAL 3d 118, 465 P 204, HEARING MANDATORY (BY JUDGE).
PURSUANT TO VOIT-V- SUPREME COURT, COURT OF APPEALS OF CALIFORNIA, SIXTH APPELLATE DISTRICT
DEC. 14, 2011 FILED, HO 37034, THE COURT HELD, "WHETHER A MOTION HAD LEGAL MERIT WAS A
DETERMINATION TO BE MADE BY A [JUDGE], NOT THE CLERK'S OFFICE." "THE COURT HELD THAT, THE
INMATE WAS ENTITLED TO MANDATE RELIEF BECAUSE THE CLERK'S OFFICE VIOLATED THE INMATE'S RIGHT
OF ACCESS TO THE COURT'S UNDER U.S. CONST., 1ST AMEND., AND CAL. CONST., ART. 1 AND 3."

2) [SEE EXHIBITS B AND B-1] CLERK DWYER, AND FUNG, USURPED AUTHORITY OF JUDGE AND BY
PROXY ACTED AS ATTORNEY PRACTICING LAW WITHOUT A LICENSE. AS WELL AS BRING THE PROXIMATE CAUSE
OF PETITIONER HAVING HIS CASE/APPEAL IN NINTH CIRCUIT COURT DENIED. THIS DUE BY, NOT ALLOWING
PETITIONER'S MANDAMUS MOTION FOR TERMINATION OF COUNSEL TO PROCEED TO A HEARING BY A JUDGE, WHICH
WOULD HAVE HAD A VERY GOOD PROBABILITY OF TERMINATION OF COUNSEL BALCON AND HARRINGTON. AS THIS

STATEMENT OF CASE

HONORABLE COURT CAN SUMMISE, 9TH CIRCUIT CLERK'S OFFICE HAS PROMULGATED AND ENFORCED A UNLAWFUL UNDERGROUND POLICY OF ATTORNEYS AGAINST PETITIONER, IN THEIR UNLAWFUL RULING/DENIAL, CLERK'S STATE NO LAW, NOR POLICY, NOR COURT RULE TO DENY MANDAMUS MOTION, ONLY WHAT APPEARS CLAIM. "PERSONAL AGENDA, BIAS, PREJUDICE UNLAWFUL ACT, WITH INTENT TO DEPRIVE". CLEARLY SUCH ACTS WERE INTENDED TO DEPRIVE PETITIONER'S DUE PROCESS, EQUAL PROTECTIONS OF LAW, AND ACCESS TO THE COURT'S IN MANNERFUL MANNER, A PRO. SR. PETITIONER, UNABLE TO AFFORD COUNSEL IN THIS MATTER, A PRISONER, AND MINORITY CLASS CITIZEN, WHILE CLERK'S WERE ACTING UNDER COLOR OF AUTHORITY TO DEPRIVE, §§ 241 - 242 VIOLATIONS. [SEE EXHIBIT B-2] SHOWING LIMITED AUTHORITY BY CLERK'S OFFICE UNDER FRAP 43, CLERK'S DUTIES.

PETITIONER, STRONGLY CONTENDS, FILING BY COUNSEL ONLY, IS, CONTRARY TO LAW. THE CONTENTION PETITIONER MUST PROCEED ONLY THROUGH HIS COURT APPOINTED COUNSEL TO FILE A MANDAMUS MOTION IN COMPLAINT OF COUNSEL IS BOTH AS INEFFECTIVE AND LUDICROUS, AND, SIMPLY UNCONSTITUTIONAL. NOT IN COMPLIANCE WITH INTENTIONS OF OUR FATHERS AS DEMANDED IN THE ENTIRE MEANING OF THE 1ST AMENDMENT OF OUR CONSTITUTION. IF, THIS WAS THE CASE OF ONLY COUNSEL, THEY WOULD HAVE STATED SO, THROUGH COUNSEL, AND THIS VIOLATES PRINCIPLES OF FOLKWAYS.

AGAIN, CLERK DUYER, HON. FUNG STATE/CLAIM ANY LAW, COURT RULE NOR POLICY FOR THEIR ACTIONS, ONLY CLAIM PERSONAL AGENDA. IT IS A GENERAL MISCONCEPTION (IF LOWER RULING POLICY WAS CLAIMED) THAT, ANY CASE LAW BEARING THE APPEARANCE OF LAW CONSTITUTES THE LAW OF THE LAND, OR US. CONSTITUTION IS SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND AND, ANY CASE LAW TO BE VALID MUST BE IN AGREEMENT. THE 1ST AMENDMENT HOLDS THAT NO LAW PROHIBITS THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE TO PETITION FOR REDRESS OF GRIEVANCE, WHEREFORE, CLEAR INTENT BY CLERK DUYER/FUNG IS MADE CLEAR, CALLING FOR INVESTIGATION, THEN REMOVAL FROM OFFICE OF BOTH CLERKS.

3) [SEE EXHIBITS C-1, C-2] DOCUMENTS RECEIVED FROM CLERK'S OFFICE, AT BOTTOM LEFT, IT STATES "PRO. SR. APPEALS (DECEMBER 2019). PETITIONER DID FILE A MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF UNLAWFUL DENIAL TO FILE AND PROCESS MANDAMUS MOTION FOR HEARING BY A JUDGE". PETITIONER ALSO FILED A PETITION FOR REMEDY FROM UNLAWFUL CLERK'S DENIALS OF DUE PROCESS.

4) [SEE EXHIBITS D-1, D-2] FILED BUT IGNORED BY CLERK'S OFFICE AND:

5) [SEE EXHIBIT D-3] PETITIONER'S 3RD FILING OF UNLAWFUL ORDERS BY CLERK'S OFFICE

STATEMENT OF CASE

1 All attempts ignored, and EXHIBIT D-3 REFUSED Filing - processing FOR HEARING BY A JUDGE.
2 AND: SEE ORIGINAL MARSDEN COMPLAINT FILLED ON THE 9TH CIRCUIT'S OWN FORMS SUPPLIED
3 BY COMPUTER SEARCH. SUBMISSION NOT FILLED, NOR GIVEN LAWFUL PROCESS BY CLERK'S OFFICE
4 AND FONG, AS LAW REQUIRES PURSUANT TO PROPER - v. MARSDEN 2 CAL 3d 118, 465 P2 44.
5 [SEE EXHIBIT D-5] 4TH REQUEST/DEMAND TO FILE OPPOSITION RESPONSE TO RESPONDENT'S
6 REPLY AND TO APPEAR PERSONALLY TO PRESENT CLAIMS TO JUDGE, ALL REFUSED Filing/PROCESSING BY
7 CLERK'S OFFICE. INTENT TO DEPRIVE MY RIGHTS REACHES AND BEYOND PRIMA FACIE CASE FOR
8 BLATANT VIOLATIONS, CALLING FOR INVESTIGATION, THEN REMOVAL FROM OFFICE OF BOTH DWYER AND
9 FONG.

10 6). [SEE EXHIBIT E-1] MARSDEN COMPLAINT TO NORTHERN DISTRICT COURT AGAINST COUNSEL
11 BACON AND ABBINGTON. FILLED, GIVEN CASE NUMBER THEN IGNORED AS TO CLAIMS. COURT
12 STATED DAMAGES COULD NOT BE SOUGHT, COUNSEL IS TO BE LEFT ALONE TO FILE WITH FEDERAL
13 ISSUES "THEY" SAID FIT TO FILE

14 7). [SEE EXHIBIT F-1] CONFLICT OF INTEREST WITH COUNSEL BACON AND ABBINGTON
15 CONCERNING COUNSEL REFUSING TO SUBMIT ISSUES HAVING MERIT AND WHICH NO DOUBT
16 HAVE BROUGHT ABOUT DIFFERENT OUT COME OF APPEAL.

17 8) (EXHIBIT F-2) SHOWS FURTHER VIOLATIONS BY REFUSING TO ISSUE A COPY OF RESPONDENT'S
18 BACON AND ABBINGTON'S SUBMISSION TO THE COURT, TRYING TO THWART/STOP PETITIONER'S
19 MARSDEN MOTION FROM BEING FILLED AND PROCESSED TO HEARING BY A JUDGE, WHICH NO DOUBT
20 WOULD HAVE LEAD TO TERMINATION OF COUNSEL FOR GOOD CAUSE.

21 9) EXHIBITS PACKAGE (G-1, G-2, G-3, G-4 AND G-5) SHOW PETITIONER'S COMPLAINTS TO CALIF.
22 STATE BAR, TEXAS STATE BAR, AMT AND AML. PETITIONER ALSO WROTE COMPLAINTS TO U.S. BAR
23 ASSOCIATION, CALIF. AND ILLINOIS, NO RESPONSE WAS RECEIVED.

24 10). (EXHIBITS H-1, H-2) CORRESPONDANCE IN COMPLAINTS TO CALIF. FBI, AND FBI IN
25 WASHINGTON DC. COMPLAINT ISSUES NINTH CIRCUIT CLERK'S VIOLATIONS. ALTHOUGH COMPLAINT IS
26 PROPER, VIOLATIONS OF CIVIL RIGHTS NOTIFICATION PURSUANT TO TITLE 18 CRIMINAL CODES § 04. NO
27 RESPONSE WAS GIVEN.

28 11) [EXHIBIT I-1] SHOWS PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR RESOLUTION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN THE

STATEMENT OF CASE

1 EASTERN DISTRICT COURT, ALL TO NO AVAIL.

2 12) FURTHER ADDITIONAL EXHIBIT OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST WITH COUNSEL, IN ALLOWING ILLEGAL
3 POLICIES AND PROCEDURES BY CALIF. COURTS [EXHIBIT K-1].

4 13) [EXHIBIT L package] SHOWS EARLY 1ST SUBMISSION OF MARSHALL MOTION TO THE NINTH
5 CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, WITHIN CONFLICT OF INTEREST REACHED POINT OF NO RECONCILIATION.
6 MOTION WAS DENIED FILING/PROCESSING BY COURT CLERKS.

7 14) [EXHIBITS M-1, M-2] CORRESPONDENCE TO US DEPT. OF JUSTICE CIVIL RIGHTS
8 DIVISION. BASICALLY I WAS GIVEN THE RUN AROUND, NO INVESTIGATION, ISSUES IGNORED,
9 AS WELL AS [EXHIBIT M-3] ALL TO NO AVAIL.

10 ALL THE ABOVE SHOWS PETITIONER SOUGHT DILIGENTLY OVER A DECADE
11 TO STOP AND CORRECT ALL SAID VIOLATIONS BY RESPONDENTS NAMED
12 HEREIN THIS SUBMISSION TO THIS HONORABLE COURT. "SHOWING TERMINATION
13 OF COUNSEL IS PROPER AND DEMANDS BY LAW"

14 15) VIEWING EXHIBITS 000 AND 0000, CLARIFYING INEFFECTIVE, INCOMPETENT,
15 AND WILFUL CRIMINALLY NEGLIGENT REPRESENTATION BY DIRECT APPEAL COUNSEL R,
16 GILMAN, ALMOST CAUSING PETITIONER TO BE EXECUTED WITHOUT DUE PROCESS BY HIS
17 GROSSLY INADEQUATE AND CRIMINALLY NEGLIGENT REPRESENTATION.

18 [SEE EXHIBITS 000, AND 0000, UNDATED AND ANNOTED AREAS]

19 PETITIONER, REQUEST AND DEMANDS RESPECTFULLY OF THIS HONORABLE COURT TO ABIDE BY
20 AND HONOR THE PROVISIONS OF THE SIX AMENDMENT WHICH GUARANTEES REMEDY FOR ABOVE
21 VIOLATIONS IN/ON EXHIBITS 000 - 0000

22 [LYNCH-V-DOLCE, 789 F3d 303 (2ND CIR 2015)]

23 1) "THE SIXTH AMENDMENT GUARANTEES THE RIGHT TO EFFECTIVE REPRESENTATION ON
24 DIRECT APPEAL."

25 2) "IN GENERAL, THE APPROPRIATE REMEDY FOR INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF APPELLATE
26 COUNSEL IS TO GRANT A NEW APPEAL."

27 ON/IN EXHIBIT 000, R. GILMAN ADMITS TO INCOMPETENCE AND BEING CRIMINALLY
28 NEGLIGENT CAUSING A/G TO SEEK FOR EXECUTION DATE.

FACTS AND ISSUES OF CASE:

- SECTION I -

ON 11/10/17, 6/18/18, 1/3/21, 5/5/21, 2/24/22 PETITIONER FILED MARSHEN COMPLAINTS TO: i) NORTHERN DISTRICT COURT, AND NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, IN RE: TERMINATION OF REPRESENTATION BY COUNSEL ROBERT BACON, CA. BAR # 73297, AND BRIAN ABBINGTON, TX. BAR # 00740500. PREVIOUS CONFLICT OF INTEREST COMPLAINTS WERE ALSO FILED TO VARIOUS COURTS, AND COMPLAINTS TO, CA. BAR ASSOCIATION, U.S. BAR ASSOCIATION, CA. FBI, WASHINGTON D.C. FBI, CA. SUPREME COURT, AND, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION, WASHINGTON D.C. ALL COURT FILINGS, AND CORRESPONDENCE WAS IN COMPLAINT, AND IRRECONCILABLE CONFLICT OF INTEREST WITH COUNSEL BACON ESPECIALLY AND WITH ABBINGTON. CONFLICT MATTERS CONCERNED, COMPLETE DISFRANCHISEMENT OF PETITIONER FROM HIS OWN APPEAL, FAILURE/REFUSAL TO FILE MERITORIOUS ISSUES SUBMITTED IN OTHER CAPITAL CASES WHICH WERE GIVEN FAVORABLE RULINGS, AS WELL AS ISSUES PETITIONER PRESENTED SUCH AS, FRAUDULENT CERTIFICATION OF TRIAL RECORD IN ALL ASPECTS, (PROVEN BY VERIFIED DOCUMENTS) AND A/L R. NEWCOMB, WITH ASSISTANCE OF TRIAL CLERK T. FALKENBERG KERN COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT, WORKING/ACTING IN CONCERT, DID FOR A FACT (PROVEN BY VERIFIED DOCUMENTS) AT (3) THREE SEPARATE OCCASSIONS AT UNLAWFUL EX PARTE HEARINGS, CRIMINALLY ALTERED NUMEROUS TRIAL TRANSCRIPT PAGES AND TOOK AWAY PETITIONER'S APPEAL ISSUES (PROVEN).

- SECTION II -

PETITIONER ALSO COMPLAINED OF A SPECIFIC ASPECT OF THE FRAUDULENT CERTIFICATION OF HIS TRIAL RECORD. RECORD WAS UNTIMELY BY YEARS, PETITIONER WAS UNDER OLD LAW 90 DAYS NOT 4 YEARS + FIRST PART, 5+ YEARS SECOND HALF. THIS ASPECT OF RECORD NOT BEING COMPLETE UNTIL A PERIOD OF APPROXIMATELY 6 1/2 YEARS BRINGS UP A MOST IMPORTANT ASPECT WHICH ATTORNEYS BACON ESPECIALLY AND THEN ABBINGTON, DIDN'T CARE ABOUT IN THE LEAST. THE QUESTION IS, "WHAT DID COUNSEL R. GILMAN (FIRST APPEAL ATTORNEY) USE FOR MY AUTOMATIC APPEAL AND A.O.B. APPELLANT'S OPENING BRIEF, WHEN HE ONLY HAD 1/2 OF THE RECORD? HE WAS ASSIGNED LATE 1993, DIDN'T RECEIVE THE MISSING PORTION UNTIL LATE 1997. AS THIS COURT SORELY KNOWS, THE A.O.B. / AUTOMATIC APPEAL IS SOLELY BASED ON THE TRIAL RECORD TRANSCRIPTS.

- SECTION III -

FACTS AND ISSUES OF CASE

THESE AFORE MENTIONED ISSUES OF DISENFRANCHISEMENT, WITH PETITIONER DEVOID OF THE KNOWLEDGE OF WHICH COURT HIS APPEAL WAS BEING HEARD; BEGAN A SERIOUS CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND CONFIRMATION THAT, COUNSEL WAS NOT REPRESENTING PETITIONER'S BEST INTEREST. AND, THAT PETITIONER HAD BECOME NOTHING MORE THAN A NUMBER ON A PAY CHECK STUB. ALL CULMINATING IN COMPLAINTS TO VARIOUS GOVERNMENTAL OFFICES, AND THE SUBMISSION OF (4) FOUR MANDAMUS COMPLAINTS 3 TO THE NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, WHO'S CLERK'S OFFICE REFUSED TO FILE AND PROCESS THE MANDAMUS MOTIONS FOR HEARING BY A JUDGE ON ITS MERITS, AS A MATTER OF LAW.

- SECTION IV -

PETITIONER MADE CLEAR TO COUNSEL IN GREAT DETAIL ASPECTS OF IMPORTANCE WHICH PETITIONER DEMAND TO BE RAISED, ALL WERE REFUSED, WITH COUNSEL ABBINGTON CALLING THE ISSUES, "BULL-SHIT" HIS WORDS NOT MINE. ISSUES WERE/ARE AS FOLLOWS:

A) FRAUDULENT CERTIFICATION OF THE TRIAL RECORD BY OTHER THAN TRIAL JUDGE HAVING KNOWLEDGE OF SUCH TRIAL, WINHOUEN - V. S. 201 F.2d 174; 1952 US. APP LEXIS 2388

B). RECORD WAS UNTIMELY, FIRST PART 4 1/2 YEARS, 2ND HALF 5 1/2 YEARS, PETITIONER WAS UNDER OLD LAW, CALLING FOR 90 DAYS CERTIFICATION AFTER CONVICTION IN 1991, FIRST PART LATE 1995, SECOND PART/HALF APPROXIMATELY 1 1/2 YEARS LATER (CONVICTION 1991, TRANSCRIPTS CERTIFIED 1995 - LATE 1996)

C) RECORD NOT COMPLETE, SENT IN (2) PORTIONS YEARS APART

D) RECORD NOT CORRECTED.

E) RECORD IMPRACHES ITSELF PURSUANT TO LAW, CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE § 1916-1917, AND PENAL CODE § 190.8 - .9

F) DUE TO EXTREMELY UNTIMELY AND NOT COMPLETE, SENT IN TWO HALVES, LATE 1995 - 1996, AND 1ST APPELLATE COUNSEL ASSIGNED 1993, WHAT TRANSCRIPTS RECORD DID COUNSEL R. GILMAN USE FOR PETITIONER'S A.O.B., APPELLANT'S OPENING BRIEF, AND AUTOMATIC APPEAL, WHEN AT THAT TIME COUNSEL ONLY HAD A PARTIAL TRIAL RECORD? A.O.B. AND AUTOMATIC APPEAL SOLELY BASED UPON TRIAL RECORD.

"AGAIN, COUNSEL ABBINGTON STATED "BULL-SHIT", HIS WORDS NOT MINE, AND COUNSEL BACON'S REMARKS, AS PER HIS USUAL RETORT, "WHO'S GOING TO PAY ME FOR THAT", AND BOTH STATED THEY WERE NOT ALLOWED TO FILE ON SUCH ISSUES ON PETITIONER'S BEHALF, PURSUANT TO INSTRUCTIONS OF FED. DEFENDER'S OFFICE.

- SECTION V -

FACTS AND ISSUES OF CASE

PETITIONER ALSO MADE COUNSEL CLEARLY AWARE, AND IN GREAT DETAIL THE FOLLOWING ISSUES.

A) A/AG R. NEWCOMB OBTAINED FINAL JUDGMENT AGAINST PETITIONER BY AND THROUGH THE USE OF FRAUDULANT INSTRUMENTS - CRIMINALLY ALTERED TRIAL TRANSCRIPT PAGES, THE RECORD, WHILE BEING ASSISTED AND IN CONCERT / CONSPIRACY WITH SPECIFIC CRIMINAL INTENT (PROVEN) TRIAL COURT CLERK T. FALKENBERG, KERN COUNTY CA, WHICH FOR A FACT TOOK AWAY PETITIONER'S APPEAL ISSUES, AND ACKNOWLEDGED BY ATTORNEY BACON, IN WRITING.

B) SAID CRIMINAL ALTERINGS ON (3) SEPARATE OCCASIONS TOOK PLACE AT EX PARTE HEARINGS (PROVEN). AND, WHAT'S MORE TROUBLING IS, THE FACT THAT, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT ALLOWED AND PARTICIPATED IN SUCH KNOWN UNLAWFUL HEARINGS WITH NO NOTIFICATION OF THEIR ATTORNEY R. GILMAN.

C) SUCH ACTS WERE PERPETRATED WITH INTENT, VIOLATING PETITIONER'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF DUE PROCESS, EQUAL PROTECTIONS OF LAW, 42 USC § 1983 CIVIL ACTION FOR DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS, 42 USC § 1985 CONSPIRACY TO INTERFERE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS, VIOLATIONS OF §§ 241-242, CAL. PENAL CODE § 182 CONSPIRACY, TITLE 18 USC CRIMINAL CODES §§ 1512(b)(1) AS WELL AS 4TH AMENDMENT, 13TH AND 8TH AMENDMENT CRUEL AND UNJUST PUNISHMENT, EXECUTE / MURDER PETITIONER WITHOUT DUE PROCESS AND PENAL CODE 115, OFFERING FALSE INSTRUMENT / DOCUMENT FOR RECORDING.

D) WHEN SERVED WITH CONTRACT SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT OF THE FACTS, WITH REQUEST PURSUANT TO LAW FOR RETURN (NUMEROUS TIMES) TO EITHER ADMIT OR DENY PETITIONER'S FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS PROVEN BY VERIFIED DOCUMENTS, A/AG NEWCOMB REFUSED A RESPONSE AND HAS VIOLATED APPELLANT'S RIGHTS BY OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, AS WELL AS CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE SECTION 3517 AND HAS, BY REFUSAL TO RESPOND / DEFEND, HAS ACQUIESCED AND ACCEPTED AS TRUE, ALL OF PETITIONER'S ACCUSATIONS AS, TRUE AND CORRECT.

WHEN PRESENTED WITH THIS PROVEN BEYOND DOUBT INFORMATION AND DOCUMENTS, PETITIONER'S COUNSEL STATED, "HARMLESS ERROR" (BACON) AND "BULL SHIT" ABBINGTON'S RESPONSE (NOT MINE), ALL CALLING FOR TERMINATION AS DEMANDED W/ON ALL 4 OF PETITIONER'S MANDAMUS MOTIONS, ON TERMINATION OF APPEAL TO FIRE / GET RID OF COUNSEL AND STOP PAY CHECKS TO PROVEN ADVERSARIES.

VI

PETITIONER CONTENDS, AND HAS CLEARLY EXPLAINED THESE MATTERS TO BOTH COUNSEL, BACON - ABBINGTON