

22-5211

No. _____

ORIGINAL

FILED

JUL 21 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

IAN LaMONTE CORMIER (IN PRO SE) PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

LYNN E. WILLIAMS et al.; — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

UNITED STATES COURT of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

IAN LaMONTE CORMIER
(Your Name)

P.O. Box 9416
(Address)

MORENO VALLEY, CA. 92553
(City, State, Zip Code)

(951) 524-8641
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- 1) WAS THE DISTRICT COURT IN SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA JUSTIFIED IN DENYING PLAINTIFF-APPELLANTS IN FORMA PAUPERIS APPLICATION IN 1998, WHEN PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT SHOWED HE WAS INDIGENT/A PAUPER, AND RATED HIS MEETING THE CRITERIA FOR HIS TO BE GRANTED IN FORMA PAUPERIS STATUS, AND HAVING HIS CASE MOVE FORWARD, TO BE HEARD BY PLAINTIFF-APPELLANTS REQUESTED JURY TRIAL?
- 2) PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT PAID THE FILING FEES TO THIS CASE, WHERE THE NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS ERRORED IN DISMISSING/AFFIRMING APPELLANTS CASE, JUSTIFYING THE DENIAL OF IN FORMA PAUPERIS STATUS TO PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT, STATING THE LOWER DISTRICT COURT WHERE JUSTIFIED IN DENYING PLAINTIFF-PETITIONERS 42 U.S.C. § 1983 CIVIL COMPLAINT, BECAUSE PETITIONER-APPELLANT HAD FILED AT LEAST THREE PRIOR ACTIONS WHICH THE DISTRICT COURTS DEEMED FRIVOLOUS/MALICIOUS, WAS A ERROR BY THE NINTH CIRCUIT COURT.
- 3) PETITIONER-APPELLANTS PREVIOUS CIVIL ACTIONS WERE COMPLAINTS ABOUT PETITIONER-APPELLANT UNJUSTIFIABLY BEING FIRED BY HIS BOSSES WHILE IN PRISON, WHERE PETITIONERS BOSSES GOT WIND THAT PETITIONER WAS CONVICTED OF FORCED ORAL COPULATION (UNJUSTIFIABLY ON FALSE CLAIMS), WHERE THAT SAN DIEGO SUPERIOR COURT TRUMPED UP THOSE FALSE CHARGES TO READ: FORCE ORAL COPULATION AGAINST A KID UNDER 14 YEARS OLD.
- 4) DID THE NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS ERROR WHEN JUDGE NGUYEN FAILED TO RECUSE HIMSELF/HERSELF, FAILING TO RECOGNIZE HE/SHE COULD BE RELATED TO THE DEFENDANT MICHAEL NYGENE(SIC); ACTING DEFENSE ATTORNEY, RIVERSIDE SUPERIOR COURTHOUSE CLAIMS PROCESSING OFFICE?

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 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 B 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 _____ 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 _____ 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 May 31, 2022.

☒ 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: 6/23/22, 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 _____.
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

AMENDMENT I: "CONGRESS SHALL MAKE NO LAW RESPECTING AN ESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION, OR PROHIBITING THE FREE EXERCISE THEREOF; ... , AND TO PETITION THE GOVERNMENT FOR REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES".

AMENDMENT V: "NO PERSON SHALL BE HELD TO ANSWER FOR A CAPITAL, OR OTHERWISE INFAMOUS CRIME, ... NOR BE DEPRIVED OF LIFE, LIBERTY, OR PROPERTY, WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF LAW...".

AMENDMENT VI: "IN ALL CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS, THE ACCUSED SHALL ENJOY THE RIGHT TO A SPEEDY AND PUBLIC TRIAL, BY AN IMPARTIAL JURY OF THE STATE AND DISTRICT WHEREIN THE CRIME SHALL HAVE BEEN COMMITTED... , AND TO BE INFORMED OF THE NATURE AND CAUSE OF THE ACCUSATION; TO BE CONFRONTED WITH WITNESSES AGAINST HIM... AND TO HAVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL FOR HIS DEFENCE".

AMENDMENT VII: "IN SUITS AT COMMON LAW, WHERE THE VALUE IN CONTROVERSY SHALL EXCEED TWENTY DOLLARS, THE RIGHT OF TRIAL BY JURY SHALL BE PRESERVED, ...".

AMENDMENT VIII: "EXCESSIVE BAIL SHALL NOT BE REQUIRED, NOR EXCESSIVE FINES IMPOSED, NOR CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT INFLICTED".

AMENDMENT IX: "THE ENUMERATION IN THE CONSTITUTION, OF CERTAIN RIGHTS, SHALL NOT BE CONSTRUED TO DENY OR DISPARAGE OTHERS RETAINED BY THE PEOPLE".

AMENDMENT XIV: "SECTION 1: ALL PERSONS BORN NATURALIZED IN THE UNITED STATES, ... NOR SHALL ANY STATE DEPRIVE ANY PERSON OF LIFE, LIBERTY, OR PROPERTY, WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF LAW; NOR DENY TO ANY PERSON WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS".

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:

KENNETH SELPH; (CORRECTIONAL OFFICER); J. PERRY (CONTROL BOOTH OFFICER); MICHAEL NYGENE (sic) NGUYEN (ACTING DEFENSE ATTORNEY; SUPERIOR COURTHOUSE CLAIMS PROCESSING OFFICE et al;).

RELATED CASES

- 1) IAN LaMONTE CORMIER v. LYNN E. WILLIAMS et al.; GEORGE E. BROWN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT; CENTRAL DISTRICT of CALIFORNIA: D.C. No. 5:20-cv-01877-SVW-AFM. JUDGMENT ENTERED: 3/11/21.
 - 2) IAN LaMONTE CORMIER v. LYNN E. WILLIAMS et al.; No. 21-55308; UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT. JUDGMENT ENTERED MAY 31, 2022.
 - 3) IAN LaMONTE CORMIER v. RIVERSIDE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY et al.; GEORGE E. BROWN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT; CENTRAL DISTRICT of CALIFORNIA: D.C. No. 5:19-cv-01151-SVW-AFM. JUDGMENT ENTERED: 12/13/19
 - 4) IAN LaMONTE CORMIER v. RIVERSIDE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY et al.; No. 19-56269 UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT. JUDGMENT ENTERED:
 - 5) IAN LaMONTE CORMIER v. JAMES COMEY, et al.; GEORGE E. BROWN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT; CENTRAL DISTRICT of CALIFORNIA; D.C. No 5:19-cv-01198-SVW-AFM; Judgment ENTERED: 11/19/19
 - 6) IAN LaMONTE CORMIER v. JACQUELINE LEE COOPER et al.; GEORGE E. BROWN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT; CENTRAL DISTRICT of CALIFORNIA: D.C. No. 5:20-cv-01722-SVW-AFM. JUDGMENT ENTERED: 10/20/20
 - 7) IAN LaMONTE CORMIER v. JACQUELINE LEE COOPER et al.; No. 20-56184 UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT. JUDGMENT ENTERED: MAY 31, 2022.
- (RELATED CASES CONTINUED NEXT PAGE)

(RELATED CASES CONTINUED)

- 8) IAN LaMONTE CORMIER V. RIVERSIDE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEYS OFFICE;
LEON X, Deputy SHERIFF (DETECTIVE), et al.; GEORGE E. BROWN UNITED
STATES DISTRICT COURT; CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA. D.C. No. 5:21-CV-
01654-SVW-AFM. JUDGMENT ENTERED: 11/8/21
- 9) IAN LaMONTE CORMIER V. RIVERSIDE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEYS OFFICE;
LEON X, Deputy SHERIFF (DETECTIVE), et al.; No. 21-56268 UNITED STATES
COURT of APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT. JUDGMENT ENTERED: May 31, 2022.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

(DUE PROCESS, EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAW)
(REDRESS).

PAGE NUMBER

STATUTES AND RULES

OTHER: CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT I: "TO PETITION THE GOVERNMENT FOR REDRESS OF GRIEVANCE," CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT V: "NO PERSON... NOR BE DEPRIVED OF LIFE, LIBERTY, OR PROPERTY, WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF LAW..." CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT VI: "IN ALL CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS, ... enjoy THE RIGHT TO A SPEEDY, AND PUBLIC TRIAL, BY AN IMPARTIAL JURY, ... AND TO BE INFORMED OF THE NATURE AND CAUSE OF THE ACCUSATION... AND TO HAVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL FOR HIS DEFENCE".

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

OTHER CONTINUED: CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT VII; "IN SUITS AT COMMON LAW, WHERE THE VALUE IN CONTROVERSY SHALL EXCEED TWENTY DOLLARS, THE RIGHT OF TRIAL BY JURY SHALL BE PRESERVED..."

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT VIII: "EXCESSIVE BAIL SHALL NOT BE REQUIRED, NOR EXCESSIVE FINES IMPOSED, NOR CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT INFLICTED".

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT IX: "THE ENUMERATION IN THE CONSTITUTION, OF CERTAIN RIGHTS SHALL NOT BE CONSTRUED TO DENY OR DISPARAGE OTHERS RETAINED BY THE PEOPLE".

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT XIV: "... SECTION 1: ALL PERSONS BORN NATURALIZED IN THE UNITED STATES, ... NOR SHALL ANY STATE DEPRIVE ANY PERSON OF LIFE, LIBERTY, OR PROPERTY, WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF LAW; NOR DENY TO ANY PERSON WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	36
CONCLUSION.....	38

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:	IAN LAMONTE CORMIER v. LYNN E. WILLIAMS et al.; No. 21-55308 UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT.
APPENDIX B:	IAN LAMONTE CORMIER v. LYNN E. WILLIAMS et al.; No. 5:20-cv-01877- SVW-AFM: U.S. DISTRICT COURT; CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA.
APPENDIX C	IAN LAMONTE CORMIER, v. LYNN E. WILLIAMS; et al., No. 21-55308 UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT (MANDATE)
APPENDIX D	
APPENDIX E	
APPENDIX F	

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

IN ABOUT THE SUMMER OF 1985, ROUGHLY THREE (3) MONTHS AFTER THIS PETITIONER GRAVITATED BACK TO THE CIVILIAN WORLD, AFTER SERVING HIS THREE (3) YEAR CONTRACT AS A UNITED STATES MARINE (1982-85; SECOND MARINE BATTALION, EIGHTH MARINE DIVISION (2/8); FOX COMPANY; CAMP GEIGER; JACKSONVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA; OPERATION URGENT FURY, AND THE MULTINATIONAL PEACE KEEPING FORCE, BEIRUT, LEBANON), PETITIONER WAS ARRESTED, AND FALSELY CONVICTED OF FORCED ORAL COUPULATION, AGAINST A MINOR, UNDER FOURTEEN (14) (SEE: THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA (SAN DIEGO, CA.) V. IAN LAMONTE CORMIER (JUDGE NAPOLEAN JONES: SUPERIOR COURT), 1986. ALSO SEE: IAN LAMONTE CORMIER V. JAMES COMEY; D.C. No. 5:19-CV-01198-SVW-AFM; UNITED STATES DISTRICT FOR CENTRAL CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE. SEE: UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT, No. 20-55320. SEE ALSO: IAN LAMONTE CORMIER V. JAMES COMEY, et al.; SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES: No. 20-6705.

PETITIONER WAS SOON AFTERWARDS DENIED OF A FAIR TRIAL; AFTER PETITIONERS BOSS'S WIFE WAS PLACED ON PETITIONERS JURY (PETITIONER NEVER EVER MEETING HER). MRS. WHITE ANSWERING THE VORE DIRE (sic) QUESTIONS CAUGHT PETITIONERS ATTENTION (HER ANSWERING ABOUT WHERE HER HUSBAND WORKED). THIS PROMPTING PETITIONER TO BELIEVE THAT MRS. WHITE WAS EITHER PETITIONERS BOSS' WIFE (LINCOLN (LINCOLN)), OR HIS BROTHER, WHOM PETITIONER WORKED WITH BOTH AS SECURITY FOR THE SAN DIEGO YACHT CLUB.

So, AFTER THE FIRST DAY OF JURY SELECTION CONCLUDED, PETITIONER CALLED HIS BOSS VIA PHONE, AND ASKED "IF HE HAD A WIFE NAMED ERIENE (sic)? LINCOLN SAID HE DID, THEN HE SAID "WHY"? (REMEMBER THIS CALL WAS BEING RECORDED). PETITIONER SAID "WHAT A COINCIDENCE YOUR WIFE IS ON MY JURY". LINCOLN THEN ASKED PETITIONER WHAT HAD HAPPENED TO PETITIONER (PETITIONER NEVER BEING SUBJECTED TO THE/JURY TRIAL PROCESS BEFORE, OR KNOWING PETITIONERS PHONE CALL COULD BE CONSTRUED AS JURY TAMPERING, AND PETITIONER NEVER VIOLATING SUCH)

LATER, IN THIS CONVERSATION, LINCOLN ASKED PETITIONER IF THERE WAS ANYTHING THE PETITIONER WANTED LINCOLN TO TELL HIS WIFE (WHOM SUPPOSEDLY, HADNT RETURNED HOME FROM HER DAYS ACTIVITIES). PETITIONER SAID "NO, BUT YOU (LINCOLN) COULD LET HER KNOW MY CHARACTER", PETITIONER FEELING THAT HIS BOSS WAS TRYING TO ENTICE PETITIONER INTO JURY TAMPERING. THE NEXT DAY OF COURT, INSTEAD OF PICKING UP WHERE WE LEFT OFF IN QUESTIONING MRS. WHITE, PETITIONER WAS ESCORTED INTO JUDGE JONES' CHAMBERS.

PETITIONERS SAN DIEGO PUBLIC DEFENDER, BRIAN BOLES WAS ALREADY IN THE CHAMBERS ALONG WITH JUDGE JONES, HIS STENOGRAPHER, AND JURIST: MRS. WHITE. PETITIONER WAS QUESTIONED BY JUDGE JONES ABOUT MAKING THIS CALL, WHERE PETITIONER DIDNT DENY MAKING THIS CALL, AND SPEAKING WITH BOSS. JUDGE JONES ASKED MRS. WHITE IF SHE COULD STILL DO HER JOB AS A JUROR, WHERE SHE SAID "NO", WHILE LOOKING STARTLED, ABOUT THIS PHONE CALL, MADE BY THIS PETITIONER, TO HER HUSBAND.

SO WHEN WE ALL RETURNED BACK TO JUDGE JONES COURTROOM, AND HE BROUGHT THE COURT BACK INTO SESSION, JUDGE JONES BROUGHT THE JURY UP TO SPEED ABOUT PETITIONERS PHONE CALL TO HIS BOSS, MRS. WHITES HUSBAND. HE THEN PUT MRS. WHITE ON THE STAND, WHERE SHE TESTIFIED TO NOT BEING ABLE TO DO HER JOB AS A JUROR (IN TEARY EYED FASHION), WHERE JUDGE JONES REPLACED MRS. WHITE WITH ONE OF THE ALTERNATES. JUDGE JONES THEN GAVE THE JURY A JURY INSTRUCTION SAYING "LADIES, AND GENTLEMEN OF THE JURY IF YOU FEEL THAT MR. CORMIER CALLED HIS BOSS, TO HAVE HIS BOSS TO HAVE HIS BOSS' WIFE SHOW MR. CORMIER LENIENCY, THEN YOU CAN FIND MR. CORMIER GUILTY OF FORCE ORAL COPULATION ON DARLA CHANCE. SOON AFTERWARDS THE COURT WAS ADJOURNED FOR THE DAY. (JUDGE JONES' JURY INSTRUCTION WAS PREJUDICIAL); (JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT).

THE NEXT DAY IN COURT, WHEN PETITIONER WAS BROUGHT INTO THE COURTROOM, INSTEAD OF PETITIONERS SAN DIEGO PUBLIC DEFENDER BRIAN BOLES BEING SEATED AT THE DEFENCES TABLE, ANOTHER MAN WAS SEATED THERE, ONCE THE BAILIFF ESCORTED PETITIONER TO HIS SEAT, THE MAN SEATED AT THE TABLE LEANED OVER TO THE PETITIONER, AND WHISPERED IN PETITIONERS EAR SAYING "YOUR ATTORNEY HAD SOMETHING IMPORTANT TO DO, SO HE ASKED ME TO FILL ME FOR HIM. MY NAME IS JAMES COMEY (EX. F.B.I. DIRECTOR). PETITIONER ASKED JAMES COMEY FOR A BUSINESS CARD, WHERE HE SAID HE'D GIVE PETITIONER ONE AT THE END OF THE DAY, BUT HE DID NOT PROVIDE PETITIONER WITH ONE, AS HE SAID HE WOULD.

THAT SAME DAY THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY PROSECUTOR FROM THE PREVIOUS DAY WAS ALSO REPLACED WITH ANOTHER WOMAN. WHEN JUDGE NAPOLEAN JONES BROUGHT THE COURT INTO SESSION THE PROSECUTOR STATED ON RECORD THAT HER NAME WAS "SUNNI HOSTIN" (OF THE DAY-TIME TALK SHOW; THE VIEW), WHERE SHE STATED THAT "SHE WAS FILLING IN FOR THE PREVIOUS WOMAN, AND FOR THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY PROSECUTORS OFFICE". JAMES COMEY FOLLOWED HER STATING HE WAS FILLING IN FOR BRIAN BOLES (BRIAN LINSEY BOLES), AND THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDERS OFFICE.

THE JURY GOT THE CASE FOR DELIBERATION THE SAME DAY, WHERE THEY CAME BACK WITH A GUILTY VERDICT THAT SAME DAY. PETITIONER FEELS THAT THIS WAS BECAUSE OF THE PREVIOUSLY GIVEN JURY INSTRUCTION ABOUT PETITIONER CALLING HIS BOSS, INQUIRING AS TO WHETHER MRS. ERLENE (SIC) WHITE BEING HIS (LINCOLN WHITES) WIFE. MRS. WHITE, BEING PETITIONERS BOSS' WIFE SHOULD HAVE NEVER HAPPENED FOR REASONS OF PARTIALITY, AND TAINTING THE JURY TRIAL PROCESS, AND THE WHEELS OF JUSTICE. THIS ACTION DENIED PETITIONER A FAIR TRIAL.

ONCE PETITIONER WAS FOUND GUILTY (OF A CRIME HE DIDN'T COMMIT) OF FORCED ORAL COPULATION, PETITIONER WAS ESCORTED OUT OF THE COURTROOM BY THE BAILIFF, WITH JAMES COMEY, AND VANN JONES (OF CNN) LITERALLY DOING CART WHEELS (VANN JONES OBVIOUSLY BEING RELATED TO JUDGE JONES).

PETITIONER WAS SOON AFTERWARDS SENTENCED TO EIGHT YEARS, DUE IN PART TO DARLA CHANCE STATING THAT PETITIONER PLACED HIS PENIS IN HER MOUTH THREE (3) TIMES. EACH TIME DARLA TESTIFIED THAT PETITIONER PLACED (SUPPOSEDLY) HIS PENIS IN DARLA CHANCES MOUTH, SHE TESTIFIED THAT SHE (SUPPOSEDLY) SPAT IT OUT OF HER MOUTH, WHERE (SUPPOSEDLY) PETITIONER INSERTED HIS PENIS IN HER MOUTH A SECOND, AND THIRD TIME. JUDGE JONES THUS THROWING THE BOOK AT PETITIONER, GIVING / SENTENCING PETITIONER TO THREE (3) COUNTS OF FORCED ORAL COUPULATION. SENDING PETITIONER TO PRISON AS A RAPIST, ALTHOUGH PETITIONER HAVE NEVER VIOLATED ANYONE IN THIS MANNER. ONCE PETITIONER WAS SENT TO PRISON, PETITIONER RECOGNIZED THAT NOT ONLY DID JUDGE JONES, AND HIS COURTROOM SEND PETITIONER TO PRISON, LABLED AS A RAPIST, PETITIONER SOON AFTERWARDS RECOGNIZED THAT COURTROOM ALSO SENT PETITIONER TO PRISON LABLED AS A PEDOPHILE. ALLEGING THAT DARLA CHANCE WAS UNDER FOURTEEN (14) YEARS OF AGE. THAT COURT CONVENIENTLY FORGETTING THAT DARLA CHANCE TESTIFIED THAT THE NIGHT IN QUESTION, SHE SUPPOSEDLY WORKED AS A BARSMID, AT SOME CLUB. IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AND NATION-WIDE, ONE MUST BE AT LEAST TWENTY-ONE (21) YEARS OLD WHERE ANY LIQUOR, OR ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE IS INVOLVED.

WHILE BEING INCARCERATED ON THIS EIGHT (8) YEAR SENTENCE OF THREE (3) COUNTS OF FORCED ORAL COPULATION ON A MINOR, UNDER FOURTEEN (14) YEARS OLD, PETITIONER BEGAN TO BE SUBJECTED TO A NUMBER OF FIST FIGHTS (MUTUAL COMBATS). THESE FIST FIGHTS WOULD MANIFEST THEMSELVES FROM CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS BEING ABLE TO ACCESS A INMATES CONFIDENTIAL (C) FILE, SEEING WHAT THEY WERE CONVICTED OF, AND THEN THESE CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS SETTING UP GLADIATOR BOUTS.

SO, ALTHOUGH PETITIONER WAS SENTENCED TO EIGHT (8) YEARS, HE ENDED UP OPENING AN NEW, LEVEL 2 STATE PRISON NAMED AVENAL STATE PRISON, IN THE FRESNO: CENTRAL CALIFORNIA AREA. A BLACK INMATE, WHILE ON THE WEIGHT PILE WAS ATTACKED BY THREE PHILLIPPINO (SIC) INMATES WHOM WAS DRUNK, OFF WINE THEY HAD DRANK. A RACE RIOT ENSUED AT THIS NEW PRISON, IN 1986, WHERE (SUPPOSEDLY) EVERYONE ON YARD 1 OR, A-YARD RECEIVED A CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS (CDC) 115-RULES VIOLATION FOR THAT RIOT. THIS CDC-115 BOOSTED THIS PETITIONERS CUSTODY LEVEL FROM LEVEL 2, TO LEVEL 3. PETITIONER WAS TRANSFERRED FROM AVENAL STATE PRISONS ADMINISTRATIVE SEGREGATION, TO ANOTHER NEW CALIFORNIA STATE PRISON NAMED DONOVAN STATE PRISON, IN SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA.

PETITIONER WAS SOONER AFTERWARDS TRANSFERRED TO FOLSOM STATE PRISON, WHICH IS LEVEL 4, AFTER DEFENDING HIMSELF, ON TWO (2) DIFFERENT OCCASIONS FROM ATTACK BY LOCAL GANG MEMBERS.

WHILE AT FOLSOM STATE PRISON, PETITIONER HAD FILED CREDIT RESTORATION FORMS (FOR THE LOST CREDITS FROM THE MUTUAL COMBAT VIOLATIONS, CDC-115 RULE VIOLATION FORMS) PETITIONER HAD RECEIVED, TO HIS COUNSELOR MR. BALCOM. SOON AFTERWARDS PETITIONER RECEIVED DOCUMENTATION FROM MR. BALCOM THAT PETITIONER HAD BEEN GIVEN A DIFFERENT COUNSELOR, A MRS. MARCIE DAVIS. BEFORE PETITIONERS CHANGE OF COUNSELORS, MR. BALCOM HAD GIVEN PETITIONER DOCUMENTATION SHOWING PETITIONER NEW PAROLE DATE, WITH THE GRANTING OF THE RESTORATION OF PETITIONERS CREDITS.

AFTER THE CHANGE OF COUNSELORS, AND AFTER ABOUT THREE (3) DAYS PAST PETITIONERS CALCULATED RELEASE DATE, PETITIONER APPROACHED HIS COUNSELOR, MRS. MACIE DAVIS, AND BROUGHT TO HER ATTENTION THAT PETITIONERS PAROLE DATE HAD COME, AND GONE ROUGHLY THREE DAYS AGO. UPON INFORMING MRS. DAVIS OF SUCH, MRS. DAVIS RESPONDED BY TELLING PETITIONER "I DON'T KNOW NOTHING ABOUT THIS, AND THERES IS NOTHING THAT I CAN DO ABOUT IT". PETITIONER, BEING TAKEN ABACK BY COUNSELOR MACIE DAVIS' RESPONSE, SUGGESTED TO MRS. DAVIS "TO LOOK INTO THE PETITIONERS ALLEGATIONS, TO SEE IF THERE WAS ANY VALIDITY TO WHAT PETITIONER WAS SAYING". MRS. DAVIS REPEATED HERSELF, STATING "I DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT THIS, AND THERES NOTHING THAT I CAN DO ABOUT IT".

UPON PETITIONER HEARING HIS COUNSELOR (MRS. DAVIS) VOICE HER RELUCTANCE TO LOOK INTO PETITIONERS PAROLE DATE HAVING COME, AND GONE, PETITIONER STATED "I KNOW WHAT I NEED TO DO" (IN ORDER TO GET HOME, PETITIONER BEING VERSE IN SUBMITTING A INMATE/PAROLEE 602 GRIEVANCE FORM TO EXPOSE INJUSTICES PETITIONER HAS BEEN SUBJECTED TO). FOR REASONS PETITIONER IS STILL TRYING TO FIGURE OUT, MRS. DAVIS MISCONSTRUED THIS STATEMENT AS A THREAT TOWARDS HER, AND AFTER PETITIONER MADE THIS STATE A SECOND TIME, SHE HAD ORDERED A CORRECTIONAL OFFICER WHOM HAD BEEN IN THE IMMEDIATE VICINITY TO PUT PETITIONER IN HANDCUFFS. PETITIONER WAS THEN TRANSFERRED TO THE NEIGHBORING STATE PRISON, NAMED NEW FOLSOM.

PETITIONER WAS SOON AFTERWARDS PLACED IN A CELL, WITH A GUY BY THE NAME (LAST NAME) OF BUNCHE. LATER THAT EVENING, BUNCHE WOULD ATTACK THIS PETITIONER. HIS CUTTING PETITIONER ON HIS ARMS, AND SHOULDER WITH A RAZOR BLADE. IN DEFENDING HIMSELF, AND GETTING THE ^{BEST} OF BUNCHE, PETITIONER WAS EXTRACTED FROM THAT CELL, AND TRANSFERRED TO PELICAN BAY STATE PRISON (ADMINISTRATIVE SEGREGATION UNIT/AD SEG: THE HOLE).

PETITIONER WAS PLACED IN A VACANT CELL, BUT SOON AFTERWARDS WAS GIVEN A CELLIE NAMED WILLIE WINDOM (Sic), WHOM WAS FROM NORTHERN CALIFORNIA. BECAUSE WILLIE WAS OBESE, HE WAS GIVEN PETITIONERS LOWER BUNK. SOON AFTERWARDS WILLIE WINDOM ATTACKER PETITIONER, WHERE PETITIONER GOT THE BEST OF MR. WINDOM. PETITIONER WOULD EVENTUALLY PAROLE FROM THE PELICAN BAY AD/SEG (THE HOLE), WHERE HE WOULD TAKE THE BUS SERVICES BACK TO SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA.

THE VERY SAME DAY THAT PETITIONER PAROLED, PETITIONER REPORTED TO HIS PAROLE OFFICER LIGGINS (SEE APPENDIX B; PG. 4; CORMIER V. LIGGINS, CASE No. CV-01-00364-K (LSP), SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA), UPON PETITIONER REPORTING TO HIS PAROLE AGENT LIGGINS, PETITIONER ASKED PAROLE OFFICER LIGGINS IF HE (LIGGINS) WOULD PLACE PETITIONER IN A HOTEL/MOTEL BECAUSE PETITIONER HAD TO PAY FOR HIS BUS TICKET, WHERE THOSE MONIES CAME OUT OF PETITIONERS THREE HUNDRED (\$300.00) DOLLAR PAROLE MONIES.

PETITIONERS PAROLE OFFICER LIGGINS ASKED PETITIONER "HOW MUCH MONEY DO YOU HAVE", WHERE PETITIONER TOLD LIGGINS HOW MUCH HE HAD, AND THAT PETITIONER NEEDED THOSE MONIES TO EAT, AND BUY A CHANGE OF CLOTHES.

PAROLE OFFICER Liggins TOLD THIS PETITIONER TO TAKE THE FEW MONIES THAT PETITIONER HAD LEFT FROM HIS THREE HUNDRED (\$300.00) PAROLE/GATE MONIES, (MINUS THE COST OF PETITIONERS BUS TICKET, PETITIONER GOING FROM PELICAN BAY STATE PRISON TO SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA), AND PURCHASE A MOTEL/HOTEL ROOM, AND REPORT BACK TO PAROLE OFFICER Liggins THE NEXT DAY. THIS MEANING PETITIONER WOULDN'T BE ABLE TO FEED HIMSELF.

WHEN PETITIONER ASKED TO SPEAK WITH PAROLE OFFICER Liggins BOSS, Liggins TOLD PETITIONER TO STAND-UP. WHEN PETITIONER STOOD-UP, Liggins TOLD PETITIONER TO FACE THE WALL, THEN TO PUT HIS HANDS BEHIND HIS BACK. WHEN PETITIONER DID SUCH, PAROLE OFFICER Liggins PUT HAND-CUFFS ON PETITIONER, WHERE Liggins, AND HIS PARTNER ARRESTED PETITIONER, AND TOOK PETITIONER TO DONOVAN STATE PRISON. VIOLATING PETITIONER FOR SUPPOSEDLY REFUSING A ORDER (NOT BUYING A MOTEL/HOTEL ROOM). PAROLE OFFICER Liggins VIOLATED PETITIONER, AND SENT PETITIONER BACK TO PRISON THE SAME DAY THAT PETITIONER PAROLED.

PETITIONER FILED A 42 U.S.C. § 1983 CIVIL COMPLAINT FOR THIS UNJUST ARREST, WHERE THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA COURT DISMISSED PETITIONERS CIVIL COMPLAINT ON MAY 8th, 2001 FOR (SUPPOSEDLY) FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM. THIS DISMISSAL WAS COUNTED AS ANOTHER STRIKE, OF WHICH PETITIONER (SUPPOSEDLY) RECEIVED THREE PREVIOUS STRIKES OF SIMILAR LIKENESS.

AFTER PETITIONER WAS RELEASE FROM DONOVAN STATE PRISON, AND AFTER DOING HIS PAROLE VIOLATION TIME, PETITIONER RENDEZVOUSED WITH HIS MOTHER, WHO CAME TO SAN DIEGO FROM LOS ANGELES.

DURING PETITIONERS PRISON STAY, PETITIONERS MOTHERS SECOND ELDEST BROTHER SHOT PETITIONERS YOUNGEST BROTHER (MALCOLM JAMES MORGAN) IN THE HEAD TWICE, WITH A HAND GUN, WHERE PETITIONERS SISTER (SHERYL LYNNETTE MOTEN), AND PETITIONERS MOTHER (ESTELLA D. CORMIER) CARED FOR MALCOLM, WHILE LIVING WITH SHERYL LYNN. SO BECAUSE PETITIONER HAD BEEN AWAY FROM HIS FAMILY FOR THE LAST SIX, AND A HALF YEARS, ONE HIS EIGHT YEAR SENTENCE FOR FORCED ORAL COPULATION, PETITIONERS MOTHER CAME TO SAN DIEGO FROM LOS ANGELES WHERE SHE WORKED AS A CARE PROVIDOR, AND BROUGHT PETITIONER TO WEST COVINA, CALIFORNIA TO SEE HIS FAMILY (SHERYL HAD GIVEN BIRTH TO A BABY GIRL NAMED ARIKA MATTHEWS THAT PETITIONER HAD NOT MET).

WHILE IN WEST COVINA, CALIFORNIA, PETITIONERS SISTER SHERYL CONFIDED TO PETITIONER THAT PETITIONERS MOTHERS YOUNGEST BROTHER (HORACE MOTEN, NOW OF CLEVELAND, OR CINCINNATI, OHIO), AS WELL AS TWO (2) MALE IN-LAWS RAYMOND EARL TRIPLETT, AND ROBERT RODGERS HAD BEEN HAVING SEX WITH PETITIONERS SISTER SHERYL, AND

PETITIONERS FEMALE, FIRST COUSINS. SO AFTER DROPPING PETITIONERS MOTHER AT HER JOB, PETITIONER TOOK (USED) HIS MOTHERS CAR, AND PICKED UP HIS BROTHER (MALCOLM) AT SHERYL'S (PETITIONERS SISTERS) HOUSE, AND TOOK HIS BROTHER TO A LOCAL THEATER, TO SEE A MOVIE (IT WAS THE WEEK OF THE RODNEY KING RIOTS) (SEE IAN L. CORMIER V. JAMES CORNEY, et al., D.C. No. 5:19-CV-01198-SVW-AFM; CENTRAL DISTRICT; SEE NINTH CIRCUIT No. 20-55320; SEE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES No. 20-6705, SEE IAN L. CORMIER V. RIVERSIDE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY OFFICE; D.C. No. 5:19-CV-01151-SVW-AFM; IAN LAMONTE CORMIER V. RIVERSIDE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY OFFICE; et al., 9TH CIRCUIT No. 19-56269; SEE IAN LAMONTE CORMIER V. RIVERSIDE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY OFFICE, LEON X: D.C. No. 5:21-CV-01654; CENTRAL DISTRICT; 9TH CIRCUIT No. 21-56268; SEE IAN LAMONTE CORMIER V. JACQUELINE LEE COOPER; et al., D.C. No. 5-20-CV-01722-SVW-AFM; CENTRAL DISTRICT; 9TH CIRCUIT No. 20-56184).

AFTER THE MOVIE CONCLUDED THAT PETITIONER TOOK HIS BROTHER TO SEE, PETITIONER FEELING BAD ABOUT HIS BROTHER BEING SHOT, AND PETITIONERS IN-LAWS HAVING SEX WITH PETITIONERS SISTER (SHERYL), AND PETITIONERS FEMALE FIRST COUSINS, PETITIONER DECIDED TO VERBALLY, INQUIRE AS TO WHY THESE IN-LAWS WOULD STOOP TO THESE LEVELS. SO BECAUSE PETITIONERS MOTHER HAD SHOWED PETITIONER WHERE IN-LAW ROBERT RODGERS HAD MOVED THE PREVIOUS DAY, PETITIONER DROVE TO THAT STREET, AND RANG

THE DOOR BELL TO WHAT PETITIONER THOUGHT WAS IN-LAW ROBERT RODGERS HOUSE (SEE CORMIER V. RIVERSIDE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY OFFICE D.C. No. 5:19-CV-01151-SVW-AFM; 9TH CIRCUIT No. 19-56269; SUPREME COURT No. 20-7222; SEE CORMIER V. WILLIAMS et al., D.C. No. 5:20-CV-01877-SVW-AFM; 9TH CIR. No. 21-55308; SEE CORMIER V. RIVERSIDE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY, LEON X; D.C. No. 5:21-CV-01654-SVW-AFM; 9TH CIRCUIT No. 21-56268; SEE CORMIER V. COOPER, et al.; D.C. No. 5:20-CV-01722-SVW-AFM; 9TH CIR. No. 20-56184).

PETITIONER, OUT OF STUPIDITY BROKE A STRAND OF CHRISTMAS LIGHTS, AND SOON AFTERWARDS THAT INCIDENT GOT PHYSICAL, WHERE PETITIONER THREW ONE (1) PUNCH IN WHICH TO EXTRICATE HIMSELF FROM THAT SITUATION. PETITIONER JUMPED IN HIS MOTHERS CAR, AND SPED AWAY. PETITIONER RETURNED HIS BROTHER BACK TO HIS SISTER (SHERYL'S) HOUSE, WHERE LATER THAT DAY, PETITIONERS SISTER PHONED PETITIONER TO INFORM PETITIONER THAT LOCAL AUTHORITIES CALLED/PHONED HER, AND WANTED TO SPEAK WITH PETITIONER.

PETITIONER SURRENDERED HIMSELF TO THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES, WHERE PETITIONER WAS BOOKED INTO THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY JAIL. SOON AFTERWARDS PETITIONER WAS BUSSED TO POMONA SUPERIOR COURT (LOS ANGELES COUNTY). PETITIONER WAS EVENTUALLY TAKEN FROM THE HOLDING TANK, AND ESCORTED TO THE CLIENT/ATTORNEY BOOTH, WHERE PETITIONER WAITED FOR HIS COUNSEL.

AFTER PETITIONER SAT IN THIS BOOTH FOR ABOUT TEN MINUTES, PETITIONER ALL OF A SUDDEN HEARD SOMEONE RIGHT OUTSIDE THE BOOTH SAY (IN A LOUD TONE OF VOICE) "I CAN'T BEAT THIS CASE, THEY WANT TO GIVE YOU EIGHT (8) YEARS" (SEE CORMIER V. RIVERSIDE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY OFFICE, et al., D.C. No. 5:19-CV-01151-SVW-AFM, 9TH CIR. No. 19-56269; SUPREME CT. No. 20-7222. SEE CORMIER V. RIVERSIDE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY OFFICE; LEON X, et al., D.C. No. 5:21-CV-01654-SVW-AFM, 9TH CIR. No. 21-56268; SEE CORMIER V. COOPER, et al., D.C. No. 5:20-CV-01722-SVW-AFM, 9TH CIR. No. 20-56184; SEE IAN LaMONTE CORMIER V. JAMES CORNEY et al., D.C. No. 5:19-CV-01198-SVW-AFM, 9TH CIR. CT. No. 20-55320; SUPREME COURT No. 20-6705).

THE CLIENT/ATTORNEY DOOR OPENED, AND A BLACK MAN SAT DOWN, THEN HE INTRODUCED HIMSELF SAYING "MY NAME IS A.C. JONES. I WORK FOR THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC DEFENDERS OFFICE, AND I'VE BEEN HIRED TO REPRESENT YOU" (PETITIONER LATER FILED A COMPLAINT WITH THE CALIFORNIA STATE BAR ASSOCIATION CASE No. 21-O-07855-07861. PETITIONER EVEN WAS INFORMED BY THE STATE ^{BAR} THAT THEY DON'T HAVE ANY MEMBERS BY THE NAME OF JAMES CORNEY, SUNNI HOSTIN, NOR A.C. JONES). PETITIONER EVEN APPEALED TO THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA; COMPLAINT REVIEW UNIT; OFFICE OF GENERAL REVIEW UNIT; 180 HOWARD STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CA. 94105-1617; REFERENCE #103; THEIR ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT WAS DATED 7/12/21).

MR. A.C. JONES (WHOM PETITIONER WONDERS IF HE'S RELATED TO JUDGE NAPOLEAN JONES WHO'S COURTROOM IN SAN DIEGO, CA. PETITIONER WAS CONVICTED OF FORCED ORAL COUPULATION, WHICH PETITIONER DID NOT COMMIT) THEN INFORMED THIS PETITIONER THAT "I CAN'T WIN THIS CASE THEY (THE PROSECUTION WANTS TO GIVE YOU EIGHT (8) YEARS". ONCE PETITIONER WAS ABLE TO RESPOND, PETITIONER STATED "ONCE YOUR FINISH ADDRESSING THE COURT, CAN YOU LET THE JUDGE KNOW THAT I'D LIKE TO ADDRESS THE COURT?" A.C. JONES SAID THAT HE WOULD, THEN HE ASKED THIS PETITIONER "WHAT IS IT YOU WANT TO ASK THE JUDGE?". PETITIONER STATED "I WANT TO ASK THE JUDGE FOR ADEQUATE/EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL, BECAUSE I WANT A JURY TRIAL, BUT NOT WITH YOU SINCE YOU (A.C. JONES) APPROACHED ME SAYING HOW YOU COULDN'T WIN THIS CASE BEFORE I EVEN TOLD YOU WHAT HAPPENED". A.C. JONES STATED THAT HE WOULD INFORM THE JUDGE OF SUCH, THEN HE SAID "CAN I MAKE A SUGGESTION?", WHEN THIS PETITIONER SAID "YES", A.C. JONES SAID "TELL THE JUDGE THAT I (A.C. JONES) MADE A HOMOSEXUAL MOVE ON YOU. HE'LL BE MORE INCLINE TO THEN RELEASE ME OF MY DUTIES".

PETITIONER, MADE HIS WANTING TO HAVE A JURY TRIAL, WHILE STATING PETITIONERS DESIRE TO GO TO TRIAL WITH ADEQUATE/EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL, PETITIONER EVEN STATED WHAT A.C. JONES SUGGESTED, WHERE THAT POMONA, CALIFORNIA SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE DENIED PETITIONERS REQUEST FOR ADEQUATE/EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL. BECAUSE OF THIS DENIAL, PETITIONER WAS COMPELLED/ FORCED TO TAKE THE EIGHT YEAR DEAL. PETITIONER FINDS THE HOMOSEXUAL SUGGESTION, STRANGE CONSIDERING THAT THAT COMMUNITY HAVE BEEN IN PURSUIT OF PETITIONER, SINCE PETITIONER CAN REMEMBER.

(18)

IT'S AS IF TO SUGGEST THAT PETITIONER EITHER ACQUIESCE TO LIVING AN ALTERNATIVE (HOMOSEXUAL) LIFE STYLE BY THE DEVIL AND HIS MINIONS, WHERE AFTER HAVING FIVE CHILDREN/BABIES PETITIONER RECOGNIZE HIS MOTHER AS A ADVOCATE FOR (THE WOMANS LIB MOVEMENT, AND THE LGBTQ MOVEMENT). IT'S AS IF PETITIONERS MOTHER HAS MADE PETITIONER A LIVING SACRIFICE TO THAT COMMUNITY, HER DISREGARDING PETITIONER BEING A STRAIGHT, CHRISTIAN MAN. PETITIONERS MOTHERS YOUNGEST BROTHERS (HORACE MOTEN) ONLY SON (NUMUBA: MALCOLM MOTEN) DIED OF AIDS AT A YOUNG AGE. PETITIONERS MOTHER SIDE OF THE FAMILY BEING BLACK, AND CHOCTAW INDIAN. PETITIONER IS THE OLDEST OF HIS SIBLINGS (PETITIONERS MOTHER HAVING FIVE KIDS BY FIVE DIFFERENT MEN TO THEN BE A ADVOCATE FOR THE WOMANS LIBERATION MOVEMENT, AND THE LGBTQ). PETITIONER HAS ASKED HIS MOTHER IF SHE HAS GIVEN HOMOSEXUALS LIKE DON LEMON OF CNN, PHARRELL WILLIAMS, AND LIL JOHN^{RIGHTS} TO PURSUE PETITIONER. A GUY WHOM PETITIONER MET IN PRISON ALSO TRIED CROSSING THAT LINE WITH PETITIONER, WHERE HE PROFESSED TO BEING BARRY GORDY'S SON (HE WENT BY BARRY TUCK).

PETITIONER HAS PRETTY MUCH GIVEN UP ON BEFRIENDING SOMEONE (A MAN) WHO IS GAY BECAUSE THEY SEEM TO HAVE A HIDDEN AGENDA, AND THAT'S TO CONVERT SOMEONE WHOM IS STRAIGHT.

IN THE MEAN-TIME, THIS PETITIONER CONTINUES TO SOLICIT THIS COURT FOR PETITIONERS FATHERS LAST NAME WITHOUT THE SCARLET LETTER ON IT (RAPE/PEDOPHILE). THE PETITIONER WONDERS IF PHARRELL WILLIAMS RELATED TO THE DEFENDANT IN THIS CASE, LYNN E. WILLIAMS, WHO ATTACKED PETITIONER WITHOUT ANY PROVOCATION? HOW ABOUT VENUS, AND SERENA WILLIAMS? SEE PETITIONER WAS BORN IN SAGINAW, MICHIGAN, AND WORD HAS IT THAT SUCH IS THE CASE FOR THEM TOO. STEVIE WONDER WAS ALSO BORN THERE, WHERE PETITIONERS MOTHER HAS INFORMED THIS PETITIONER THAT HER YOUNGEST BROTHER WAS FRIENDS WITH STEVIE, AND WOULD AT TIMES BRING HIM TO THE FAMILIES HOUSE PERIODICALLY. ENOUGH OF CHASING RABBIT HOLES.

PETITIONER BEING A SIXTY (60) YEAR OLD, AFRICAN-AMERICAN SINGLE MAN, HAS TWO (2) STRIKES ON HIM. BOTH CONVICTIONS ARE QUESTIONABLE (EX. F.B.I. DIRECTOR JAMES COMEY MASQUERADING AS A SAN DIEGO COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDER, AND SUNNI HOSTIN OF THE DAY-TIME TALK SHOW: THE VIEW, MASQUERADING AS A SAN DIEGO COUNTY PROSECUTOR IN 1986). THEN THAT COURT PUTTING PETITIONERS BOSS' WIFE ON THE JURY WAS UNETHICAL, PROMPTING JUDGE JONES TO GIVE THAT PREJUDICIAL JURY INSTRUCTION "... LADIES, AND GENTLEMEN OF THE JURY, IF YOU FEEL MR. CORMIER CALLED HIS BOSS, TO HAVE HIS BOSS TO SHOW LENIENCY, THEN YOU CAN FIND HIM GUILTY OF FORCE ORAL COPULATION". (20)

THAT JURY INSTRUCTION WAS PREJUDICIAL, AND IS REASON PETITIONER HAS BEEN CATEGORIZED AS A SOCIAL PARIAH. THIS PETITIONER REALIZES THAT THIS PETITIONER HAS ALREADY SOLICITED THIS COURT IN THAT MATTER (CORMIER V. COMEY et al.; SUPREME COURT No. 20-6705), WHERE NOW THIS PETITIONER HOPE, AND PRAYS FOR SOME SEMBLANCE OF JUSTICE IN THIS CASE.

THIS CASE WAS FILED AND PROCESSED IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT (SAN DIEGO, CA.) IN 1998. IT WAS GIVEN A CASE NUMBER IN 1998, PRIOR TO THE DEFENDANT MALICIOUSLY PROSECUTING THIS PETITIONER IN MONTEREY COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT, WHERE PETITIONER WAS THIRTY-ONE (31) DAYS FROM PAROLING FROM SALINAS VALLEY STATE PRISON.

NOW, THE DISTRICT COURTS, AS WELL AS THE NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS REFUSES TO AFFORD THIS PETITIONER HIS REQUESTED JURY TRIAL, THEY STATING/DENYING PETITIONERS APPLICATION FOR IN FORMA PAUPERIS (IFP), WHICH PETITIONER EVENTUALLY PAID THE FILING FEE, AFTER PETITIONERS FALSE ARREST OF 10/24/2018 (SEE CASE: IAN LaMONTE CORMIER V. RIVERSIDE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEYS OFFICE; LEON X; D.C. No. 5:21-CV-01654-SW-AM; 9TH CIRCUIT No. 21-56268). PETITIONER BEING RELEASED ON 8/20/2021. THIRTY-FOUR (34) MONTHS AFTER HIS FALSE ARREST OF 10/24/2018.

MORENO VALLEY (RIVERSIDE COUNTY) DEPUTY SHERIFFS LEON X, AND GIL, PLACING A FABRICATED CHARGE ON PETITIONERS ARREST SHEET. THE FABRICATED CHARGE BEING THAT PETITIONER PENAL CODE 290 SEX OFFENDER REGISTRATION WAS NOT UP TO DATE. THIS WAS A FABRICATION OF THE TRUTH, FOR PETITIONER HAD REGISTERED ON 10/20/2018, FOUR (4) DAYS BEFORE PETITIONER BEING ATTACKED BY HIS 51/30, NEXT DOOR NEIGHBOR (KEVIN), IN PETITIONERS BACK YARD, AS PETITIONER TRIED EXERCISING HIS JOB DUTIES, AS A CARE-PROVIDOR. TAKING HIS TWO (2) HANDICAPPED CLIENTS (ESTELLA CORMIER, AND MALCOLM MORGAN) TO THEIR SCHEDULED DOCTORS APPOINTMENTS (SEE: CORMIER V. RIVERSIDE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY OFFICE; LEON X; D.C. No. 5:21-CV-01654-SVW-AFM; 9TH CIRCUIT No. 21-56268).

THIS FABRICATED CHARGE PROMPTED THIS PETITIONER TO BE DENIED HIS CONSTITUTIONAL I, AMENDMENT, FOR REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES. FOR PETITIONERS V, AMENDMENT FOR THE DENIAL OF LIFE, LIBERTY, OR PROPERTY, WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF LAW. PETITIONERS VI, CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO A SPEEDY, AND PUBLIC TRIAL, BY A IMPARTIAL JURY, THE NATURE OF THE ACCUSATION; TO CONFRONT WITNESSES AGAINST HIM, AND TO HAVE ADEQUATE/EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL FOR HIS DEFENCE.

PETITIONERS CONSTITUTIONAL VII AMENDMENT WAS VIOLATED, WHICH STATES "IN SUITS AT COMMON LAW, WHERE THE VALUE IN CONTROVERSY SHALL EXCEED TWENTY DOLLARS, THE RIGHT OF TRIAL BY JURY SHALL BE PRESERVED," PETITIONERS VIII CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT WAS VIOLATED WHICH STATES "... NOR CRUEL AND UNUSAL PUNISHMENT INFLICTED" PETITIONERS IX CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT WAS VIOLATED WHICH STATES "THE ENUMERATION IN THE CONSTITUTION, OF CERTAIN RIGHTS, SHALL NOT BE CONSTRUED TO DENY OR DISPARAGE OTHERS RETAINED BY THE PEOPLE." PETITIONER WAS ALSO DENIED HIS CONSTITUTIONAL XIV AMENDMENT: SECTION 1: WHICH STATES "ALL PERSONS BORN, NATURALIZED IN THE UNITED STATES ... NOR SHALL ANY STATE DEPRIVE ANY PERSON OF LIFE, LIBERTY, OR PROPERTY, WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF LAW; NOR DENY TO ANY PERSON WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS".

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT; CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA EASTERN DIVISION DENIED PETITIONERS ORDER DENYING LEAVE TO PROCEED WITHOUT PREPAYMENT OF FILING FEES AND DISMISSING ACTION PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1915 (a), IN *CORMIER V. WILLIAMS, et al*, WAS IN ERROR (SEE APPENDIX B). THIS 42 U.S.C. § 1983 CIVIL COMPLAINT WAS INITIALLY FILED IN THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY (DOWNTOWN) DISTRICT COURT IN 1998, WHILE PETITIONER WAS AT SALINAS VALLEY STATE PRISON. IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE SEGREGATION (THE HOLE) FACING STRIKE TWO (2), AND THREE (3) IN MONTEREY COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT.

WHEN PETITIONER WAS JUST THIRTY-ONE (31) DAYS FROM PAROLING FROM SALINAS VALLEY STATE PRISON (PETITIONERS LAST DAY, HAVING TO WORK) WAS ATTACKED BY CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS (C/O) LYNN E. WILLIAMS, AND KENNETH SELPH, WITHOUT PROVOCATION BY PETITIONER OTHER THAN ASKING THAT LYNN E. WILLIAMS MOVE HIS ARM SO PETITIONER COULD GO TO WORK FOR THE LAST TIME, BEFORE PAROLING.

LYNN E. WILLIAMS, AND WITHOUT PROVOCATION PUNCHED PETITIONER IN THE HEAD, WHEN LYNN E. WILLIAMS REFUSED TO MOVE HIS ARM. HIS PROHIBITING PETITIONER FROM GOING TO WORK, WHEN THIS PETITIONER ASKED TO SPEAK WITH HIS (WILLIAMS) SERGEANT.

PETITIONER WAS THEN PLACED IN SALINAS VALLEY STATE PRISONS ADMINISTRATIVE SEGREGATION FOR THE NEXT YEAR, WHERE AFTER PETITIONER WAS DENIED HIS REQUESTED THOROUGH INVESTIGATION, PETITIONER DREW UP, AND FILED HIS 42 U.S.C. § 1983 CIVIL COMPLAINT. PETITIONER, FILING SUCH IN, AND AT THE SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA, DOWNTOWN DISTRICT OFFICE. SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA BEING WHERE PETITIONER WOULD BE PAROLING TO.

DURING PETITIONERS SECOND TRIP TO PRISON, PETITIONER WOULD BE TRANSFERED FROM ONE PRISON, TO ANOTHER.

PETITIONER WOULD BE PLACED ON A JOB WAITING LIST AT THE PRISON RECEIVING THIS PETITIONER, WHERE BECAUSE THE RECEIVING, PRISONS ADMINISTRATION WOULD RECOGNIZE PETITIONER HAD TWO (2) YEARS COLLEGE, PETITIONER WOULD RECEIVE A JOB (MOSTLY CLERICAL, BECAUSE OF PETITIONERS TYPING SKILLS) PETITIONER WOULD RECEIVE A JOB RELATIVELY FAST.

WHILE PETITIONER WOULD BE EXERCISING HIS JOB DUTIES, PETITIONERS BOSSES WOULD EVENTUALLY GET WIND OF THE CHARGES (FORCE ORAL COUPULATION ON A PERSON UNDER 14 YEARS OF AGE, TRUE OR NOT) WHERE PETITIONERS BOSS WOULD CONJURE UP SOME FALSE ALLEGATION TO JUSTIFY FIRING THIS PETITIONER. MOST CASES, AFTER PETITIONER WOULD EXHAUST HIS ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES VIA A INMATE/PAROLEE 602 APPEALS FORM, WHERE PETITIONER WOULD HAVE TO TAKE IT/THE 602 APPEALS FORM ALL THE WAY TO THE HIGHEST LEVEL WHICH WOULD BE SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA (INMATE APPEALS).

AFTER PETITIONER EXHAUSTED ALL HIS ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES, PETITIONER WOULD THEN SOLICIT THE LOCAL UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS, VIA 42 U.S.C. § 1983 CIVIL COMPLAINT

THIS IS WHERE THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WOULD DISMISS PETITIONERS 42 U.S.C. § 1983 COMPLAINT, CLAIMING IT TO BE FRIVOLOUS/MALICIOUS, OR THAT PETITIONER FAILED TO STATE A CLAIM OF ACTION. ALL OF THIS WASN'T JUSTIFIABLE CAUSE FOR THE DISTRICT COURTS TO HELP IN SAVING FACE FOR THOSE WHOM HAS SLEIGHTED PETITIONER. EACH TIME PETITIONER WOULD BE SUBJECTED TO SUCH, PETITIONER WOULD ACQUIRE A STRIKE, WHERE AFTER RECEIVING THREE STRIKES OF THIS NATURE, PETITIONER WOULD LITERALLY BE BARRED FROM SUBMITTING ANY SUCH GRIEVANCE TO THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS. PETITIONER FEELING THAT THE DISTRICT COURTS WOULD JUST GO TO BAT FOR THE STATE, AND STATE EMPLOYEES (PETITIONER WELCOMES THIS COURT TO REVIEW ANY, AND ALL 42 U.S.C. § 1983 CIVIL COMPLAINTS FROM APPENDIX B, OR ANYWHERE ELSE, TO SEE IF THE DISTRICT COURTS WERE CORRECT IN STATING PETITIONERS CIVIL COMPLAINTS WHERE EITHER FRIVOLOUS/MALICIOUS, OR FAILED TO STATE A CLAIM OF ACTION).

AS A MATTER OF FACT, PETITIONER WILL GIVE THIS COURT A BRIEF SUMMATION OF THE STRIKES THAT THE U.S. DISTRICT COURTS RECOGNIZED AS STRIKES FROM APPENDIX B; Pg. 4:13-Liggins-

CORMIER V. LIGGINS: DURING PETITIONERS INITIAL TRIP TO PRISON, WHILE AT FOLSOM STATE PRISON (OLD FOLSOM), PETITIONER HAD SURPRISINGLY RECEIVED A CHANGE IN COUNSELORS AFTER PETITIONER SUBMITTED CREDIT RESTORATION FORMS FROM HAVING TO DEFEND HIMSELF FROM CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS WHOM WOULD SET UP GLADIATOR BOUTS IN WHICH THEY WOULD BET ON THE WINNER.

BOTH PARTIES WOULD BE FOUND GUILTY FOR MUTUAL COMBAT, AND ASSESSED SIX (6) POINTS, WHERE CREDITS/GOOD-TIME CREDITS WOULD BE TAKEN. A INMATE, IN MOST CASES WOULD HAVE TO REMAIN DISCIPLINARY FREE FOR AT LEAST NINETY (90) DAYS IN ORDER TO GET ONES CREDITS BACK. PETITIONER HAD THE GOOD-TIME, IN WHICH HE SUBMITTED HIS CREDIT RESTORATION FORMS TO HIS COUNSELOR MR. BALKOM. PETITIONERS GRANTED CREDIT RESTORATION FORMS WOULD LEAVE PETITIONER WITH ROUGHLY THIRTY (30) DAYS BEFORE PAROLING. CONVENIENTLY PETITIONERS COUNSELOR WAS SWITCHED FROM MR. BALKOM TO A MRS. MARCIE DAVIS. PETITIONERS RELEASE DATE HAD COME, AND GONE WITHOUT PETITIONER BEING PAROLED. PETITIONER WAITED ABOUT TWO (2) TO THREE (3) DAYS AFTERWARD BEFORE APPROACHING HIS COUNSELOR MRS. MARCIE DAVIS. WHEN PETITIONER INFORMED MRS. DAVIS ABOUT HIS DILEMMA, MRS. DAVIS RESPONDED BY SAYING "I DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT, AND THERES NOTHING I CAN DO ABOUT".

Again, PETITIONER WAS TAKEN-ABACK BY HER RESPONSE, AND ASKED MRS. DAVIS IF SHE COULD CHECK WITH PETITIONER'S PREVIOUS COUNSELOR (MR. BALKOM) TO VALIDATE WHAT PETITIONER WAS TELLING HER. ESPECIALLY CONSIDERING, HOW MUCH A LEVEL FOUR PRISON WAS LIKE A TENDER-BOX. MRS. DAVIS REPEATED HER PREVIOUS STATEMENT "I DON'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT IT, AND THERE'S NOTHING I CAN DO ABOUT IT." PETITIONER HEARING THIS SAID "I KNOW WHAT I CAN DO ABOUT IT. MEANING TO APPEAL IT VIA INMATE/PAROLEE 602 APPEALS FORM. FOR REASONING UNBEKNOWNST TO PETITIONER, MRS. DAVIS CONSTRUED PETITIONER'S STATEMENT AS SOME KIND OF THREAT TOWARDS MRS. DAVIS.

MRS. DAVIS STATED "IF YOU SAY THAT AGAIN I'M GOING TO HAVE FONDVILLE (A CORRECTIONAL OFFICER, WHOM WAS IN THE IMMEDIATE AREA) TO CUFF YOU. PETITIONER EXPLAINED THAT HE MEANT TO APPEAL HER RELUCTANCE TO DO HER JOB VIA 602 APPEAL FORM, WHERE MRS. DAVIS ORDERED FONDVILLE TO PLACE CUFFS ON PETITIONER. PETITIONER WAS THEN TRANSFERRED TO NEW FOLSOM, FOUND GUILTY, ATTACKED BY HIS NEW CELLIE BUNCHE WHOM CUT PETITIONER UP WITH A RAZOR. PETITIONER WAS THEN TRANSFERRED TO PELICAN BAY STATE PRISON, SEGREGATED HOUSING UNIT (SHU) AFTER BEING AT PELICAN BAY (SHU), PETITIONER PAROLED BACK TO SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA, WHERE PETITIONER REPORTED TO HIS PAROLE AGENT LIGGINS

AFTER THIS LONG BUS RIDE FROM PELICAN BAY STATE PRISON (NORTHERN CALIFORNIA) TO SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA (SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA) UPON REPORTING TO PAROLE AGENT LIGGINS THE VERY SAME DAY (PETITIONER HAD TWENTY-FOUR (24) HOURS FROM RELEASE TO REPORT TO LIGGINS), BECAUSE PETITIONER ASKED LIGGINS TO PLACE PETITIONER IN A MOTEL HOTEL, PAROLE AGENT LIGGINS ASKED HOW MUCH GATE MONEY PETITIONER HAD. ONCE PETITIONER TOLD LIGGINS (PETITIONER HAVING TO PURCHASE HIS BUS TICKET); AND PETITIONER NEEDED WHAT HE HAD LEFT TO EAT, AND TO BUY A CHANGE OF CLOTHES, PAROLE AGENT LIGGINS TOLD PETITIONER TO TAKE HIS MONIES, AND GET A MOTEL ROOM WITH IT, AND COME BACK TO SEE HIM THE NEXT MORNING. THIS MEANT PETITIONER WOULDN'T BE EATING THAT NIGHT IF HE WAS TO PAY FOR HIS OWN ROOM.

PETITIONER ASKED PAROLE AGENT LIGGINS IF HE COULD SPEAK TO HIS (PAROLE AGENT LIGGINS) SUPERVISOR, WHERE PAROLE AGENT LIGGINS SAID "YOU WANT TO SPEAK WITH MY SUPERVISOR?" WHEN PETITIONER SAID "YES", LIGGINS (WITH HIS PARTNER IN HIS OFFICE) SAID "STAND UP", AND THEN "TURN AROUND, AND ~~FACE THE WALL~~", THEN "PLACE YOUR HANDS BEHIND YOUR BACK." WHEN PETITIONER COMPLIED, PAROLE AGENT ^{LIGGINS} PLACED HAND CUFFS ON PETITIONER, WHERE HE, AND HIS PARTNER TOOK PETITIONER TO DONOVAN STATE PRISON. LIGGINS VIOLATING PETITIONER'S PAROLE STATING PETITIONER REFUSED AN ORDER.

PETITIONER CONTESTED THIS PAROLE VIOLATION VIA 42 U.S.C. § 1983 CIVIL COMPLAINT, WHERE THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA DISMISSED PETITIONERS CLAIM, STATING PETITIONER FAILED TO STATE A CLAIM. PETITIONER WAS ALSO ASSESSED A STRIKE.

PETITIONER THEN SUBMITTED A 42 U.S.C. § 1983 CIVIL COMPLAINT ENTITLED CORMIER V. PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, CASE No. CV-00-00249-L(RBB) IN THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, PETITIONER CONTESTING HIS 1998 CONVICTION. THIS ATTEMPT TO RECEIVE JUSTICE WAS DISMISSED ON 3/21/2000, FOR AGAIN (SUPPOSEDLY) FAILING TO STATE A CLAIM, WHERE PETITIONER WAS BARRED VIA HECK.

PETITIONER THEN FILED A 42 U.S.C. § 1983 CIVIL COMPLAINT ON HIS BOSS MANNY, CASE No. CV-00-00025-W-(CGA). PETITIONER WORKING AS A CLERK FOR MANNY (PETITIONERS TYPING SKILLS BEING RECOGNIZED FROM A COLLEGE COURSE). MANNY FIRED PETITIONER FOR NO PARTICULAR REASON, OTHER THAN HIS RECOGNIZING THE (BOGUS) CHARGES PETITIONER WAS CONVICTED OF. AGAIN, THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA DISMISSED PETITIONERS CIVIL COMPLAINT, THEIR STATING AGAIN, THAT PETITIONER FAILED TO STATE A CLAIM.

PETITIONER FILED A 42 U.S.C. § 1983 CIVIL COMPLAINT ENTITLED CORMIER V. CALIFORNIA, CASE No. CV-00-00004-L(RBB) IN THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, IN WHICH THAT COURT DISMISSED ON 5/11/2000 FOR FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM.

PETITIONER FILED A 42 U.S.C. § 1983 CIVIL COMPLAINT ENTITLED CORMIER V. SUTER, CASE No. EDCV-11-00801-UA (MLG) IN THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA. THAT COURT DENIED PETITIONERS APPLICATION/REQUEST FOR IN FORMA PAUPERIS (IFP), WHILE CALLING PETITIONERS 42 U.S.C. § 1983 CIVIL COMPLAINT FRIVOLOUS ON 6/3/2011.

PETITIONER FILED A 42 U.S.C. § 1983 CIVIL COMPLAINT ON HIS RETAINER ATTORNEY ERIC SIEGLER, CASE No. CV-11-04907-ABC-(MLG), IN THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA. ERIC SIEGLER FAILED TO FILE ON PETITIONERS 42 U.S.C. § 1983 CIVIL COMPLAINT THAT PETITIONER FILED IN SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA IN 1998, ENTITLED IAN LA MONTE CORMIER V. LYNN E. WILLIAMS et al.; ATTORNEY ERIC SIEGLER DROPPED THE BALL TWICE (FAILING TO RESPOND TO THE DISTRICT COURT'S ORDERS, PROMPTING THE DISTRICT COURT TO DROP/DISMISS PETITIONERS 42 U.S.C. § 1983 CIVIL COMPLAINT (CORMIER V. WILLIAMS et al.)).

ON 7/22/2011, THE CENTRAL DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA DENIED PETITIONERS REQUEST TO PROCEED IFP (THAT COURT OVERLOOKING PETITIONER BEING UNJUSTIFIABLY ARRESTED, AND RETAINED BY RIVERSIDE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY OFFICE FOR EIGHTEEN (18) MONTHS, WHERE PETITIONER WAS ATTACKED ON THREE OCCASIONS BY A NEIGHBOR NAMED LEONARDO.

PETITIONER WAS DENIED HIS DUE-PROCESS, AND EQUAL PROTECTION OF LAW IN THIS CASE: SEE CORMIER V. RIVERSIDE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY et al.; No. 5:19-CV-01151-SVW-AFM).

THE EASTERN DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA DENIED PETITIONERS CASE ENTITLED CORMIER V. COMEY (EX. F.B.I. DIRECTOR JAMES COMEY) et al.; CASE No. EDCV-19-01198-SVW-AFM. PETITIONER (IF PETITIONER ISNT MISTAKEN) PAID HIS FILING FEES FOR THIS CASE, AS WELL AS CORMIER V. WILLIAMS et al.; D.C. No. 5:20-CV-01877-SVW-AFM; CORMIER V. COOPER et al.; D.C. No. 5:20-CV-01722-SVW-AFM; AND CORMIER V. RIVERSIDE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEYS OFFICE; LEON X; et al.) D.C. No. 5:21-01654-SVW-AFM.

THIS, IN-TURN ANSWERS THE (QUESTIONS PRESENTED) PORTION OF THIS WRIT OF CERTIORARI: QUESTIONS 1, 2, 3, AND 4.

BECAUSE OF THE STIGMA ASSOCIATED WITH BEING FOUND GUILTY OF A HEINOUS ACT, (ALTHOUGH THESE ALLEGATIONS WERE FALSE), PETITIONER HAS NOW BEEN DEEMED A SOCIAL PARIAH. PETITIONER, NOW CAN'T MAINTAIN A JOB OVER ONE (1) YEAR, WHERE PETITIONER HAS BEEN FORCED OUT OF THE WORK FORCE.

THE DISTRICT COURT HAVE HAD THIS CASE SINCE 1998, WHERE THEY HAVE DONE EVERYTHING WITHIN THEIR POWER TO KEEP PETITIONER FROM HAVING A JURY HEAR THIS CASE (i.e. CLAIMING PETITIONER HAD THREE (3) STRIKES, THUS DENYING PETITIONER IFP APPLICATION. THEN THE DISTRICT COURT OVERLOOKED THE FACT THAT PETITIONER PAID THE FILING FEE IN WHICH TO HAVE A JURY HEAR PETITIONERS CASE. THE DISTRICT COURT FORCING PETITIONER TO APPEAL TO THE NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, AND FORCING PETITIONER TO PAY THAT COURTS (9TH CIRCUITS) FILING FEES).

THE DISTRICT COURT HAS THUS SUBJECTED PETITIONER TO A RACKET. PETITIONER PAYING FOR SOME SEMBLANCE OF JUSTICE, TO BE DENIED OF SUCH (PETITIONERS REQUESTED JURY TRIAL).

PETITIONER, BEING AN INCARCERATED INMATE, AT SALINAS VALLEY STATE PRISON, IN SALINAS, CALIFORNIA, WHERE PETITIONER HAD THIRTY-ONE (31) DAYS BEFORE PETITIONERS PAROLE, WAS ATTACKED BY CALIFORNIA CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS LYNN WILLIAMS, AND KENNETH SELPH, WITHOUT PROVOCATION BY PETITIONER. THESE CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS, ALONG WITH CORRECTIONAL OFFICER J. PERRY FABRICATED THEIR CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS (CDC) 115 RULES VIOLATION REPORT TO READ THAT PETITIONER ATTACKED BOTH C/O (CORRECTIONAL OFFICER) LYNN WILLIAMS, AND KENNETH SELPH.

PETITIONER WAS PLACED IN ADMINISTRATIVE SEGREGATION FOR A WHOLE YEAR, AND PROSECUTED IN MONTEREY COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT, WHERE PETITIONER WAS FACING TWO (2) COUNTS OF ASSAULT ON CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS, AND TWENTY-FIVE (25) YEARS TO LIFE IN PRISON. THAT MONTEREY COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT JURY CAME BACK WITH A NOT GUILTY VERDICT.

Again, PETITIONER HAD FILED A 42 U.S.C. § 1983 CIVIL COMPLAINT IN THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY DISTRICT COURTS IN 1998. THIS NOT GUILTY VERDICT FROM THIS MONTEREY COUNTY JURY THUS GAVE PETITIONERS 42 U.S.C. § 1983 CIVIL COMPLAINT MORE WEIGHT, WHERE NOW THE DISTRICT COURTS (FOR THE LAST 24 YEARS) HAVE DENIED PETITIONER OF HIS REQUESTED JURY TRIAL. NOW THE NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS HAS JOINED IN ON DENYING PETITIONER OF HIS REQUESTED JURY TRIAL, BY AN IMPARTIAL JURY.

THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES (THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY SHERIFFS DEPARTMENT/MORENO VALLEY (CA.) POLICE) HAS FALSELY ARRESTED, AND RETAINED PETITIONER IN LOCK-UP ON TWO OCCASIONS, THEIR ATTEMPTING TO SEND PETITIONER BACK TO PRISON, TO THOSE PETITIONER WAS Suing VIA 42 U.S.C. § 1983 CIVIL COMPLAINT: CORMIER V. WILLIAMS et al., D.C. No. 5:20-CV-01877-SVW-AFM; NINTH CIRCUIT No. 21-55308 (ALSO SEE: CORMIER V. RIVERSIDE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY et al.; D.C. No. 5:19-CV-01151-SVW-AFM; NINTH CIRCUIT No. 19-56269, AND CORMIER V. RIVERSIDE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEYS OFFICE; LEON X, DEPUTY SHERIFF (DETECTIVE), et al.; D.C. No. 5:21-CV-01654-SVW-AFM; NINTH CIRCUIT No. 21-56268).

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT I STATES: "...
TO PETITION THE GOVERNMENT FOR REDRESS OF GRIEVANCE".

THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT V STATES
"NO PERSON..., NOR BE DEPRIVED OF LIFE, LIBERTY, OR PROPERTY
WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF LAW..."

THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT VI STATES
"IN ALL CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS, ... ENJOY THE RIGHT TO A SPEEDY,
AND PUBLIC TRIAL, BY AN IMPARTIAL JURY, ... AND TO BE
INFORMED OF THE NATURE AND CAUSE OF THE ACCUSATION...
AND TO HAVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL FOR HIS DEFENCE".

THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT VII STATES
"IN SUITS AT COMMON LAW, WHERE THE VALUE IN CONTROVERSY
SHALL EXCEED TWENTY DOLLARS, THE RIGHT OF TRIAL BY JURY
SHALL BE PRESERVED..."

THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT VIII STATES
"EXCESSIVE BAIL SHALL NOT BE REQUIRED, NOR EXCESSIVE
FINES IMPOSED, NOR CRUEL AND UNUSAL PUNISHMENT INFLICTED".

THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT IX STATES
"THE ENUMERATION IN THE CONSTITUTION, OF CERTAIN RIGHTS
SHALL NOT BE CONSTRUED TO DENY OR DISPARAGE OTHERS
RETAINED BY THE PEOPLE".

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION (CONTINUED)

THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT XIV STATES
"... SECTION 1: ALL PERSONS BORN NATURALIZED IN THE
UNITED STATES, ... NOR SHALL ANY STATE DEPRIVE ANY
PERSON OF LIFE, LIBERTY, OR PROPERTY, WITHOUT DUE PROCESS
OF LAW; NOR DENY TO ANY PERSON WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION
THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS".

PLEASE RECOGNIZE THAT PETITIONER IS A LAYMAN OF THE
LAW, WHOM DOESN'T HAVE THE MONIES TO RETAIN
ADEQUATE COUNSEL (PETITIONER ON A FIXED INCOME OF
ROUGHLY SIXTEEN HUNDRED DOLLARS) A MONTH, WHERE
PETITIONER HAS BEEN LIVING IN HIS CAR SINCE REGAINING
HIS FREEDOM ON 8/20/21.

CONCLUSION

BECAUSE PETITIONER HAS BEEN DENIED REDRESS, AND A JURY TRIAL
FOR THE LAST TWENTY-FOUR (24) YEARS, EVEN AFTER PAYING THE FILING FEES
PETITIONER PRAYS
The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan L. Conley

Date: June 14th, 2022