

22-5492

No. _____

ORIGINAL

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

AUG 15 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

William Wallace — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.
Florida commission
on offender Review — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

United State's District Court Southern District of Fla
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

William Wallace
(Your Name)

1150 S.W. Allapatta Road
(Address)

Indiantown, Florida 34956
(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- (1) Is it proper to use false evidence to convict a petitioner for a crime. Where there has never been any type of weapon that was use in this case to cause any type of deadly used to kill the victim
- (2) Is it proper for the petitioner to be deprived the right to be given a review in the proper time. Were the Parol commission went pass the time allowed to have a hearing
- (3) And on the commission's ruling that was given to the petitioner did not have a signature, on any document for it to be binding it must have a signature on it.
- (4) And the petitioner should not have been given assessed points because there was no such multiple separate offense as stated by the commission
- (5) And if the petitioner does not have a unsatisfactory institutional conduct then why was he given points for this were the petitioner only has 4 dis reports
- (6) And in the petitioner motion that he place into the court it can be seen that Judge White state's that there is no blood are DNA are any blood spatter that were found at the crime scene
- (7) And is it proper for the Parol commission to base there PPRD Date to be set with false evidence. Were the commission state's that it make's it finding from a police Affidavit Were it state's that the petitioner was seen at the crime scene by a witness with blood on his hand's

Would come down to the county Jail and they would pull inmates
out of the Guard that were house with the petitioner. And they would
offer them a deal if they would testify on the petitioner. And if they did
not know of what to say in court they would tell them what to say in court.

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:

RELATED CASES

Brady v. Maryland 373 U.S. 83 87, 83 S.Ct. 1194 10 LE2d 215 (1963)
McGee v. State No. 2014000297 (S.C.) PP. 152-153
Buch. 580 U.S. at 137 S.Ct. 759, 197 LE2d 2d
Tharpe v. Selles 583 U.S. 138 S.Ct. 545 199 LE2d 2d 424 (2018)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	
CONCLUSION.....	

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

Brady v. Maryland 373 U.S. 83, 87, 83 S.Ct 1194 10 LEd (83) 215 (1963)
 McGee v. State No. 2014-000297 (S.C.) PP 152-153
 Buck, 580 U.S. 138 S.Ct 545 199 LEd 2d 424-2018

STATUTES AND RULES

Burke v. Canfield III. Fed 52672 App (DC) 127 cir. 1940 (52672)
 Stark v. American Dredging Co. 31 F.R.D 300 (D.Pa. 1943) 300
 Builders Corp v. United States, 259 Fed 766 (9th cir 1958) 766
 Rorick v. Devon Syndicate Ltd. 307 U.S. 299, 59 S.Ct 871, 83 LEd 1303
 Talking Pictures Corp v. Western Electric Co. 304 U.S. 175, 58 S.Ct 849-82
 LEd 1273-1983 Dec. comm 37, U.S.P.P (BNA) 357 (1938)

OTHER

Constitutional provisions Rule 511 implements 28 U.S.C. 2403
 Rule 4(c)

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 _____ 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 August 19, 2020.

☐ 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: NA, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix NA.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including NA (date) on NA (date) in Application No. NA A NA.

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 NA.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix NA.

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

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including NA (date) on NA (date) in Application No. NA A NA.

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

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

William Giglio and Frank Livorsi, Petitioners

US.

United States of America (No 10), 355 US 399, 2 LEd 321, 78 S Ct 311, reh den 355 US 967, 2 LEd 1542, 78 S Ct 529 Argued October 14-15, 1957

Brady v Maryland 373 U.S. 83, 83 S Ct 1194 10 LEd (83)

Rule 8(c)

Rorick v. Devon Syndicate Ltd, 307 U.S. 299, 59 S. Ct. 877, 83 LEd 11303

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The petitioner in this case was charge with one count of murder in the first degree on December 10, 1992. And he plead not guilt and at first appearance. And he went to trial in 1994 were he was found guilt by a jury. At what time the state gave there case to the jury with very false statements and also very false evidence that was made up by the prosecuting Attorney. There has never been any evidence that linked the petitioner to this crime. The pard commission are basing there ruling on evidence that dont exist. Where there's no finger prints that were ever found that belong to the petitioner in this case. And it's stated that the petitioner's was seen at the crime scene with blood on his hands and this was never proven. Because there was never any DNA or blood that belong to the petitioner that were ever found at the crime scene that belong to the petitioner. When ask George T Duncan did any one give ever give you any thing to be tested in this case from the victim the answer was no George T Duncan Trial Transcript pg 214217.

If the petitioner can be given a chance to prove that there is no evidence that link's him to this crime then he can have these charges dismissed and then he want need parol. But if the court's will look at the petitioner's case in hold. Then it will grant the petitioner parol as well. Because there should never been any matrix points given to the petitioner because the evidence that was used was made up by the state.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

The petitioner asks this court to grant his motion because he has proven that he does qualify for parole. And the petitioner has also shown that he does also qualify for prompt release from his detention that he has place upon him at this time. Because the petitioner does qualify for parole and he does also qualify for release at this time.

The petitioner ask this court to accept his motion that he has
befor the court at this time and to please grant him the releaf that he
is asking this court for at this time

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

William Wallace

Date: 8-15-2022