

No. 22-5669

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

SEP 16, 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Robert Carrasco Gomez — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

Arizona — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

Arizona Court of Appeals
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

MR. Robert Carrasco Gomez #131401
(Your Name)

APC-Egman SMU I
(Address)

PO Box 4000 Florence, AZ 85302
(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

ORIGINAL

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

1. State v. GOMEZ, CR-2003-1552 Arizona Superior Court for PIMA County judgment entered 14 July 21.

2. State v. GOMEZ 2-CA CR-2021-0077 Court of Appeals for State of Arizona DIV. TWO judgment entered 1 Dec 21.

3. State v. GOMEZ, CR-21-0399-PK Arizona Supreme Court judgment entered 14 July 22.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	Arizona Court of Appeals decision 1 Dec 21
APPENDIX B	Arizona Superior Court Pima County 14 July 21
APPENDIX C	Arizona Supreme Court 14 June 22
APPENDIX D	
APPENDIX E	
APPENDIX F	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

1. ~~Halbert~~ v. Michigan 1545 U.S. 605 (2005)

5

STATUTES AND RULES

1. Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure 32.1

OTHER

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

☐ reported at _____; or,

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

☐ reported at _____; or,

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☐ is unpublished.

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

☐ reported at _____; or,

☒ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☒ is unpublished.

The opinion of the Alaska Superior Court / 9th Cir. Court 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.

JURISDICTION

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was _____.

☐ No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

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

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

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was 14 June 22.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix C.

☐ 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

1. U.S. Const. Sixth and Fourteenth Amend.; Procedural
Due Process, Equal Protection Clause. Substantive
Due Process; Right to Effective Trial Counsel

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

(Gonzalez) alleges that that Counsel Direct Appeals /
Trial Review Collateral Proceeding Counsel were ineffective for
failing to provide legal representation through DA the entire
Criminal Judicial Proceedings in violation of (Gonzalez's) Rights
under the Sixth and the Fourteenth Amendment - Due Process
Clause.

As a Matter of State Law A Constitutional claim
falling under Rule 32.1(A), may be raised in a successive
petition under Rule 32.2 (A)(3) and it is not subject to
preclusion under Rule 32.2 (A)(2), if it is of "Sufficient
Constitutional Magnitude" Ariz. R. Crim. P. 32.2 (A)(3) (2000);
Smith 46 P.3d at 1071-10.

(Gonzalez) further alleges his Ineffective Assistance
of Counsel (IAC) claim is not precluded under 32.2 (A)(1)
because the Arizona Supreme Court has not held that
a derivative (IAC) claim related to the failure to
raise a Rule 32.2 (A)(3), claim is precluded in successive
(PCR) proceedings.

In fact, the Arizona Supreme Court has recently
clarified that the rule of preclusion does not apply when
a petitioner claims a violation of a Constitutional right
that can only be waived knowingly, voluntarily and personally
by the defendant. Ariz. R. Crim. P. 32.2 (A)(3) (2020). If the rule
of preclusion does not apply to a claim of "Sufficient
Constitutional Magnitude" it follows that derivative (IAC)

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

As a Non Plea Bargain Arizona defendants are not entitled to effective assistance of (PCL) counsel, not (CAMEZ) plea to the indictment and was denied effective assistance of trial counsel and (initial-review) counsel and was denied an effective procedural recourse to challenge the Nullity.

In *Halbert v. Michigan* 545 U.S. 605 (2005), the Supreme Court ruled that the Due Process and Equal Protection clause require the appointment of counsel for defendants convicted on their pleas, who seek access to First-Tier review in the Michigan Court of Appeals.

When the State of Arizona deliberately chose to move that ineffectiveness claims outside of the direct Appeals process where counsel is constitutionally guaranteed it significantly diminished (CAMEZ's) ability to file a Ineffective Assistance of trial counsel claim and related claims. Persons in (CAMEZ's) position are completely ill equipped to represent themselves because they do not have a shot from counsel of an opinion of the Court addressing their claim of error. *Halbert v. Michigan* 545 U.S. 605 (2005).

For the foregoing reasons, (CAMEZ) moves this Court to grant relief, AS AVAILABLE.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

30 Aug 22

MR. Roberto Casado Gomez # 131401

APPC-PRMAN-SMU I

P.O. Box 1400 Florence, AZ 85132