

No. 22-7267

ORIGINAL

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

FILED

JAN 17 2023

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

Lloyd Leslie Kindred

— PETITIONER

(Your Name)

vs.

T. Pisheros.

— RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

United States Court of Appeals For Ninth Circuit.
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Lloyd Leslie Kindred

(Your Name)

P.O. Box 5248

(Address)

Corcoran, Ca. 93212...

(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

10f149

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

26F149

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 THE 9TH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS DECISION .	145-146
APPENDIX B THE EASTERN DISTRICT COURT DECISION	129-130
APPENDIX C THE 9TH CIRCUIT RECONSIDERATION DECISION ..	131
APPENDIX D CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT DECISION	84
APPENDIX E CALIFORNIA THIRD APPELLATE DECISION	148
APPENDIX F CALIFORNIA SUPERIOR COURT DECISION ...	59-60-61

APPENDICES FROM PAGE 12 THROUGH
PAGE 146, THEN PAGE 148

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

* Grounds(1), Was I denied the 6TH Amendment of the U.S. Constitution: Regarding Counsel's performance wasn't reasonably effective and that there is a reasonable probability that for Counsel's derelictions, the outcome would have been a different outcome. Because I am innocent. * See., Strickland v. Washington (1984). * See., Exhibit A1 of 2* Exculpatory Evidence Letter From (CAC) Frances C. Huey, State Bar # 105147. Phone # (916) 925-4571 Cell # 916-925-5666. Exculpatory document Signed by Attorney at Law Miss Frances C. Huey. Proving my Grounds(1) Claim IAC. Reversal should be Warranted.

* * See.. People v. Pope., People v. Frierson (1979), People v. Borba (1980)...

* California Penal Code 1473 (b)(3)(A): Regarding Credible evidence, Warranting Relief From the Convictions... Review is Warranted...

* Ground(2) Is the term of 150 yrs, a Cruel and Unusual Punishment under People v. Kindred's Case Factors (Review case Factors) 8TH Amendment prohibits the infliction of a Cruel punishment

* See Robinson v. California 370, U.S. 660-67 (1962). The 8TH Amendment limits criminal punishments in 3 ways Which has not been considered in petitioner's Favor # (1) it imposes substantive on what can be made criminal and punished as such. # (2) it prohibits certain kinds of punishments. # (3) it prohibits punishments like in People v. Kindred's Case of 150 years to life as grossly disproportionate to the severity of the offense... Reversal in the interest of Justice should be Warranted...

* See.. Assembly Bill 518 in conjunction to Penal Code 654.., States:

(a). An "act" or omission that "is" punishable under either of such provisions, but in "no" case shall the act or omission be punished under more than one provision. An acquittal or conviction and sentence under any one bars a prosecution for the "same" act or omission under any other.. Relief should be given where applicable in the interest of Justice...

These are my questions Warranting relief From the Unconstitutional convictions...

40F149

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
Strickland v. Washington	12-18, 112-116-120
Robinson v. California	15.
Ingram v. Wright	15.
Rompilla v. Beard	18
Wiggins v. Smith	19.
Williams v. Taylor	19.
Alabama v. Shelton	19.
LaFler v. Cooper	20
People v. Marseiler	21
Brecht	21
People v. Kindred	21- 114
United States v. Lane	21- 115
Rhodes v. Ditmar	21
Remmer v. United States	21
Etzel v. Rosenbloom	21
Gary v. Avery	147
Haines v. Kerler	

STATUTES AND RULES	
Art. I, Section 24 Const. of Cal.	20
Cal. Rules of Court 4.551 (a) (2)	17
28 U.S.C. Section 2254 - Art. I, section 24 Const Amendments VIII-XIV	67
In re Winship (1970) - Jackson v. Virginia - Tibbs v. Florida	69-70
Victor v. Nebraska - Fourteenth Amendment - People v. Marshall - Estate v. Teed	70
People v. Bassett - People v. Johnson	71
Rules 901 and 902 of the Federal Rules of Evidence - 107-108-109-110-132-133-134-135-136	119
28 U.S.C. Section 2253 (c)(2) - Evidence Code Section 410 - 5th-6th-14th Amendment	116
Miller-El v. Cockrell	119
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, rule 59 - Rishor v. Ferguson	120
28 USC Section 2254 (2)(i) - 6th Amendment - 147th Amendment	123

OTHER	
Penal Code Section 1423 (a) (3) (A) (B)	12.
Penal Code Section 667.61. (e) (5)	12.
Penal Code Section 654	12.
Penal Code Section 288(a) 667.61 (e) (5)	18
Penal Code Section 1473(b)(3)	64
Michael Jackson v. Santa Maria California	115-116

5 of 149

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 D 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.

6 of 149

JURISDICTION

☒ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was SEPTEMBER 16, 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: OCTOBER 26, 2022, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix C.

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

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

7 of 149

☐ 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).

3

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

* Article I, Section 24 Constitution of California (Constitutional Rights - Rights Reserved)	20	Page
Amendment V	20-116	
Amendment VI	20-116-123	
Amendment VIII	15-67	
Amendment XIV	67-70-123	

2 of 149

4

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Accused of Lewd and Lascivious acts upon a child under 14 - With Multiple victims...

* Consecutive 15yrs to life on Counts: 1-4-5-6-7-11-13-17-18 and 19...
15yrs to life Concurrent on Counts: 2-3-8-9-10-12-14 and 15

* Additional determinate term see (CR-290)

* Penal Code 667.61(e) 5))

* Count 21 Penal Code 311.4(c) Use of a child to pose for child Porn: Term 3yrs... "Pursuant to PC 654 Stay"

* Count 22 Penal Code 311.11(a) Possession of Obscene Matter, child under 18. Consecutive 1/3 Non-Violent 8 months
"Pursuant to PC 654 Stay"

* Count 20 Penal Code 664-288(c)(1) Attemp Oral Cop: Child under 14 deft 10 yrs older Consecutive 1/3 Non-violent 4 months...

* Total time excluding County Jail Term 4yrs...

* Please note my plea was not guilty to all untrue allegations...

* Please Note, there was no physical and/or Medical evidence that any criminal act of Penal Codes 288(a) nor 288(c) in conjunction with Penal Codes 667.61(e), 667(e)(5), 667.61(e)(5), nor Penal Code 664 P.C. 288(c)(1)...

Page 149

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Questions involved are of importance because I was denied a Fair Court and trial proceedings...
Denied Article I, Section 24. Constitution of California Constitutional (Rights - Rights Reserved) Denied equal protection of the Law, to due process of law,
Denied proper (CAC) Refer to Exculpatory Evidence produced by my (CAC) stating why her performance fell below an objective standard of reasonable (CAC) * the Document Entitled "Exculpatory Evidence Pages 134-135, The Email From "Counsel" Proving I was denied The 6TH Amendment of the United States Constitution... * See, Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668 (1984.) Notice The exculpatory evidence produced by (CAC) is signed by ineffective (CAC), proving her ineffectiveness caused the unfavorable outcome nor was she prepared... The Last Courts decided an important "Federal Question" in away that conflicts with the 6TH Amendment and 14TH Amendment, to the United States Constitution... My Case is one that should be considered by U. S. Supreme Court to settle the important Federal Question(s) of law * See, example Cases mentioned in my valid petition Strickland v. Washington, I am innocent and I was not properly defended and there was no proof Physical or Medical of Counts: 1-4-5-6-7-11-13-17-18 and 19 of 15 yrs to life Consecutive, no proof Medical or Physical of 15 yrs to life Concurrent on Counts 2-3-8-9-10-12-14 and 15. And Two Counts (9-10) were Calculated incorrectly causing more additional prison time, that's because (CAC) Failed to do a proper investigation, it required simple Mathematics of ages if brought to the attention of the Court would prove a unauthorized Charge / conviction of those Counts (20-19)

16 of 149

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.
In the interest of Justice for all...

Respectfully submitted,

Lloyd L. Kindred

Date: JANUARY 16, 2023

116F149