

No. _____

22-782

ORIGINAL

IN THE


SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JEZ [REDACTED] "EMERGENCY" 18pgs MOTION, 237pgs EXHIBITS

JOE WALLACE PEEPLES III

(Your Name)

Pro Se
— PETITIONER



W.D.N.Y. JUDGE FRANK GERACE ^{vs} ET AL

RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE 2ND CIRCUIT

(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Joe WALLACE PEEPLES III F#40425-048

(Your Name)

U.S.P. TUCSON P.O. Box 24550

(Address)

TUCSON, ARIZONA 85734

(City, State, Zip Code)

N/A

(Phone Number)

UNPRECEDENTED!

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- ① CAN YOU LOCATE ONE CONSTITUTIONALLY REQUIRED (BILL OF RIGHTS) LAW-FUL SIGNATURE, NAME, TESTEE OF PROCESS OF ANYONE IMPARTIAL ON MY "TRUE BILL OF INDICTMENT"? IS IT CERTIFIED 28 U.S.C. § 2249?
- ② DO YOU SEE A SIGNATURE BY A U.S. JUDGE GRANTING PROBABLE CAUSE UPON MY ACTUAL "SWORN AFFIDAVIT OF CRIMINAL COMPLAINT", AND HAVE YOU EVER, IN YOUR CAREER SEEN THAT BEFORE? (BLANK JURAT ON ANY AFFIDAVIT?)
- ③ WHAT WOULD YOU DO IF YOUR SON, DAUGHTER, OR LOVED ONE WAS CHARGED WITH A CRIME BY U.S.A.; AND AS CHECK AND BALANCE, YOU LOOKED AT THEIR CONSTITUTIONALLY REQUIRED (BILL + AFFIDAVIT) DOCUMENTS, AND COULD FIND NO ATTESTMENT/AFFIRMATION OF JUDGE, GRAND JURY, OR CLERK (STAMP OR SEAL)? WHAT WOULD YOU DO?
- ④ WHAT IS THE BLACKS LAW DEFINITION OF A "TRUE BILL/BILL" AND CAN IT LEGALLY BE LEFT "VOID" OF ANY AFFIRMATION? NO SEAL NO STAMP?
- ⑤ WHAT IS THE BLACKS LAW DEFINITION OF A "DULY SWORN AFFIDAVIT" AND CAN IT LEGALLY BE LEFT "VOID OF AFFIRMATION"?
- ⑥ WHY WASN'T ANY LAWFUL (ENTIRE RULE 5, 5.1) "GUARANTEED DUE PROCESS" DOCUMENTS FILED IN THE UNPRECEDENTED TRANSFER (KIDNAPPING) OF MR PEEPLES BODY AGAINST HIS WILL 173 MILES FROM N.D.N.Y.?
- ⑦ HOW DOES MR PEEPLES "POP-UP" 173 MILES AWAY WITH "OBVIOUS" FRAUDULENT WARRANT, NO-PRE-LIMINARY HEARING ON A "BLANK JURAT"? BINGHAMTON JAIL DOCUMENTS REFUSED (FOI).

Cover-Up

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

APPENDIX
C

APPENDIX
F

#2 + #3

⑧ WHY DID, WHY WOULD JUDGE GERACI AND A.U.S.A. MARANGOLA ABJURE UN-TRUTHS IN BOTH OF THEIR RULINGS: STATING MR PEEPLES FAILED TO RAISE INDICTMENT AND AFFIDAVIT ISSUES, WHEN THE RECORD, §2255 OF DOCKET, SENTENCING, AND DIRECT APPEAL "CLEARLY" SHOW A VALIANT EFFORT?

APPENDIX
A
Group #2

⑨ IF A COURT/BOARD CERTIFIED FORENSIC DOCUMENT EXAMINER PROVIDES YOU WITH A "SWORN AFFIDAVIT", SWEARING THE SIGNATURE OF YOUR DECEASED LOVE ONE ON A "COVER PAGE"; PLACED ON TOP OF THE ACTUAL "SWORN AFFIDAVIT" WITH A BLANK JURAT, DIVIDING HIS/HER ESTATE IS A FAX... NOT AN ORIGINAL OR EVEN A COPY OF ORIGINAL "CONTAINING NO INK SIGNATURES, WOULD THAT BE OK WITH YOU?

⑩ ARE THE JUSTICES OF THIS SUPREME COURT GOING TO UNPRECEDENTEDLY, GOING TO DENY ME MY CONSTITUTIONAL AND CIVIL RIGHT TO A TRUE BILL DELIVERED TO A CLERK BY AFFIRMATION OF AN IMPARTIAL CITIZEN, AND MY RIGHT TO A VERIFIABLE SIGNATURE OF PROBABLE CAUSE BY A JUDGE?

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

U.S.A. vs Joseph W Peeples III W.D.N.Y.

6:17-CR-6032-FPG

Peeples vs U.S.A. "EMERGENCY MANDAMUS" U.S. C.O.A. 2ND CIR

18-1369

U.S.A vs Peeples "DIRECT APPEAL/Pro Se" U.S. C.O.A. 1ST CIR

18-2309 / 18-2309-CR

Peeples vs U.S.A. "Supreme Court WRIT OF CERTIORARI"

20-6580

Peeples vs W.D.N.Y. "EMERGENCY 28 U.S.C. § 2255"

6:21-cv-6607-FPG

Peeples vs U.S.A. "EMERGENCY RECONSIDERATION HEARING EN Banc"

22-2469

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

237 TOTAL PGS

INDEX TO APPENDICES LETTER FR: JILLIAN S. HARRINGTON

17pgs/#1=7pgs/#2=38pgs/#3=14pgs	APPENDIX A	28 U.S.C. § 2255 MOTION TO VACATE SENTENCE. FILED 9-27-21 WITH EXHIBITS ARE ATTACHED.
(10pgs)	APPENDIX B	GOVERNMENTS ANSWER AND MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN RESPONSE TO 28 U.S.C. § 2255. FILED 1-11-22. NO 28 U.S.C. § 2249.
(30pgs)	APPENDIX C	PETITIONERS RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO GOVERNMENTS ANSWER. FILED 3-21-22. 30pg MOTION. 48 EXHIBITS NOT ATT.
(14pgs)	APPENDIX D	W.D.N.Y. DISTRICT JUDGE FRANK P. GERACI JR DECISION AND ORDER. FILED 1-17-23. NO 28 U.S.C. § 2249 CERT ATTACHED.
(28pgs)	APPENDIX E	PETITIONERS U.S.C.O.A. "MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION" ORIGINALLY FILED 10-11-22. DENIED 5-9-23
(86pgs)+3	APPENDIX F	IN LIGHT OF "UNPRECEDENTED" SITUATION, AND ALLIGATIONS OF HIGH CRIMES AND MISDEMEANORS BY MR PEEPLES BY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE'S AND ESOTERIC COVER-UP: IN "APPENDIX F" I OFFER W.D.N.Y. DOCKET SHEETS 182 sided PGS, EIGHT PAGES OF SENTENCING TRANSCRIPTS 7-27-18, MY PRO SE "DIRECT APPEAL" U.S.C.O.A. 18-2309-CR 16pgs AND "ADDENDUM" 18-2309-CR 8pgs, AND "EMERGENCY MANDAMUS U.S.C.O.A. 22-2469 9pgs. THIS DONE TO ABSOLUTELY REFUTE INTENTIONAL, MERRITLESS CLAIMS BY BOTH LOWER COURTS THAT MR. PEEPLES ISSUES ARENT CONSTITUTIONAL, AND THAT MR PEEPLES DID NOT FEROCIOUSLY RAISE ISSUES FROM 2017-PRESENT.

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 E 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 D 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**:

N/A

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 9th 2023.

☐ 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: MAY 9th 2023, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix E.

☐ 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).

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
① BECKER v MONTGOMERY 532 U.S. 757	(ALL PAGES)
151 S.CT 1801, 149 L ED 2ND - Supreme Ct. DEFINITION OF SIGNATURE	
② CALLAN v WILSON - EX PARTE WILSON 714 (ALL PAGES)	
U.S. 417, 425-26, 29 S.CT - RIGHT TO A GRAND JURY INDICTMENT	
③ BRIAN FRANK v NCS 2ND CIR 2004 U.S. DIST (ALL PAGES)	
LEXIS 20990 - SINCE INDICTMENT IS NOT SIGNED	
(NOT CLERKED IN MY CASE) NO PROOF IT WAS EVER DELIVERED/ENTERED	
STATUTES AND RULES	
① 28 U.S.C. § 2249 - NO CERT COPY OF INDICTMENT FILED: NOT CLERKED!	(28 U.S.C. 2255) (CANT BE)
② FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE - 103A, 401, 406, 702A-D, 901A, 902(1)A+B, 902(4)A+B, 902(11), 1002, AND 1005.	
③ F.R.C.P. - 3, 4, 5, 5.1, 6(C), 6(E)(1), 6(7) KNOWING VIOLATION, 6(7)(F), 7(C), 16(E), 16(C)(ii), AND F.R.C.P. 55 (CLERKS).	
④ PLAIN ERROR 52B, ⑤ 28 U.S.C. § 1691 TESTEE OF PROCESS, "NARA"	
CHAP 446 TITLE CHAP 21 § 3301 A-2, § 2116 B, § 2904 a-3, § 2905 A, AND CHAP 31 § 3101.	
OTHER	
18 U.S.C. § 2071 + 2076 (CLERKS) + (RECORDS) - EVEN ACCIDENTAL.	
"PRIMA FACIE" LATIN - ORDAN'S DEFINITION: AT FIRST SIGHT!	
SOMETHING THAT'S TRUE! UNLESS DISPROVED! ON ITS FACE!	
SUPREME COURT HEADNOTE § 681 - DEFECTIVE/NO COMPLAINT	
28 U.S.C. 535(B) "MUST REPORT POSSIBILITY"	

14TH EQUAL DUE PROCESS AND APPLICATION

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

- ① MY 1ST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO SPEECH! GAG ORDER
W.D.N.Y. "MOTION IN LIMINE" DOCUMENT #78 ^(APPENDIX "F" #10) 3-7-18.
I JUST WANTED TO TELL THE TRUTH! BY THE RECORD OF DOCKET!
- ② MY 4TH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO AFFIRMATION BY PROBABLE CAUSE
FROM IMPARTIAL MAGISTRATE BEFORE WARRANT. MY ACTUAL^{"A"}
AFFIDAVIT OF CRIMINAL COMPLAINT IS "VOID" OF SIGNATURE!
- ③ MY 5TH AND 6TH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO EQUAL DUE PROCESS
TO HAVE AN IMPARTIALLY ELECTED GROUP OF CITIZEN
PEERS AFFIRM/ATTEST POLLING VOTE TO "TRUE BILL" AND
DELIVER THAT TRUE BILL TO JUDGE/CLERK IN "OPEN
COURT." TRANSPARENCY AND TESTEE OF PROCESS.
- ④ GERSTEIN Rule 420 U.S. 113-14, MC LAUGHLIN Rule
500 U.S. 44, 56. I WAS ARRESTED "TWICE" WITHOUT A
WARRANT ON SAME CHARGE IN SAME DISTRICT ON
2 DIFFERENT DAYS; WITH NO PRE-LIMINARY HEARING OR
OPPORTUNITY TO WAIVE ONE. "MUST" HAVE PRE-LIM IN 48 HRS.
- ⑤ GORDENELLO vs U.S. 357 U.S. 480, JABEN vs U.S.
381, 214. "THERE" "MUST" BE PROOF AFFIDAVIT WAS READ IN
LIGHT OF CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENTS. THE COMPLAINT "MUST"
BE MORE THAN A "COVER SHEET" ^{"FAXED"}; IT "MUST" CONTAIN A
"SWORN AFFIDAVIT," IT'S NOT SWORN IF NOT ATTESTED/AFFIRMED!

"PRIMA FACIE"

①

STATEMENT OF THE CASE - 11 PAGES

PETITIONER HEREBY LAYS STRONG U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL
"BILL OF RIGHTS" CLAIM OF USURPATION ARGUMENTS
AS TO WHY IT IS OF URGENT PUBLIC MATTER OF UN-
PRECEDENTED IMPORTANCE; THAT THIS HIGH COURT
OF THE LAND...

... RULE IN
IMMEDIATE DETERMINATION OF THIS MATTER

... IN THE U.S. 2ND CIRCUIT C.O.A.
(F.R.A.P. RULE 22/28 U.S.C. § 2853 (C)(2)). NOW FINAL!

NEVER BEFORE HAS OUR "BILL OF RIGHTS" BEEN SO OPENLY
AND DIRECTLY CONTRADICTED ON ONE ARREST AND
CONVICTION IN TOTAL ENCOMPASSMENT (52B). DONE
BY ABSOLUTE UNPRECEDENTED INCOMPETANCE
AND UNPRECEDENTED NEGLECT OF MR. PEEPLES
GUARANTEED (18 U.S.C. § 242) "CIVIL RIGHTS" TO
"DUE PROCESS" (6TH + 14TH AMEND) BY TRANSPARENCY
OF THE LOWER COURTS. YOU HAVE TO SHOW THE PUBLIC ^{NOT} VERBALLY!
THE UNPRECEDENTED CRIMINAL ILLEGAL CAPTURE
AND GAIN OF ILLEGAL JURISDICTION OVER MR.
PEEPLES BODY; VIOLATED (52B) THE "BILL OF RIGHTS"
(FRANK V NCS 2ND 2004 LEXIS 20990) - SINCE INDICTMENT NOT SIGNED; NO PROOF!

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

(4th, 5th, & 6th), F.R.C.P. RULES (3, 4, 4.1, 5, 5.1, 6, 7 etc.), AND EVERYONE'S (THE PUBLICS) 14th AMENDMENT. THIS UNPRECEDENTED CONTRAVENTION OF THE "BILL OF RIGHTS" HAS NEVER HAPPENED IN MODERN JUDICIAL HISTORY, BECAUSE IT LEGALLY CAN'T! "PRIMA*FACIE" IF ANY MEMBER OF THIS COURT DISAGREES, OR SAYS UNDER BREATH, "IT CAN'T BE THAT BAD". I RESPECTFULLY CHALLENGE YOU TO LOOK AND FIND ONE CASE ALIKE STATE OR FEDERAL; WHERE THE "ACTUAL" SWORN AFFIDAVIT OF PROBABLE CAUSE (4th) OF DOCKET, AND THE "ACTUAL" TRUE BILL OF INDICTMENT OF DOCKET... HAVE NO SIGNATURES, OF ANYONE IMPARTIAL AND NO TESTEE OF PROCESS (28 U.S.C. § 1691) ATTESTMENT OR AFFIRMATION BY, NAME, STAMP, OR SEAL OF CLERK OF BUSINESS FOR THE U.S.A. UNBELIEVABLE! IF MY TRUE BILL OF INDICTMENT WAS POLLED IN (602) SECRECY, VOTED, AND DELIVERED (F.R.C.P. 6(f)(F)) TO A U.S. JUDGE IN "OPEN COURT", AS MOST DEFINATELY REQUIRED; THEN A U.S. CLERK WOULD HAVE NO DOUBT RECEIVED IT BY LAW (F.R.C.P. Rule 55/18 U.S.C. § 2071 + § 2076) (CALLAN v WILSON S.Ct U.S. 417 425-26, 29) "Right to 6th Indictment".

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

" * * * "
EVEN A COPY WOULD HAVE; NO DOUBT HAD TO HAVE
VERIFICATION OF PROCESS (F.R.E. 1005). NOT ELECTRONIC-
ALLY FILED BY THE PROSECUTING A.U.S.A. MELISSA
M. MEETZE-MARANGOLA ON 2-23-17 ALONE, AND ILLEGALLY
ENTERED BY CLERK "TF" ON 2-24-17, WITH NO ATTESTA-
TION SHE REALLY RECEIVED IT; BECAUSE IT LOOKS
JUST LIKE THE ILLEGAL ONE ENTERED THE DAY BEFORE
BY THE A.U.S.A. (see ^{APPENDIX "A" EXHIBIT GROUP #3} CASE DOCKET SHEET #7). THAT PRAC-
TICE IS NOT ROUTINE (F.R.E. 406) FOR ANY COURT,
STATE OR FEDERAL, AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL!
BY ALL THE POWER VESTED IN YOUR ROBES OF OATH
TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, PLEASE GO TO THE EX-
HIBITS (APPENDIX "A") AND PERSONALLY VIEW W.D.N.Y.
"SWORN AFFIDAVIT DULY SWORN BY AGENT OF PROBABLE
CAUSE", AND "TRUE BILL OF INDICTMENT" (PRIMA FACIE).
NOW THAT YOU HAVE, AND AMERICA ALONG WITH THE
WORLD BODY, WHO'S CITIZENS MAY ONE DAY AFFORD THE
PROTECTIONS OF OUR "BILL OF RIGHTS" (PUBLIC):
IN ACCORDANCE WITH OUR 14th AMENDMENT EQUAL
RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS UNDER THE LAW. CAN YOU

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

LOCATE ONE, JUST ONE, SIGNATURE, NAME, OR TESTEE OF PROCESS (§1691) BY ANYONE OTHER THAN A U.S. DEPT OF JUSTICE EMPLOYEE (A.U.S.A./FBI AGENT) PRIMA FACIE?

CAN YOU LOCATE A TRUE SIGNATURE (F.R.E. 103, 401, 406, 901A, 902(4)(A), 1002, OR 1005) OF "AFFIRMATION" OF PROBABLE CAUSE (4*) UPON THE "JURAT" AT THE CONCLUSION OF "DULY SWORN DECLARATION BY THE AFFIANT" PRIMA FACIE? UNBELIEVABLE! (U.S. v GERHART 538 F2ND 807)

CAN YOU LOCATE ANY IMPARTIALLY ELECTED CITIZEN PEER (5*, 6*, 14*) OF THE GRAND JURY BY NAME, SIGNATURE, SIGNATURE LINE, STAMP, OR SEAL (§1691) CHARGED WITH THE CONSTITUTIONAL DUTY (5* 6* 14*) OF RECORDING POLLING VOTE TO YEA OR NAY TRUE BILL, AND DELIVERING (6(7)(F)), (6(C)) THAT "TRUE RECORD" TO A MAGISTRATE JUDGE BEHIND A U.S. CLERK IN "OPEN COURT"? UNBELIEVABLE! PRIMA FACIE.

THAT TRUE BILL WAS TO BE LAWFULLY (52B) DELIVERED IN "OPEN COURT" TO A U.S. CLERK FOR BUSINESS SEATED BEFORE A U.S. JUDGE OF BUSINESS. "I DONT DESERVE MY LIFE, LIBERTY, AND PROPERTY SNATCHED; BY A TYPED PAPER FROM A, A.U.S.A."

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

"RESPECTFULLY! THAT IS THE ROUTINE (F.R.E. '406).
 NOT ELECTRONICALLY FILED BY A.U.S.A. MELISSA M.
 MEETZ-MARANGOLA (MORE ON HER POSSIBLE INTENTIONAL CRIMES
 AND COVER-UP LATER) AS JUDGE, JURY, AND EXECUTIONER.
 NOW WAS THERE SOME SORT OF ERROR OR FOUL PLAY
 THAT PREVENTED MR. PEEPLES FROM OBTAINING THE
 "TRANSPARENCY" BY (14th EQUAL) ATTESTMENT/AFFIRMATION
 OF THOSE TWO BENCH MARK BILL OF RIGHTS DOCUMENTS
 FOR LAWFUL CERT COPIES (F.R.C.P. 55, F.R.E. '1005, 18 U.S.C. '2071+'2076)
 ... POSSIBLY. OR WAS IT MALICIOUS, INTENTIONAL, AND
 WILLFUL (18 U.S.C. '242) TO COVER-UP OBVIOUS FRAUD,
 AND THE POSSIBILITY: THEY MIGHT NOT EXIST?
 WELL I SUGGEST USING THIS TEST AS A LOGICAL
 BAROMETER. HOW ABOUT FOR 5 YEARS MR. PEEPLES
 HAS CRIED OUT, CITING APPROPRIATE LAW AND U.S.
 CONSTITUTION IN EVERY MOTION TO W.D.N.Y. AND
 U.S. COURT OF APPEALS: IN/AT SENTENCING (APPENDIX F),
 MANDAMUS (APPENDIX F/U.S.C.D.A. case #18-1369), Pro Se Direct Appeal
 (APPENDIX F), AND SEVERAL U.S. C.O.A. JUDICIAL COMPLAINTS
 (FRANK P. GERACI AND OTHERS) AND U.S. ATTY COMPLAINTS.
 THESE PUBLIC SERVANTS COVERED-UP FOR EACH OTHER ILLEGALLY.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

NOT ONE OF THESE LOWER COURTS HAS DEMANDED "TRANSPARENCY"
 IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE "BILL OF RIGHTS" (4th, 5th, 6th) AND CIVIL
 RIGHTS OF MR. PEEPLES, BECAUSE OF THE COLOR OF HIS SKIN
 (18 U.S.C. § 242). THERE IS REALLY NO NEED TO GET INTO THE
 ENTIRE ILLEGAL CASE IN DEPTH, BECAUSE Juxtaposition TO
 THE UNSTAMPED, UNSEALED, UNATTESTED, UNAFFIRMED, UN
 SIGNED, CONSTITUTIONALLY (4th, 5th, 6th, 14th) REQUIRED DOCS...
 THERE CAN NEVER LEGALLY BE A "TRUE BILL" OR CONTRACT. IT'S
 NOT U.S.A. vs PEEPLES, IT'S A. U.S.A. MARANGOLA, AND
 FBI AGENT SETH FLEITMAN vs PEEPLES (PRIMA FACIE).
 WHO REPRESENTS U.S.A. ON MY "NO 67 Forfeiture" TRUE BILL? NO STAMP
 NO CLERK, NO SEAL
 THE U.S.A. HAS VERY STRICT LAWS FOR U.S. CLERKS, IN
 FACT; THEY ARE ALWAYS UNDER OATH (F.R.C.P. 55) PER THE
 "ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES OF U.S. COURTS". CLERKS ARE
 BY "CRIMINAL STATUTE" (18 U.S.C. § 2071 + § 2076) SUBJECTED TO
 FINES AND OR IMPRISONMENT IF SOMETHING LIKE THIS
 WERE TO EVER HAPPEN, EVEN IF ACCIDENTAL. THAT'S WHAT'S
 PUZZLING ABOUT MY CASE! IT'S UNPRECEDENTED! MY
 BOGUS DOCUMENTS HAD TO GO THROUGH SO MANY HANDS
 OF CHECK AND BALANCE, TOO MANY TRUSTED OATH TAKERS.
 COVER-UP FOR WHITE CLERKS, JUDICIALLY LYNCH BLACK MAN.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

FOR SOME PUBLIC SERVANT TO NOT SAY "HOLD UP" THIS IS WRONG AND "UNPRECEDENTED", MR PEEPLES IS RIGHT! THE U.S.A. DOES NOT CONDUCT LAWFUL BUSINESS THIS WAY, LET'S FIX THIS, THEIR NOT VALID! THE 2nd CIRCUITS JOB! WHAT ABOUT (NARA) NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS WHO "MUST" FILE AND RECORD THESE SAME DOCUMENTS (TRUE BILL & SWORN AFFIDAVIT) IN WASHINGTON D.C.. IT WOULD NO DOUBT BE A DIRECT INTENTIONAL UNPRECEDENTED VIOLATION FOR ANY "SWORN" ARCHIVIST TO DO SO (TITLE 44 CHAPT 21 § 3301(A)(2), § 2116(B), § 2904 (b)(3), § 2905(A), CHAPT 31 § 3101), BECAUSE THEIR BLANK OF U.S.A. MARKINGS FROM BUSINESS CLERK OF U.S.A.. THEY HAVE NO STAMP OR SEAL! THEY COULD BE FRAUDS! THEY CANT TRACE BACK TO A SPECIFIC CLERK. THE PUBLIC (MEDIA/HISTORIANS) HAVE THE RIGHT TO FOIA THE "NARA". WHAT, IS THE NARA ARCHIVIST GOING TO RELEASE UNATTESTED/UNAFFIRMED/UNSEALED/UNSTAMPED DOCUMENTS TO THE MEDIA, OR AN HISTORIAN? (PUBLIC) UNFORTUNATELY IT'S 6yrs TOO LATE TO PULL A RABBIT OUT OF A HAT! CIVIL LIBERTIES, DUE PROCESS, EXCULPATORY & BRADY RULE, DISCOVERY RULES (FRCP 16, 16(e)(ii), AND PROSECUTORIAL

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

MISCONDUCT MAKE ANY EFFORT TOO LATE. UNFORTUNATELY,
THE DOCUMENTS ARE AUTHENTICATION
LACKING INVOLVING SUBSTANTIAL RIGHTS
BY PRIMA FACIE.

POSSIBLE HIGH CRIMES AND MISDEMEANORS BY U.S.
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

TO AVOID REDUNDANCY BECAUSE YOUR TIME IS PRE-
CIOUS, I ASK YOU TO PLEASE REVIEW MY "RESPONSE
TO GOVERNMENT'S ANSWER (28 U.S.C. § 2255 / APPENDIX "C")
EVERYTHING I ALLEDGE AND WHY I BELIEVE IT'S AGAINST
RULES OF LAW, UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND JURISDICTIONLESS
IS IN THERE. BASICALLY MY THEORY IS THIS WAS AN
ESOTERIC COVER-UP FROM THE BEGINING TO COVER-UP
THE UNPRECEDENTED OBVIOUS CRIME OF TWO ROUGE
AGENTS BEING ILLEGALLY DISPATCHED 173 MILES
WITH NO LEGAL DOCUMENTS WALK INTO A PRIVATE JAIL
(SOMETHING JOE BIDEN CAN'T DO) AND WALK OUT WITH A BOOKED
STATE DETAINEE CHARGED WITH NYS PENAL CODE 160.05
3RD DEGREE ROBBERY; AGENTS GET BACK TO W.D.N.Y
DRAFT OBVIOUS FRAUDULENT WARRANT 5½ HRS LATER, ^{WRONG} CITY (173mi)
ON A BLANK JURAT. UNBELIEVEABLE!

* PLEASE USE "302" OF JESSIE (APPENDIX "A" GROUP #2) ⑨
AND GRAND JURY MINUTES (APPENDIX "A" GROUP #3) WHEN REVIEWING
THIS PAGE + NEXT STATEMENT OF THE CASE

IT'S WHY A.U.S.A. MELISSA M. MEETZ-MARANGOLA TIPPED HER CONSPIRACY HAND
WHEN SHE INSTRUCTED A NON-FEDERAL EMPLOYEE NAMED "ANDREW"
JESSIE (NAME STATED ON RECORD AT GJ) TO BE THE ONLY WITNESS
TO TESTIFY AT MY GRAND JURY (SUPPOSEDLY IN FRONT OF GJ / I BELIEVE DIFF).
PLEASE GO TO APPENDIX "A" (GROUP EXHIBITS #2(1)) YOU FIND A TYPED
"302" BY A JESSIE ANDREW JOSEPH (WHY FLIP NAME). THIS WAS
TO HAVE HER (AUSA MARANGOLA) CO/CONSPIRATOR BE HER STAR WITNESS
AT A "SHAM" GRAND JURY HEARING. WHAT A.U.S.A. MARANGOLA DID NOT
EXPECT ME TO PICK UP ON, WAS THAT THIS WAS THE SAME ROUGE
AGENT ON "302" (DIFF NAME) WHO UNPRECEDENTEDLY OBVIOUSLY ILLEGALLY
TRAVELED WITH SA FIORITO 173 miles to "KIDNAP" MR PEEPLES WITH NO
DOCUMENTS (A STATE PRISONER). ON THAT "302" JESSIE DESCRIBES THEM/
THEM^{self} AS "WRITER" WHO WAS OTHER AGENT. AH, NICE TRICK, BUT
UNSCRAMBLED NOW! ANDREW JESSIE IS JESSIE A. JOSEPH, AND "WRITER".
OBVIOUSLY AND INTENTIONALLY, AT ALLEGED GJ TESTIMONY OF
JESSIE! WHY DOES A.U.S.A. MARANGOLA IN OBVIOUS COHESION WITH
JESSIE, NOT MENTION ANYTHING ABOUT THE ARREST THAT JESSIE
DROVE 173 miles WITH FIORITO TO MAKE; HMMM. ON PG 7 OF GJM
LINE 20 (APPENDIX "A" EXHIBIT GROUP #3) THEY MAKE IT VERY OBVIOUS
AS "MARANGOLA" QUESTIONS JESSIE SAYING "DID MR. PEEPLES
SAY ANYTHING TO LAW ENFORCEMENT UPON HIS ARREST?"

*POSSIBLY HELD OUTSIDE PRESENCE OF JURY AND OR ⑩
Foreperson MAJOR FRAUD POSSIBLE, COULD BE WHY IT WAS
NEVER DELIVERED TO JUDGE AND HAS NO Foreperson SIGNATURE.
STATEMENT OF THE CASE

TO LAW ENFORCEMENT! HOW ABOUT SAYING TO YOU JASSIE!
WHY GO THROUGH ENTIRE GJ HEARING AND NOT MENTION ANYTHING ABOUT
INITIAL + 2ND WARRANTLESS ARREST WITH NO DOCUMENTS 173 miles AWAY
IN BINGHAMTON NY BY JASSIE? MMMM... Please GO TO PG 8 OF GJM
Lines 14-17. THIS IS ONE OF THE REASONS WHY MY GUT STREET SENSE
*** SCREAMS FRAUD ETC... BY A.U.S.A. MELISSA M. MEETZ MARANGOLA. EVERYONE
WAS NOT SHAKING THEIR HEAD AT "SAME TIME", AS SHE RESTED TESTI-
MONY. NOT EVEN CLOSE! IT'S AN AMATURE ATTEMPT TO DEFLECT. A CHEAP
ATTEMPT AT A "DISCLAIMER". WHY NOT DEFER TO THE NAMELESS, SIG-
NATURE LESS Foreperson (ONCE BY A.U.S.A. / ONCE BY STENOGRAPHER)
ONLY TYPED ON ENTIRE CASE DOCKET? GRAND JURIES
DO NOT END LIKE THAT! THAT'S NOT ROUTINE (406)! TO IMMEDIATELY SKIP
TO CERTIFICATION BY STENOGRAPHER. KEEP IN MIND JUSTICES MY
ILLEGALLY DELAYED (GERSTEIN RULE 5(C)(3)(A) - 5(C)(3)(C) - 5.1(a)) PRE-LIMINARY HEARING WAS
ON 2-28-17 IN 2 BUSINESS DAYS; WHERE THE UNPRECEDENTED
100% UNCONSTITUTIONAL KIDNAPPING WITHOUT ANY DOCUMENTS AND FORGERY
OF DOCUMENTS 173 miles BACK IN W.D.N.Y., AND ACTIONS OF
JASSIE, FIORITO, AND BINGHAMTON JAIL EMPLOYEES WHO SUPPOSEDLY
UNPRECEDENTEDLY RELEASED MY BODY WITH NOTHING AND REFUSED (FOI).
BOTH A.U.S.A. AND JASSIE HAD MOTIVE TO STOP IT!
EGG UNSCRAMBLED SIR!
28 U.S.C. 535(B)

*PLEASE USE ALL OF (APPENDIX A GROUP #2)
WHEN REVIEWING THIS PAGE.

11

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

LASTLY JUSTICES; THE LOWER COURTS HAVE MAINTAINED AN
ERRONIOUS, MERITLESS, UNPRECEDENTED^{POSITION} IN REGARDS TO A
"COVER PAGE" BEING "BILL OF RIGHTS" ACCEPTABLE, AS "THE ONLY" SIG-
NATURE "OF ANYONE" ON "SWORN AFFIDAVIT" AND "TRUE BILL".
IF THE RECORD AND ACTUAL EVIDENCE BY TRANSPARENCY
SUPPORTED THIS, UNPRECEDENTED FAR OUT CLAIM; THEN
A VALID LEGAL ARGUMENT BY THE SUPREME COURT; AS TO ACC-
EPT AN UNPRECEDENTED SITUATION, AS TO A "COVER PAGE",
SWORN BY A JUDGE, & AGENT LIVE IN COURT, AFTER
READING OF ACTUAL AFFIDAVIT WITH A "BLANK JURAT" SHOULD
TAKE PLACE. AGENT NOT LEGALLY UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY ON COVER PAGE. ★
HOWEVER, NEWS FLASH! IT'S A FAX 100%! SOME KIND OF TELEPHONIC
TRANSMISSION WITH NO ORIGINAL OR COPY OF ORIGINAL ON RECORD!
AS COURT/BOARD CERTIFIED FORENSIC DOCUMENT EXAMINER (FRE 702),
MS. JOAN M. WINKELMAN PUT IT IN HER NOTARIZED, ATTESTED,
AFFIRMED (SIGNED) SWORN AFFIDAVIT: "CONTAINING NO
INK SIGNATURES". * PLEASE TAKE NOTICE! ALL FORENSIC DOC
EXAMINERS NEED AN ORIGINAL OR AT LEAST A COPY
OF THE ORIGINAL TO FACTUALLY DETERMINE ANYTHING!
THE FACT THAT THEY DONT HAVE ONE OF RECORD ONLY A
VERY SUSPICIOUS FAX, SPEAKS VOLUMES!

UNDER S.C.T. Rule

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION - 7p65

①


THE TWO LOWER COURTS HAVE DEPARTED SO FAR FROM THE ACCEPTED AND USUAL (^{FRE}406) COURSE OF U.S.A. BUSINESS AND JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS (STATE OR FEDERAL) WITH THE "BACKSTOP HIGHER COURT" (2ND CIR) REFUSING TO EDIT LOWER COURT (W.N.D.Y.), TO SHOW CONSTITUTIONAL TRANSPARENCY: THEREFOR IN DE-FACTO SANTIONING SUCH AN UNPRECEDENTED DEPARTURE. THE FACTUAL PRIMA FACIE * USURPATION BY EVIDENCE BEFORE YOU: IS A YELL FROM THE PUBLIC, NOT A CALL! THERE IS NO COMPARABLE CASE IN MODERN U.S. HISTORY (240 yrs); WHERE BOTH U.S.A. "BILL OF RIGHTS" DOCUMENTS; RELINGUISH IMPARTIALITY AND TRANSPARENCY TO THE DEPT OF JUSTICE ALONE, WITH ABSOLUTELY NO VERIFICATION OF JUDGE, GRAND JURY MEMBER, U.S.A. CLERK OF BUSINESS BY NAME, STAMP, OR SEAL (^{FED RULES OF EVIDENCE} 901, 902(4)(A), 902(1)(A)(B)) OF THE CHARGING COURT. THE LACK OF TRANSPARENCY USUALLY IS A PRETEXT TO FRAUD. YOU CANT CERTIFY (28 U.S.C. § 2249) A BLANK. A 28 U.S.C. § 2255 HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH GUILT OR INNOCENSE. I LEVIED IT ON THE LAWFUL GROUNDS IT STIPULATES; THAT I AM BEING USURPED WITHOUT ANY (901(A), 902(1)(A)-(B), 902(4)(A)) LAWFUL "BILL OF RIGHTS Documents", IN (52B) PLAIN ERROR VIOLATION OF THE

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

UNITED STATES LAWS OF THE LAND UNPRECEDENTEDLY!
 FORMER U.S. CHIEF JUDGE GERACI JR., WILLFULLY AND INTENTIONALLY (18 U.S.C. § 242) IGNORED AN UNPRECEDENTED
 "BLANK JURAT" WITH VERY SUSPICIOUS "COVER ^{FAXED} PAGE" NOT
 EVEN ATTEMPTING A HEARING OR ATTEMPT TO LOCATE ORIGINAL.
 JUDGE GERACI'S IGNORANCE OF THE FBI'S UNPRECEDENTED
 ILLEGAL TRAVEL 173 miles INTO "DISTANT DISTRICT" WITHOUT
 ANYTHING LAWFUL, THE ENTRY INTO A PRIVATE LOCK-UP, AND
 SUBSEQUENT KIDNAPPING OF A STATE BOOKED PRISONER.
 THE OBVIOUS FRAUDULENT WARRANT DRAFTED 5½ HOURS
 AFTER A 2ND WARRANTLESS ARREST WITH NO OFFER OF PRE-
 LIMINARY AFFORDED. SWABBING ALL OF THAT! I HAD NO RULE 5!
 JUDGE GERACI'S SELF ABJURING EXPLANATION OF RULE
 3 IS PREPOSTEROUS! KNOWING IT'S UNPRECEDENTED! ALSO
 THE 2ND CIRCUITS COVER-UP OF SAME! THERE IS NO BILL
 OF RIGHTS (4TH) AMENDMENT GUARANTEES AFFIRMATION OF "SWORN
 AFFIDAVIT" BEFORE WARRANT. IT'S BLANK JURAT IS UNPRECEDENTED!
 A SEPARATE "COVER SHEET" NOT "DULY SWORN" TELEPHONIC FAX
 SUSPICIOUS PIECE OF PAPER, WITH THE ABILITY TO BE
 INCORPORATED LATER: COMES NOWHERE CLOSE TO

JUSTICES RESPECTFULLY; YOU HAVE A MAJOR PROBLEM ON YOUR WATCH~~ES~~. IN ^{***}PRIMA FACIE^{***} UNPRECEDENTED VIOLATION OF THE "BILL OF RIGHTS" AND "DUE PROCESS", I HAVE BEEN USURPED 6 YEARS+. THIS CASE REEKS OF SPOILED OATH BREAKERS, AND COVER UP. I ^{WE PUBLIC} EXPECT A STRONG REBUKE FROM THIS COURT ON BEHALF OF ME + AMERICA. THE MALICE DENIAL OF TRANSPARENCY IS ABORANT. PLEASE IMMEDIATELY, ORDER MY RELEASE. I HAVE BEEN THREATENED FOR 6 YRS! NOT AFRAID! I'VE SAVED THE BEST FOR LAST. PLEASE GO TO 2pg "FINAL EXHIBIT" NOW; THE FAXED WARRANT AND COVER SHEET. EGG UNSCRAMBLED!

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted, *ProSe'*

Date:  2023
May 30th

IF I DID NOT SIGN
HERE WOULD IT STILL
BE ACCEPTED? NO LIFE
OR LIBERTY INVOLVED.

GOOD? UH? U