

No. 23-5160

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

JUN 9 2023

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Scott E. Houston — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

State of Louisiana — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Scott E. Houston #602008
(Your Name)

P.O. Box 788
(Address)

Jackson, Louisiana 70748
(City, State, Zip Code)

N/A
(Phone Number)

ORIGINAL

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- (1) Whether the district Court Complied with the Louisiana Supreme Court order?

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

State v. Godejohn, 425 So. 2d 750 (La. 1983)

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

STATUTES AND RULES

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☐ is unpublished.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☐ is unpublished.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**:

^{Order}
The ~~opinion~~ of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

- ☒ reported at Louisiana Supreme Court; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

^{Judgement}
The ~~opinion~~ of the First Judicial District court appears at Appendix B to the petition and is

- ☒ reported at First Judicial District Court; 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☐ is unpublished.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 March 28, 2023. 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

Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution as
well as Article 1; Section 2 of the Louisiana Constitution of
1974.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On November 1, 2022, the Louisiana Supreme Court sent a order in docket# 2022-KH-01403 to the First Judicial District Court.

On January 26, 2023, the First Judicial District Court issued their judgement in docket# 314,868 and then sent documents to the Louisiana Supreme Court to show proof of compliance.

The movant then filed a Motion To Enforce arguing that the First Judicial District Court failed to comply with such order.

On March 28, 2023, the Louisiana Supreme Court had denied movant's Motion To Enforce as moot and stating that the First Judicial District Court has acted.

Reasons For Granting The Petition

The Louisiana Supreme Court abuse their discretion in denying petitioner's Motion To Enforce as moot in violation of his due process under the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution as well as Article 1; Section 2 of the La. Constitution of 1874. The petitioner record contained in docket# 314, 868 is vague and ambiguous and On November 1, 2022 the Louisiana Supreme Court had ordered for corrections. See Appendix A. On January 26, 2023, the First Judicial District Court sent their judgment pertaining to the order but avoided parts of the substance in the order and then omit documents from petitioner's record before transmitting the documents to the Louisiana Supreme Court to show proof of compliance. See Appendix B. However, the First Judicial District Court failed to comply with the Louisiana Supreme Court order by failing to perform their ministerial duties that was lawfully required of them but instead using unlawful tactics to try to undermine the legal system in a way that's favourable to them while violating the petitioner's constitutional rights and prohibiting the petitioner from getting his criminal record corrected. This case shows a prime example of unfair bias and prejudice towards the petitioner by the First Judicial District Court. Now despite the corrupt practice from the First Judicial District Court the order that was sent by the Louisiana Supreme Court clearly states;

To the extent the district court minutes and commitment order are inconsistent with the relevant transcripts (e.g., May 15, 2014 and July 2, 2014) regarding applicant's bench trial, convictions, and sentences, the district court is ordered to correct them. See *State v. Godejohn*, 425 So.2d 750 (La. 1983).

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott E. Houston

Date: June 7th, 2023