

23-5561

NO.

FILED

JUL 08 2023

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

In the Supreme Court of the United States

In re Reginald L. Shumper, Petitioner

Petition for writ of Extraordinary Relief
Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1651(a) and 2241
Habeas Corpus

Pro Se Representation
Reginald L. Shumper
45833-044

U.S.P. Terre Haute
P.O. Box 33

Terre Haute, Indiana
47808

Questions Presented for Review

1.) Was the District Court and the Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit a part of a cover-up "of Misconduct" that deprive it's victim of the means to challenge unlawful conduct in court? [See Appendix One and Three]

* Appendix one is Petitioner being denied Access to the information that is needed from the Freedom of Information Act - "to present his claim", against "the defendants".

- Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a (b)(2) of the Privacy Act, - Represent Congressional Mandate that the Privacy Act "NOT" be used as a barrier to FOIA access.

List of Parties in Court Below

1.) Reginald L. Shumperdt, [petitioner]
45833-044

U.S.P. Terre Haute

P.O. Box 33

Terre Haute, Indiana 47803

2.) United States Magistrate Judge
Abbie S. Crites Leoni, [Respondent]

555 Independence

Cape Girardeau, Missouri 63703

3.) Keith D. Sorrell, [Respondent]

Office of U.S. Attorney
555 Independence

Room 3000

Cape Girardeau, Missouri 63703

Table of Contents

	Page No.
1. Questions Presented for Review.....	2
2. Relief Sought	3
3. Unavailability of Relief in other courts.....	3
4. Unsirability of Any other form of Relief.....	3
5. List of Parties in Court Below.....	4
6. Table of Authorities Cited	6
7. Jurisdictional Statement	7
8. Citations of Lower Court decisions.....	7
9. Controlling Provisions, Statutes and Regulations	7-10
10. Statement of the case and Governing facts	10-11
11. <u>Argument</u>	
[I] On May 19, 2016 an indictment was returned in open court. This indictment was initiated on false inaccurate information!	
	12

[II] On May 23, 2016, petitioner was taken to
inlaco Texas "illegally detained" under federal
Rules of Criminal Procedure [Rule 5a Initial
Appearance]. Petitioner was not Magisterated by
the Commissioner in inlaco Texas 12

[III] the "fruits of invasions of Constitutional
Rights" is inter established in Any other court
or Federal agencies 10

Table of Authorities Cited

(1) IN Re John Bonner, On Petition for writ
of Habeas Corpus... 38 L. Ed. 149, 151 U.S. 242
Attached to Petition writ, Hereto 10

(2) IN Re. Grand Jury Investigation, Joseph B.
Sturgis, 412 F. Supp. 943; 1976 U.S. Dist. Lexis 15328;
1 Fed. R. Evid. Serv. (Callaghan) 1139 103

(3) Noto G. Ordeneillo V. United States, 357
U.S. 480; 2 L. Ed. 2d. 1503; 78 S. Ct. 1245 49

(4) Zachary Lee Steward V. Karl Wagner, Moff
Selby 836 F.3d. 978; 2016 U.S. App. Lexis
16642 NO. 15-2394 63

Jurisdictional Statement

This Court has jurisdiction to issue the Requested writ under 28 U.S.C. 1651(a) and Supreme Court Rule 20; 28 U.S.C. 2241

Citation of Lower Court Decisions

The decisions of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia District are set out in the written orders attached to this petition on pages 90-92 of the Appendix, as noted above. [Appendix Three]

Controlling Provisions, Statutes and Regulations

The Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides:

"No Person shall be ... deprive of Life, Liberty or property without due Process of Law; NOR shall private property be Taken for Public Use, without Just Compensation".

Section 552a (i)(3) of Title 5 of the United States Code ^{provides} ~~provides~~ :

" Any person who knowingly and willfully Requests or obtains any Record concerning an individual from an Agency under false Pretense shall be guilty of a Misdemeanor and fined Not More than \$ 5,000.00 "

Section 5 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure provides:

" a person who is arrested for an offense must be taken before a United States Commissioner immediately and informed of his rights, and a preliminary examination to determine whether probable cause exists to believe that an offense has been committed and that he committed it must be held at that time or promptly thereafter.

Section 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure provides:

"That an arrest warrant shall be issued only upon a written and sworn complaint which sets forth the essential facts constituting the offense charged, and shows that there is probable cause to believe that such an offense has been committed and that the defendant has committed it, must be read in light of the constitutional requirements they implement".

Section 4 of Title 18 of the United States Code provides:

"Whoever, having knowledge of the actual commission of a felony cognizable by a court of the United States, conceals and does not as soon as possible make known the same to some judge or other person in civil or military authority under the United States, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both."

Section (B)(6) of Canon 3: A Judge should perform the duties of the office fairly, impartially and diligently.

(B) Administrative Responsibilities

(6) A Judge should take appropriate action upon receipt of reliable information indicating the likelihood that a Judge's conduct contravened this Code, that a judicial employee's conduct contravened the Code of Conduct for judicial employees or that a lawyer violated applicable rules of professional conduct.

Statement of the Case and Governing Facts

I. Fruits of Invasion of Constitutional Rights
Courts which sit under the federal Constitution cannot and will not be made party to lawless invasions of the constitutional rights of citizens by permitting unhindered governmental use of the fruits of such invasions. Appendix Three

Statement of the Case and Governing Facts

II. Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure

Title II. Preliminary Proceedings

Rule 5. Initial Appearance

Section (C) Place of Initial Appearance; Transfer to Another District.

(2) If the defendant was arrested in a district other than where the offense was allegedly committed, the initial appearance must be: "(A) IN the district of arrest; in Laco, Texas."

28 U.S.C 636 Magistrate Judge Abbi. Crist-leoni failed to Apply Rules of the Judicial Council of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims Governing Complaints of Judicial Misconduct and Disability.

(i) She failed to notify authorities and that she took an affirmative step to conceal the crime.

In furtherance, failed to Advise the petitioner of Rule 20; that a Judge had engaged in conduct prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the court. See Criminal complaint that was planned, prepared to be

presided by Judge Stephen M. Limbaugh Jr.
by a Judicial employee. See Appendix one
pgs 26-31

Argument

I. On May 19, 2016 a indictment was
Returned in open court on 5/19/2016.
This indictment was initiated on
false inaccurate information established
under 5 U.S.C.S 552a(i)(3) False Pretense.

II. On May 23 2016 petitioner was taken
to ~~inlaco~~ Texas "illegally detained" under
Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure - Rule
5a Initial Appearance. Petitioner was
"NOT" Magistrated by the Commissioner
in ~~inlaco~~, Texas.

III. The "fruit of invasion of Constitutional
Rights" is well established in Any other
court or federal Agencies. See Appendix
one.

Petitioner file with this court a Petition for
Extraordinary writ because no other court
can grant the relief sought. See Appendix
three.

Conclusion

Petitioner, Reginald L. Shumper, comes now to file with this court a Petition for Extraordinary Relief in the nature of a Writ of Habeas Corpus asking for Release from Confinement.

For the reasons stated, Petitioner prays that this court grant the requested writ of Prohibition or Mandamus [Extraordinary writ] and direct the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Southeastern Division District of Missouri, Cape Girardeau, to dismiss the action filed in that court against petitioner, with prejudice, immediately and without condition.

Respectfully Submitted on this 14 day of
August 2023

Shumper, Reginald L.
45933-044

Prose Representation
Reginald L. Shumper
45833-044
U.S.P. Terre Haute
P.O. Box 33
Terre Haute, Indiana
47808

Certified Mail Receipt, Tracking Number
U.S.P.S 7018-3090-0002-1468-0845

28 U.S.C. 1651(a)

* 2241 (Habeas corpus)

Rule 33 and 34.

"In re Reginald L. Shunper"

Rule 14 [form]

Rule 20. Petition for an Extraordinary Writ

Rule 20.4(a)

- To justify the granting of Any such writ, the Petitioner must show that the writ will be in Aid of the Court's Appellate Jurisdiction "that exceptional circumstances warrant the exercise of the Courts discretionary powers" and "that adequate relief can not be obtained in Any other form or from Any other Court".
[See Appendix three]

(i) Section 552 a (e)(4) of ~~Title~~ 5 of the United States Code provided; Subject to the Provision of Paragraph E(1) of this Subsection - [Publish] in the Federal Registry upon establishment of Revision a notice of the existence and character of the system of Records, which notice shall include... [agency Requirements]

(a) the denial of the "Supreme Court decision" which fail to "Review Petitioners documents presented" upon its Appellate Jurisdiction.

Rule 20.4(a) continued
gavental to a shield for the
government's "fruit of invasions
of Constitutional Rights." [see 141
S. Ct. 2550 No. 20-7546]

- This denial had a very strong adverse effect on Petitioner, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2242, "Reasons for not making Application to the district in which the Applicant is held. [due to the insurmountable barrier]

[ii] Had the Supreme Court reviewed the entirety of the Pleading, this issue would have been revealed. [the Misconduct] the Government uses the decision of the Supreme Court's Ruling through 5 U.S.C.S. 552a(e)(4) Subsection of the "Federal Registry", to cover-up their Misconduct. See, Reginald L. Shumper 141 S. Ct. 2550; 209 L. Ed. 568; 2021 U.S. Lexis 1922; 89 U.S.L.W. 3354; NO. 20-7546.

Relief Sought

Petitioner prays for a writ of Extraordinary Relief [habeas corpus] (prohibition or Mandamus) directed to United States District Court for the Eighth Circuit, Eastern District of Missouri, and to the Honorable Judge of the Southeastern District Court, Cape Girardeau Missouri, directing and commanding these respondents to immediately dismiss the action against petitioner and release petitioner from confinement.

Unavailability of Relief in Other Courts

No other court can grant the relief sought. As stated in the Opinion in 1:22-CV-03500 (D.C.) Petitioner faces an insurmountable barrier. [Judge Stephen N. Limbaugh Jr.]

Unsuitability of Any Other Form of Relief

No other form of relief will be sufficient to protect the rights of the petitioner, because "the fruits of invasion of constitutional rights" was well established in the beginning.