

No. 23-5961

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

FILED
OCT 23 2023
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

Martin Robinson -PETITIONER

vs.

Ohio Civil Rights Commission, et al. -RESPONDENT(S)

ORIGINAL

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

MARTIN ROBINSON, WRONGFULLY IMPRISONED #756785

Address:

TOCI

P.O. Box 80033

Toledo, OH 43608

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

Original Complaint in the Supreme Court of Ohio,

The right to an effective judicial process. Why are the courts ignoring my claims of wrongful imprisonment?

Why have the corrupt acts, lying, stealing, fraud of public officials been allowed to carry on for the past years, without any investigation. Is there a lack of accountability? Where are the people in the positions being paid to investigate these allegations? Why are the Justices that are being paid to be impartial, covering for public officials committing bad acts (criminal acts if by a civilian)?

Why does the S.C.O. intentionally mail inter-departmental decisions untimely in order to prevent the timely filing of a ten day reconsideration? Why is it ignored when inmates have repeatedly brought it to the courts' attention?

How do I get this court to act? Who is filling in for Justice Clarence Thomas while he is busy traveling lavishly all around the world? Is he the reason this court refuses to hear my cases?

In the Supreme Court of Ohio, all of the attorneys for respondents did not sign the answer which violated Civ.R.11, failing to sign the complaint as required by Civ.R.11.

Should the SCO have transferred jurisdiction to OH Court of Claims or U.S. District Court? Or simply granted the complaint? The SCO failed to hold a hearing prior to dismissal of the original action.

LIST OF PARTIES

[X] 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:

Charles K. Steele, Civ. Rights. Investigator; Comm., Lori Barreras, Chair; Comm., J. Rita McNeil Danish; Comm., William Patmon, III; Comm., Madhu Singh; Comm., Charlie Winburn; Comm. Angela Phelps-White, Exec. Director; OH Governor, Mike DeWine; OH Atty. Gen., Dave Yost; countless OH Asst. Atty. Gen.

RELATED CASES

See: Lexis® cases for “Martin Robinson;”; the post-conviction relief appeal and appeal for New Trial per ORC ANN. 2945.79, .80, .83, .831 to the ninth district OH court of appeals is not on Lexis®

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	4, 5
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....	6
CONCLUSION.....	7
PROOF OF SERVICE.....	8

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Original Complaint to SCO, 2023-0585, Robinson v. Ohio Civil Rights Comm., et al. 05/03/2023

APPENDIX B: Robinson v. Ohio Civ. Rights Comm.(missing et al.), 2023 Ohio Lexis 1355, 170 Ohio St. 3d 1487 on 07/12/2023

APPENDIX C: Reconsideration, Robinson v. Ohio Civ. Rights Comm'n (missing et al.), 2023-Ohio-3169, 2023 Ohio Lexis 1759 (September 12, 2023)

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
Depp v. Heard	3,4
State Ex Rel. Ctr. For Media & Democracy v. Off. Of Ag David Yost, 2023-Ohio-364 2/8/23	4

STATUTES AND RULES

OH.Civ.R. 11

OH R.C. 4112

OTHER

United States Treaty, "American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man"

Americans with Disabilities Act

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

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

OPINIONS BELOW

For cases from state courts:

The opinion of the highest state court to not review the merits appears at Appendix

B

to the petition and is

reported at Robinson v. Ohio Civ. Rights Comm., 2023 Ohio Lexis 1355 on 07/12/2023; or,

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

is unpublished.

The reconsideration of the Supreme Court of Ohio court

appears at Appendix C to the petition and is

reported at Robinson v. Ohio Civ. Rights Comm'n (missing et al.), 2023-Ohio-3169, 2023 Ohio Lexis 1759 (September 12, 2023); or,

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

is published.

JURISDICTION

For cases from state courts:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case July 12, 2023. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix B.

A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date:

_____Sept. 12, 2023_____, 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. _____

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a).

2.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

First, fourth, fifth, eighth, and fourteenth U.S. Constitutional Rights and OH Const. Rights.

Depp v. Heard

OH.Civ.R. 11

OH R.C. 4112...

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner, Martin Robinson, alleges that Cuyahoga County, Lorain County, and municipality authorities/officials kidnapped him and wrongfully detained, arrested, and imprisoned him. During which, subjected him to excessive force and violations of his fourth, fifth, eighth, and fourteenth U.S. Constitutional Rights and OH Const. Rights.

Petitioner, Martin Robinson was also denied the right to proper health, mental, and dental care and clean drinking water along with more deprivations such as unnecessary restricted access to shower, recreation, time outside of a cell, and extreme cell temperatures.

Petitioner, Martin Robinson has been and is permanently disabled since July 10, 2009. The Federal and State of Ohio governments are aware of this fact: OH Civil Rights Comm., social security administration, OH Bureau of Workers' Comp, and OH Industrial Commission; Supreme Court of OH and Supreme Court of the United States...

Cuyahoga, Lorain County Common Pleas, the State of Ohio... violated and continue to violate OH Revised Code 2305.43 as it pertains to petitioner, Martin Robinson. Also violating the United States Treaty, "American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man," as it pertains to petitioner, Martin Robinson, his disabilities, and his other basic human rights... As well as the American with Disabilities Act...

State Ex Rel. Ctr. For Media & Democracy v. Off. Of Ag David Yost, 2023-Ohio-364
2/8/23; *Depp v. Heard...*

Petitioner respectfully asks that any and all rights and arguments afforded him be preserved in this matter as he is not a licensed lawyer or attorney.

Petitioner has brought his claims appropriately to the proper parties tasked with investigating them. R.C. 4112?

Should the SCO have transferred jurisdiction to OH Court of Claims or U.S. District Court? Or simply granted the complaint? The SCO failed to hold a hearing prior to dismissal of

the original action on July 12, 2023, *Robinson v. Ohio Civ. Rights Comm.* (missing et al.), 2023 Ohio Lexis 1355.

Pertaining to the Clerks' Office of this Court and the Rules of this Court (specifically Rule 1. Clerk) and prior petitions that this petitioner has attempted to file with SCOTUS.

"**Rule 1. Clerk 1.** The Clerk receives documents for filing with the Court and has authority to reject any submitted filing that does not comply with these Rules." In petitioner's opinion, this Rule needs to be reviewed and amended. The Clerk is being given too much discretion in its interpretation of the Rules and whether or not to assign the petition a case no.

There are at least 48 specific Rules and due to 48 being a large amount, makes it near impossible to know and comply with every rule, especially for a non-licensed attorney or lawyer, having not passed the BAR or/and Law School.

If the Clerk does not like the petitioner, does not agree with what is being submitted, is told to deny the petition and purposely continues denying the persons' petitions (as in at least two of my prior petitions, there were a couple early on), or is attempting to cover up miscarriages of justice denying petitioners' Constitutional Rights.

Petitioners may be attempting to preserve any and all rights. It also causes a hardship on the petitioner who may not have the funds or capabilities or abilities to have enough postage, paper, ink, and so on to keep revising and correcting and copying and mailing, yada yada. This is where electronic filing would be helpful.

In petitioner's opinion, every petition should be accepted and put on the record, then it becomes the opposing party(ies) argument to make about any technical rule mistakes or the court can advise the petitioner to submit their corrections, as long as the merits of the case are still heard and argued also.

It appears this court is not investigating (instead ignoring) the complaints I made against the U.S. Postal Service, this Court, or the Prison for losing mail I've mailed to this Court in prior pets.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

This court has a duty to address the evidence petitioner, Martin Robinson has set forth in this and related cases, being ignored, pushed aside, swept under the rug... by the proper authorities.

Petitioner, Martin Robinson has cited law, case law, treatise, and so on in previous related petitions and now this petition, to support why this court has the authority to grant each and every petition, he has brought in front of this court...

The court knows it has a duty and obligation to review its subordinates and hold them accountable. Instead, it is choosing to deliberately remain indifferent to the miscarriages of justice being suffered by petitioner, Martin Robinson, as well as many of other incarcerated Ohioans.

How do I get this court to act? Who is filling in for Justice Clarence Thomas while he is busy traveling lavishly all around the world? Is he the reason this court refuses to hear my cases?

In the Supreme Court of Ohio, three of the four attorneys for respondents did not sign the answer which violated Civ.R.11, failing to sign the complaint as required by Civ.R.11. Relator, Robinson did not have the opportunity to rebut the motion for dismissal due to the untimely service of it upon him and the 10 day rule of the SCO. Thus, he makes his argument here on appeal.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,


Martin Robinson, Wrongfully Imprisoned, #756785

Date: 10/17/2023