

no 23-6089

in The
Supreme Court of The United States

Christopher Lenard Blockson - petitioner
pro se

vs

Ronald Oliver, Warden, et al.

Petition For Rehearing on the Merits for
Writ of certiorari to


United State Supreme Court

Petition For rehearing on the Merits
for writ of certiorari

Christopher Lenard Blockson
pro se

P.O. Box 208

Indian Springs, Nevada 89070



Argument For Rehearing on The Merits

My petition for certiorari was filed on 11/17/2023. The case was docketed on 11/22/2023. The request for certiorari was to review the denial of a certificate of appealability in action for a writ of Habeas corpus by the 9th circuit court of appeals.

Pursuant to Supreme Court rule 15.1:
A brief in opposition to a petition for writ of certiorari may be filed by the respondent in any case, but is not mandatory except in a capital case, see rule 14.1(a) or when requested by the court.

This is not a capital case. However, case analyst Susan Frimpong, through the power of Scott Harris, Clerk of the Court, ordered the state of Nevada to file an answering brief. See Supreme Court rule 15.3:

Any brief in opposition shall be filed within 30 days after the case is placed on the docket, unless the time is extended by the court or justice or by the clerk under Rule 30.4...

Pursuant to the language of Supreme Court Rule 15.1 a response by the State of Nevada was mandatory once they were ordered to do so. However, the state of Nevada filed no answering brief or sought an extension of time.

This review in certiorari was sought because of the refusal of all lower courts to acknowledge the official record on appeal proving fraud on the court and outrageous government conduct.

As the case at bar originates from a petition for an extraordinary writ, Supreme Court rule 20.4(a) is relevant, which reads in pertinent part:

... To justify granting of a writ of Habeas Corpus, the petitioner must show that exceptional circumstances warrant the exercise of the court's discretionary powers, and adequate relief cannot be obtained in any other form or from any other court...

(b) Habeas corpus proceedings, except in capital cases, are ex parte, unless the court requires the respondent to show cause why the petition for writ of Habeas Corpus should not be granted. A response, if ordered, or in a capital case, shall comply fully with Rule 15.

Supreme Court rule 15.2 in pertinent part reads:

In addition to presenting other arguments for denying the petition, the brief in opposition should address any perceived misstatement of fact or law in the petition that bears on what issues properly would be before the Court if certiorari were granted. Counsel are admonished that they have an obligation to the Court to point out in the brief in opposition, and not later, any perceived misstatement made in the petition. Any objection to the consideration of a question presented based on what occurred in the proceeding below, if the objection does not go to jurisdiction, may be deemed waived unless called to the Court's attention in the brief in opposition...

The petition for certiorari was sufficient and extraordinary enough to warrant the Court clerk to order the State of Nevada to respond, which amounted to an order to show cause why the petition should not be granted. And, when the state did not respond, it should have won under the rules of equity.

The state of Nevada did not respond because they could not respond. How does one reconcile seven factual lies told on the statute in the Guilty Plea agreement? It can not be done while keeping a straight face.

I have done what is required of me before the laws of this Country and God. Yet I am denied relief.

Pursuant to Supreme Court rule 44:
Any petition for rehearing of any judgment on the merits shall be filed within 25 days after entry of the judgment or decision, unless the court or a justice shortens or extends the time...

It is now apparent why I have received no official notice pursuant to Supreme Court rule 16.(3)-despite the fact that my petition for Certiorari was denied on 1/22/24. I have seen these tactics repeatedly in my quest for justice.

Let the court understand that I understand; all courts that signed on to the trespass of my rights became liable along with the prosecutor.

I hereby release all courts of liability under 1983. I ~~do~~ want only the state prosecutor. I have been denied an attorney to keep this silent.

My question to all Justice's is this: what is the difference between America and any dictatorship around the world if America picks and chooses upon whom to enforce the law?

At the core of this case is the fact that I protected myself against an attacking pit bull dog. The prosecutor rewrote the animal cruelty statute. It was criminal in nature. Now the entire Nation has showed up in her defense. This case is a mockery of the United States Constitution.

I have a long criminal history. But I was trying desperately to change my life. I fell prey to a ruthless and malicious prosecutor. Her willful acts should be sanctioned not praised or protected.

I pray that this court will uphold the Constitution of The United States of America and give me a favorable ruling.

Respectfully Submitted.

Christopher J. Blockson
pro se

1/31/2024

Certificate of Pro Se Petitioner

In compliance with Supreme Court Rules 44.1 and 44.2; The grounds of this petition for rehearing of petition for certiorari on the merits is limited to intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect which constitute substantial grounds not previously presented.

1/31/2024

Christopher Z Blocker

This petition for rehearing of petition for certiorari is presented in good faith and not for delay.

Christopher Z Blocker

1/31/2024

No. 23-6089

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

Christopher Leonard Blockson - Petitioner
Pro Se

VS
Ronald Oliver, Warden, et al.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Christopher Blockson, do swear that on this date February 2, 2024 as required by Supreme Court Rule 29 I have served the enclosed petition for rehearing on the merits for writ of certiorari on each party to the above proceeding or that party's counsel, and every person required to be served, by depositing an envelope containing the above documents in the U.S. mail properly addressed to each of them with first-class postage prepaid, or by delivery to a third-party commercial carrier for delivery in three days. The person and address served:

Matthew S. Johnson (Bar 12412), Deputy Attorney General
State of Nevada, 100 North Carson Street, Carson City Nevada,
89701, I declare the foregoing is true & correct under
penalty of Perjury. 8 February 2, 2024 Christopher J Blockson