

No. 23-6272 ORIGINAL

2 NO SERVICE

AMENDED


FOR THE 8<sup>th</sup> 8-31-23  
AD.

extraordinary writ

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

IN WRIT OF MANDAMUS



BRUCE LAMONT FULLER — PETITIONER

(Your Name)

VS.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF  
CALIFORNIA — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

the CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

BRUCE LAMONT FULLER

(Your Name)

3000 CECIL AVENUE

(Address)

DELANO, CALIFORNIA [93216]

(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

**QUESTION(S) PRESENTED**

I. HOW SHALL WE HAVE A CONCLUSIVE ANSWER OF CORPUS DELICTI  
OF STATEWIDE IMPORTANCE , WHEN THIER HAS NOT BEEN AN EFFECTIVE  
ASCERTAINMENT OF EXPEDITIOUS TRUTH?

## 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: CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT:350 McALLISTER STREET 94102;FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT,3389 TWELTH STREET ,92501:SAN BERNARDINO SUPERIOR COURT 8303 HAVEN AVENUE,91730;GOVERNOR OF CALIFORNIA, STATE CAPITOL,95814;BPH/COMMISSIONER 93216.

2ND SERVICE 8-31-23 8:00:01 PST *BB*

## RELATED CASES

(PEOPLE V. SEIJAS)(2005) 36 C4TH 291,307,30 CR3d 493  
(PEOPLE V. GARCIA)(1986)1833 CA3d 335,345,2228,CR 87  
(PEOPLE V. JENNINGS)(1991) 53 C3d 334,279, CR 780(TRIAL)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW .....	1
JURISDICTION..... § 1651.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....	5
CONCLUSION.....	6
PROOF OF SERVICE(S).....	7

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A JUDGEMENT CALIFORNIA SUPREME  
JULY 31, 2023

APPENDIX B APPEAL COURTS [ORDER] ELECTRONICALLY  
FILED (7-24-23)

APPENDIX C UNSTAMPED WRIT OF MANDAMUS  
PROOF OF SERVICE - POS-040 - CDATED (5-17-23)

APPENDIX D CERTIFIED LEGAL MAIL FROM PRIVATE  
INVESTIGATOR RYAN WARD # 2523 (8-4-23)  
APPENDIX E VERIFICATION RECEIPT (5-25-23)

MINUTE ORDER SUPERIOR COURT  
(7-14-2023)

APPENDIX F CERTIFIED U.S.P.S  
TRACKING NUMBERS, RECEIPTS  
FOR PROOFS OF SERVICE AND CONFIRMATION  
OF RECEIPTS

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
ON THE PREVIOUS LIST OF PARTIES PAGE	

STATUTES AND RULES WRIT OF MANDATE , ALSO CALLED A WRIT OF MANDAMUS(CCP\$\$ 1084) IS USED TO COMPEL A COURT, OFFICER, OR AGENCY TO PERFORM A DUTY REQUIRED BY. WITHOUT UNECESSARY DELAY, TO ASSUME JURISDICTION, AND EXERCISE DISCRETION AFTER ITS REFUSAL TO ACT:

OTHER CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION VI 4410 -11  
COURTS OF APPEAL HAVE JURISDICTION OVER MANDATE AND PROHIBITION IN FELONY CASES.

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**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

reported at PETITION FOR REVIEW#E081729; or,  
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
 is unpublished.

The opinion of the FOURTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL court appears at Appendix B to the petition and is

reported at E081729; 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 JULY 31, 23. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix A.

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).

28 USC 1651

## **CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED**

THE CORPUS DELECTI REQUIREMENT , COMBINED WITH THE MANDATE REQUIREMENT HAS NO PLAIN , SPEEDY , AND ADEQUET REMEDY AT LAW.

1 20.2  
2 RULE EXPRESSLY STIPULATES ON HOW THIS PETITION IN AID  
3 COURTS APPEALATE JURISDICTION (PEOPLE V. FRANKLIN) IN THIS  
4 MATTER, REASON WARRANTING THIS MATTER IS THE REASON OF LAW  
5 RELIEF CANNOT BE OBTAINED IN ANY OTHER COURT BECAUSE THIS  
6 IS PRECEDENT, AND SUPERSEDED FRANKLIN HEARINGS, THESE ISSUES  
7 WOULD CHANGE THE STANDARD NOW YOUR LETTER SHOWS (SEPT. 13, 2023)  
8 AND K.V.S.P. STATES IT RECEIVED (OCT. -16-2023) ON 72 HOUR  
9 U.S.P.S TRACKING NO. 9205-5902-4503-8800-0000-2861-43, WHICH RE-  
10 TALIATION IS PROVEN. THIS LIMITS THE COMMUNICATION WITH THE HIGH  
11 COURT AND MAKES THE PRISON LIABLE TO U.S. MARSHALL INVESTI-  
12 GATION FOR THE ILLEGALITY HEREWITH.  
13 rule 20.3  
14 IS EXPRESSLY APPENDED ON JULY 27th, 2023 VERIFY THE  
15 APPENDIX ON THE MANDATE. IT IS QUITE IMPRESSIVE!  
16 A CONFIRMED COPIE WAS SERVED UPON ALL PARTIES TWICE,  
17 BPH REFUSED TO ACCEPT THE MAIL AND RETURNED IT. THE PETITIONER,  
18 THEN SERVED THE DOCUMENT UPON CHIEF S. GATES CDCR RISK  
19 POLICY BRANCH UNDER the PENALTY OF PERJURY OF CALIFORNIA  
20 STAFF  
21 PROOF OF SERVICE 28.U.S.C. 1746  
22 EXCUTED (10-30-23)      X      BRUCE LAMONT FULLER      SUI JURIS



RECEIVED

NOV -7 2023

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT U.S.

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

**THE INFERIOR COURT REFUSES TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE CORPUS  
DELECTI AND STAY PROCEEDINGS!**

## **REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION**

**IT IS FUNDAMENTALLY LOGICAL THAT A EXPEDITIOUS REMEDY  
IS ASCERTAINED DUE TO THE LACK OF RESPECT OF MATTERS AT LAW!**


## CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of ~~certiorari~~ <sup>MANDAMUS</sup> should be granted.

Respectfully submitted, "WITH EXTREME PREJUDICE"

  
X  
BRUCE LAMONT FULLERR

Date: 8-17-23

2 NO SERVICE  
 8-31-23 AD

G.