


23-6986

No. \_\_\_\_\_



ORIGINAL

\_\_\_\_\_  
IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
\_\_\_\_\_

RAGHVENDRA SINGH — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

vs.

CALIFORNIA — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

THIRD APPELLATE STATE DISTRICT COURT  
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

RAGHVENDRA SINGH, CDCR # BW2602  
(Your Name)

HIGH DESERT STATE PRISON  
(Address)

P.O. BOX 3030, SUSANVILLE, CA 96127-3030  
(City, State, Zip Code)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Phone Number)

### QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- ① THE STATE COURTS DID NOT ALLOW TO PROVE THAT ALLEGED CHARGES ARE NOT CRIMES. (SEE ATTACHMENT 2). (SEE PAGES (31) TO (34)).
- ② THE COURT OF APPEAL REFUSED TO ADDRESS ITS OWN RULING (SEE ATTACHMENT 1) AND RULINGS OF CIVIL COURT THAT ALLEGED CHARGES ARE NOT CRIMES. NO COURT SHOULD EVEN IGNORE ANY RULING. OTHERWISE, IT RESULTS IN GROSS INJUSTICE AS IT HAPPENED IN THIS CASE.
- ③ PETITIONER SINGH WAS CHARGED WITH OFFERING FOR FILING FALSE PROOFS OF SERVICE WITH THE CIVIL COURT UNDER CALIFORNIA PENAL CODE SECTION 115 ("PC 115"). SUCH CHARGES AFFECT ACCESS TO COURTS. (SEE ATTACHMENT 1). COURTS SHOULD PROTECT ACCESS TO COURTS. SO, PLEASE GRANT THIS PETITION.

THE REASON FOR REFUSAL TO ADDRESS ALL ~~CR~~ CRITICAL ISSUES WAS THAT THEY WERE NOT RAISED IN FIRST APPEAL (SEE PAGE (32)). BUT, FOR JUSTICE AND FOR EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL, COURTS SHOULD ADDRESS ALL ISSUES. DEFENSES LIKE CHARGES ARE NOT CRIMES CAN BE RAISED ANYTIME IN ANY PROCEEDINGS. CONVICTION FOR NON-CRIME IS VOID AND CAN BE SET ASIDE ANYTIME IN ANY PROCEEDING (PEOPLE V. VASILYAN (2009) 174 CA 4TH 443). SINGH REPEATEDLY RAISED THESE ISSUES IN EVERY PROCEEDINGS. COURTS STILL REFUSED TO ADDRESS THEM. SINGH WAS DENIED SELF REPRESENTATION. APPOINTED ATTORNEYS DID NOT RAISE THESE ISSUES.

### SOLE QUESTION

CAN "DEFENSES LIKE ALLEGED CHARGES ARE NOT CRIMES" BE ADDRESSED IN THIS CASE? SINGH SHOULD NOT REMAIN CONVICTED FOR NON-CRIMES, BASED ON FALSE AND FABRICATED TESTIMONY.

HUBBARD V. UNITED STATES (1995) 514 US 695 RULED THAT ALLEGED CHARGES ARE NOT CRIMES.

## 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

ALL RELATED CASES ARE DISCUSSED IN ATTACHMENT 1. THE STATE COURTS REFUSED TO ADDRESS THE CRITICAL ISSUES STATING THAT THEY WERE RAISED IN FIRST APPEAL (SEE PAGE 32). THESE ISSUES INCLUDE THAT ALLEGED CHARGES ARE NOT CRIMES (SEE ATTACHMENT 1), CONVICTION FOR NON-CRIME IS VOID AND CAN BE SET ASIDE ANYTIME IN ANY PROCEEDING. (PEOPLE V. VASILYAN (2009) 174 CA4<sup>TH</sup> 443), SINGH RAISED THESE CRITICAL ISSUES IN EVERY PROCEEDING. THE COURTS STILL REFUSED TO ADDRESS THEM.

IN HUBBARD V. UNITED STATES (1995) 514 US 695, THIS COURT STATED THAT THE COURTS ESTABLISHED "JUDICIAL FUNCTION EXCEPTION" WHICH PROHIBITS PUNISHMENT FOR OFFERING FOR FILING FALSE DOCUMENTS WITH THE COURTS. OTHER AUTHORITIES ARE STATED IN ATTACHMENT 1.

SINGH WAS CONVICTED FOR OFFERING FOR FILING FALSE PROOFS OF SERVICE WITH THE CIVIL COURT. ATTACHMENT 1 SHOWS A LOT OF DEFENSES AND AUTHORITIES.

THIS CASE HAS NO RELATED CASES OTHERWISE, EXCEPT RELATED CIVIL CASES IN WHICH ALLEGED PROOFS OF SERVICE WERE FILED. BUT, THEY DO NOT DEAL WITH PENAL CODE.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
OPINIONS BELOW .....	<u>I</u>
JURISDICTION .....	<u>II</u>
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	<u>III</u>
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	<u>IV</u>
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....	<u>VI</u>
CONCLUSION .....	<u>VII</u>

### ATTACHMENTS INDEX TO APPENDICES

ATTACHMENT 1 - <del>APPENDIX A</del>	THE COURT OF APPEAL GRANTED SINGH'S MOTION FOR NEW EVIDENCE SHOWING SINGH'S CONVICTION FOR FALSE, FABRICATED AND NON-CRIME CHARGES BASED ON FALSE AND FABRICATED TESTIMONY OF MR. HOBBS	PAGES ① TO ②⑦
<del>APPENDIX B</del>		
<del>APPENDIX C</del>	EXHIBIT A - OPINION OF FIRST APPEAL SHOWING WRONGFUL CONVICTION BASED ON FALSE AND FABRICATED TESTIMONY	PAGES ⑦ TO ②①
<del>APPENDIX D</del>	EXHIBIT B - JUDGMENT WAS AGAINST RAWAT NOT AGAINST SINGH. THIS SHOWS THAT PROSECUTOR'S WITNESS, MR. HOBBS HAD FALSE AND FABRICATED TESTIMONY	PAGES ②② TO ②④
<del>APPENDIX E</del>		
<del>APPENDIX F</del>	EXHIBIT C - CIVIL COURT'S RULING THAT ALLEGED CHARGES ARE NOT CRIMES	PAGES ②⑤ TO ②⑦
ATTACHMENT 2 -	FINAL OPINION SHOWING THAT THE COURTS REFUSED TO ADDRESS ITS OWN RULING (SEE ATTACHMENT 1) AND SINGH'S DEFENSES INCLUDING THAT ALLEGED CHARGES ARE NOT CRIMES. (SEE PAGES ③① TO ③②). <u>THIS RESULTS IN GROSS INJUSTICE</u>	PAGES ②⑧ TO ③④

# TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
HUBBARD V. UNITED STATES (1995) 514 US 695	VI
IN RE HARRIS (1993) 50. 4TH 813	III, VI
PEOPLE V. PARMAR (2001) 86 CA4TH 781	V
PEOPLE V. VASILYAN (2009) 174 CA4TH 443	II, IV, VI

STATUTES AND RULES	
CALIFORNIA EVIDENCE CODE SECTION 647	III, VI
CALIFORNIA PENAL CODE SECTION <del>647</del> 115	III, IV, V, VI

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**:

ATTACHMENT 2 The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at  
Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is ATTACHMENT 2

- ☐ reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
☒ is unpublished.

The opinion of the \_\_\_\_\_ 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.

## 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 1/10/24.  
~~A copy of that decision appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.~~

**STATE SUPREME COURT CASE NO. 5282993. WE DID NOT RECEIVE IT**

☐ 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).

**AS WE DID NOT RECEIVE IT, WE CANNOT ATTACH IT, BUT, IT IS AVAILABLE ONLINE.**

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

① SINGH'S CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY RIGHTS ARE GROSSLY VIOLATED BECAUSE THE COURTS REFUSED TO ADDRESS HIS DEFENSES. HE ADDRESSED THESE DEFENSES IN EVERY PROCEEDING, STILL, THE COURTS REFUSED TO ADDRESS THEM. GROSS INJUSTICE OCCURES WHEN ACCUSED IS NOT HEARD.

② SINGH WAS CONVICTED FOR OFFERING FOR FILING FALSE PROOF OF SERVICE WITH THE CIVIL COURT UNDER PC115. ATTACHMENT 1 SHOWS THAT THE COURT OF APPEAL GRANTED SINGH'S MOTION FOR NEW EVIDENCES FOR THE FOLLOWING: (PAGES ① TO ②7):

"THE COURTS REPEATEDLY RULED THAT ALLEGED CHARGES ARE NOT CRIMES. CONVICTION FOR NON-CRIME IS VOID AND CAN BE SET ASIDE ANYTIME IN ANY PROCEEDING (PEOPLE V. VASILYAN (2009) 174 CA 4TH 443; IN RE HARRIS (1993) 5C. 4TH 813). SINGH'S CONVICTION IS FOR FALSE, FABRICATED AND NON-CRIME CHARGES BASED ON FALSE AND FABRICATED TESTIMONY OF JONATHAN HOBBS. SERVICE IS AN ACT OF PROCESS SERVER; AND PROCESS SERVER SIGNED THE PROOFS OF SERVICE. THUS, SINGH IS A WRONG PERSON FOR ALLEGED CHARGES, PURSUANT TO EVIDENCE CODE SECTION 647, A "PROOF OF SERVICE" IS A "PRESUMPTION OF SERVICE". BUT, A PRESUMPTION CAN NOT BE AN INSTRUMENT FOR PC 115. THUS, ALLEGED CHARGES ARE NOT CRIMES. THE STATE AND FEDERAL SUPREME ALSO STATED THAT ALLEGED CHARGES ARE NOT CRIMES. ALLEGED CHARGES AFFECT ACCESS TO COURT. THE COURTS SHOULD PROTECT ACCESS TO COURTS, THUS, ALLEGED CHARGES SHOULD NOT BE A CRIME FOR THIS REASONS AND OTHER REASONS."

STILL, THE COURT OF APPEAL REFUSED TO ADDRESS CRITICAL ISSUES OF THIS CASE AND "SINGH'S MOTION FOR NEW EVIDENCES" (SEE ATTACHMENT 2; PAGES ②8 TO ③4). THIS ITSELF IS A GROUND FOR REVERSAL. SO, PLEASE REVERSE APPELLATE OPINION AND DISMISS CHARGES.

AS SHOWN HERE, SINGH WAS CONVICTED FOR FALSE, FABRICATED AND NON-CRIME CHARGES BASED ON FALSE AND FABRICATED TESTIMONY. THE STATE COURTS ARE SO FAMOUS FOR DELAY AND INJUSTICE THAT, IN 2022, EX-ADMINISTRATIVE JUSTICE BECAME FIRST JUSTICE IN HISTORY TO BE PUNISHED FOR THIS. A REVIEW IS ALSO NECESSARY TO END PUBLIC TERROR BY D.A.

### STATEMENT OF THE CASE

OUR STATE COURTS ARE FAMOUS FOR EXTRA-ORDINARY DELAY AND LEGALLY IMPOSSIBLE JUDGMENTS. FOR THIS, IN 2022, EX-ADMINISTRATIVE JUSTICE HON. VANCE RAYE BECAME FIRST JUSTICE IN HISTORY TO BE DISCIPLINED FOR THIS. SO, A REVIEW OF THIS CASE WILL HELP CALIFORNIANS.

- ① IN 2019, SINGH WAS CHARGED WITH OFFERING FOR FILING WITH THE CIVIL COURT FALSE PROOFS OF SERVICE UNDER CALIFORNIA PENAL CODE SECTION ("PC") 115. THE APPELLATE COURT GRANTED A MOTION FOR NEW EVIDENCES SHOWING THE FOLLOWING (SEE ATTACHMENT 1): ① ALLEGED CHARGES ARE FALSE, FABRICATED AND NON-CRIMES BASED ON FALSE, AND FABRICATED TESTIMONY OF ATTORNEY JONATHAN HOBBS;
- ② THE CIVIL COURTS REPEATEDLY RULED THAT ALLEGED CHARGES ARE NOT CRIMES. BUT, ~~CRIMINAL~~ CRIMINAL COURT ~~REF~~ REFUSED TO ADMIT SUCH RULINGS; AND REFUSED TO ADDRESS CRITICAL ISSUES OF THIS CASE WITHOUT ALLOWING SELF-REPRESENTATION (SEE ③1) TO ③4). THUS, ACCUSED ARE CONVICTED EVEN FOR NON-CRIMES; AND COURTS REFUSE TO ADDRESS THEIR DEFENSES; AND ITS OWN RULING ON NEW EVIDENCES AND RULINGS OF CIVIL COURT.
- ③ SINGH REPEATEDLY RAISED THESE CRITICAL ISSUES IN EVERY PROCEEDING. THE COURTS STILL REFUSED TO ADDRESS THEM. SINGH WAS DENIED SELF REPRESENTATION. APPOINTED ATTORNEYS DID NOT RAISE THESE ISSUES. FOR JUSTICE AND FOR EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL, THE COURTS SHOULD ADDRESS THESE ISSUES. DEFENSES LIKE CHARGES ARE NOT CRIMES CAN BE RAISED ANYTIME IN ANY PROCEEDING. CONVICTION FOR NON-CRIME IS VOID AND CAN BE SET ASIDE ANYTIME IN ANY PROCEEDING (PEOPLE V. VASILYAN (2009) 174 CA4TH 443).
- ④ AS DISCUSSED HERE, DISTRICT ATTORNEY ("D.A.") CAUSED PUBLIC TERROR, KILLINGS, SUICIDES AND DESTRUCTION OF PROPERTIES AND FAMILIES. FOR DECADES, ~~PER~~ D.A. PROSECUTED OWNERS FOR LIFE IMPRISONMENT FOR ACTS OF OTHERS AFTER TAKING THEIR PROPERTIES BASED ON FALSE CASE IS NEEDED. TO END THIS, A REVIEW OF THIS

FACTS: "STATE COURTS REFUSED TO ADDRESS CRUCIAL ISSUES INCLUDING ALLEGED CHARGES ARE NOT CRIMES (SEE PAGES (31) TO (34)) \*\*\*

CALIFORNIA DOES NOT ALLOW SELF REPRESENTATION. AS A RESULT, ACCUSED ARE CONVICTED FOR NON-CRIMES BASED ON FALSE AND FABRICATED TESTIMONIES; AND THE STATE COURTS REFUSE TO ADDRESS CRUCIAL ISSUES (SEE PAGES (31) TO (34)). ATTACHMENT 2 IS THE FINAL OPINION IN THIS CASE (SEE PAGES (28) TO (34)). THE STATE SUPREME COURT DENIED REVIEW WITHOUT ANY OPINION ON JANUARY 10, 2024 (CASE NO. S282993)

FACTS OF THIS CASE ARE STATED ON PAGES (1) TO (6) ALSO. SINGH WAS CHARGED WITH OFFERING FOR FILING FALSE PROOF OF SERVICE WITH THE COURT UNDER CALIFORNIA PENAL CODE ("PC") 115. HE WAS CONVICTED FOR FALSE, FABRICATED AND NON-CRIME CHARGE BASED ON FALSE AND FABRICATED TESTIMONY OF MR. HOBBS. THIS IS SHOWN IN SINGH'S SECOND MOTION FOR NEW ~~BE~~ EVIDENCE (PAGES (31) TO (34)). THIS MOTION WAS GRANTED. BUT, THE STATE COURTS DID NOT EVEN CONSIDER THIS MOTION FOR FINAL OPINION. THIS, ITSELF, IS A GROUND FOR REVERSAL.

"DISTRICT ATTORNEY CAUSED PUBLIC TERROR, KILLINGS, SUICIDES, AND DESTRUCTIONS OF PROPERTIES. FOR DECADES, D.A. PROSECUTED OWNERS FOR LIFE IMPRISONMENTS FOR ACTS OF OTHERS AFTER TAKING THEIR PROPERTIES BASED ON FALSE, FABRICATED AND NON-CRIME CHARGES USING FALSE AND FABRICATED TESTIMONIES. CLEARLY, IT IS THE END OF DEMOCRACY. SO, ITS REVIEW IS JUSTIFIED."

IN "PEOPLE V. PARMAR (2001) 86 C.A. 4TH 781", PARMAR FACED 250 MISDEMEANORS [OR LIFE IMPRISONMENT] ~~OF~~ FOR NUISANCE CREATED BY OTHERS AFTER THEIR PROPERTIES WERE TAKEN BY THE COUNTY. CLEARLY, D.A. PROSECUTED FOR LIFE IMPRISONMENT FOR THE ACTS OF OTHERS. THIS CAUSED PUBLIC TERROR, SUICIDES, KILLINGS AND DESTRUCTIONS OF PROPERTIES ALSO.

AS SHOWN HERE, CIVIL COURTS  
REPEATEDLY RULED THAT ALLEGED  
CHARGES ARE NOT CRIMES. STILL,  
PETITIONER WAS DENIED TO  
PROVE THIS. THIS CASE HAS  
PUBLIC ISSUES ALSO.

## SUMMARY

AS SHOWN HERE, SINGH WAS CONVICTED FOR FALSE, FABRICATED AND NON-CRIME CHARGES BASED ON FALSE AND FABRICATED TESTIMONY. BUT, THE STATE COURTS REFUSED TO ADDRESS THESE ISSUES (SEE PAGES (31) AND (32))

THIS RESULTED IN INJUSTICE. THE STATE COURTS ARE SO FAMOUS FOR DELAY AND INJUSTICE THAT, IN 2022, EX-ADMINISTRATIVE JUSTICE HON. VANCE RAYE BECAME FIRST JUSTICE IN THE HISTORY TO BE ~~PUNISHED~~ PUNISHED FOR THIS. A REVIEW IS ALSO NEEDED TO END PUBLIC TERROR CREATED BY EX-DICTRICT ATTORNEY. SO, PLEASE HELP.

### REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

- ① THE SOLE QUESTION HERE IS "SHOULD COURTS ADDRESS SINGH'S DEFENSES [LIKE ALLEGED CHARGES ARE CRIMES]?" THE ANSWER IS DEFINITELY YES. "NO ONE [SINGH HERE] SHOULD REMAIN CONVICTED FOR FALSE, FABRICATED AND NON-CRIME CHARGES BASED ON FALSE AND FABRICATED TESTIMONY."

THE COURT OF APPEAL PARTIALLY GRANTED SINGH'S MOTION FOR NEW EVIDENCES FOR THE FOLLOWING (SEE ATTACHMENT 1): ALLEGED CHARGES ARE NOT ~~CRIMES~~ CRIMES, AND SINGH WAS CONVICTED FOR FALSE, FABRICATED AND NON-CRIME CHARGES BASED ON FALSE AND FABRICATED TESTIMONY OF JONATHAN ~~HOBBS~~ HOBBS. CONVICTION FOR NON-CRIMES IS VOID AND CAN BE SET ASIDE ANYTIME IN ANY PROCEEDING. (PEOPLE V. VASILYAN (2009) 174 CA4TH 443; IN RE HARRIS (1993) 5C.4TH 813), PAGE ⑤ OF ATTACHMENT 1 SHOWS MANY REASONS FOR WHY ALLEGED CHARGES ARE NOT CRIMES.

- ② SINGH WAS CONVICTED FOR OFFERING FOR FILING FALSE PROOFS OF SERVICE WITH THE CIVIL COURT UNDER CALIFORNIA PENAL CODE SECTION ("PC") 115. IN HUBBARD V. UNITED STATES (1995) 514 US 695, THIS COURT STATED THAT SUCH CRIMES ARE BARRED BY "JUDICIAL FUNCTION EXCEPTION". (SEE PAGE ⑤ OF ATTACHMENT 1), PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA EVIDENCE CODE SECTION 647, A "PROOF OF SERVICE" IS A "PRESUMPTION OF SERVICE". A PRESUMPTION CAN NOT BE AN INSTRUMENT FOR PC 115.
- ③ A "PROOF OF SERVICE" IS SIGNED BY A PROCESS SERVER AND DESCRIBES ACT OF SERVICE BY PROCESS SERVER. ~~TH~~ THUS, SINGH IS NOT CORRECT PERSON FOR ALLEGED CHARGES. SO, PLEASE DISMISS CHARGES.
- ④ OUR STATE APPELLATE COURT IS FAMOUS FOR EXTRAORDINARY DELAY AND GROSS INJUSTICE. IN 2022, EX-ADMINISTRATIVE JUSTICE HON. VANCE RAYE BECAME FIRST JUSTICE IN THE HISTORY TO BE DISCIPLINED FOR THIS. A REVIEW OF THIS CASE WILL IMPROVE THIS A LOT. SO, PLEASE REVIEW THIS CASE.

REVIEW WILL ELIMINATE PUBLIC TERROR

⑤ AS EXPLAINED HERE, EX-DISTRICT ATTORNEY (EX-DA), ANN SCHUBERT, ~~CA~~ CAUSED PUBLIC TERROR, KILLINGS, SUICIDES AND DESTRUCTIONS OF PROPERTIES. HER DETECTIVES BROKE SINGH'S FEET IN AN ATTEMPT TO GET FALSE CONFESSIONS FROM SINGH. THEY TOOK EVIDENCES, DOCUMENTS AND INFORMATION ABOUT HELPERS AND WITNESSES FROM SINGH'S JAIL CELL. THUS, SINGH WAS UNABLE TO PRODUCE WITNESSES, EVIDENCES AND DOCUMENTS TO PROVE THAT THE ALLEGED CHARGES AND TESTIMONY OF PROSECUTOR'S WITNESSES ARE FALSE AND FABRICATED. D.A. TOOK SINGH'S PROPERTIES, EVEN OUT OF COUNTY PROPERTIES WITHOUT INFORMING SINGH. MINORITIES WERE SO MUCH TERRORIZED ~~THEY~~ THAT THEY SPENT BILLIONS TO REPLACE HER IN 2023.

CONCLUSION

DISTRICT ATTORNEY IS FAMOUS FOR CREATING TERROR, AND COURTS ARE FAMOUS FOR GROSS INJUSTICE RESULTING IN KILLINGS, SUICIDES ALSO. CLEARLY, A REVIEW IS NEEDED TO END ALL THIS.

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

RAGHVENDRA SINGH

Date: 1/31/24

NO ONE SHOULD REMAIN CONVICTED FOR FALSE, FABRICATED AND NON-CRIME CHARGES BASED ON FALSE AND FABRICATED TESTIMONY.

STATE COURTS ARE SO FAMOUS FOR DELAY AND INJUSTICE THAT EX-ADMINISTRATIVE JUSTICE HON. VANCE RAYE BECAME FIRST JUSTICE IN THE HISTORY TO BE DISCIPLINED FOR THIS. A REVIEW OF THIS CASE WILL END PUBLIC TERROR CREATED BY EX-DISTRICT ATTORNEY. SO, PLEASE REVIEW THIS CASE.