


23-7048

ORIGINAL

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES



JUSTIN DALCOLLO - PETITIONER;


- v -

ANTHONY WELLS et al - RESPONDENT;

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
USCAP 7th Cir. 111

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Justin Dalcollo
751682
10938 Lawrence Rd
Sumner IL 62466
LAW CORR. CTR.
3-11-24



QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Is there a SUBSTANTIAL-CONSTITUTIONAL-DEPRIVATION in-which a Writ of CERTIORARI NEED ISSUE.
- DGE'S THE EVIDENCE PROVIDE OVERWHELMING PROOF OF ; Double Jeopardy Violations ; Corruptions ; Aiding IN Criminal Enterprises THAT FLOUT CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES, in which Created a MISFEASANCE OF JUSTICE AND HAVE UNDOUBTEDLY CAUSED A INJURIOUS EFFECT IN EPIC-PORTIONS.
- Is THERE MALICIOUS PROSECUTION
- Should Miller BE RETROACTIVELY APPLIED TO THE STATES SEE Miller V. Alabama 132, S. Ct, 2455 (2012).

LIST OF PARTIES

UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY PURSUANT TO 28 USC 1746, I
Declare That due to SEGREGATION STATUS I'm UNABLE TO
Provide A Proper APPENDIX AND LIST OF PARTIES AS I AM
DEPRIVED OF PROPERTY AT THIS POINT. All Parties INVOLVED
ARE Cited AS et, al:

Dalcollo V. ANN WALSH et, al;

Dalcollo V. ANTHONY WILLS et, al;

DALCOLLO V. DEE DEE BROOKHART et, al
(11SCA1 7th Cir 23-2348).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW ... 1

JURISDICTION

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISION INVOLVED

STATEMENT OF CASE

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

CONCLUSION

INDEX TO APPENDICES

A (COURT- ORDERS-)

B EXHIBITS

C

D

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES:

PG #

U.S. v. Sablby 21 F.3d 747, 752, (7th Cir 1994);	3
U.S. v. Robertson 19 F.3d 1318, 1321 (10th Cir);	3
MIRANDA V. ARIZONA	1; 3
BLOCKBURGER V. UNITED STATES	5
U.S. v. Dinitz 424 U.S. at 611	5
U.S. v. PEREZ, 22 U.S. 579	5
PEOPLE V. STAFFORD, 325 Ill. App. 3d 1069, 259 Ill. Dec 635 759 N.E. 2d 115, 2001 Ill. App. Lexis 811 (Ill. App. Ct. Dist 2001);	6
UNITED V. JACKSON id at 188-189	7
Briet, 1996 MUSE 67, P. 9 122 N.M 665, 930 P.2d.	7
GREEN V. U.S. 355, U.S. 184-187	
NAPUE V. ILLINOIS	9
PEOPLE V. DLINGER, 176, Ill. 2d 326	9
ALBERTA V. TEXAS, 355 U.S. 28, 31-32 (1927)	9
U.S. v. SEQAI, 495 F. 7d 826, 832, 33 (7th Cir 2007);	10
HECK V. HUMPREY 512 U.S. 477, 486-47 (1993)	12
IN RE GUALT 387 U.S. 1	13
U.S. v. TATEO, 377 U.S. 463	13
MILLER V. ALABAMA	

STATUTES AND RULES

42 § 1983	1
720 ILCS 5/8-4 (a)	1
720 ILCS 5/9-1 (a)	2
34 U.S.C. § 10272	9
18 U.S.C. § 1623	10
(RULE 59 c) AND (RULE 59 d)	12
28 § 2254 Habeas Corpus	8

OTHER

U.S. 5th AMEND;
U.S. 6th AMEND
U.S. 4th AMEND
U.S. 13th AMEND
U.S. 8th AMEND
U.S. 14th AMEND
E.H. CONST., ART 1 § 10 1970 AND ART. 1 § 7 PG 5-6
U.S. CONST. AMEND 1 "FREEDOM OF SPEECH".

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND STATUTES

• Amendments 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 13, 14.

• 42 § 1983

• 34 U.S.C. § 10272

• 28 U.S.C. § 1254 (1)

• 28 USC § 1257 (1)

• 18 USC 1623

• 28 USC § 2244

• 720 ILCS 5/8-4(a)

• 728 ILCS 5/9-1(c)

• Ill. Const. Art. 1 § 10 AND (§ 1-7).

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 A 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 BA to the petition and is

☒ reported at DALCOYA V. AUTHENT WILLIS et al; or,

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

☒ is unpublished.

☐ For cases from state courts:

Im REDED, & Frustrated
The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits 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 _____ 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 2-20-24.

[] No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case. ~~IT'S~~ PENDING NOW

[] 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).

SUPP. CT. R. 10 (a) (B) ; (C) ALSO SEE : SUPP. CT. R. 11 28 USC § 2101(c).

[] For cases from state courts: (IMPEDED & FRUSTRATED) - CONCEALED

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was NA 11.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix _____.

[] 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).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

[ON]-5/25/22 A [§ 1983]-CIVIL-RIGHTS COMPLAINT WAS FILED.

The Claims [RANGED] FROM, MAIL-TAMPERING; MAIL-THEFT; [DENIAL]-OF ACCESS-TO-THE-COURT'S [AND] LAW LIBRARY; TO A -- [UNLAWFUL]-WRONGFUL "ALLEGED"-CONVICTION, AND THAT, THE JUDGE-Sheriff; S.A. and A.S.A. [CONSPIRED] TO COMMIT-MURDER-AGAINST ME.

THUS, [PRIOR], [I] WAS FORCED TO COURT, DURING THE-SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED-STATE'S MANDATE AGAINST-GATHERINGS. ALSO, THE-SUPREME-COURT-OF-ILLINOIS-MANDATE, THAT REQUIRED THE SAME, AND REFRAIN-FROM, [COURT-ACTIONS]. THUS EVEN-THOUGH [MANDATES] WERE IMPLEMENTED, [DUPAGE-COUNTY [IGNORED]-THIS-ORDER]. WHILE, [I] WAS [BEING-FORCED], TO COURT AND TRIAL, NO-OTHER'S [WERE-PRESENT]. PLEASE [UNDERSTAND] UNDER THE [ATTEMPT-MURDER]-STATUTE IT IS CLEAR, UNDER THE [ATTEMPT-ELEMENTS] IT-STATES:

(720 ILCS 5/8-4) "(a) A [PERSON] COMMITTS THE OFFENSE OF attempt when, WITH-INTENT TO COMMIT A SPECIFIC-OFFENSE He or She, does [any-Act] that CONSTITUTES [a] SUBSTANTIAL-STEP, toward the Commission of that OFFENSE".

NOTE: The Petitioner, Dalcollo, is ASTHMATIC MEANING HE HAS ASTHMA, A Lung DISEASE, WHICH CAUSE'S DIFFICULTY BREATHING, AND ALL INVOLVED (KNEW)-THIS, EVEN THE DOCTOR, A SERIOUS MEDICAL NEED

Thus, Under the [FIRST-DEGREE]-MURDER STATUTE PURSUANT TO (720 ILCS 5/9-1 (a)) "[A] PERSON KILLS AN INDIVIDUAL WITHOUT [LAWFUL-JUSTIFICATION] COMMITTS FIRST-DEGREE MURDER IF, IN [PERFORMING] THE ACT'S WHICH CAUSE THE DEATH :

(1) He [INTENDS] to Kill or do GREAT-BODILY-HARM TO, THAT [INDIVIDUAL] OR ANOTHER, OR [KNOWS] THAT SUCH ACT'S WILL CAUSE DEATH TO THAT [INDIVIDUAL] OR ANOTHER;

(2) "HE KNOWS THAT SUCH ACT'S CREATE A STRONG-PROBABILITY."

Thus, forcing a Person to [COURT] TO TRIAL WHEN [MANDATE'S] ARE IMPLEMENTED TO [REFRAIN-FROM-GATHERING'S], DURING A DEADLY-OUT BREAK OF (COVID-19) IS A [DIRECT-ATTEMPT-AGAINST] MY-LIFE. SEE: [APPENDIX B COURT ORDER 1 EXHIBIT]. THIS IS A - UN-DESPUTIBLE [TRUTH] - AND [FACT]. NOW, THE COURT AND JUSTICE'S ARE ASKING [WHY], I WAS BEING [TARGETED]? LET ME EXPLAIN HOW [EVERY-THING] - IS - [INTER TWINED]. LET'S FIRST TAKE A LOOK AT THE CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS THAT COMMENCED ON 3/23/19. ON 3/23/19 A ARREST TRANSPIRED IN DOWN-TOWN CHICAGO. A - SEARCH "FRISK" WAS DONE, AND [NO-FIREARM] FOUND ON HIS [PERSON], ALLEGEDLY IN A [BAG] OUTSIDE HIS PRESENCE.

[ACCORDING] TO 'A.T.F.-REPORT' the Said firearm Was Already in the Pos-ses-sion of the [FEDERAL-A.T.F.] SEE: [APPENDIX B Exhibit 2]. Following, MR. DALCANTO Was Then Brung-forth to the (Bloomington P.d) - Where he Was DRUGGED- WITH [METHADONE], to Elicit (a) "CONFESSIO" - FALSE. Thus - SEE: UNITED STATES V. PARKER "if a individuals MENTAL IM-PAIRMENT] Should have been Reasonable Apparent to INTERROGATORS, a lesser QUANTUM OF Coercion May render a CONFESSIO INVOLUNTARY". SEE: U.S. V. SABLITO 21 F.3d 747, 752 (7th Cir 1994) "In other words, the Police [MUST] Some How Over-REACH] By Exploiting a Weakness or Condition Known to Exist" U.S. V. ROBERTSON 19 F.3d 11318, 1321 (10th Cir).

Thus, A [CONFESSIO]-FALSELY [MADE], AFTER Coercion, While Under [DURESS] is A Violation OF THE 5th AMEND RIGHT Under the (U.S. Const.) as All Have The "RIGHT TO REMAIN - [Silent]. Thus in Violation of SEE: (MIRANDA V ARIZONA).

NOTE: AFTER BRINGING UP this FACT AND Providing TRUTH - A Suppression HEARING, OFFICER Savobada #74 made The Statement He did say you'll Receive Your 2nd-dose on Record Which DIRECTLY-IMPLIES HE ADMINISTERED THE FIRST DOSE. (OTHER, WITNESSES Will Confirm this FACT (THE GOOD-GUYS).

LEADING me to this... Pretrial [HEARING'S] COMMENCED AND Counsel WAS APPOINTED - WITHOUT PROPER-ADMINISTRATION BY the Court. MEANING (PRE-MEDITATED-APPOINTMENT). Thus for 2 + YEARS no motions, other Than, A. S.O.J MOTION, in the very Beginning as (JUDGE KINSella WAS PREJUDICE).

ESSENTIALLY, Mr. Dalcollo Through Intimidation, Threat's WAS [FORCED] to [PLEAD-OUT]. SEE: [Appendix B Exhibit 3]. Counsel WAS Just LEAVING ME IN THE COURT, STANDING BY MYSELF! Jennifer MAPEL'S And Kristen NEVADAL THREAT'S TO REPRESENT MY-SELF Manifested [IN-EPIC-Portions]. Essentially a PLEA WAS ENTERED-AFTER [FORCE]. I then Wrote a letter to the Probation dePartment [APPRIISING] THEM OF SAID ISSUE'S. The following Court-date, The JUDGE [ANN WALSH], Construed Said letter in to - a Motion to the [COURT].

ALL PROCEEDING'S HALTED. I asked The Judge "Can You Tell me What STAGE OF THE PROCEEDING'S WE WERE AT". The Judge [CLEARLY]-REPLIED "A SENTENCE ENTERED AGAINST YOU". Which Means POST-CONVICTION STAGE'S SEE: [Appendix B Exhibit 4A And Exhibit 4B]. THE EXHIBITS Shall Clarify.

Thus, Bringing me to this Species of Subjects... THE
[DOUBLE] JEOPARDY CLAUSE OF U.S. CONST. AMEND. 6TH. Thus, Under
This clause it states, "NO MAN SHALL be PUT Twice IN JEOPARDY
OF [Life] or [Limb]". SEE: BLACKBURGER V. U.S. : WHERE THE 2-
OFFENSES CANNOT SURVIVE THE SAME ELEMENTS TEST THE DOUBLE
JEOPARDY BAR APPLIES". SEE: [Appendix: B Exhibit 5 A
And Exhibit 5 B]. There Were Two Indictments, For the
SAME OFFENSES AND [12] COUNTS ALLEGED EXACT SAME OFFENSE WHICH
[ULTIMATELY] IS [24-COUNTS] OF THE SAME OFFENSE. DOUBLE JEOPARDY-THEN
[ALREADY- ATTACHED]. The 2 Counties are KANE-COUNTY AND DURAGE-
COUNTY. Exhibits already Provide Proof.

The Same Principles are Embodied in the Illinois Const.,
SEE: (ILL. CONST. ART. 1 § 10 1970) "The resource's and Power by the
State should not be allowed [MULTIPLE ATTEMPTS]- to Convict a
Person of an Alleged [OFFENSES]". SEE: UNITED STATES V DINIETZ
424 U.S. AT 611) "Double Jeopardy does Protect Against Governmental
Action's intended to Provoke [MISTRIAL] or IMPOSE MULTIPLE --
PROSECUTION'S") ; SEE: UNITED STATES V. PEREZ, 22 U.S. 579) " --
Manifest- [NECESSITY]- Doctrine ... " WHERE PROSECUTION IS MOTIVATED
BY [BAD- FAITH] OR UNDER TAKEN TO HARASS OR PREJUDICE THE --
DEFENDANT " [Double Jeopardy Applies].

ON 2/18/21, after being Forced into a [Pro-Se]-Position a Hearing Commenced and I WAS INDICTED BY THE JUDGE [ONCE-AGAIN]. How-ever THE STATE NOIE PASSED ALL THE CHARGE'S EXCEPT 2. Also at this Particular time, A PLEA WAS ENTERED, And it WAS POST-CONVICTION. Double Jeopardy ATTACHED -AGAIN. ON [4/28/2021] AND [5/4/2021] A Hearing finally Commenced to Withdraw Plea, and ULTIMATELY THE CONVICTION VACATED SEE: [Appendix B Exhibit 4 B]. The State NEVER [MOVED]-TO REINSTATE CHARGE'S NOR MOTION FOR LEAVE FILED TO DO THE SAME.

Also, on the Record, The Judge Stated Were Starting all over, And "YOUR PRO SE". I never PLEAD ANEW, OR WAS GIVEN "OPPORTUNITY FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL". SEE: [Appendix B Exhibit 6]. Thus ULTIMATELY I WAS FORCED TO Trial on Charge's not [LEGALLY PENDING]. SEE: PEOPLE V. STAFFORD, 325 ILL. APP. 3d 1069, 259 ILL. DEC. 635, 759 N.E.2d 115, 2001 ILL. APP. LEXIS 811 (ILL. APP. CT. 1st DIST 2001); ILL. CONST., Art. I, § 7] "Allowing the State to Proceed to trial after NOIE - PASSED - CHARGE'S and NEVER Reinstated, Violated Right to [DUE-PROCESS] AND FAIR-TRIAL and U.S. CONST., AMEND XIV Defendant WAS Unfairly FORCED TO DEFEND himself Against Charge's NOT even Pending."

In UNITED STATES V. JACKSON id at 188-189 The U.S. SUPREME COURT HELD; "Jeopardy ATTACHES at the time of a [Guilty-Plea], is Accepted-by the Court, Jeopardy had-attached to [ORIGINAL-CHARGES], or INDICTMENT (id. at 189).

JUSTICE BLACK QUOTED "BRIET, 1996 MURC 67, P. 9 - 122 N.M. 665, 930 P.2d" (The Underlying idea, one that is deeply Ingrained in at least the ANGLO-AMERICAN-SYSTEM of Jurisprudence is that, the State with all its Resources, should not be Allowed to make [REPEATED-ATTEMPTS] to Convict AN Individual, thereby Subjecting him, EMBARRASSMENT; EXPENSE AND [BREA], COMPELLING HIM TO LIVE IN A CONTINUING-STATE OF [ANXIETY]-AND -INSECURITY, AS WELL AS EVEN THOUGH INNOCENT MAY BE FOUND GUILTY" (GREEN V. U.S. 355, U.S. 184-187).

MOST-IMPORTANTLY, a Habeas Corpus Was Filed on 11/03/2021. The claims, [Double-Jeopardy]; SPEEDY TRIAL [WRONGFUL-CONFINEMENT] AND MUCH MORE.

THIS IS WHERE MAIL-THEFT AND A.T.T.C. --
MEANING ACCESS TO THE COURT'S WERE FRUSTRATED AND IMPEDED-UPON.

NOTE: EVERYTHING INTERLWINE'S DUE TO CONCEALING PROCESS WHICH WERE due, and The Impediment is Obstruction of Justice As The Record - Reflect's; PerJury; FRAUD; TREASON; THEFT and So on. TO INCLUDE APPEAL Being Sealed - CON-SEALED TO PREVENT RELIEF.

THROUGH [MAIL-THEFT], B3 James Mendrick; Ann Walsh AND S.A
James Scaliatone, my Original Habeas Corpus Wasn't filed.
How-ever [i]-filed A 2nd-one Through First Class Postage, with
Over night Delivery. I Would ask the Court to SEE: --
[Appendix B Exhibit 7A-B AND Exhibit 7-C-J]. THE
JUDGE Admitt's to Taking mail on [Record], and S8 does
P.d OFFICE ["STEVE DALTON"]. But He, ACTUALLY RECEIVED it
Already - OPENED, indicating [James - Scaliatone] Was Also - Stealing
[mail], as He Also Admitt's on Record.

The Question is Why, Were they Doing all of this. Well,
to [COVER-UP], PERJURY; PREJUDICE; PERSONAL INTEREST; FORGED AND
FABRICATED - EVIDENCE; WITNESSES IMPEACHED; ALTERING VIDEO DISCOVERY;
AND [Police-Report's], FALSE WITNESSES TESTIFYING AS THE RECORD-REFLECT'S.
Please Keep in Mind 3 MAJOR issue's as Well:

- 1). Juror [ELDERVELD], STAND'S UP AND STATES HE IS A
[ACTIVE] ATTORNEY IN DUPAGE;
- 2). Juror 2 - STATES HE [Believes] Im' GUILTY due TO THE
CHARGE'S;
- 3). DETECT-Svoboda GRAND JURY PERJURY.

NOTE: JAMES Scaliatone (A.S.A.) STATES There's NO Fraud, PerJury -
How-ever SEE: [Appendix B Exhibit 8 B], I mean Common
THE PROOF IS TANTAMOUNT AND Undisputable.

SEE: NAPUE V. ILLINOIS "Prosecutors Have The Responsibility to Correct What he KNOWS to be [FALSE-TESTIMONY], A-Lie is a Lie". A CONVICTION OBTAINED THROUGH USE OF [FALSE]-TESTIMONY - KNOWN TO be SUCH-A-REPRESENTATIVE OF THE [STATE]-MUST fall [UNDER], U.S. CONST., AMEND XIV DUE-PROCESS-VIOLATION; SEE: PEOPLE V. OLENER, 176, 111.2d 326 - "STATE'S KNOWING USE OF [PERJURED-TESTIMONY] to obtain a-Criminal-[CONVICTION] Violates DUE PROCESS OF LAW".

SEE: ALBERTA V. TEXAS, 355 U.S. 28, 31-32 (1957) - Holding "A Prosecutor's [ENCOURAGEMENT-OF-PERJURY]-Violated DUE PROCESS". James Sealatine Stated, "I WAS THERE AT THE BODD THE ENTIRE TIME". So he KNEW, The Police Were LYING AND himself to. SEE: [Appendix B Exhibit 9A-B AND Exhibit 9C]. GRAND-JURY-Perjury. SEE: [Appendix B AND Exhibit 10A-~~D~~F].

James Sealatine - Perjury himself! ULTIMATELY, this falls Under the STATUTE 18 U.S.C. - OR 34 U.S.C. § 10272 "FALSIFICATION AND CONCEAL-MENT OF MATERIAL FACTS".

A SELECTIVE AND VENDETTIVE PROSECUTION

While Case 2019CF698 Was Pending - James Sealatine AND Judge Walsh, INSTITUTED A PROSECUTION For Falsely IN CASE (2021CF-842).

They were ATTEMPTING to make it appear, as though i - -
[FORGED] a CRIMINAL COMPLAINT AGAINST MYSELF. This was done
shortly before trial to make others believe I FORGED ALL
DOCUMENTS, and not to believe what i said. ONLY AFTER
THEY - Received a FORCED-TOTAL VERDICT of GUILTY, the other
Case was then [DROPPED].

THIS, SEE: [18 USC 1623] "A Prosecution is Vindictive
and due Process Violated if, it's [UNDER-TAKEN] to Punish A
PERSON, [BECAUSE] HE HAS done what the LAW-ALLOWED". of
Course i was [EXERCISING] MY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS, Regarding
there Misconduct, and for That i was Retaliated Against.
With a MALICIOUS-PROSECUTION AND-WRONGFUL-IMPRISONMENT.
SEE: U. S. V. SE DAI, 495 F.3d 826, 832-33 (7th Cir 2007);
"Vindictive Prosecution Exist when it can be shown that the
Government's Actions [WERE-MOTIVATED], by the Prosecutor's --
Personal Stake in the [OUT-COME] of a Case, or a Personal
DESIRE to Seek VINDICATION for PREVIOUS ERRORS that he Committed
in the Case".

NOTE: The Evidence, Exhibits Provide A Substantial Proof of
Vindictive Prosecution. Also, This is Why They have Continued A
Pattern To Prevent Relief as, THE ACTUAL-APPEAL-PROCESS, HAS been
Concealed in CASE NO: 2019CF698, because I've SEEN AND-HEARD-AND-
AS it Pertains TO CASE 2019CF698. So WHERE IS THIS CASE AT?

ON [3/9/23] a letter NOT a Complaint Was Sent to the
(S.D.C. II) - Through Mail. HOW-ever INTERCEPTED AND
[E-Filed]. AGAIN MAIL THEFT. They Were doing this to Prevent
Relief because of the ASSAULTS-AND-BATTERIES TO --
INCLUDE (S.A). They didn't Want Anyone to Know that
[JAMES-SCALATINE]; ANN WALSH; JAMES MENDOCIA Paid People to -
Harm me. THAT WAS ALSO PART OF THERE COVER UP!

UPON, my Arrival at Lawrence C.C. WARDEN BROOKHART
STATED " You Have to be Punished First". MT-MAIL - Again Was
Redirected to [MENARD]-C.C. FROM LAWRENCE C.C., However it
Was Addressed to (S.D.C. III).

Following Said Complaint-Letter i WAS Told to
Amend it So i did [BRINGING FORTH] - my Criminal Case - to
Allow the Court's to See: That my Entire Appeal WAS
WAS [CONCEALED] IN CASE [2019CF698]. Judge STEPHEN P.
MCGLYNN, HOW-eve KNEW my Appeal and Claims Were True.
HE ALSO TRIED TO, Conceal- other Crimes. JUDGE MCGLYNN
[CONTINUED] TO Refer TO "LAWRENCE C.C." AS Were the 1st
Spring of issue's TRANSPIRED at. How-ever it Was at Menard
C.C. Were the FIRST Issue's HAPPEND.

I NOW, Know Why he Stated That. Because He
[KNEW] DEE DEE BROOKHART Was Going to Set me UP, AND ALSO
Tried to have me Harmed. Finally THAT CASE DISMISSED.

Following A Rule 59(c) motion Was Filed, Then
[NO]-HEARING TRANSPIRED- Pursuant RULE 59(d). Then A APPEAL
to the [SEVENTH Circuit App. Ct] ON [AUG. 30-23] WAS FILED.
The Appeal Held in Abeyance For [7 mos]. The Clerk NEVER
[SERVED-PROCESS] AND THE COURT'S AWARE. THUS THE COURT-
STATED [Para: 1 Substantial Issues]. THE APP. CT THEN -
[CONCLUDED]-Failure To STATE A Claim, AND UNDERLYING-CON-
VICTION INTACT. However, not True. It Seems As Though
the Court's IGNORE [BOTH-CASES] OF MALICIOUS -
[Prosecution] [CASE # 201921 CF 842] Which Was Then -
[Dismissed]-After a Year of Imprisonment. THUS I AM
Entitled to Relief. THE HECK V. HUMPHREY, 512 U.S. 477, 486
47 (1993)- Was Clearly Wrong Interpretation in MY CASE -
SEE: [Appendix A Exhibit 1A-B].

NOTE: CASE # 842 Was Dismissed. CASE # 698 WAS DISMISSED,
VACATED AND NEVER REINSTATED SO Relief is Clearly Warranted.
Also, there Was never a WARRANT FOR ARREST ISSUED. The Record
is CLEAR SEE: [Appendix B Exhibit 11].

PLEASE BE ADVISED, The N.D.C.111 also dismissed Said Civil Suit and failed to Allow Amendment, However in that Case THE FACT'S WHERE WELL PLEAD. The Judge WAS Paid OFF to dismiss the Case "AS Futile TO Amend".

SEE: (IN Re GUALT, 387, U.S. 1) it Held "NEITHER MAN - Nor - CATCHED [AN - be] ALLOWED TO STAND CONDEMNED BY [Methods] - Which flout CONSTITUTIONAL - REQUIREMENTS OF DUE - PROCESS".

KEEP IN MIND [D.N.A.] Evidence WAS IN THE NAME OF [JASON] - and Also didn't Match me. This is also on the RECORD. They Knew this. Do You SEE Why THEY HAVE BEEN CONCEALING SAID APPEAL. I don't Even KNOW Who Counsel IS ON APPEAL AS TO Criminal Case 2019CF698 - BECAUSE ITS NOT - EVEN - PENDING. The App. Ct for me is the 2nd Cir. NOT 3rd district App. Ct.

SEE: (U.S. V. TATEO, 377 U.S. 463) "We resolve ANY DOUBT in favour of the Liberty of the CITIZEN, rather than Exercise what would be [UNlimited], UNCERTAIN, AND - [Arbitrary] JUDICIAL Discretion. SEE: DALEOLLO V. ANTHONY - WILLS et al; DALEOLLO V. ANN WALSHE et al; DALEOLLO V. DEE DEE BROOKHART et al.

I add, this: THE [Presumption] OF INNOCENCE EVER + MAN-CHILD, WOMEN ARE SUPPOSE TO BE [CLOAKED] WITH, AS IT PERTAINS TO ME, IS REMOVED THROUGH [Media]-COVERAGE. So the [Burden-of-Proof] IS ALTERED AND THE SCALES UN-BALANCED. Thus the 14th Amendment [DUE-PROCESS]-CLAUSE AND § 1140; § 1141; § 1142 MAKE'S IT CLEAR: "A CLASSIC DUE PROCESS VIOLATION WHEN THE TRIAL COURT, ALLOW'S PUBLIC HOSTILITY AND PREJUDICE TO [MANIFEST] TOWARDS THE DEFENDANT, AND INTIMIDATING THE COURSE OF TRIAL, UNJUSTIFIED PUBLIC CREATING PREJUDICE BY THE JUDGE, JURY, IN HABBITANTS.

Thus, This is the Case AS THE [REFLECTION]-OF THE COURT'S IN IT. PROVIDE PROOF. The Administration of Prejudice is what's Created a SPECIES OF CANCER THAT [NEEDS] THE SUPREME COURT OF THE U.S. TO INTERVENE AND CURE THE [INJUSTICES].

ON [12-15/23] I WAS RUSHED TO THE HOSPITAL. UPON ARRIVAL, I WAS SEEN BY [MULTIPLE-NURSES]. JANE DOE 2, CAME IN AND HERSELF AND ALISHA-CURTWRIGHT ASSAULTED ME AS CURTWRIGHT PULLED HER GUN-OUT. SEXUALLY. I'm IN SEG DUE TO THIS, AND THEY TRYING TO MAKE IT [APPEAR]-IN GUILTY OF THE OFFENSES CHARGED. Malicious - Intentions. And this CORR-CTR LAW. IS LINKED TO DUPAGE DIRECTLY.

REASONS FOR GRANTING RELIEF

DUE TO [CONTINUED]-MAIL-IMPEDIMENT STATE CORRECTIVE [PROCESS]-WERE-UNAVAILABLE. ON 11/03/21 A HABEAS CORPUS [PETITION] FILED STATING DOUBLE JEOPARDY VIOLATIONS AND OTHER ISSUE'S. DUE TO MAIL-[THEFT], AND DENIAL FOR FAILURE TO PAY \$5.00 fee. THE HABEAS PETITION [WAS]-DENTED. THIS WAS A ONGOING ISSUE. EVERY AVENUE-AVAILABLE FOR-RELIEF WAS IMPEDED. THUS, TO APPLY MILLER V. ALABAMA 132 S. CT 2955 (2012) IS A MUST. THE TIME LIMITS SET-OUT IN THE [AEDPA]-ARE CONTRARY TO JUSTICE AND LIMIT-RELIEF-PROCESS.

THUS, [APPLYING]-MILLER RELIES ACTIVELY WOULD-IN JANITA MOUNT PROVIDE RELIEF TO THOSE WHOM RELIEF PROCESS WERE [CONCEALED] OR OTHERWISE IMPEDED. THUS I FURTHER STATE:

THE [EPIC]-PORTIONS IN WHICH MANIFESTED A GREAT [MANIFEST]-NECESSITY DUE TO [CONSTITUTIONAL-DEPRIVATIONS] [BEYOND-DIMENSIONAL]-REALMS. TO CURE SUCH, GRAVE DEPRIVATIONS THE CANCEROUS INJUSTICE NEED NOT ONLY BE 'DIMINISHED' BUT IN [REMISSION] AT ONCE. THIS CASE IS OF SUCH CONSTITUTIONAL IMPORTANCE AS TO RENDER THE COURTS-UN-DEVOIDED ATTENTION. THE GREEDINESS OF MAN NEEDS THE-

[RECALIBRATION] AND IMMEDIATE INTERVENTION. Thus leading ME TO THIS:

PAUPERISM: IS THE [LEAKAGE] THROUGH EVERY-Joint OF A SHIP THAT IS ROTTEN. Were all men doing their duty or [SERIOUSLY] Trying to, Would be NO PAUPER. The [POISSNESS-DRIPPING] FROM ALL THE SINS, AND POTRED -- [UN-VERACITIES] AND GOO-FORGETTING GREEDINESS, AND - [DEVIL-SERVING]-CANT'S, JESUITISM, THAT EXIST AMONG US. Not ONE IDOL-SHAM LOUNGING ABOUT CREATION UPON FALSE PRETENSE, UPON MEANS WHICH HE HAS NOT EARNED, UPON THEORIES [WHICH-HE] DOES NOT [PRACTISE], BUT TELDS HIS SHARE OF -- PAUPERISM SOMEWHERE OR ANOTHER.

CONCLUSION

[BECAUSE], THROUGH MAIL TAMPERING, AND IMPEDIMENT OF ACCESS TO THE COURT'S, ALL PROCESS THAT A PERSON HAS - AVAILABLE FOR RELIEF FOR WHIT INCLUDES CRIMINAL CASE'S [WAS-IMPEDED] SOME PEOPLE ARE LOST WITHOUT PROPER REDRESS; [REDRESS]-OF-THEIR CONVICTIONS - BECAUSE STATE-ACTOR'S CONCEAL THOSE PROCESSES AND OPPRESS THOSE WHO SEEK RELIEF EVEN THOSE [INNOCENT]... THIS CASE SETS THE BOUNDS THAT WOULD REQUIRE MILLER TO APPLY RETRO ACTIVELY. ALSO SEE: IN RE MORGAN, 717 F.3d 1186 (11 Cir 2013).

Respectfully
Submitted

Justin Dalcollo
#51682

Justin Dalcollo
10930 Lawrence Rd
Sumner IL 62766
3-11-24

AFFIDAVIT

UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C.
1746, I Justin Dalcollo DECLARE THAT THIS PETITION
WAS MAILED ON 3/11/24 AND REQUEST FOR FIRST-CLASS
POSTAGE ATTACHED. I FURTHER DECLARE THAT DUE TO CURRENT
CONFINEMENT I'M UNABLE TO PROVIDE A ADEQUATE APPENDIX
AS ISSUES WITH MAIL HAVE BEEN ON-GOING. THE -
EXHIBITS ARE ALSO ~~ENCLOSED~~ ENCLOSED IN THIS ENVELOPE. ~~THE~~
~~ENCLOSURES ARE ALSO ENCLOSED IN THIS ENVELOPE.~~
~~THE ENCLOSURES ARE ALSO ENCLOSED IN THIS ENVELOPE.~~
~~THE ENCLOSURES ARE ALSO ENCLOSED IN THIS ENVELOPE.~~
I FURTHER
DECLARE THIS IS NOT TAKEN MALICIOUSLY NOR FRAUDULENTLY
AND IS IN GOOD FAITH.

Also To Add, THE NOTARY SIGNED SAID CERT AND
PROOF OF SERVICE ON 3/8/24 I ALSO SIGNED IT. - -
HOWEVER I SENT IT ON 3/11/24 DUE TO MAIL NOT
RUNNING ON 3/8/24. PLEASE UNDERSTAND. THANKS.

Justin Dalcollo
10930 LAWRENCE RD
SUMMER IL. 62966
LAWRENCE C.C.
3/11/24

Signed on 3/11/24. - -
Justin Dalcollo
781682