

No. 23-7053

ORIGINAL

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

FILED
MAR 13 2024
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

Jonathan James Markle — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

TEXAS DEPT. OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

Court of Criminal Appeals of Texas
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Jonathan James Markle TDC# 0582926
(Your Name)

2101 FM 369 North
(Address)

Iowa Park, Texas 76367
(City, State, Zip Code)

51A
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

AT WHAT POINT DOES THE STATE COURT PROCESS GET HELD ACCOUNTABLE IN ITS DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE
TO THE FACTS AND STATUTES THAT GOVERN ITS NON-DISCRETIONAL DUTY?

IF A PERSON HAS A PROTECTED LIBERTY INTEREST THEN EXACTLY HOW IS THAT SAID INTEREST PROTECTED
IF THE STATE COURTS REFUSE TO DENY THEIR STATUTORY DUTY?

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

CAUSE NO. 91 CR 1460 W STATE OF TEXAS v Jonathan James Markle MARCH 27, 1991

226th JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF BEXAR COUNTY, TEXAS

CAUSE NO. 91 CR 1461 W STATE OF TEXAS v Jonathan James Markle MARCH 27, 1991

226th JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF BEXAR COUNTY, TEXAS

CASE NO. WR-95, 408-01 EX PARTE Jonathan James Markle JANUARY 31, 2024

COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS OF TEXAS

CASE NO. WR-95, 408-2 EX PARTE Jonathan James Markle JANUARY 31, 2024

COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS OF TEXAS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - DENIED W/O WRITTEN ORDER CASE NO. WR-95-408-1

APPENDIX B - DENIED W/O WRITTEN ORDER CASE NO. WR-95-408-2

APPENDIX C - 226th DISTRICT COURT ORDER - 5 PGS

APPENDIX D - COPY OF APPLICANT'S ORIGINAL BRIEF - 5 PGS

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

	PAGE NUMBER
<u>CARMEL v TEXAS, 529 US 319</u>	5
<u>CAIDEN v BULL, 390 F.2d 648</u>	5
<u>EX PARTE Hallmark, 883 SW2d 672</u>	5

STATUTES AND RULES

<u>THE RULES OF JUDICIAL POWERS</u>	5
-------------------------------------	---

OTHER

<u>US CONST Amend V</u>	5
<u>US CONST Amend XIV</u>	5

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 & B 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 226th Judicial District court appears at Appendix c 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 _____.
S

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 1/31/2024.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix A & B.

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 _____.
S

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

* TEXAS RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE 79.2 (d) PROHIBITS APPLICANTS FROM FILING A MOTION FOR REHEARING ONCE A DENIAL OR DISMISSAL HAS BEEN ISSUED

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

US CONST AMEND V - DUE PROCESS, LIBERTY

US CONST AMEND XIV - MADE APPLICABLE: DUE PROCESS, LIBERTY

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

ON MARCH 27, 1991 PETITIONER WAS CONVICTED IN CASES NO. 91 CR 1460 W (P.L. § 19.02) AND NO. 91 CR 1461 W (P.L. § 28.03) OF WHICH FELL UNDER THE 71ST LEGISLATURE IN THE STATE OF TEXAS

ACCORDING TO THE COURT'S ORDER THE LATTER CASE WAS TO BE SERVED FIRST WHICH MEANT THAT UNDER SAID LEGISLATURE PETITIONER WAS ELIGIBLE FOR PAROLE ON THIS FIRST CASE IN 10 YRS AND THE SECOND CASE 15 YEARS AFTER OBTAINING PAROLE IN THE FIRST

PETITIONER WAS MADE TO SERVE 15 YRS BEFORE BECOMING ELIGIBLE ON HIS FIRST CASE, WAS GRANTED PAROLE AFTER A TOTAL OF 18 YRS, AND WAS ERONEOUSLY RELEASED ON BOTH CASES DUE TO CLERICAL ERROR.

PETITIONER SERVED 10 YRS ON PAROLE AND WAS SUBJECT TO TECHNICAL VIOLATIONS TWICE TO WHICH HE WAS SANCTIONED W/O REVOCATION, YET UPON REALIZATION OF THE CLERICAL ERROR, THE TEXAS DEPT. OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE - WHO PROVIDES PAROLE AND PAROLE - CHARGED PETITIONER W/ ANOTHER TECHNICAL VIOLATION AND REVOKED HIS PAROLE AND DENIED TIME ACCRUED - 10 yrs in/ON EACH CASE - DESPITE NO CRIMINAL ACT, CHARGE, OR CONVICTION.

PETITIONER AND HIS FAMILY MEMBERS SPENT GREATER TIME TRYING TO RESOLVE SAID ISSUES AS WELL AS THE ADDITIONAL FACTS THAT THE TEXAS DEPT. OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE HAD CONFUSED HIS CUSTODY FILES TO WHERE THEY DID NOT REFLECT HIS JUDGMENTS OR SENTENCES CORRECTLY

ON NOVEMBER 2, 2023 PETITIONER FILED FOR HABEAS CORBUS RELIEF FROM THE 226TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF BEXAR COUNTY, TEXAS IN WHICH PETITIONER CLAIMED VIOLATIONS OF:

CLERICAL ERROR

DOUBLE JEOPARDY

VIOLATION OF LIBERTY INTEREST

VIOLATION OF STATUTORY LAW

SAID COURT RELIED ON RESPONDENTS RESPONSE TO DEM. RELIEF AND SAID DENIAL WAS UPHELD BY THE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS DESPITE SHOWING OF FEDERAL COURT RULINGS IN CONTRADICTION TO SUCH

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE RULES & JUDICIAL POWERS THE STATE OF TEXAS COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS IS Bound

BY DUTY TO FOLLOW THE RULINGS OF THE HIGHER COURTS, I.E., THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, THE COURT

OF APPEALS FOR THE 5TH CIRCUIT, THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, AS WELL AS ITS OWN CONCURRING OPINIONS

IN SUCH MATTERS PRESENTED - THIS RULE APPLIES TO THE STATE DISTRICT COURTS AS WELL

PETITIONER HAS SHOWN SUFFICIENT CONTROLLING CASE LAW IN HIS BRIEF AT STATE LEVEL TO SUPPORT RELIEF, YET,

EVEN DESPITE THE DENIAL OF RELIEF, THE STATE HAS STILL FAILED TO ORDER THE CORRECTION OF THE CLERICAL ERROR

IN ITS OBSTINATE EFFORT TO APPEAR CORRECT IN THE MATTER OF WHICH IS BEST SUMMED UP IN CARMELL V.

TEXAS, 529 U.S. 519, 533 - "IN EACH INSTANCE, THE GOVT REFUSES AFTER THE FACT, TO PAY FOR ITS OWN RULES,

ALTERING THEM IN A WAY THAT IS ADVANTAGEOUS ONLY TO THE STATE, TO FACILITATE AN EASIER CONVICTION."

[CITING CALDWELL V. BHILL, 390 U.S. 648 (1798); EX PARTE HALLMARK, 883 SW2D 672, 674 (TEXCRIMAPP 1994)]

THE COURTS ARE VIEWING / HAVE VIEWED THIS CASE ERONEOUSLY, AND WITH DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE, &

WHICH EXCEEDS NEGLIGENCE - THIS CASE IS SUPPOSE TO BE VIEWED UNDER THE LAWS & THE 71ST LEGISLATURE

THAT WERE IN PLACE WHEN THE CONVICTION WAS ADJUDICATED - LET ALONE FOR THE PROPER PENAL CODE WITH

THE SENTENCE AS PASSED BY THE ORIGINAL TRIAL JUDGE & WHICH THE TEXAS DIST. OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE'S

RECORDS DO NOT, AND HAVE NOT, ACCURATELY REFLECTED

THIS ALL VIOLATES DUE PROCESS UND. U.S. CONST. AMEND. V., MADE APPLICABLE TO PETITIONER THROUGH

U.S CONST. AMEND XIV, AND AFFECTS PETITIONER'S PROTECTED LIBERTY INTEREST UNDER AND/OR THROUGH

BOTH AFOREMENTIONED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS AND THE FEDERAL VOTER ID THROUGH PETITIONER

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

John Khan Wankle

Date: MARCH 13, 2024