

No. _____

23-7202

ORIGINAL

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

FEB 21 2024

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

Craig Alford
(Your Name)

— PETITIONER

Haidle, Baylor, et al
ARMONIS

vs.

— RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

3rd Circuit Court of Appeals

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Craig Alford #120225

(Your Name)

SCI-Phoenix

1200 Mokychic Drive

(Address)

Collegeville, PA 19426

(City, State, Zip Code)

610.409.7890 - SCI-Phoenix

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- 1.) Did the 3d Circuit err when they made new docket numbers at 23-2987 and 23-1513 when IFP was granted at docket #20-3297 for the same case @ U.D. Pa. Civ. No. 1:20-cv-01784?
- 2.) Was petitioner/appellant granted IFP status in the U.S.D.C. and 3rd Circuit and his IFP status should continue ~~for~~ for the same case @ U.D. Pa. Civ. No. 1:20-cv-01784 and/or demonstrated imminent danger of serious bodily injury?
"I TOLD THEM I CAN DIE FROM THIS SCEN" "MCCF"
- 3.) After this case @ U.D. Pa. Civ. No. 1:20-cv-1787 was vacated and remanded by the 3rd Circuit allowed to proceed on 14th Amendment violations by defendants/respondents by overruling a motion to dismiss, and defendants never responding to discovery request, and not one of my exhibits was considered in my motions for summary judgment, declaratory judgment, and motion to compel discovery and ~~the~~ ^{did he} U.S.D.C. err when it granted defendants summary judgment without no discovery submitted by them...?
- 4.) Did the U.S.D.C. err when it did not allow me to obtain discovery from defendants?
- 5.) Should petitioner/appellant \$1,672,000.00 + interest (a) prime rate be awarded @ PCORP Claim #s EC 0637182, OC 062339.

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

- Alford v. Baylor, et al. # 23-3982 - Relates to
- Alford v. Baylor, et al. # 23-1513 - #20-3297 same issues
- 3d Circuit original case #20-3297 - LORA, et al. Baylor, et al. (VACATED AND REMAND) IFP GRANTED... 7.19.21 - 3d Cir. judgment
- ORIGINAL TRIAL COURT DOCKET # 1:20-cv-01782 - Alford v. Baylor, et al. (al REMAND: ALLOWED TO PROCEED ON 14TH AMENDMENT VIOLATIONS AGAINST DEFENDANTS) IFP GRANTED 8.9.22 - U.S.D.C. MD. PT judgment

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	8
CONCLUSION.....	6

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	DECISION OF COURT OF APPEALS
APPENDIX B	DECISION OF U.S. D. C.
APPENDIX C	DECISION OF COURT OF APPEALS NOT TO REPEL #20-3297 that was vacated and
APPENDIX D	remanded by the 3d circuit
APPENDIX E	
APPENDIX F	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
- Oviatt by and through Waugh v. Pearce, 954 F.2d 1470, 1475, 1478, 1481 (9th Circuit)	4
- STAPLE v. DIECKS, 885 F.2d 1099, 1108-09, 1112, 1115-16, 1118 (3d Circuit)	4
- INGLE v. YELTON, 439 F.3d 191, 196 (4th Circuit)	4, 5
- LEIGH v. WARNER Bros. INC. 212 F.3d 1210, 1219 (11th Circuit)	4, 5
- RANNEY v. (Coughlin), 94 F.3d 71, 73-74 (2nd Circuit)	4, 5

STATUTES AND RULES

L.R. §26.3; §30.2; §30.5; §33.1; §34.1; §36.1; §37.1; §83.3(a); §83.3.2	4, 5
F.A.R. C.R.M.P. §571(A) / §600(B)(1)(i)(2)	4

OTHER

14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution 3, 4

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 B to the petition and is

☒ reported at 853 FED. APP'X 861 / 2021 U.S. APP. LEXIS 21256; or, DOCKET # 18-1465
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix B to the petition and is

☒ reported at 2022 U.S. DIST. LEXIS 141661; or, DOCKET # 88
☐ 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 _____ 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 JAN. 28, 2024, DEC. 28, 2023

☐ 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: JAN. 25, 2024, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix A.

☐ 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 _____.
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).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

- 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution - Due process and equal protection clause
- F.R. CIV. P. §27; §30; §31; §33; §34; §36
- L.R. §26.3; §30.2; §30.5; §33.1; §34.1; §36.1; §37.1; §33.3(a); §33.3.2
- Pa. R. CRIM. P. §57(A) / §600(B)(1) & (2)

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

While at Monroe County Correctional Facility inmates filed a class action because we were not arraigned or given a timely trial. On Oct. 13, 2020 the case was dismissed. IFP Granted

I Craig Aiford was the only one who opposed, and the 3rd Circuit vacated and remanded the Oct. 13, 2020 decision. IFP granted I remanded the complaint...

Defendants filed a motion to dismiss. I opposed. This case was allowed to proceed on the following claims 1) Aiford's official capacity 14th Amend. due process claims against defendant Heidle and 2) Aiford's individual capacity 14th Amend. due process claims against Baylor, Armond, and Heidle. A case management order issued. Defendant was admonished by the court to comply with discovery.

I submitted discovery on defendants who did not reply at all. I sought summary judgment, declaratory judgment, and motion to compel discovery. I tried to confer or attempt to confer with defendants but fail on death ears. My motions was denied without any of my exhibits considered, then the court grant defendants summary judgment without no discovery submitted by defendants. I asked to reopen 20-3297 was denied, then given 2 new docket #s for 'the same case already on remand. IFP denied. Defendant was not agreeable to mediation. I sought the U.S.D.C. help, fail on death ears, I went back to the 3rd Circuit for relief. Tried to fix it, was denied, this appeal followed.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

This court should grant certiorari because IFP was granted in the U.S.D.C. and 3d Circuit court of Appeals, and/or 23-2987 and 23-1513 merges with 20-3297. Because defendants never submitted discovery so summary judgment should of been denied by defendants, and granted in my favor if my arguments, documents, and exhibits is considered...

The 3d circuit decision is in conflict with other courts of appeals on the same important matter. So this court should settle this unique case that's never been decided by the U.S.D.C. and 3d Circuit governing pretrial errors and this important question of Federal law that I had no way to remedy or retrieve discovery from defendants who has violated the rules of court and both courts U.S.D.C. and 3d circuit decision in my case is erroneous, IFP was granted... IFP should continue and/or counsel should be appointed. (SEE DOCKET # 30 / # 51 @ 1:20-CV-01787) APPENDIX B

This case has affected the public interest and is important to the public of the issue governing pretrial confinement. (SEE DOCKET # 64 / # 65 / # 88 @ 1:20-CV-1787) APPENDIX B

Defendants has violated the order at Docket # 92 @ 1:20-CV-1787) APPENDIX B and did not submit discovery at all and the deadline expired 1.20.23; defendants are not agreeable to mediation; dispositive motions was filed, no pretrial conference was scheduled and/or compliance deadline of 1.27.23 expired and defendants should be sanctioned for their actions.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Craig Alford

Date: 2.13.24