

23-7254 ORIGINAL

FILED  
APR 12 2024

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPR

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

WASHINGT0N, D.C.

ALFREDA JOHNSON <sup>SR.</sup> PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

VS. EVY JARRETT  
STATE OF Ohio — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

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

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

#798-288

ALFREDA JOHNSON SR.

(Your Name)

JK.  
PRO SE

P.O. Box 456 99

(Address)

LUCASVILLE, Ohio 415699  
(City, State, Zip Code)

N/A

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

Application rule 26(B) ineffective  
Appealate Counsel 5<sup>th</sup> + 14<sup>th</sup> Substantive  
And due process violation of effective  
Counsel. omitting Federal law of  
Faretta, Brady v. Maryland, Frank's, Biggers  
Due process

Ariz R. 24 Due process  
6<sup>th</sup> + 14<sup>th</sup> Amend of Self representation  
Unfair trial from "Brady"

Search warrant Violations of  
Frank v. DeLeuze.

Suggestive Identifications of  
In court I. D. when pretrial  
photo with mask on Suspect  
could not I. D.

## 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

6<sup>th</sup> District Appellate Court of Ohio  
STATE v. JOHNSON 2023-Ohio-2424  
Decided July 14<sup>th</sup> 2023 (1084)

The Ohio Supreme Court  
23-1543 Decided February 6<sup>th</sup> 2024

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW .....	1
JURISDICTION.....	
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....	
CONCLUSION.....	

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A S.C.T. of Ohio 23-1543 Decided 2-6-24

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

### CASES

### PAGE NUMBER

FRANK'S V. DELAWARE, TR-TRN, 293-294 Pg. 1 BRIEF  
 BRADY V. MARYLAND TR-TRN, 140+176, Pg. 1 BRIEF  
 BIGGERS TR-TRN, 235-238 Pg. 3 Brief  
 FARETTA V. CALIFORNIA TRN Pg. 7-15 Pg. 3 BRF,

### STATUTES AND RULES

CRIM. R. 24 Pg. 63 Pg. 4 Brief  
 RULE 44(A) / 44(c) TR-TRN Pg. 7-15 Pg. 3 BRIEF  
 2945-27 Pg. 63 Pg. 4 Brief  
 VOIRE DIRE Pg. 63 TRN Pg. 4 BRIEF

### 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**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits 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 \_\_\_\_\_ 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 2-6-2024.  
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).

## CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Sec. 10 Art 1 Ohio Constitution

Rule 44(A) & (C)

6<sup>th</sup> + 14<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment of the  
Federal constitution

"Faretta" > "Brady"  
"FRANKS" > "Biggers"

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Federal Constitution as decided  
by this Court in "Faretta" did  
not provide due process of  
rule 44(A)-(C).

A Brady disclosure of Det. Richard  
Fisher and unsigned warrant  
Search warrant written, violating  
Fair Trial and Frank's v. Delaware

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

These reason is A blatant violation of Federal established rights that the Ohio Supreme Court Declined Discretionary review of An App. R. 26 B on ineffective counsel of A "FRANK'S" Violation, A "Brady" Violation, A "FARETTA" And A "Biggers" All supported by the record. the ohio Supreme Court Abused it's discretion in overlooking Federal Constitutional errors<sup>LAW</sup>. the Appellate Court of the 6<sup>th</sup> District of Ohio, Did Decide in ST. V. JOHNSON 2023-Ohio-2424 And misapplied the law when Judge Osowik in HN12 Knew there should of been A "FARETTA" Inquiry and A written Waiver of record violated Rule 44(A) & (K). He Substituted his decision for that of the trial judge, M. NAMSIA Decided Attorney Simmons Advisory TRNS. Pg. 13 P. 7 & was Pro Se. Osowik no Abuse of discretion, this is contrary to federal established & unreasonable Determination of the Fact's of Federal law. This is Appeal at THE 6<sup>th</sup> District in Ohio.

## CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

#798-288

Alfred John Jr. pro se  
Date: April 5<sup>th</sup>, 2024