

No. 23-7254

ORIGINAL

FILED
APR 12 2024
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, D.C.

ALFREDA JOHNSON SR. — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.
STATE OF Ohio — RESPONDENT(S)
EUY JARRETT

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

ALFREDA JOHNSON SR.
(Your Name)

#798-288

PRO SE

P.O. BOX 45699
(Address)

LUCASVILLE, Ohio 45699
(City, State, Zip Code)

N/A
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

Application rule 26(B) & ineffective
Appellate Counsel 5th + 14th Substantive
And due process violation of effective
Counsel. omitting Federal law of
Faretta, Brady v. Maryland, FRANKS, Biggers

Due process

crim R. 24 Voir Dire Due process

6th + 14th Amend of self representation

Unfair Trial from "Brady"

Search Warrant Violation of
FRANKS v. Delaware.

Suggestive Identification of
Jury Court I.D. When pretinal
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

6th District Appellate Court of Ohio
STATE v. JOHNSON 2023-Ohio-2424
Decided July 14th 2023 (10845)

The Ohio Supreme Court
23-1543 Decided February 6th 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.Ct. 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
RULE 44(A)/44(C) TR. TRN Pg. 7-15
2945.27 Pg. 63
VOIRE DIRE Pg. 63 TRN

Pg. 4 Brief
Pg. 3 BRIEF
Pg. 4 Brief
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)

6th + 14th, 5th Amendment of the
Federal Constitution

"Faretta" } "BRADY"
"FRANK'S" } "BIGGERS"

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Federal Constitution As Decided
by this Court in "Faretto" 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^{LAW}. the Appellate Court of the 6th 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, McNAMARA 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 Facts of Federal law. This
is Appeal at THE 6th District in Ohio.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

#798-288

Alfred A. Johnson, Jr. pro se

Date: April 5th, 2024