

23-7496 No. 4:23-CR-136 ORIGINAL

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

MAY 14 2024

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

In Re OLAMIDE OLATAYO BELLO PETITIONER
(Your Name)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

OLAMIDE OLATAYO BELLO

(Your Name)

INMATE #65100510, FANNIN COUNTY JAIL

2389 SILO ROAD

(Address)

BONHAM, TEXAS 75418

(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the failure of the Counsel to Pursue an appeal or motion the Petitioner would have otherwise Pursued Violate the Sixth amendment, Prejudice to the Petitioner and denial Petitioner's access-to-court
2. Whether the Prosecution of Information Content Provider and Interactive Computer Service Provider for Content created by "third Party" and testimonies as a result of Interactive Computer services is Constitutional and in accordance to Section 230 of Communication Decency Act
3. Whether it is Constitutional to prosecute a Controlling Person without a Primary violation of the Controlled Person
4. Whether the trial Court have Jurisdiction over an offense not Under the federal law
5. Whether it is Constitutional to force an Individual to give up that which he was not unlawfully and unjustly enrich and that which no existence of enrichment
6. Whether been Compelled to witness against self is Constitutional
7. Whether the Speedy trial Act has been Violated and Pretrial detention Punishment is Constitutional

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	7-26
APPENDIX B	27
APPENDIX C	28-29
APPENDIX D	30
APPENDIX E	
APPENDIX F	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

Garza v. Idaho

United States v. Ogbonna

Bounds v. Smith

San fernando Valley v. Roomates.com LLC

ATSI Communication, Inc. v. Shaar Fund LTD

United States v. Salemo

Sellers v. United States

Gorden v. Faber

farmer v. Brennan

United States v. steward

United States v. Brocednaax

Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of AM

Conservation force v. Salazar

Balisteri v. Pacifica Police Dept.

Thos v. United States

Montalvo v. LIs Benjamin Reas, Inc

Puerto Rico Tel Co. v. SprintCom, Inc.

Hatton v. Municipality of Ponce

Puntalima, LLC v. Punta Lima Dev. Co.

Winnie v. Hilton Worldwide Holdings Inc

QVC, Inc. v. OurHouseworks LLC

Methameccanica del Tieberina v. Kelleher

Equitas Disability Advocs, LLC v. Bryant

CASES

Page Number

Hettinger v. Kleinman	19, 20
USA Disaster Recovery, Inc v. St. Tammany Parish Govt	20
Edwards v. Comforto	20
Minyard v. Curtis Products, Inc	20
Mary V. Lupin Foundation	20
Walters v. Medsouth Record Mgmt, LLC	20
S.E.C v. Commonwealth Chem Secs, Inc	21
S.E.C v. Jones	21
S.E.C v. Inorganic recycling Corp.,	21
S.E.C v. Opulentical, LLC	21
Zedner v. United States	24
United States v. Gates	26
United States v. Tirasso	26
United States v. Valencia-Gambou	26
United States v. Jordan Nos. 88-1175, 88-1219	24
United States v. Lloyd No 96-30149, NO 96-30183	25

STATUS AND RULES

Page Number

47 U.S.C § 230

9

USCS SEC. 2254 CASES R4

13

18 U.S.C § 3231

14, 15, 17

Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 12

16

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12

15

18 U.S.C § 3109

22

18 U.S.C § 3161

25, 26

18 U.S.C § 3164

26

OTHER

Page Number

Sixth Amendment

7, 8, 25

First Amendment

8

Fourteenth Amendment

8, 22

Fifth Amendment

22

Speedy Trial Act

24, 25

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	103
JURISDICTION.....	104
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	105
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	106
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	107
CONCLUSION.....	108

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

~~109-110~~

APPENDIX B

21 - 31

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

32 - 34

APPENDIX E

35 -

APPENDIX F

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of habeas corpus issue.

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 C to the petition and is

reported at PACER.GOV; 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 _____ 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**[X] 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 _____. 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

- First Amendment
- Fifth Amendment
- Sixth Amendment
- Fourteenth Amendment
- Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12
- Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 12
- 18 U.S.C. § 3109
- 18 U.S.C. § 3161
- 18 U.S.C. § 3164
- 18 U.S.C. § 3231
- 47 U.S.C. § 230
- USCS Sec. 2254 ~~RASES~~ R4

STATEMENT OF THE CASE
& RULE 20.4(A) STATEMENT

The Petitioner is currently unlawfully held in the Fannin County Detention Center Sherman Texas for over 8 months in violation of the sixth amendment right to confront and cross examine adverse witness and in violation of the federal rule of evidence and due process. A copy of Memorandum in support is attached hereto Appendix A and made a part for all purpose.

Adequate relief cannot be obtained in any other form or from any other court and exceptional circumstances warrant the exercise of this court's discretionary power. In support of this shows:

- a: The Petitioner's Counsel failed to pursue the motions and Appeals the Petitioner would have otherwise pursued - Appendix B
- b: The Petitioner's writ was denied without notice - Appendix B, Dkt # 182
- c: The Petitioner's motions was denied due to the ineffectiveness of the Counsel - Appendix B. Petitioner do not have constitutional right to hybrid-representation
- d: The Petitioner has been denied access to the district court in which the Petitioner is held - Appendix C
- e: The Petitioner's Counsel failed to withdraw upon petitioner's decommission and the trial court failed to dismiss the Counsel - Appendix B, Dkt # 185

The Petitioner invite this court to grant such other relief as may be appropriate and to dispose of matter as law and justice required and also exercise this court's discretionary power to review the Petitioner's pretrial motions and grant revocation of the pretrial release revocation order with immediate release of the Petitioner from the custody.

The Court of Appeal do not have original jurisdiction over writ or motions the Petitioner would have otherwise pursue - Appendix D

5

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

The Petitioner has in some extraordinary way been prevented from asserting his Constitutional and statutory right and due process.

The Court has misled the petitioner regarding the steps that the Petitioner needs to take to pursue or preserve a claim.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of habeas corpus should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,


Olamile Olatayo Bello

Date: April 22, 2024