

No. _____

23-7561

ORIGINAL

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

FILED
MAY 20 2024
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

Charles Hyde — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

Southern District of Georgia vs.
11th Cir Court of Appeals — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

11th Circuit Court of Appeals

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Charles Hyde

(Your Name)

FCC-USP-1, P.O. BOX 1033

(Address)

Coleman, FL 33521

(City, State, Zip Code)

N/A

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1) WHETHER my FIRST APPEAL WAS PROPERLY DENIED
"forcing" HYDE TO TAKE AN APPELLATE ATTORNEY?
a) WHICH THIS APPELLATE ATTORNEY NEVER ADDRESSED
the most EGREGIOUS CONDUCT BY PROSECUTORS;
WITHHOLDING EXONERATING EVIDENCE, WHICH PREJUDGED
HYDE IN GETTING A FAIR TRIAL (REMEDY: NEW TRIAL)
X EXONERATING EVIDENCE DISMISSED EXPERTS (6th AMEND. CONFIRMATION)
X DISMISSED EXPERTS (6th AMEND. CHOOSE)
#2) APPEALS COURT NEVER ADDRESSED HYDE'S (PRO-SE) APPEAL?
HYDE SENT IN PRO-SE APPEAL (3 COPIES) NO ANSWER?
#3) HYDE'S WHOLE DEFENSE WAS CENTERED ON "1 SHOT", PROSECUTORS
NEVER PROVIDED THE BULLET THAT HYDE WAS SHOT WITH?
ALSO DISMISSED THE EXPERT WHO WOULD TESTIFY - "1 SHOT"
a) WHY WITHHELD THE DNA BULLET THAT "IMPEACHES EVERYONE"?
(6th AMEND. CONFIRMATION, CHOOSE) PROSECUTORS SUPPORTING PERJURY?
#4) WHY WASN'T HYDE ALLOWED MORE THAN 1 PHONE CALL WITH
"FORCED" APPELLATE ATTORNEY? (14th AMEND, DUE PROCESS ISSUE)

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:

AUSA Jen Solari
AUSA Ron Hubbard } NOT Parties - omit
JUDGE Lisa Godbey Wood
Liberty Co. Sheriff
FBI

RELATED CASES

Brady v. Maryland 373 US 83 (1963) withheld Exculpatory
Connelly v. Thompson, S. Ct. 131, 1350, 1360 (2011) DNA (eg Bullet)

Pyle v. Kansas, 317, U.S. 213 (1942) Deprivation
Kyle v. Whitley, 514 US 419, 435 (1995) Controlling

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

		PAGE NUMBER
1) <i>Bright v. Maryland</i> 373 U.S 83 (1963)	Withheld Exculpatory Evidence	
2) <i>Kyle v. Whitley</i> 514 U.S 419, 435 (1995)	Dismissed Expert (Forensics) Source of Evidence	
3) <i>Connick v. Thompson</i> 5 U.S. 131, 1350, 1360 (2011)	Withheld the Science That Would Impair & Persuade A Jury Different	

STATUTES AND RULES

- 1) 6th Amendment violation - Confrontation Clause (Dismissed Forensics Expert)
- 2) 14th Amendment violation - Unfair Trial - Controlling Evidence & Experts (Dismissed A Week Before Trial (Expert was on first witness list) (Expert Defense))
- 3) Appeals Court NEVER RESPONDED TO PROSE APPEAL (Deprivation, Prejudice)
- 4) Prosecutors Supporting PERJURY & Withholding EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE

OTHER

Deprivation from addressing violations of Constitutional Human Rights that would allow a defendant to defend himself and access to mandatory evidence to PROVE INNOCENCE NOT Complete Innocence But Enough to Get 2 U.S. ATTORNEYS to Control the Evidence that would IMPEACH GOVT TESTIMONY AND Tangible Evidence of Complete Defense. TRAVESTY AND MISCHARGE of Justice see *Connick v. Thompson* 5 U.S. 131 (2011)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A PRO-SE APPEAL BRIEF (IN FORMA PROPERIS) (1ST BRIEF)
6TH AMEND. Confrontation Clause - 14TH Amend. Due Process

APPENDIX B APPEAL BRIEF (TOLD TO TRUST HER) | CONVERSATION (2ND BRIEF)
"Different Argument & Issues"

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D BRIEF FOR EXTENSION OF TIME, BECAUSE THEY ONLY TALKED 1 TIME
AFTER THIS BRIEF WAS FILED HOW IS THAT ADEQUATE REPRESENTATION?

APPENDIX E SHE CHOSE MY ISSUES - "I CHOSE DIFFERENT ISSUES" UNFAIR

APPENDIX F

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 _____; 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 N/A 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 _____ 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 _____. 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).

u
PZ

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

- 1) The Right to Appeal - Constitutional & Statutory Violations that deprived Charles Hyde of a complete defense & fair trial [the 14th Amendment to US Constitution]
- 2) Trial - Withholding Exculpatory Evidence to impeach
- 3) Brady Rule: Withholding Exculpatory Evidence to impeach and source of info by Dismissing Forensic Expert to allow case agent to testify as expert (No Jenks v. 3508)
- 4) Appeals Court ignored Hyde's Appeal Brief?
- 5) Due Process Violations to address Brady Rule and seek relief from prosecutors controlling experts, evidence and supporting personnel -- NOT ADVERSARY functions

* Pyle v. Kansas 317 US 213 (1942) Prosecutors Supporting Perjury

* Hyde presented Appeal Brief for Direct Appellate Review - ignored - Hyde challenges prosecutor conduct on Direct Appeal Review - Deprived of Justice - EVEN w/o objecting from no exp. prose of Justice

1) U.S. v. Young 470 US 1, 15 (1985)

2) GA Code § 9-14-1 - 9-14-53 Title 9 Chap. 14 are 1:2

3) Giglio v. US, 405 US 150 (1972)

Impeachment - Giglio v. US, 405 US 150 (1972) (Inferior Trial)

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

An INEXPERIENCED PRO-SE spent 1 year RESEARCHING AND
COMMUNICATING WITH APPEALS COURT (E.G. IN FORMA PAUPERIS GRANTED
BY CIRCUIT JUDGE) MR. HYDE WAS DEPRIVED OF A FAIR TRIAL BY
ALBUTT'S SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA (BRUNSWICK) JUDGE SAWAYI
RON THLEBOARD DOUBLE TEAMED A DEFENDANT (CHARLES HYDE) OUT
OF HIS REALM OF EXPERIENCE/KNOWLEDGE, PROSECUTORS WITHHELD
EXCIPITARY EVIDENCE OF IMPROVING QUALITY X SUPPORTER
DEPOTRY! HYDE SPENT A YEAR PREPARING APPEAL BRIEF.
DEPOTRY! HYDE SUBMITTED APPEAL BRIEF - NEVER HEARING FROM COURT?
HYDE WAS RUNNING OUT - THEN COURT CLERK SMITH SENT
HYDE INFO ON HAVING TO CONTACT APPELLATE ATTORNEY - WITH THIS
TRAIL TRANSCRIPT. HYDE CONTACTED HER THRU MAIL - CAUSE
HER PHONE WOULDNT ACCEPT PHONE CALLS - ONLY MESSAGES...
HYDE TALKED TO ATTY LEIGH ANN WEBSTER - ATLANTA GA. 30316
404-590-7963 - AT TIME ON PHONE AND NEVER GOT TO EXPRESS HIS
ISSUES. 846 IS NOT A SERIOUS DRUG OFFENSE BUT SHE DIDN'T
WANT TO HEAR IT. DUPREE V U.S. NO. 19-13776 (11TH CIR 2023).
HYDE EXPRESSED HIS CONCERN ABOUT HIS SUBMITTED APPEAL BRIEF.

SHE HAD NO KNOWLEDGE EVEN AFTER CHECKING?
* HYDE WAS DEPRIVED OF HIS RIGHT TO APPEAL THE DEPRIVATION OF
PROSECUTORS CHEATING HIM OUT OF A FAIR TRIAL AND INFO TO
A COMPLETE DEFENSE. THE APPEALS COURT IGNORED HIS BRIEF
COMPLETELY. (THE PROCESS DOESN'T STOP AT DISTRICT COURT.)

INEXPERIENCE DOESN'T TAKE PROSECUTORS & RIGHT TO CHEAT - YOU
CAN TELL PROSECUTORS EXIST THRU THEIR ACTS. (E.G. NOTICE)
"AT TRIAL" (NO FORENSICS EXPERT X NO DNA BULLET) BUT

HYDE'S WHOLE CASE WAS (1 SHOT) [DNA BULLET] OFFICERS SHOT UP
HYDE'S HOUSE TO FABRICATE SCENARIO "POINT" DIFFERENT CALIBER!! oops...

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

THE APPEAL BRIEF filed BY Charles Hyde shows the Real Constitutional violations BY PROSECUTORS Depriving HYDE of a chance to present evidence of TRUTH &

depriving HYDE of FAIR TRIAL. If PROSECUTORS weren't afraid of facts - WHY withhold the Sciences (eg Connick v.

Thompson S.C.T. 131, 1350, 1360 (2011) REASONABLE OPPURTUNITY TO PRESENT EVIDENCE = Court gave HYDE potential

Life Sentence X Cheated HYDE out of TRUTH (HYDE WAS THERE)

- 1) GRANT HYDE A NEW TRIAL - Court Entitled HYDE for OBSTRUCTION (Twice) - AND HYDE WAS Arguing Evidence (eg withheld)
- 2) Withholding HYDE'S EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE IS Reason WHY AUSP'S CAN'T EXPLAIN (WHY) - IF HYDE WAS ATTEMPTING TO SHOOT AT OFFICER WHY NO CHARGES X NO TOPOGRAPHICS X NO PROOF (Only FALSE TESTIMONY)
- 3) 6th AMEND. CONFRONTATION CLAUSE (Dismissed the Expert THAT WOULD COOPERATE HYDE'S DEFENSE - Withheld EVIDENCE X Dismissed Expert)
- 4) HOW CAN HYDE GET A FAIR TRIAL w/ Deprivation of MATERIAL EVIDENCE? (6th AMEND, 14th AMEND, VIOLATIONS U.S. CONSTITUTION)
- 4) APPEALS COURT NEVER RULED ON HYDE'S (PROSEC) APPEAL BRIEF?

* Government Respect the DUE PROCESS Guarantees.

NOT REVIEWING (pro se) Appellate Brief - MANDATORY Exculpatory Evidence missing from Record - Proof that it was withheld Simple "DNA Brief" CONCLUSION
Because 11th Cir. Appeals Court - NEVER ADDRESS, the EXTREME Violations of Constitution and Human Rights - thus enabling the District Ct to ~~Support~~ Deprive Hyde of FAIR Trial
The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles T. Hyde II

Date: 5-17-2024

(pg 6)