

23-7612


COVER

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

WADE GREELEY LAY,
PETITIONER,

ORIGINAL

v.

CHRISTI QUICK,
RESPONDENT

*Petition for writ of certiorari to the
Supreme Court of the United States*

CAPITAL CASE

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "WADE GREELEY LAY".

OKLAHOMA STATE PENITENTIARY

P.O. BOX 91

MCALISTER, OKLA. 74502

DATE: 03/26/2024

pjd-sl

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

PETITIONER, WADE LAY, WHO NOW FACES AN EXECUTION DATE OF JUNE 26, 2024 APPROACHES THIS COURT WITH SERIOUS QUESTIONS WITH REGARD TO FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS THAT HAVE BEEN SYSTEMATICALLY WITHHELD FROM HIM BY BUREAUCRATIC ACTORS (STATE AND FEDERAL) IMPULSED BY JUDGES IN BOTH FEDERAL AND STATE COURTS IN AN EFFORT TO CENSOR HIS CONSTITUTIONAL OPINIONS AND ALTER THE FACTS OF THE ORIGINAL CRIMINAL CAUSE. THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS HAVE ARISEN OUT OF THIS CONFLICT.

- 1.) SHOULD REMEDY BE MORE READILY AVAILABLE TO A DEATH ROW INMATE, A STATE PRISONER FACING EXECUTION WHO HAS SUFFERED UNDER THE ILLICIT WILL OF FEDERAL JUDGES CAUSING AN IMPEDIMENT TO FILING A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS?
- 2.) SHOULD THE COURT RECOGNIZE THE CLEAR AND PRESENT INTENT - THAT THE INITIAL REMEDY TO PREVENT AN IMPEDIMENT TO FILING A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS IS FOUND IN THE

- 2.) PROHIBITIVE NATURE OF THE HABEAS CORPUS CLAUSE, IN THE COMPOSITION AND STRUCTURE OF THE STATE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENTS THAT EXIST BETWEEN THE EXERCISE OF THEIR POWERS ?
- 3.) SHOULD *McFarland V. Scott* BE REEXAMINED SEEING THAT THE PRESENTATION OF A *McFarland* MOTION BY GOVERNMENT LAWYERS ABSENT THE CHARACTERIZATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL ERROR WAS UTILIZED TO ALTER THE FACTS OF AN ORIGINAL CRIMINAL CAUSE ?
- 4.) WHY NOT REEXAMINE THE FUNDAMENTALS OF ARTICLE IV, SECTION 4, AS TO ITS MEANING, AS JAMES MADISON DOES IN *FEDERALIST 39-51*, WITH THE INTENT TO INCORPORATE ORIGINAL INTENT, WITH THE CHAOS CAUSED BY SUBSTITUTIVE DUE PROCESS ?

LIST OF PARTIES

1. APPELLANT/PETITIONER - WADE GREENLY LAY # 516263
2. CHRISTI QUICK (WARDEN, O.S.P.) - RESPONDENT

PARTIES OF INTEREST

3. FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER - JEFF BYERS (DIRECTOR)
OKLAHOMA CITY - WESTERN DISTRICT
4. OKLAHOMA ATTORNEY GENERAL - GENTNER DRUMAND
5. RHODA KEMP (SISTER TO WADE LAY - POWER OF ATTORNEY)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED	i, ii
---------------------	-------

LIST OF PARTIES	iii
-----------------	-----

TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
-------------------	----

INDEX OF APPENDICES	v
---------------------	---

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	vi
----------------------	----

JURISDICTION	vii
--------------	-----

STATEMENT OF THE CASE	viii
-----------------------	------

CERTIORARI PETITION	pg. 1-22
---------------------	----------

APPENDICES 1 & 2	
------------------	--

INDEX OF APPENDICES

1. COMPLAINT TO THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE
2. PLEADING TO THE PITTSBURGH COUNTY DIST. COURT

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

A. UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1.) <i>Glossip v. Chandler</i> , (CA) -14-665-F | 8, 19, 20 |
| 2.) <i>Glossip v. Gross</i> , 135 S.Ct. 2726 (2015) | 5, 19 |
| 3.) <i>Martin v. Hunter's Lessee</i> , 14 US 304 (1816) | 2, 11, 12 |
| 4.) <i>McFarland v. Scott</i> , 512 US 849 (1994) | ii, 13 |
| 5.) <i>Ryan v. Gonzalez</i> , 568 US 57 (2013) | 16 |
| 6.) <i>Teague v. Lane</i> , 489 US 288 (1989) | 11 |

B. FEDERAL CASES

- | | |
|---|--------|
| 1.) <i>Lay v. Oklahoma Dept. of Corrections</i> , 17-1224-D | 4, 5 |
| 2.) <i>Lay v. Otto</i> , 12-888-D, | 14, 17 |
| 3.) <i>Lay v. Workman</i> , 08-617-SCM-PJC | 14 |

JURISDICTION

THIS CERTIORARI PETITION IS FROM THE TENTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS. 28 USC § 2244 (d) (1) (B) IS APPLICABLE BECAUSE NO IMPEDIMENT EXIST TO FILE A HABEAS WRIT CAUSED BY FEDERAL JUDGES. THE ORIGINAL CONSTITUTION PROVIDES A REMEDY WITHIN A VERY DIFFERENT CONSTRUCT, AS DESCRIBED BY PETITIONER IN HIS EXHIBITS ATTACHED. IN THIS MODERN PARADIGM HOWEVER, IT IS THIS COURT THAT HAS ASSUMED THOSE FORMERLY RESERVED POWERS.

THE BORDEN FALLS ON THIS COURT TO PROVIDE A REMEDY, TO ENFORCE THE PRINCIPLES OF THE ARTICLE III RIGHT TO ADVANCE THE ORIGINAL FACTS ON APPEAL.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

THERE HAS NEVER BEEN A CASE LIKE THIS. THE FEDERAL JUDGES COMPLAINED ABOUT, IN THE COMPLAINT TO THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE HAVE INVOLVED THEMSELVES IN A CONSPIRACY, UTILIZING THE BUREAUCRATIC CORPS - BOTH STATE AND FEDERAL ACTORS. THE OUTCOME IS SIMILAR TO THE ACTIONS TAKEN BY TOTALITARIAN GOVERNMENTS, SUCH AS: RUSSIA AND CHINA; WHERE THE TRIAL AND APPEALS ARE CONTROLLED BY GOVERNMENTAL ACTORS.

SUBSTANTIVE DUE PROCESS, AS A DOCTRINE, HAS BECOME A BEAST THAT DESTROYS ITS OWN OBJECTIVES. THIS COURT MUST CONSIDER THIS CASE HAVING SUCH SEVERE ISSUES CRITICAL TO THE WHOLE NATION.

THE PROHIBITIVE NATURE OF THE VIRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS, THE BILL OF RIGHTS, AND THE STATE OF FEDERALISM MUST BE REEXAMINED BY THIS COURT. (SEE THE ATTACHED DOCUMENTS)

1. IN NOVEMBER OF 2008, FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER (FPD) PATTI GHERZI VISITS OKLAHOMA STATE PENITENTIARY (OSP) WITH AN UNKNOWN COLLEAGUE - BELIEVED TO BE THE CLERK OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DIST. OF OKLA. (USDC ND/OK) PHIL COMBARDI. THE TWO WERE SENT TO O.S.P. BY U.S. DIST. JUDGE TERRENCE KERN, TO COMPEL WADE LAY THROUGH DECEIT, TO SIGN TWO PIECES OF PAPER UNDER THE PRETENCE OF THE NEED FOR MEDICAL INFORMATION. THOSE TWO PAGES BECAME THE SIGNATORY PART OF THE IN-FORMA-PROPETUS AND THE McFarland MOTION, A FRAUDULENT HABEAS PETITION.
2. THE INTENT OF JUDGE KERN IS CLEAR. THE U.S. DIST. JUDGE WANTED TO ALTER THE FACTS OF THE TRIAL COURT, DUE TO THE FACT WADE LAY PRESENTED THE *casos federis* DEFENSE. THE *casos federis* DEFENSE BEING A DEFENSE OF LIBERTY IS LEGITIMISED

F.N.X

- 1) FOR MORE INFO. ON THE SIGNING OF BLANK PAGES, SEE: DOC NO. 010110013289, OF *Lay V. O.D.C.*, 11-1224-D, 10-6024, PG. 11

2. BY THE MARSHALL COURT IN *Martin v. Hunter's Lessee* 14 U.S. 304

(1816). THE CONCEPT WAS BREACHED AT THE FEDERAL CONVEN-

TION ON JULY 18, 1787, AND J. STORY IN *Martin* MAKES

REFERENCE TO THE CONDITION OF "*casus foederis*". ARISING

DIRECTLY, OR INCIDENTALLY IN STATE COURTS. AT THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION JULY 18TH, DANIEL CARROL (MARYLAND)

DECLARES THAT "SOME SUCH PROVISION IS ESSENTIAL", WITH

RESPECT TO THE REPUBLICAN FORM OF GOVERNMENT GUAR-

ANTEED TO ALL THE STATES. HE SAYS: THAT "EVERY STATE

COULD TO WISH FOR IT. IT HAS BEEN DOUBTED WHETHER IT IS

A *CASUS FEDERIS* AT THE PRESENT."

3. THE PREMISE THAT EXIST, IS THAT A PARTICULAR STANDARD

SHOULD BE UPHOLD, WITH A SUBSEQUENT MEANS TO SUSTAIN

²
SUCH AN ESTABLISHED CONDITION. THE PEOPLE OF THE

E.N.*

2) WE SEE A SIMILAR PREMISE IN ART. IV, SECT. 4, AS EXPLAINED BY JAMES
MADISON IN FEDERALIST 39-51.

3.- UNITED STATES POSSESS WITHIN THEIR CONSTITUTION A MEANS TO OVERCOME AN OPPRESSIVE GOVERNMENT. THEY HAVE THE NATURAL RIGHT " TO THROW OFF SUCH GOVERNMENT" ³ THROUGH THE RESIDUAL POWERS OF THE STATES.

4. JAMES MADISON MAKES THIS ARGUMENT VERY CLEAR IN HIS REPORT ON THE ALIEN AND SEDITION ACTS. BEFORE THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS CREATED AN EXPANSIVE CRIMINAL CODE, USURPING UNDELEGATED POWERS, MADISON WRITES:

5. " IF THE DELIBERATE EXERCISE OF DANGEROUS POWERS, PALPABLY WITHHELD BY THE CONSTITUTION, COULD NOT JUSTIFY THE PARTIES TO IT IN INTERPOSING EVEN SO FAR AS TO ARREST THE PROGRESS OF THE EVIL, AND THEREBY TO PRESERVE THE CONSTITUTION ITSELF, AS WELL AS TO PROVIDE FOR THE SAFETY OF THE PARTIES TO IT, THERE WOULD BE AN END TO ALL RELIEF FROM USURPED POWER, AND A DIRECT SUBVERSION OF THE RIGHTS SPECIFIED OR RECOGNIZED UNDER ALL THE STATE CONSTITUTIONS, AS WELL AS A PLAIN DENIAL OF THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE ON WHICH OUR INDEPENDENCE WAS DECLARED. "

6. THIS IS WHY JUDGE KERN IN THE USDC ND/OK SET OUT TO ALTER

F.O.R.

3) SEE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

BT, THE FACTS ESTABLISHED IN THE STATE COURT. THIS PROFOUND REASONING SET FORTH IN THE STATE COURTS, GAVE CAUSE TO THE FEDERAL JUDGE CREATING THE IMPEDIMENT. BOTH STATE AND FEDERAL BUREAUCRATIC ACTORS PLAYED A PART IN THIS ILLEGAL AFFAIR. THERE ARE TWO EVENTS THAT HELP FRAME THE CONTEXT, UNDENIABLE INCIDENTS THAT ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE CLAIMS.

1. IN SEPTEMBER AND OCTOBER OF 2018, AS RECORDED IN DKT# 66

OF *Lay v. Oklahoma Dept. of Corrections*, CIV-17-1224¹⁰, OSP SENDS NEARLY

\$400⁰⁰ TO THE USDC WVD/OK WITH THE INTENT BY THE FEDERAL COURT

TO REGAIN CONTROL OF THE CASE AND DESTROY THE LAWFULLY

PENDING CERTIORARI PETITION. (SEE *Lay v. O.D.C.*, NO. 19-5942).

THIS TRANSFER OF FUNDS WAS DONE WITHOUT LAY'S KNOWLEDGE, APPROVAL,

OR SIGNATURE, VIOLATING STATE LAW; AND, THE WD COURT MISREPRESENTS

THE FACTS, FEIGNING AN ALTERNATE NARRATIVE, THAT THE FUNDS

7. WERE MISTAKENLY APPLIED TO THE DISTRICT COURT FILING FEE,

RATHER THAN THE 10TH CIRCUIT C.F.P. THE ADMISSION MADE

BY THE COMPTROLLER OF THE O.D.O.C. (LEON WILSON) DETAILS

4

THAT CLAIM, IT IS CLEAR, THE FEDERAL COURT ATTEMPTED TO

ILLEGITIMATE RECLAIM IMMEDIATE JURISDICTION.

8. THE SECOND EXAMPLE IS EQUALLY EGREGIOUS WITH THE FIRST,

BUT THE IMPACT OF THIS INCIDENT IS SO FAR REACHING AS BEING

A PART OF THE IMPEDIMENT TO FILING A WRIT OF HABEAS

CORPUS AND POSSIBLY RESULTING IN EXECUTION ASSENT

APPEAL.

9. THIS COURT IN *Glossip v. Gross*, CIV-14-665-F; NO. 14-7995;

135 S. CT. 2126 (2015), ESTABLISHED BY ORDER THAT PRISONERS IN

OKLAHOMA, ON DEATH ROW, MUST PROVIDE AN ALTERNATIVE

F.N.*

4) SEE DOC. NO. 661, PG. 1 OF *Key v. O.D.O.C.*, 17-1224. ~~(RETRACTED)~~

9. METHOD OF EXECUTION, OR FACE EXECUTION BY THE EXISTING

PROTOCOLS. ON JULY 30, 2021 WADE LAY WAS NOTIFIED BY

THE USDC WD/OR (JUDGE PRIOT) THAT HE WOULD BE REQUIRED

TO PROVIDE AN ALTERNATIVE MODE OF EXECUTION AS A PRO-SE

PLAINTIFF. WADE LAY HOWEVER, WAS COMPLETELY IN THE

⁵
DARK. THE PRISON HAD COMPLETELY CUT HIM OFF FROM THE

ACTIVITIES OF THE CASE, CONTRARY TO THE COURT'S ORDER

FOR ALL ORDERS OF THE COURT AND PLEADINGS OF THE PARTIES,

OR, ALL DOCUMENTATION PERTAINING TO THE CASE BE FOR-

WARDED TO LAY AS A PRO-SE PLAINTIFF/PARTY.

10. O.S.P. HAD ALSO USED A SOGUS MISCONDUCT CHARGE ON MAY 3RD

TO IMPLEMENT SANCTIONS WHICH DISABLED LAY FROM COMMUNI-

CATING WITH ANYONE OTHER THAN THE FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFEN-

DER FOR (90) NINETY DAYS. THEREFORE, ON JULY 30, 2021

R.N.R

5) see doc. nos. 451-460 of *Glossip v. Chandler*, LW-14-065-F.

10. MADE LAY HAVING RECEIVED THE ORDER OF THE COURT,

BEING IN A STATE OF IGNORANCE DUE TO THE PRISON

WITHHOLDING THE PERTINENT DOCUMENTS, CALLS THE LAWYERS

AT THE FPD. IN HINDSIGHT IT IS SHOCKING THAT THE FEDERAL

AGENCY DESIGNATED BY THE CONGRESSIONAL ORDER FOUND IN

18 USC § 3599 WOULD GIVE SUCH ADVICE, TELLING LAY

"NOT TO PROVIDE AN ALTERNATIVE METHOD OF EXECUTION"

THE ATTORNEYS AT THE FPD BEING PRIVITY TO THIS COURT'S

RELEVANT AND CONTROLLING ORDER, AND SEEING THAT ALL

(31) THIRTY ONE OF THE OTHER PLAINTIFF'S/PRISONER'S

WERE ADVISED BY THOSE SAME LAWYERS - THAT THEY

SHOULD PROVIDE AN ALTERNATIVE, OR FACE EXECUTION, IS A

VERY REVEALING SET OF FACTS SUPPORTING THE CLAIM OF A

CONSPIRACY WITHIN THE FEDERAL COURTS,

11. IT IS REDICULOUS, EVEN IMPLAUSIBLE TO SUGGEST THE ATTOR-
NEYS AT THE FPD ACTED ALONE IN THIS MYSTERIOUS SCENARIO.
THE ONLY RATIONAL EXPLANATION IS THAT U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE
FRIOT IMPULSED THE ILLICIT AFFAIR. IN DKT[#] 457-460 OF
THE LETHAL INJECTION CASE *Glossip v. Campbell*, CIV-14-665-F,
THE SUPREME COURT WILL FIND A DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE
EVENTS THAT OCCURRED, TO INCLUDE A COPY OF THE DOCUMENT
SENT TO WADE LAY ON THE 21ST OF JULY, 2021, FROM THE FPD,
INSTRUCTING PETITIONER ON WHAT TO SAY SPECIFICALLY. THE
FPD PROVIDES A SCRIPT WITH ARGUMENTS THEY KNEW THE COURT^{DIST.}
HAD ALREADY REJECTED, A POSITION THAT DEFIED THIS COURT'S
ORDER AND AUTHORITY.

12. THESE EVENTS AS DESCRIBED ABOVE, ESPECIALLY SURROUNDING
SUCH A CASE AS THIS, A DEATH PENALTY CASE INVOLVING A PATRIOTIC

C.N.F.

6) see also - *Key v. A.C.L.U.* CIV-21-214-SFH-SFS.

12. CONSTITUTIONAL SCHOLAR, ONE WHO HAS PRESENTED ARGUMENTS

CONCERNING THE ILICIT CONTROL OF THE HABEAS

CORPUS APPEAL THAT IS CONTRAINDICATED BY FEDERAL STATUTE -

28 USC § 2244(d)(1)(B), WHICH READS:

" A 1-YEAR PERIOD OF LIMITATION SHALL APPLY TO AN APPLICATION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS BY A PERSON IN CUSTODY PURSUANT TO THE JUDGMENT OF A STATE COURT. THE LIMITATION PERIOD SHALL RUN FROM THE LATEST OF -

THE DATE ON WHICH THE IMPEDIMENT TO FILING AN APPLICATION CREATED BY STATE ACTION IN VIOLATION OF THE CONSTITUTION OR LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES IS REMOVED, IF THE APPLICANT WAS PREVENTED FROM FILING BY SUCH STATE ACTION; " CANNOT BE IGNORED BY THIS COURT!

13. THEREIN LIES THE CRITICAL QUESTION. THE FACTS ARE ABUNDANT

AND UNDENIABLE, BUT BECAUSE THE PRISONER MUST APPEAL TO THE

SOURCE OF THAT WHICH IMPEDES, THE REMEDY THE CONSTITUTION

PROVIDES TO SUCH AN IMPEDANCE IS UNAVAILABLE. IF THE CONST-

ITUTIONAL PARADIGM CREATED BY THE FOUNDING GENERATION

13. FOSTERS A SPECIFIC SET OF CONDITIONS, FASHIONING A COMP-

SITION WHICH ESTABLISHES A CONSTRUCT, WHERE AMBITION

COUNTERACTS AMBITION AS DESCRIBED BY JAMES MADISON; THAN

THE COUNTERVAILING POWER DESIGNED TO STAND AGAINST "THE

ANGER OF ATTACK", MUST BE PRESERVED AS THE CONSTITUTION

DEMANDS. MADISON DECLARES:

"THE GREAT SECURITY AGAINST A GRADUAL CONCENTRATION OF THE SEVERAL POWERS IN THE SAME DEPARTMENT, CONSIST IN GIVING TO THOSE WHO ADMINISTER EACH DEPARTMENT THE NECESSARY CONSTITUTIONAL MEANS AND PERSONAL MOTIVES TO RESIST ENCROACHMENTS OF THE OTHERS. THE PROVISION FOR DEFENSE MUST IN THIS, AS IN ALL OTHER CASES, BE MADE COMMENSURATE TO THE DANGER OF ATTACK. AMBITION MUST BE MADE TO COUNTERACT AMBITION. THE INTEREST OF THE MAN MUST BE CONNECTED WITH THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE PLACE."

14. IF THE FEDERAL COURTS ARE TO POSSESS THE "PRESUMPTION

OF CORRECTNESS", WHEREIN THE STATE JUDGES ARE BOUND TO THE

"CLEARLY ESTABLISHED FEDERAL LAW, AS DETERMINED BY THE

14. "SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES" PARADIGM, RATHER THAN THEIR OWN AUTONOMOUS DISCRETION CONCERNING THE MEANING OF THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND AS DETERMINED BY THE STATE JUDGES INDEPENDENT CONCLUSIONS ON THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION; THAN THE PURPOSE OF ARTICLE VI, CLAUSE 2 IS DESTROYED.

15. IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED BY THE MARSHALL COURT, IN *Martin v. Hunter's Lessee*, 14 US 304 (1816), THAT THE DELEGATION OF ARTICLE VI, CLAUSE 2 SUPERVENES THE NOTION OF *Teague v. Lane*, 489 U.S. 288 (1989). THE COURT IN *Teague* CONCLUDES, THAT A HABEAS CLAIM MUST BE DISMISSED WHEN IT WOULD REQUIRE A COURT TO BREAK NEW GROUND OR IMPOSE A NEW OBLIGATION ON THE STATES OR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, I.E., WHEN IT WOULD REQUIRE A RESULT "NOT DICTATED BY PRECEDENT".

F.O.

1) ~~489 US 301, 310~~ see 28 USC § 2254 / B) 489 US 301, 310 *Teague v. Lane*

16. THIS STRIKES AT THE HEART OF ARTICLE VI, CLAUSE 2,^{IN MS} INDEPENDENCE.

JUSTICE STORY IN *MUTU* SAYS:

"SUPPOSE AN INDICTMENT FOR A CRIME IN A STATE COURT, AND THE DEFENDANT SHOULD ALLEGE IN HIS DEFENCE THAT THE CRIME WAS CREATED BY AN *EX POST FACTO* ACT OF THE STATE, MUST NOT THE STATE COURT, IN THE EXERCISE OF A JURISDICTION WHICH HAS ALREADY RIGHTFULLY ATTACHED, HAVE A RIGHT TO PRONOUNCE ON THE VALIDITY AND SUFFICIENCY OF THE DEFENCE? IT WOULD BE EXTREMELY DIFFICULT, UPON ANY LEGAL PRINCIPLES, TO GIVE A NEGATIVE ANSWER TO THESE INQUIRIES. INNUMERABLE INSTANCES OF THE SAME SORT MIGHT BE STATED, IN ILLUSTRATION OF THE POSITION, AND UNLESS THE STATE COURTS COULD SUSTAIN JURISDICTION IN SUCH CASES, THIS CLAUSE OF THE SIXTH ARTICLE WOULD BE WITHOUT MEANING OR EFFECT, AND PUBLIC MISCHIEFS, OF A MOST ENORMOUS MAGNITUDE, WOULD INEVITABLY ENSUE."

IT. THE EXERCISE OF A JURISDICTION - THAT IS THE KEYSTONE

PHRASE. THE STATE JUDGE IS NOT BOUND TO ANY ENUMERATED

STANDARD OTHER THAN THAT WHICH IS GIVEN IN ARTICLE VI,

CLAUSE 2 OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION. JUSTICE

17. THOMAS IN *McFarland v. Scott*, 141 S CT 2568 (1994) AT

2581 STATES:

"IN EXPANDING THE FEDERAL COURTS' POWER TO GRANT STAYS, THE COURT'S DECISION CONFLICTS WITH THE SOUND PRINCIPLE UNDERLYING OUR PRECEDENTS THAT FEDERAL HABEAS REVIEW EXIST ONLY TO REVIEW ERRORS OF CONSTITUTIONAL DIMENSION. ANTE. AT 2575 (CONCURRING IN JUDGMENT IN PART AND DISSENTING IN PART). UNDER THE COURT'S INTERPRETATION OF § 2251, A PRISONER MAY OBTAIN A STAY OF EXECUTION WITHOUT PRESENTING A SINGLE CLAIM TO A FEDERAL COURT. INDEED, UNDER THE COURT'S READING OF THE STATUTE, A FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT DETERMINING WHETHER TO ENTER A STAY WILL NO LONGER HAVE TO EVALUATE WHETHER A PRISONER HAS PRESENTED A POTENTIALLY MERITORIOUS CONSTITUTIONAL CLAIM."

18. PETITIONER BELIEVES IT IS NECESSARY TO DIG A LITTLE

DEEPER THAN J. THOMAS HAS ABOVE, WHAT HAS OCCURRED

IN THIS CASE IS OF A MORE SEVERE NATURE. IN EXPANDING

THE POWER OF THE FEDERAL COURTS, A PRISONER MAY SUFFER

UNDER THE ENCROACHMENT OF FEDERAL ACTORS WITH THE

18. ASSISTANCE OF STATE ACTORS UNITED IN THEIR USURPATION, BOTH
SUBJUGATED TO THE COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES.

19. AFTER THE EPD ACCOMPLISHES THE FRAUDULENT FILING, U.S. DIST.

JUDGE TERRENCE KERN BINDS WADE LAY TO A PETITION THAT

SUPPLANTS THE ORIGINAL CAUSE, THROUGH AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION

THE DISTRICT COURT (USDCND/OK)^{IN 2011} TETHERS LAY TO A SIGNATORY

APPROVAL FROM GOVERNMENTAL LAWYERS, DISPLACING THE

PRISONER FROM ANY LEGAL EXPRESSION ON HABEAS.

20. AFTER TWO YEARS OF DILIGENT PURSUIT TO DISCOVER THE

FACTS CONCERNING THE PREVAILING LAWS GOVERNING WADE LAY'S

CASE AND PECULIAR SET OF CIRCUMSTANCES, HE FILES A CIVIL

ACTION IN AUGUST OF 2012. *Lay V. Otto*, CIV. 12-888-D IS THE BEG-

INNING OF A PURSUIT TO FILE CLAIMS ON HABEAS CORPUS THAT

F.N.R.

10)

SEE DKT# 50 & 71 OF *Lay V. Workman*, 08-617-FCR-PSC

20. ARE CORROBORATIVE TO THE FACTS AT THE ORIGINAL

CRIMINAL CAUSE. HOWEVER, THE USDC WND/OK CHOSE

TO JOIN WITH THE JUDICATURE OF THE 100 COURT

U.S. DIST. JUDGE TERRENCE KEERN IN HIS WILL TO

ALTER THE FACTS OF THE JURY TRIAL COURT.

21. AT TRIAL LAY ATTEMPTED TO ARGUE IN HIS DEFENCE

WHAT IS KNOWN AS A *Casus Federis* DEFENCE OF LIBERTY.

THIS LEGAL POSITION IS UNKNOWN TO MODERN MINDS, BUT THE

CONCEPT IS ROOTED DEEP WITHIN THE UNITED STATES CONST.

ITUTION. (IN ORDER TO BETTER UNDERSTAND PETITIONER'S

CONSTITUTIONAL POSITION - SEE ATTACHMENT# 1 ~~SEE~~). IT IS

WITHIN THIS IDEOLOGY THAT JUDGE KEERN, AND WHATEVER

AND HAS BEEN AFFORDED TO HIM BY GOVERNMENT ACTORS,

FIND THEIR MOTIVATION - TO DESTROY THE RIGHT TO A

21. ¹¹ "BACKWARD-LOOKING, RECORD BASED" APPEAL ON HABEAS,
DUE TO THE CONSTITUTIONAL PHILOSOPHY OF THE ORIGINAL
CAUSE.

22. MENTAL ILLNESS IN THE UNITED STATES IN THIS INSTANCE
IS A MEANS TO CONTROL A PATRIOTIC CITIZEN FROM EXERCISING
HIS RIGHTS AS DICTATED BY THE CONSTITUTION, DUE TO THE
POIGNANCY OF THE INDIVIDUALS ADVANCED UNDERSTANDING AND
ABILITY TO ANIMATE THE RIGHTS OF RESISTANCE TO THE POWERS
THAT ARE IN PLACE PRESENTLY. TO ILLUSTRATE THIS CLAIM
PETITIONER WILL DISPLAY FOR THE SUPREME COURT A BROAD JUDICIAL
DISSIMULATION, A FALSE PRETENSION THAT UTILIZES LAW AS THOMAS
JEFFERSON DESCRIBED - "LIVE UPON LIE", TO CREATE SOMETHING
THAT DOES NOT EXIST.

23. AFTER THE USDC WD/OR CARRIES OUT A FRAUDULENT CIVIL ACTION,

2.10.18

11) RYAN V. CONZULES, 568 US 57 (2013)

23. *Lay v. Otto*, A 42 USC § 1983 CIVIL RIGHTS ACTION FILED IN IGNORANCE BY LAY, THE FEDERAL JUDGE DELCOSTI, AND THE U.S. MAGISTRATE ROBERT BALHARACH (NOW A TENTH CIRCUIT JUDGE) LEAD PETITIONER DOWN A PATH OF FUTILITY. WHILE KNOWING THE § 1983 LAW SUIT HAD NO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, THE FEDERAL JUDGES PURPOSELY MISLEAD LAY WHO SIMPLY SOUGHT THE EFFECT OF A FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT (FOIA), USING THE § 1983 FORM DUE TO HIS LACK OF KNOWLEDGE.

24. THE W.D. COURT SENDS TO LAY A NEW 1983 FORM WITH A CASE NO. 12-888-D WRITTEN ON THE TITLE PAGE, INSTRUCTING HIM TO
12
FILE AN AMENDED COMPLAINT. THIS INSTRUCTION WAS DUPLICATED, SO THE W.D. COURT DRAGGED THE PRISONER AROUND, KNOWING THE W.D. COURT HAD A COMPETENCY HEARING SCHEDULED FOR

6.4.8

12) THIS WAS DONE IN A § 1983 LAW SUIT AGAINST FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDERS.

24. JANUARY OF 2013. YET, SUSAN OTTO (DIRECTOR F.P.D.) HAD

CUT WADE LAY OFF, ALSO BEING AWARE OF THE ROSE, KNOWING

PETITIONER SIMPLY DESIRED A COPY OF THE MENTAL EXAMINER'S

REPORT, KEEPING LAY IN THE DARK CONCERNING

THE COMPETENCY HEARING. JUDGE KERO HAD STATED ON

THE RECORD, THAT HE WOULD NOT ALLOW LAY TO ATTEND THE

COMPETENCY HEARING, SO IT IS OBVIOUS, THAT THE W.D. COURT

WAS PLAYING ALONG, UNTIL WADE LAY WAS DEEMED INCOMPETENT,

RENDERED UNABLE TO APPROACH ANY COURT.

25. THIS EFFORT BY THE USDC ND/OR TO RENDER LAY INCOMPETENT DURING

HABEAS REVIEW WAS THWARTED BY THIS COURT'S DECISION IN *Ryan V*

Gonzales, 508 US 57 (2013). HOWEVER, THE HEART OF THE OPINION

IS IGNORED. THE "BACKDATED" LOOKING, "RECORD-BASED" CONSTRUCT,

UPON WHICH THE ABILITY FOR COUNSEL TO PURSUE THE STATE

25. COURT RECORD, THIS IS THE REASON FOR THE FRAUDULENT FILING, IT IS TO ALTER THE FACTS OF THE ORIGINAL CAUSE. THIS IS WHY THE FPD PATTI CHERZI FAILS TO FILE THE MOTION TO EXPAND THE RECORD, TO COMPLY WITH ANTICIPATORY PROCEDURAL BAR, AS WARNED MULTIPLE TIMES BY THE STATE. THE OVERALL INTENT IS TO CONTROL THE SUBJECT MATTER AND NARRATIVE ON HABEAS REVIEW, IN ORDER TO CHANGE, OR TO DILUTE AND RENDER Moot THE ORIGINAL CAUSE.

26. THE FRAUDULENT PETITION *Lilly V. Royal* 584 US 936 (2018) WENT TO THIS COURT, NOTWITHSTANDING WADE LAY'S INTENSE EFFORTS TO STOP THE USURPATION. THAT IS WHY LAY FILES AS A PRO-SE PLAINTIFF IN *Glossy V. Gross/Chandler*, EW-14-665-F, IN ANOTHER ATTEMPT TO GAIN CONTROL OVER HIS

26. HABEAS APPEAL THROUGH ANY MEANS, THE THOUGHT OF GAINING PUBLIC FAVOR THROUGH AWARENESS THAT COULD OPEN UP DUE TO THE TRIAL IN Gossip. HOWEVER, THAT OPPORTUNITY WAS THWARTED BY "DO NOT PROVIDE AN ALTERNATIVE"!

27. THIS COMPETENCY TO BE EXECUTED TRIAL IS A PART OF THE IMPEDIMENT TO FILING A WRIT, AS PROHIBITED BY 28 USC § 2244 (d)(1)(B).

THE IMPEDIMENT BEGINNING WITH THE FRAUDULENT FILING, WHICH HAS RECENTLY BEEN CONFIRMED, WADE LAY RECEIVING PICTURES OF PILLONBARDI (CLERK OF THE USDC NO/OK (IN 2008)), THERE IS
 *
 PROOF OF THE FRAUDULENT FILING, AS RECORDED IN ATTACHMENT (P. 1) THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA HAS

5.00
 *) THIS COURT MUST ORDER A RETOLLING OF THE 1-YEAR LIMITATION!

27. SHOWN A WILLINGNESS TO ENGAGE IN BRUTAL ACTIONS ON BEHALF OF CORRUPT FEDERAL JUDGES. OVER TWENTY (20) BOLUS MIS-CONDUCT CHARGES HAVE BEEN THE MEANS TO DESTROY WADE LAY'S ABILITY TO GAIN CONTROL OVER HIS HABEAS CORPUS APPEAL. NOW, THE STATE HAS EXTENDED ITS BRUTALITY, RENDERING LAY INCOMPETENT WITHOUT A HEARING.

30. WADE LAY WILL NOT HAVE OPPORTUNITY TO DEFEND HIS MENTAL STATE CONTRARY TO LAW. THE IMPEDIMENT IS COMPLETE, THIS COURT MUST INTERVENE¹³. CONSIDERING THE CIRCUMSTANCES, TO DENY CERTIORARI WOULD

F.20. #

(3) THE US SUP. CT. MUST PROVIDE A MEANS OF REMEDY FOR THE IMPEDIMENT TO FILIP, WHEN IT INVOLVES THE FEDERAL JUDICIARIES.

30. BE THE EQUIVALENT OF WHAT PUTIN DID TO

NAVALNY, BECAUSE WHEN A MAN'S OPINIONS

ARE TAKEN FROM HIM, SO IS HIS LIFE. ADDIT-

IONALLY, THE LIFE THAT WILL BE PUT BEFORE

PETITIONER ^{IS} ONE OF ISOLATION IN SOLITARY

CONFINEMENT, DUE TO THE BOGUS MIS-

CONDUCTS BY THE OKLAHOMA STATE PENITE-

NTIARY OVER THE PAST FIFTEEN YEARS.


31. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN SHOULD HAVE TO FACE SUCH

CRUELTY DUE TO HIS OPINIONS ABOUT THE

CONSTITUTION. THIS COURT MUST TAKE JURIS-

DICTION, PROVIDE A REMEDY FOR THE IMPEDIMENT!

2/28/24
Date



RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

MADE LAY. AT O.S.P.

P.O. BOX 97

MC ALISTER, OKLA. 74502

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

WADE LAY

PETITIONER,

VS.

CASE NO. 23-7085

CHRISTIE QUICK,

(WARDEN A.D.S.P.)

RESPONDENT

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF PURSUANT TO - Rules of the Supreme
Court of the United States RULE 15.8, 28 USC A

WADE GREEN LAY # 516263

OKLAHOMA STATE PENITENTIARY

P.O. BOX 97

MAKLESTER, OKLAHOMA 74502

DATE:

PRO-SE

LIST OF PARTIES

1. APPELLANT/PETITIONER - WADE CREELY LAY #516263
2. CHRISTI QUICK (WARDEN W.O.S.P.) RESPONDENT

PARTIES OF INTEREST

3. FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER - JEFF BYERS (DIR.)
OKLAHOMA CITY WESTERN DISTRICT
4. OKLAHOMA ATTORNEY GENERAL - CENTNER DRUMMOND
5. RHONDA KEMP (SISTER TO WADE LAY, B.WER OF ATTY)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF PARTIES

i

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ii

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

iii

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF

iv

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

1. UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Ford v. Weinwright, 447 US 399 (1980) 4, 6

Martin v. Hunter's Lessee, 14 US 304 (1816) 4

2. FEDERAL STATUTES

28 USC § 2244 (d)(1)(B) 7, 7
42 USC § 1983 3

3. STATE STATUTES

22 O.S. § 1005.1 6
STATE STATUTE ACCOMODATING FOR THE FORD V
WEINWRIGHT TRIAL

REASONS RELIED ON FOR THE ALLOWANCE OF THE WRIT

(SEE RULES 10 AND 11(h))

1. THE LOWER COURTS, BOTH STATE AND FEDERAL HAVE NOT IN THIS

CASE CONFORMED WITH DECISIONS OF THIS COURT, STATE STATUTES,

AND FEDERAL LAW. THE TENTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS HAS

DECIDED AN IMPORTANT FEDERAL QUESTION IN A WAY THAT

CONFLICTS WITH RELEVANT DECISIONS OF THIS COURT.

2. IN 28 USC § 2244 (d)(1)(B) CONGRESS REFERS TO AN

IMPEDIMENT TO FILING AN APPLICATION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS

CORPUS. THIS TERM IMPEDIMENT, IT IS FAIR TO SAY, BEING WITH THE

POWER TO IMPEDE, TO HINDER OR OBSTRUCT, LIES WITHIN THE HANDS

OF FEDERAL JUDGES MORE SO THAN THE BUREAUCRATIC ACTORS.

(STATE OR FEDERAL). IN THIS CASE, FEDERAL JUDGES IN THIS STATE

AND THE TENTH CIRCUIT IMPOSED THEIR WILL UPON THOSE

BUREAUCRATIC ACTORS. THIS IS WHY THE TENTH CIRCUIT

REFUSES TO RECOGNIZE THE HABEAS PETITION, THROWING PETITIONER INTO THE REALM OF 42 USC § 1983, BECAUSE THOSE SAME JUDGES HAVE CREATED A FALSE PARADIGM OF RESTRICTION UNDER THE PRISON LITIGATION AND REFORM ACT (PLRA) - THE THREE (3) STRIKE RULE.

3. LET IT BE KNOWN AS A STATEMENT OF FACT, THAT PHIL LOMBARDI (CLERK OF THE U.S.D.C. N.D. /OK) CAME TO OKLAHOMA STATE

OR DECEMBER
PENITENTIARY (O.S.P.) IN NOVEMBER OF 2008 WITH PATTI

CHERZI (ASST. FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER (F.P.D.)) AND DECEIVED

WADE LAY, TELLING HIM THEY NEEDED SIGNATORY APPROVAL

FOR MEDICAL INFORMATION, COMPELLING LAY TO SIGN TWO

BLANK PIECES OF PAPER, WHICH BECAME THE SIGNATORY

PORTIONS OF THE MCFARLAND MOTION.

4. DISCOVERY HOWEVER IS NECESSARY TO PROVE SUCH A CLAIM.

4. FOR THAT REASON THE COURT SHOULD TAKE NOTE, NO

COURT, STATE OR FEDERAL WILL ALLOW WADE LAY TO ATTEND

AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING; AND NOW, CONTRARY TO STATE

STATUTE AND THIS COURT'S PRECEDENT IN *Ford v. Wainwright*,

477 US 399 (1986). THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA IS DENYING

WADE LAY A TRIAL THAT WAS SCHEDULED FOR APRIL 29,

2024. DENYING PETITIONER THE ABILITY TO DEFEND HIS MENTAL

STATE.

STRICKEN WITH

~~THEIR REPRESENTATION GIVEN TO THE INTERESTS~~

~~OF WEALTH, THIS IS WHAT, DOESN'T KEEP THE~~

~~OWN WAR SUBSTITUTIVE DOES PROCESS STRETCHES~~

~~THE RIGHT, AND STILL DOES. MEDICAL TREATMENT~~

~~IS A MEANS OF COURAGE~~, THAT IS WHY PET-

ITIONER IS BEING LEFT IN ISOLATION, AT

O.S.P., IN ^{AND} EXTREMELY INHUMANE ENVIRONMENT.

5. THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA HAS NO INTENT OF A MORAL OR

LOGICAL APPLICATION OF JUSTICE, THIS IS EVIDENCED BY

THEIR NEGLECT OF WADE LAY IN HIS LAWFUL TREATMENT

TO INCLUDE MEDICAL CARE; AND, THEIR DISREGARD


OF THE STATUTE (SEE 22 O.S. § 1005.1), AND THIS

COURT'S PRECEDENT IN *Ford v. Wainwright*, 477 U.S. 399

(1986) CLEARLY SHOWS WHEN IT IS RECOGNIZED THAT

THE INDIVIDUAL BEING STIGMATIZED AS INSANE, HAS
 A RIGHT TO A PUBLIC HEARING! (SEE THE PLEADING
 SENT TO THE PITTSBURGH COUNTY DISTRICT COURT
 IN JULY OF 2022, BY PETITIONER, SEEKING JUST
 SUCH OPPORTUNITY TO REVEAL THE TRUTH AND
 FACTS OF THE CASE - TO INCLUDE THE IMPED-
 IMENT TO FILING A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS.

6. THE CLAIMS OF MENTAL ILLNESS ABSENT A
 PUBLIC HEARING IS A PART OF THE IMPEDIM-
 ENT. SEE 28 USC § 2244 (d)(1)(B). THIS
 COURT MUST TAKE UP THE CERTIORARI PETITION!



Jennifer Lazor
 #24000888
 Commission Expires
 01-19-28

SINCERELY, VHADELAI
 AT O.F.P.
 P.O. BOX 97
 MCALISTER, OK 74502

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

~~THERE HAS OCCURRED~~ AN IMPEDIMENT TO FILING A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS WHICH INCLUDES THE ILLEGAL ACTIONS OF MULTIPLE FEDERAL JUDGES, HAS OCCURRED.

SUBSEQUENT TO THIS, AND BEING A PART OF THE IMPEDIMENT AS ESTABLISHED BY 28 USC § 2244 (d)(1)(B), A STATE ACTION WAS EMPLOYED - "COMPETENCY TO BE EXECUTED" TRIAL IN RE WADE GREENLY LAY 21-224 IN THE PITTSBURGH COUNTY DISTRICT COURT.

PETITIONER HAD THE INTENT TO PRESENT HIS ARGUMENTS AT TRIAL WHICH WAS SCHEDULED FOR APRIL 29, 2024, YET STATE ACTORS AND STATE JUDGES ACCOMMODATE THE LARGER CONSPIRACY IN THE FEDERAL COURTS. THE SCHEME, THE STIGMATISM OF MENTAL ILLNESS IS USED AS A TOOL OF CONTROL FOR THOSE IN POWERFUL POSITIONS TO CENSOR AND SUPPRESS A VALID CONSTITUTIONAL HABEAS APPEAL, ONE THAT IS "BACKWARD, LOOKING-RECORD BASED". (SEE *Ryan v. Gonzalez*, 568 US 57 (2013))