RCB

No. 24-1000

In The Supreme Court of the United States

In re MICHAEL PRETE,
Petitioner,

On Petition For Writ Of Habeas Corpus

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Michael Prete
782 Boston Neck Road
Narragansett, RI 02882
May 8, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

RULES

Herein, supporting Petitioner's rehearing request, are some briefly discussed substantial grounds not previously available.

In the show "Suits," to force a partner of the law firm to leave the firm and effectively accept a settlement, an associate holds up and tosses onto the table in front of the partner what he claims is a signed affidavit declaring incriminating information on the partner. The associate quickly looks to his superior and shakes his head "No" (indicating it's a bluff).

The "Suits" scene was merely for a civil dispute where the partner HAD done improper things and the firm BLUFFED about a signed affidavit. Here, a criminal matter (where State's seeking up to 20 years in prison (with mandatory minimum of FOUR YEARS in prison) against Petitioner), **the STATE committed multiple federal felony crimes, etc. (proven different ways) to FORGE (COUNTERFEIT) a document to bring fraudulent charges against a KNOWINGLY INNOCENT PERSON for a crime that NEVER OCCURRED.**

Moreover, RI Judiciary ("RIJ") (who's supposed to be, effectively, the watchdog over such illegal, etc. tactics, etc.) has been repeatedly advised (with evidence) by Petitioner and fully aware of State's crimes, etc. yet continues to aid and abet, etc. Prosecution. Among other things, RIJ's pretended Petitioner's appeals, filings, etc. don't exist,

repeatedly attempted to sabotage Petitioner's appeals, corruptly, etc. shut down Petitioner's appeals in defiance of this Court's ("SCOTUS") binding case law, etc.

RIJ's even illegally issued arrest warrants to, among other things, coerce, etc. Petitioner into pleaing. Such efforts have been recorded. For example, as Petitioner's already exposed A YEAR AGO and mentioned in his "Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus" (24-1000) (12/20/24) ("HC"), **TO COERCE PETITIONER (WHO WAS SHACKLED (HANDS AND FEET)), JUDGE (REKAS SLOAN) LIED THAT PETITIONER WAS OUT OF OPTIONS AND HAD NO CHOICE BUT TO PLEA OR FACE UP TO 20 YEARS IN PRISON.** Rekas Sloan KNEW Petitioner had multiple options still available (e.g. appealing to RI Supreme Court ("RISC") (and SCOTUS), Habeas Petition, etc.), KNEW Prosecution had ADMITTED they were withholding exculpatory evidence, etc. yet lied to assist Prosecution, etc. in coercing Petitioner to plea. On 4/14/25, ANOTHER JUDGE issued a fraudulent, etc. bench warrant for Petitioner's arrest to, among other things, AGAIN have Petitioner shackled (hands and feet) to coerce Petitioner to plea. *See* App.1-36.

As Petitioner's stated, this case wasn't meant to go to trial. Prosecution's, RIJ's, etc. continued actions keep reinforcing it:

-when Petitioner didn't bend to coercive, etc. tactics, etc., RISC stripped Petitioner's bar and expressly stated it did so for Petitioner exposing corruption

-four business days after RISC stripped Petitioner's bar, when Petitioner continued to not bend to coercive, etc. tactics, etc., Prosecution instructed RIJ, on July 3rd, to set in motion (without evidence, etc.) the process to lock-up Petitioner in a psych ward for 13.33 years (which bypasses a trial on the alleged crime) (which RIJ dutifully complied)

-ETC.

Since 10/19/23, judges have been repeatedly advised (with proof) by Petitioner of State's forged (counterfeited) document.

Despite RISC's corruption having already been repeatedly displayed via documented court actions, Petitioner tried to seek appeal to RISC (a right Petitioner was supposed to be guaranteed by SCOTUS binding precedent, RI Law, etc.). Further demonstrating Petitioner cannot obtain a fair process, fair appellate review, etc. (as guaranteed by law, the Constitution, etc.), in defiance of SCOTUS, etc., on 1/30/25 RISC dismissed BOTH of Petitioner's appeals (including one appeal which hadn't technically begun (as RISC's order acknowledged) (Petitioner had until 2/14/25 to file his Case

Prebriefing Statement (discussing what the appeal's about))) claiming the lower court can do ANYTHING (literally ***ANYTHING***) it wants (e.g. bypass any jury trial without Petitioner's consent, lock Petitioner in a psych ward without any evidence, etc., arrest Petitioner any time and for any reason, make-up reasons to administratively close Petitioner's proper appeal (without ever dealing with the appeal's merits), etc.), and Petitioner can only appeal if the issue has to do with Double Jeopardy. SCOTUS's binding precedent (*Abney v. United States*, 431 U.S. 651 (1977)), established HALF A CENTURY ago, made clear ***ANYTHING IS APPEALABLE*** if it fits within the collateral-order exception to the final-judgment rule (as do Petitioner's RISC appeals). **IF RISC ACKNOWLEDGED SCOTUS'S BINDING INSTRUCTIONS, RISC WOULD BE FORCED TO ADDRESS, AMONG OTHER THINGS, STATE'S CRIMINALLY FORGED (COUNTERFEITED) DOCUMENT (THE ELEPHANT IN THE ROOM THAT NO JUDGE HAS WANTED TO ADDRESS).**

RIJ effectively stated it can use the U.S. Constitution, Bill of Rights, etc. as toilet paper and there's nothing Petitioner can do about it.

As Petitioner's HC briefly addressed, the U.S. District Court ("DC") is similarly useless given conflicts of interest, etc.

RIJ's, etc. been desperately creating ways to ensure they can continue to trap Petitioner in their corrupt, etc. system to get to their goals.

Petitioner sought assistance from SCOTUS. Instead, practically EVERY FILING PETITIONER'S SUBMITTED TO SCOTUS HAS GONE MISSING WHILE IN SCOTUS'S POSSESSION, BEEN IMPROPERLY REJECTED/RETURNED BY CLERKS, AND/OR ATTEMPTS WERE MADE TO ENSURE SCOTUS NEVER TOOK POSSESSION OF THE FILING TO BEGIN WITH. *See* below and App.37-94 (which has neither been docketed nor returned) for more.

Perhaps one of the most mind-blowing examples of such tactics was what Petitioner was **put through, FOR WEEKS, just to have Clerk file (as Court rules REQUIRE) a simple one-page (single-sided) letter dated 3/21/25, addressed to "Clerk of Court" (as required by Rule 22.4), consisting of only the following two (2) sentences:**

> "Pursuant to Rule 22.4, Petitioner Michael Prete respectfully renews his Emergency Application for Stay Pending Appeal previously addressed to Justice Jackson, and requests that the renewed application be directed to Justice Alito.
>
> Enclosed hereto are 10 copies of the original March 18, 2025 Application."

Petitioner's Emergency Application (24A902) (3/18/25) ("EAS") was regarding, AMONG OTHER THINGS, a hearing scheduled for 3/25/25. After TWO AND A HALF WEEKS, FOUR (4) filings (including a Petition for Writ of Mandamus (3/30/25) (which has neither been docketed nor returned) asking SCOTUS to instruct its Clerks to docket Petitioner's letter), and multiple e-mails (on which included Chief Justice Roberts, SCOTUS's U.S. Marshall, Deputy Police Chief, etc.), on 4/9/25 at approximately 11AM, Clerk posted only:

> "Application (24A902) refiled and submitted to Justice Alito."

In the process, Petitioner also dealt with FedEx attempting to sabotage Petitioner's filings (e.g. cancelling pickup, intentionally and repeatedly delaying delivery, falsifying records, etc.). *See* App.95-114.

RIJ, etc. didn't expect Petitioner to file a Habeas Petition (12/20/24). However, RIJ's, etc. concerns were put at bay when Petitioner's Habeas Petition mysteriously disappeared while in SCOTUS's possession. Because Petitioner involved SCOTUS's Justices, Clerk miraculously discovered HC but, instead of docketing it, Clerk Redmond Barnes intentionally (as demonstrated by Petitioner (*see* App.37-94)) rejected HC on knowingly false grounds. Hadn't Petitioner involved SCOTUS's Justices, HC would still remain M.I.A.

Shortly after Clerk's miraculous discovery and simultaneous rejection of HC, RIJ ramped up the speed against Petitioner. After all, as Petitioner's resubmission of HC (and its subsequent docketing) demonstrated, though HC was rejected, Petitioner can always resubmit and address how Petitioner's filing is proper. RIJ's rush was so obvious that RISC issued an order disallowing Petitioner from even being able to file a request for stay pending appeal to SCOTUS. As RISC was aware, had Petitioner filed such request, RISC would conference on the request, Petitioner could submit (as allowed) a request for reconsideration, etc. All of that takes time; time RIJ couldn't afford since HC was back in the picture.

HC was docketed on 3/20/25. On 3/26/25, HC was scheduled for SCOTUS conference for 4/17/25. That same day (3/26/25), RIJ scheduled Petitioner for a frivolous hearing (under threat of arrest) for 4/14/25. SCOTUS can provide reasoning for scheduling its conference during Holy Week (SCOTUS provides a case distribution schedule showing, in advance, when things will be distributed for conference). What was RIJ's RUSH to schedule Petitioner for a frivolous hearing (under threat of arrest), during Holy Week, effectively HOURS before SCOTUS would decide upon HC, etc.? Note, RIJ's repeatedly provided Petitioner one MONTH before Pre-Trial Conferences occur.

Petitioner attempted to appeal the judge's threat of arrest order. As RIJ knew, per RISC rules,

immediately upon docketing Petitioner's appeal at RISC, the judge's order would no longer become enforceable because the appeal removes jurisdiction. Knowing that docketing the appeal would effectively stay the order's enforcement and given that Petitioner had filed all necessary paperwork to perfect the appeal and was only waiting on the lower court clerk ("LCC") to electronically transmit the record (which was already in electronic format, ready to be sent at a click-of-a-button, and which, per court rules, Petitioner cannot transmit himself (Petitioner has to depend on LCC)), LCC waited until 4PM on the Friday before the Monday, 10:30AM hearing to e-mail Petitioner stating he would NOT transmit the record because IN LCC's VIEW (which, per court rules, LCC has no say in the matter) the judge's order wasn't appealable. Note, it didn't matter that RISC's court rules ORDERED LCC to transmit the record (*see* R.I.Sup.Ct.Art.III, Rule 11(b)), etc., under no circumstances would Petitioner's RISC appeal be docketed.

While LCC was preventing a stay, SCOTUS's Clerks were preventing SCOTUS from issuing an administrative stay while it considered Petitioner's EAS. Given new intervening case circumstances, Petitioner submitted a Supplemental Brief (24A902) (4/5/25) ("SB"). However, on 4/9/25, Emergency Applications Clerk Robert Meek rejected SB claiming: "Supplemental briefs are not permitted in renewed applications." No rule, etc. was provided justifying such statement. Why? Setting aside the

statement's absurdity (e.g. according to Meek, Petitioner isn't allowed to inform SCOTUS of new case developments, etc.), as Meek knows, that's a LIE. For example, in Case No.23A230, attorney Paloma Capanna (member of SCOTUS's bar) submitted TO MEEK (**addressed specifically "To Clerk Mr. Robert Meek"**) a "second supplemental brief" (as declared in Capanna's document) for a RENEWED application and MEEK ACCEPTED AND FILED IT. That case's docket shows:

> "Sep 12 2023 Application (23A230) refiled and submitted to Justice Thomas.
>
> Sep 15 2023 Second supplemental [brief]...submitted."

Why would Meek brazenly LIE (like Clerk Redmond Barnes brazenly lied in order to reject Petitioner's properly filed HC (as since effectively admitted given its docketing upon Petitioner's resubmission))?

Note, Meek's rejection letter dated 4/9/25 (and returned SB) was delivered on Friday afternoon, 4/11/25. Recall, LCC waited until 4PM Friday, 4/11/25 to e-mail Petitioner stating he wouldn't allow Petitioner's appeal of judge's Monday, 4/14/25 10:30AM order.

Petitioner swiftly submitted an Emergency Supplemental Brief (24A902) (4/12/25) ("ESB") (which was ready for FedEx pickup at 12PM (noon))

addressing Meek's LIE, only to discover Meek took-off the entire week of 4/14/25. Moreover, despite Petitioner e-mailing Kyle Ratliff (Meek's designee), ESB (delivered 4/14/25 at 9:06AM, signed by "W.Lee") wasn't docketed/returned.

Petitioner's shipped additional copies of ESB (e.g. delivered 4/22/25 at 3:03PM (signed by "S.ROBINSON"), 4/24/25 at 10:30AM (signed by "W.Lee"), 4/28/25 at 9:02AM (signed by "W.Lee"), 4/29/25 at 9:24AM (signed by "L.Johnson")) (each box marked "EMERGENCY").

Two weeks after the original ESB (delivered 4/14/25 at 9:06AM, box labeled "EMERGENCY"), Petitioner received it (SCOTUS stamped received 4/15/25) back with a rejection letter from Ratliff dated 4/22/25. Ratliff's rejection was word-for-word like Meek's. Again, no rule, etc. justifying rejection. Why didn't Ratliff issue his rejection letter anytime between 4/15/25-4/18/25? Moreover, per Meek's out-of-office e-mail, Meek was back in beginning 4/22/25 (the same date of the rejection letter) therefore why didn't Meek issue the rejection letter? Because Meek was caught lying (as demonstrated in ESB), Meek used Ratliff to continue corruptly, etc. blocking ESB.

SCOTUS's Clerks actions continued. *See e.g.* App.128-131 for more.

Petitioner's even dealt with attempted break-in into Petitioner's home (which occurred as Petitioner was

preparing his HC (Petitioner advised Prosecution, etc. of his forthcoming HC in his Writ of Certiorari (24-614) (11/25/24)), Google randomly stopping Petitioner's e-mail, Petitioner's home-internet going dead (even Petitioner's internet-provider not knowing why), etc.

Petitioner needs to be stopped by any means necessary.

As HC addressed:

> -Prosecution's sole "evidence" attempting to establish the bills are allegedly counterfeit is an unsigned, unnotarized, etc. letter dated 8/3/23 allegedly from the United States Secret Service ("USSS") however, USSS has informed Petitioner (via responses to Petitioner's Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Requests #20230784 and #20230856) **NO SUCH DOCUMENT EXISTS IN THEIR RECORDS (DESPITE THE DOCUMENT APPEARING TO ALLEGEDLY BE *FROM* USSS)**. Prosecution submitted a knowingly forged (counterfeited) document (**WITHOUT WHICH THERE'D BE NO CASE**).
>
> -Prosecution does NOT have any evidence of any tests, etc. allegedly conducted by USSS (reinforcing the alleged USSS letter's a forgery (counterfeit) by the State) and USSS's FOIA Responses declare **USSS DOESN'T HAVE**

ANY RECORDS OF ANY KIND (E.G. SUBMISSION, TESTS, LETTER, ETC.) OF, ABOUT, CONCERNING, ETC. THE BILLS, ETC.

-Prosecution refuses to identify Petitioner's accuser

-Prosecution refuses to call Petitioner's accuser as a witness

-Prosecution refuses to allow Petitioner to inspect the alleged bills

-Prosecution refuses to allow any future jury to inspect the alleged bills

-Prosecution does NOT have chain of custody for the bills, etc. (in fact, from existing evidence, **SPD intentionally broke the chain of custody**)

-Prosecution continues to knowingly withhold exculpatory evidence, etc.

-Prosecution hasn't produced Santander's alleged criminal complaint

-SPD's documentation, etc. indicates SPD tampered with witnesses (e.g. coached (at a minimum) them as to what, etc. to write down in their witness statements)

-SPD's police report intentionally left out exculpatory evidence, information, etc. and, instead, was written in a way to portray vast criminality by Petitioner when in reality they not only KNEW no crimes of ANY kind had been committed but they ADMITTED the bills were GENUINE

-**Santander surveillance footage was purposefully cut off (CONFIRMED break in chain of custody)**

-**SPD intentionally didn't list the bills' serial numbers in the police report (claiming they weren't available ("NOT AVAIL" (No Emphasis Added) (EXACT WORDS USED)) (despite the serial numbers being crystal clear))**

-**SPD confiscated and later destroyed Santander's provided photocopies of Petitioner's GENUINE bills**

-**SPD effectively instructed Santander to destroy (and Santander confirmed it did destroy) Santander's records of the serial numbers of Petitioner's bills, etc.**

-as confirmed by documentation, Santander attempted to destroy surveillance footage of the incident

-Santander surveillance footage (which Santander attempted to destroy, Prosecution admitted to withholding from Petitioner, etc.) shows State's star 43-year expert witness confirming (at the time of the incident) the watermarks, security threads, etc. were correct (further demonstrating State's letter (claiming the watermarks, security threads, etc. are allegedly incorrect) is a forgery (counterfeit))

-RIJ'S RULED PETITIONER ISN'T ENTITLED TO EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE (DIRECTLY VIOLATING SCOTUS'S BINDING CASE LAW)

-RIJ'S DISALLOWED PETITIONER FROM SUBPOENAING DEFENSE WITNESSES

-RIJ'S RULED PETITIONER ISN'T ENTITLED TO APPEAL *ANYTHING* THE LOWER COURT DOES (DIRECTLY VIOLATING SCOTUS'S BINDING CASE LAW)

-RIJ'S RULED PETITIONER'S NOT ALLOWED TO EVEN REQUEST A STAY PENDING APPEAL TO SCOTUS

-ETC.

In 1940, U.S. Attorney General Robert Jackson (who became SCOTUS Justice in 1941) said:

> "The prosecutor has more control over life, liberty, and reputation than any other person in America. His discretion is tremendous. He can have citizens investigated and, if he is that kind of person, he can have this done to the tune of public statements and veiled or unveiled intimidations...The prosecutor can order arrests...and on the basis of his one-sided presentation of the facts, can cause the citizen to be indicted and held for trial...While the prosecutor at his best is one of the most beneficent forces in our society, when he acts from malice or other base motives, he is one of the worst."
>
> "If the prosecutor is obliged to choose his cases, it follows that he can choose his defendants. Therein is the most dangerous power of the prosecutor: that he will pick people that he thinks he should get, rather than pick cases that need to be prosecuted. With the law books filled with a great assortment of crimes, a prosecutor stands a fair chance of finding at least a technical violation of some act on the part of almost anyone. In such a case, it is not a question of discovering the commission of a crime and then looking for the man who has committed it, it is a question of picking the man and then

> searching the law books, or putting investigators to work, to pin some offense on him. It is in this realm—in which the prosecutor picks some person whom he dislikes...and then looks for an offense, that the greatest danger of abuse of prosecuting power lies. It is here that law enforcement becomes personal, and the real crime becomes that of being unpopular with the predominant or governing group..."

RI's openly referred to as a "relationship rich," "I know a guy," etc. State.

As Petitioner's stated, prior to SPD's illegal arrest, Petitioner's family had lawsuits lined up against FM Global (a nearly 200-year-old (per FM's website) multi-billion-dollar RI-based international insurance company), entities contracted with, controlled by, etc. FM, etc., etc., etc. Note, SPD tried, without basis and by falsifying information, to have Petitioner's home raided.

ALL JUDGES (OF EVERY APPLICABLE RIJ LEVEL) HAVE KNOWINGLY LIED, FALSIFIED, ETC. (ALL DOCUMENTED), BEEN FULLY AWARE THROUGHOUT THIS PROCESS OF PROSECUTION'S CRIMINALLY FORGED DOCUMENT (WITHOUT WHICH, PROSECUTION WOULD HAVE NO CASE), ETC. YET HAVE, AMONG OTHER THINGS, DESPITE PETITIONER'S REPEATED

EFFORTS, AIDED AND ABETTED PROSECUTION'S FRAUD, ETC.

RIJ's out-of-control and, among other things, making a mockery of SCOTUS, the Judiciary, etc.

Entire cases are dismissed for things like: police not reading someone their *Miranda* rights before they voluntarily confessed, police illegally obtaining authentic evidence of crime, etc. Recently, SCOTUS has, in multiple cases, held (one case (24A949) unanimously) in favor of criminal Defendants (e.g. an illegal "got-away"/gang-terrorist member/human smuggler/etc. (already TWICE ordered deported by Federal Judges); etc.) (who received Due Process, etc.) merely because allegedly there wasn't PERFECT Due Process.

YET, AN AMERICAN'S (attorney, multiple honors, etc., etc.) RIGHTS CONTINUE BEING OBLITERATED.

Normally Justice R.Jackson's concerns would be swiftly addressed by "...a ferociously independent..." Judiciary (quoting Justice Gorsuch). However, when, in Petitioner's case, RIJ corruptly aids and abets, etc. lawless Prosecution, Petitioner stands no chance to a fair process, etc. (as RIJ's, etc. repeatedly demonstrated). The process is being used to end a knowingly innocent person.

SCOTUS must intervene.

Respectfully
Michael Prete
782 Boston Neck Road
Narragansett, RI 02882
May 8, 2025

RULE 44.2 CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that this petition for rehearing is presented in good faith and not for delay and is restricted to the grounds specified in Rule 44.2.

Michael Prete
782 Boston Neck Road
Narragansett, RI 02882
May 8, 2025

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

No. 24-1000

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

In re MICHAEL PRETE,

Petitioner,

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Michael Prete, certify that on the 8th day of May, 2025, my *Petition for Rehearing* in the above-captioned matter was sent to:

John Perrotta (Attorney for State of R.I. AG's Office)
150 South Main Street
Providence, RI 02903

by depositing three copies of same in a properly addressed package to FedEx.

All parties required to be served have been served.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on May 8, 2025.

Michael Prete

No. 24-1000

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

In re MICHAEL PRETE,

Petitioner,

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

As required by Supreme Court Rule 33.1(h), I certify that my Petition for Rehearing contains 2,995 words, excluding the parts of the petition that are exempted by Supreme Court Rule 33.1(d). I have relied on the word count of a word-processing system (set to include footnotes) used to prepare the document.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on May 8, 2025.

Michael Prete

Michael Prete