


24-5250 ORIGINAL
No. _____



IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Terry Lee — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

KEVIN PATTERSON et al — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS For EIGHTH Circuit
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Terry Lee
(Your Name)

2501 STATE Farm Rd
(Address)

TUCKER ARK 72168
(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. Did THE District Court violate 28 U.S.C 1915(A) by Dismissing Claims For Concise statement instead of (A) Are Legally Frivolous (b) Fail to state A claim upon which relief may granted or (c) seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief
2. Did petitioner state A claim upon which relief may be granted
3. Should the Court appointed attorney
4. Is it LAW IN Reviewing A prose Complaint under 1915(e)(2)(B), THE COURT must give the Complaint the benefit of A liberal Construction THE COURT must also weight ALL factual Allegations in ~~the~~ FAVOR OF the plaintiff.
5. IF the Dismissal A violation of 1st Denial Access to the Courts ~~of~~, Due process AND equal protection 14th Amendment

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:

Terry Lee ADCth 120966 Petitioner
vs

Dexter Payne, Director of Arkansas Department of
Correction, Sarah Huckabee Governor, ~~BOA~~ Arkansas
Board of Correction, Asst Director William Strauss
WARDEN ATTACH SHEETS ADDED

RELATED CASES

HAINES v. KERNER, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972)
DENTON v. HERNANDEZ, 504 U.S. 25, 32 (1992)
FLAHERTY v. COUGHLIN 713 F.2d 10, 13 (2nd Cir 1983)
GREGG v. GEORGIA (428 U.S. 153), 73
Farmer 517 U.S. at 832, 114 S. Ct

Terry Antonio Lee

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

Kevin Patterson, Lt., Tucker Max; Mariquise McCan, Sgt., Tucker Max; Cierra Washington, Sgt.; Kerium Broadway, Sgt.; Does, Nessa, Sgt., Tucker Max; EARU; Board of Correction; Tucker Max; John and Jane; R. D. Refus, Sgt., Tucker Max; Numery, Sgt., Tucker Max; Jaylin Lee, Sgt., Tucker Max; K. Love, Commissary, Tucker Max; S. Scott, Capt., Tucker Max; Wright, Sgt., Tucker Max; Roosevelt Barden, Capt., East Arkansas Regional Unit; M. Kelly, Lt., East Arkansas Regional Unit; Watson, Lt., East Arkansas Regional Unit; Conway, Sgt., Tucker Max; Jackson, Sgt., Tucker Max; Smith, Sgt., Tucker Max; Stewart, Sgt., Tucker Max; Jordan B. Slayden, Lt., Tucker Max; Matthew Elias, Sgt., Tucker Max; Karma Throne, Lt., Tucker Max; Chrystal Ridley, Sgt., Tucker Max; Brandeisjha M. Burnett, Sgt., Tucker Max; Stewart, Lt., Tucker Max; Dycus, Assistant Warden, East Arkansas Regional Unit; Raymond Naylor, Internal Affairs Supervisor; Reed, Assistant Director; K. Randle, Major, East Arkansas Regional Unit; Etherly, Capt., East Arkansas Regional Unit; Dexter Payne, Director; William Straughn, Assistant Director; Thomas Rowland, Supervisor, Internal Affairs; Lay, Warden, East Arkansas Regional Unit; J. Andrews, Warden, East Arkansas Regional Unit; James Shipman, Warden, Tucker Max; Maurice Culcalger, Assistant Warden, Tucker Max; Joseph P. Mahoney, Major, Tucker Max; Clark, Capt., Tucker Max; Cantrell Bass, Capt., Tucker Max; Swiney, Lt., Tucker Max; Grant, Lt., Tucker Max; William Freeman, Capt., Tucker Max; Sarah Huckabee, Governor; Ery, Sgt., Tucker Max; Jermniy Lee, Sgt., Tucker Max; Anthony Jackson, Assistant Warden, EARU, ADC; Tyrone Allison, Major, ADC; Fidel Cobbs, Lt., ADC; Kierra V. Walker, Cpl., Federal Unit; Amanda Pasley, PREA Coord., ADC; Leavy Watson, III, Sgt., EARU, ADC; William McNary, Capt., EARU, ADC; Glenda Bolden, Lt., EARU, ADC; Cameron Moore, Lt., ADC; Cornelius A. Granville, Sgt., ADC; Jennifer Thompson, Medical, EARU, ADC; Douglas, Medical, EARU, ADC; Kelly McCaine, Medical, EARU, ADC; Sandra K. Davis, Sgt.; Roy Williams, Sgt./Lt., ADC; Anita Palmer, Sgt., EARU, ADC; April Brandon, Sgt., EARU, ADC; Paul Harris, Capt.; Daniels, Cpl., EARU, ADC; Karen Davis, Sgt., Tucker Max; Dona Davis, Sgt., Tucker Max; Tevon Smith, Sgt., East Arkansas Regional Unit; King, Sgt., East Arkansas Regional Unit; Jenkins, Mail Room Staff; East Arkansas Regional Unit; D. Lons, Mail Room Staff; East Arkansas Regional Unit; Casle, Lt., Tucker Max; C. Blizzard, APN; Tucker Max; Taylor, APN, Tucker Max; Haley Trantham; Isom, Sgt., Tucker Max; C. Jackosn, Sgt.; Tucker Max; Nessa, Sgt.; Tucker Max; Beasley, Sgt.; Tucker Max

Defendants - Appellees

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

HAINES v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972)
Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 32 (1992)
452 U.S. at 247. 101 S. Ct. at 2399 - 2400
Gregg v. Georgia (428 U.S. 153)
Farmer, 517 U.S. at 832 114 S. Ct

STATUTES AND RULES

28 U.S.C. 1915(A) (A)
28 U.S.C. 1915 (e) (2) (B)

OTHER

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	THE OPINION OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
APPENDIX B	THE OPINION OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
APPENDIX C	UNTIMELY petition for rehearing
APPENDIX D	Order by the United State District Court on Amend to Short and Concise Statement
APPENDIX E	The motion to, proceed in forma pauperis by the United States Court of Appeals
APPENDIX F	Order denying motion for Appointment of Counsel by the United State District Court
APPENDIX G	THE United States Court of Appeal to put motion for Appointment of Counsel up for panel
APPENDIX H	Mandate by the United States Court of Appeals for the EIGHTH Circuit
APPENDIX I	Order from the United States Court of Appeal for the EIGHTH Cir

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 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 United States district court 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.

☐ 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 MAY 20 2024, mand. denied same 18 2024

☒ No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case. untimely Appendix CC)

☐ 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

1st Amendment denial Access to the
Courts

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

8-30-2023 PETITIONER Terry Lee Filed Civil
COMPLAINT IN THE UNITED STATE DISTRICT COURT STATING
ALL CONSTITUTIONAL CLAIMS THAT WAS BEING VIOLATED
ESPECIALLY THE 1ST AMENDMENT DENIAL ACCESS TO THE
COURTS EXPLAINING HOW SECURITY STAFF STEALING
AND THROWING AWAY LEGAL DOCUMENTS STUDY
ATTACKING MY LEGAL WORK AND CAUSING PROBLEMS SO
THEY CAN PLACE ME ON BEHAVIOR CONTROL TO GO
THREW MY LEGAL WORK AND STEAL DOCUMENTS EXPLAINING
HOW I GOT SPRAY WITH CHEMICAL AGENTS CAUSE
THEY TRIED TO GET LEGAL WORK OUT CELL AND STOP
MY ACCESS TO THE COURTS I EXPLAINING IN ORIGINAL
COMPLAINT I HAD TO RUSH IT AND STATE EVERY
THING THATS GOING ON BECAUSE I WANTED BE
ABLE TO FILE ANOTHER COMPLAINT THE
DISTRICT COURT THOUGHT I WAS JUST TALKING
AND ORDER ME TO FILE A AMENDED COMPLAINT
KNOWING ITS WAS HARD TO GET THAT COMPLAINT
INT OUT. THE ORDER OF THE AMENDED ~~COMPLAINT~~

CONTINUE STATEMENT OF CASE
COMPLAINT WAS TO BE WITH A SHORT
CONCISE STATEMENT APPENDIX (D)
AT THE TIME THE UNITED STATE
DISTRICT COURT WANT ME TO WRITE

A SHORT CONCISE STATEMENT I
HAD MY MOTHER SEND OTHER
DOCUMENT TO THE COURT ON
WHAT I MAILED TO HER CAUSE
A I STATED IN CIVIL SUITE

SST BURNETT WAS DESTROYING
ALL LEGAL DOCUMENTS TRYING TO
GET SO MORE SO THEY FORCE
ME TO MAIL SOME HOME BUT
AS I MAILED IT HOME SST
KAREN DAVIS, LT SMITH

STOLE MORE LEGAL DOCUMENTS
SO AS IM TRYING DO THE
AMENDED COMPLAINT SECURITY
FOUND OUT ABOUT SUITE AND
WAS ATTACKING IN EVERY
DIRECTION SO I TO FAST DO
IT THEN ~~WA~~ ONCE I GOT IT
DONE TO THE BEST OF MY
ABILITY SECURITY STAFF WOULDNT
SIGN OFF ON LEGAL MAIL

So It got Filed but not the
Time Frame the Judge order so
Case was dismissed with
out prejudice for failure to
File a short and concise
Statement I file Notice
of Appeal and a Informing
paupris the Court Filed the
Notice of Appeal but refuse
to grant Inform a paupris
THE UNITED STATE EIGHTH
Circuit Court of Appeal
granted Informa paupris to
proceed which still got
Affirmed to the District
Court Ruling Appewix ()
petitioner Case That was
Filed in District Court
WHERE ON THE CONSTITUTION
VIOLATIONS DENIAL ACCESS TO
THE COURTS, EXCESSIVE USE
OF FORCE ET 1ST AND
8TH AMENDMENT CONSTITUT
IONAL VIOLATIONS I Filed
For A re HEARING on the ruling I
Receive on THE MANDATE by
S.O.F. 993

THE 8TH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEAL
THAT WAS MANDATED JUNE 18, 2024
APPENDIX (H) EXPLAINS THAT SECURITY
STAFF WERE STOPPING MY LEGAL MAIL
AND STOPPING IT FROM GOING OUT
STATED I HAVE CAMERAS IN MY CELL
BUT MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME
WAS MADE IT TO THE COURT ~~WILL~~
THE REHEARING WAS DENIED STATING
UNTIMELY APPENDIX (D) I FILE
A NOTICE OF APPEAL WITH MOTION FOR
REHEARING TO GO TO THE UNITED
STATE SUPREME COURT BUT I HAVEN'T
HEARD NOTHING ON THE NOTICE OF
APPEAL SO NOW PETITIONER FILE
A WRIT CERTIORARI SO THE UNITED
STATE COULD REVIEW THE LOWER
COURTS ORDERS AND DETERMINE IF
IT'S ACCORDING TO LAW OF THE
UNITED STATE SUPREME COURT THE
COURT ORDER FROM THE UNITED STATE
DISTRICT COURT ~~WAS~~ ON THE DEMAND
FOR CONCISE STATEMENT WAS
STOLEN BY SECURITY BUT OTHER
DOCUMENTS THAT WEREN'T STOLEN ARE
FILE WITH PETITION

S.O.F. PG 4

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

1. Because of the Screening process the United State District Court could only ~~dismiss~~ dismiss a Civil Complaint under 28 U.S.C. 1915 (A) by

(A) ARE Legally Frivolous (b) fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted or (c) seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief NOT for a short concise statement.

HAINES v. Kerner, 464 U.S. 519, 520 (1972)
AND Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 32 (1992)

2. ~~Dismiss~~

Abuse of discretion of the United State District Court Judge to dismiss case on short and concise statement.

3. 28 U.S.C. 1915 (e) (2) 1915 (A)(B) Complaint Filed in forma pauperis can only be dismissed on initial review if plaintiff fail to allege sufficient facts to state a factual plausible claim for relief

4. claim should NOT be dismissed on screening process
452 U.S. AT 347, 101 S.Ct. 923 99-2400
Gregg v. Georgia (428 U.S. 153) 73 Farmer v. S17 V.S
AT 832 114 S.Ct.

- 1, reverse And remand to the district court
- 2, direct Appointment of Counsel
- 3 what the court feel Just

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Tengde

Date: _____