

24-5361

No. _____

FILED

AUG 12 2024

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT U.S.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ORIGINAL

SR.
CARL DWAYNE STEVENSON *#J-05244* — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

VS.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, WARDEN
Ca. board of parole, JOE LIZZARRAGA RESPONDENT(S)
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEAL
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT
ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

SR.
CARL DWAYNE STEVENSON
(Your Name)

CA. STATE PRISON - LA COUNTY, P.O. Box 4430 -
(Address) *#1-120*

LANCASTER, CA. 93539
(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

justices I come before, you honored / stumbled with the up-most respect for this process. Once again as mentioned in another most recent civil action, I just mailed to the Court, it being the United States Supreme Court. After a basic night of stress, I am under extreme distress. As I write my vision is dull.

Justices I have contemplated noted above, Question (A) to be asked to frame the minds of all minds in reference to law. I actually can't implicate a question (B), that would be relevant, to the frame-works of all justices minds. I have come up with relevant statements of fact (C).

Justices this is a clear case of deviant minds, noted as tyrants, exercising the act of a Government, under our structured Government. (Tyranny). These individuals have proven to degrade our justice system rather than just insure my life for parole date.

Justices (you will see) I have addressed every person which was brought forth to deny myself parole April 1, 2021, after an advancement of parole hearing was granted from a 2009 11th Constitutional denial of (15) years based on Mark's law. Now I am here based on the fact the District refuses to respond to Certificate of Appealability, dated 5-1-23, this after the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit remanded my appeal back down to the District Court. See document dated May 10, 2023, from the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

As a Godly person, I conclude with relevant biblical books / chapters, as being Jeremiah chapter 51 / Revelation chapters 18 / 19. This matter reflects a current justice system in California.

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:

RELATED CASES

IN RE LAWRENCE, 44 CAL. 4TH 1181, IN RE PEREZ (2017) 7 CAL. APP. 5TH 65, 87-88 [212 CAL. RPTR. 3d 441], HUNTER (2012) 205 CAL. APP. 4TH 1529 [141 CAL. RPTR. 3d 350], IN RE SANCHEZ (2012) 209 CAL. APP. 4TH 962 [147 CAL. RPTR. 3d 336], IN RE RIVER (2011) 196 CAL. APP. 4TH 533 [126 CAL. RPTR. 3d 380, 392], IN RE GOMEZ (2010) 190 CAL. APP. 4TH 1291 [118 496 CAL. RPTR. 3d 900], IN RE MOSES (2010) 182 CAL. APP. 4TH 1279, 1303 [106 CAL. RPTR. 3d 608], IN RE JUAREZ (2010) 182 CAL. APP. 4TH 1316, 1339 [106 CAL. RPTR. 3d 648], IN RE DANNENBERG (2009) 173 CAL. APP. 4TH 237 [92 CAL. RPTR. 3d 647], IN RE GULB (2009) 170 CAL. APP. 4TH 20 [87 CAL. RPTR. 3d 736], IN RE SINGLER (2008) 169 CAL. APP. 4TH 20 [87 CAL. RPTR. 3d 736], IN RE SINGLER (2008) 169 CAL. APP. 4TH 1227 [87 CAL. RPTR. 3d 319], IN RE ROSS (2009) 170 CAL. APP. 4TH 1490 [88 CAL. RPTR. 3d 873], IN RE CRISTOFANI (2009) 173 CAL. APP. 4TH 60 [92 CAL. RPTR. 3d 258], IN RE LIZOR (2009) 172 CAL. APP. 4TH 1185 [92 CAL. RPTR. 3d 36], MILLER V. OREGON BOARD OF PROBATION (9TH CIR. 2011) 642 F.3d 711, 712, 716-717, BIGGS V. TERPUNE (9TH CIR. 2003) 334 F.3d 910; STISS V. CALIFORNIA BOARD OF PRISON TERMS (9TH CIR. 2006) 461 F.3d 1123; IRONS V. GREY (9TH CIR. 2007) 505 F.3d 846; HAYWARD V. MARSHALL (9TH CIR. 2010) 603 F.3d 546, 555; POWELL V. GOMEZ (9TH CIR. 1994) 33 F.3d 39, 40; JANCSEK V. OREGON BOARD OF PROBATION (9TH CIR. 1987) 833 F.2d 1389, 1390; O'BREMSKI V. MYSS (9TH CIR. 1990) 915 F.2d 418, 422. EX POST FACTO CASES DOCKEN V. CHASE (9TH CIR. 2004) 393 F.3d 1024; BROUN V. PHILPOTTER (9TH CIR. 2004).

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 DOCUMENTATION(S) LEADING TO CURRENT CIVIL ACTION, @ BODRO OF PTROLE, RESPONSE DATED MARCH 24, 2021, @ PPT COMPREHENSIVE RISK ASSESSMENT, DATED 3-15-21, PTROLE DECISION DOCUMENTATION THEIR DENIAL, @ BODRO HEARING TRANSCRIPTS DATED 4-1-21, MISCL. SUPPORT DOCUMENTATION

APPENDIX B PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS, CASE NO. PH013775. SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, RESPONSE, DATED 12-16-21.

APPENDIX C PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS, AMENDED CASE NO. PH017748. COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT, DIVISION FIVE. STAMPED FEB. 24, 2022.

APPENDIX D UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA. PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS, 28 U.S.C. § 2254. DOCUMENTS IN REFERENCE TO PETITION. CASE NO. 22-CV-06823-MWF. FM. JANUARY 26, 2023 RESPONSES GIVEN.

APPENDIX E I DO NOT RECOLLECT OFFILING A OBJECTION / MOTION WHICH I DID NOT HAVE. SEE AMENDED / C.O.A. DATED 5-1-23. SUPREME COURT OF CA. LETTER DATED OCTOBER 3, 2022 ORDER OF DISTRICT RECEIVING RELEVANT LETTERS FROM MYSELF TO THE CA. SUPREME COURT, DOCUMENT STAMPED SEPT. 21, 2022 DENYING PETITION

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES ARE TO BE USED IN THE SAME CONTEXT DIFFERENT PLATFORM
NOTED AS CO. BOARD OF PRISON (CONTEXT-SENSE) PAGE NUMBER

- ① *WIGGINS V. SMITH* 539 U.S. 510 (2003), ② *TINSLEY V. MILLER* 399 F.3d. 796, 802 (6th CIR 2005), ③ *LOCKHART V. FREY* 506 U.S. 364, 369 113 S.Ct. 838, 122 L.Ed. 2d 180 (1993) ④ *U.S. V. CHRONIC* 466 U.S. 648
- ① *U.S. V. RUSSELL* 411 U.S. 423 (1973), ② *VASQUEZ V. HILLERY* 474 U.S. 254 (1986), ③ *BLACKLEDGE V. PERRY* 417 U.S. 21 (1974), ④ *U.S. V. GOODWIN* 457 U.S. 368, ⑤ *REMMER V. S* 347 U.S. 227 (1954)
- ③ *ROBINSON V. CALIFORNIA* 370 U.S. 660 (1962), ② *COLLINS V. YOUNGBLOOD* 497 U.S. 37 (1990)

STATUTES AND RULES

- ① CONSTITUTION OF CALIFORNIA ARTICLE 1 SECTION 15 / SECTION 18 / SECTION 19
UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION SIXTH AMENDMENT
UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT
- ② CONSTITUTION OF CALIFORNIA ARTICLE 1 SECTION 1 / SECTION 3(a) / SECTION 7(a) / SECTION 24,
UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT
UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION FIRST AMENDMENT
PENAL CODE 3055
- ③ CONSTITUTION OF CALIFORNIA ARTICLE 1 SECTION 9 / SECTION 17 / SECTION 24
EX POST FACTO CLAUSE
UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION EIGHTH AMENDMENT
UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION NINTH AMENDMENT
UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT

OTHER

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 E 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 _____ 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 OPEN AUGUST 1, 2024.

☐ 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

- ① CONSTITUTION OF CALIFORNIA ARTICLE I SECTION 15, SECTION 18, AND SECTION 19.
- ② CONSTITUTION OF CALIFORNIA ARTICLE I SECTION 1, SECTION 3(a), SECTION 7(a), AND SECTION 24.
- ③ CONSTITUTION OF CALIFORNIA ARTICLE I SECTION 9, SECTION 17, AND SECTION 24
- ④ UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION FIRST AMENDMENT.
- ⑤ UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION SIXTH AMENDMENT.
- ⑥ UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION EIGHTH AMENDMENT.
- ⑦ UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION NINTH AMENDMENT.
- ⑧ UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT.
- ⑨ EX POST FACTO CLAUSE
- ⑩ PENAL CODE 3055 (CALIFORNIA)

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

After 15 years, UNCONSTITUTIONAL PROLE DEATH, OFFERED ON MRS. L. L. SOME-
TIME IN THE YEAR OF 2010, I FILED TO ADVANCE MY PROLE HEARING. MY REQUEST WAS GRANTED,
WHICH MY LIST C O C RVR 115 WAS BROUGHT FORTH. I RESPONDED GIVE-THE FULL UNDER-
STANDING OF THE MATTER THAT WITH THE HEARING, THIS WAS A CONTINUANCE OTHER OF A RITE, POLITICAL
ORGANIZED CERTAINLY. EXAMPLE I HAVE NOT HAD A C O C RVR 115 SINCE, WHICH HAVE BEEN TEN YEARS.
UNTIL I RECEIVED A C O C RVR 115 FOR REFUSING TO WORK. THIS WAS AFTER I HAD SUBMITTED A PROPLE
TO SUPERVISOR K. BOOS, IN REGARDS TO PERSONALITY OF STRIP SEARCHING MYSELF, COME-
ING FROM WORK THROUGH WORK EXCHANGE AS A KIDNAPER OF SUPERVISOR, C O K. BOOS THE APPROPRI-
ATE RATIONMENT I LET C O K. BOOS KNOW THAT I WAS STRIKING UP FROM STRIP PERSONALITY POLICY
OF STRIP SEARCHING MYSELF, WITH-OUT ANY JUST CHARGE. I FILED ALL DOCUMENTS IN RELATION
TO THIS MATTER AS A TORT CLAIM, WITH THE GOVERNMENT CLAIM BOOKS. "WHICH I HAVE NOT REC-
EIVED ONE RESPONSE. MATTERS (SUCH AS) INFLUENCED APRIL 1, 2011 (SEVEN YEARS DEATH).
AT THIS POINT I WAS ASSIGNED A FOREIGN FEMALE ATTORNEY ELIZABETH KAHN, WHICH CLAIMS
NO DEER OF MY ETHNICITY AS BEING FOREIGN IMPERIAL. FROM ONE AND ALL I HEARD WAS NOT ASSIGNED
BOOKS MEMBERS GET, P'S IN REFERENCE TO INFLUENCES THE TWO GRANT PROPLE TO IF ANY SELF HELP
GROUPS WITH THE TOP OF THE P'S. INTO BEING WITH LATER GROUP BEFORE I WAS MOVED TO A FACILITY,
PROGRESSIVE PROCKNIMING FACILITY. WHICH I WAS HERE ON A FACILITY FIVE YEARS BEFORE THE
JUDICIAL CHAIRMAN CONTACTED CALIFORNIA PROPLE AND MADE REFERENCE TO THIS ASSIG-
ED ATTORNEY I NEVER ASKED FOR. SINCE SELF HELP GROUPS, WAS ASSIGNED ATTORNEY YOUTH POINT.
I ASKED IS THERE A MATTER, THAT YOU HAVE TO HAVE SELF HELP GROUPS TO BE PROPLED. GROUPS ARE
RESERVED FOR IMMIGRANTS WHO ACTUALLY NEED SELF HELP GROUPS. A REMOVED LETTER WAS MENTIONED
THAT I SHOULD WRITE, WHICH I DID. THIS LETTER WAS NOT SUBMITTED UNTIL THE PROPLE HEARING
WAS IN PROCESS, WHICH I BROUGHT FORTH. THIS WAS THE THIRD SIGN I HAD GOTTEN BOOKS MEM-
BERS MEMBERS WHO CONVINCE I HAD 15 YEARS TO LIVE SEPARATE, INSTEAD OF THE FIVE YEAR TERM
PLUS FIVE AND THREE.
THE NEXT ASPECT WAS A PROPLEMENT THAT ASSESSMENT WHICH I THOUGHT WOULD BE. WHEN I
RECEIVED THE REPORT I SAW WHERE, THE INDIVIDUAL OFFERED HIS OWN DISAGREE, PHYSICALLY
CHECK IN REFERENCE TO THE HEARING, OFFERED ON CIVIL ACTION(S) I HAD TO HAVE THE
PRE-CONVINCE THROUGH RITUAL, POLITICALLY, AND THE PROPLEMENT THAT ASSES-
MENT. BOOKS MEMBER IN MY DE REFERENCE TO, THE CASE WITH TRASH, SEVERITIES, AND
CONVINCE FOR OVER-TOLERANCE, FROM THE ON OF THE HEARING. AT THE END OF THE
2009 15 YEAR DEATH PLUS 3 YEARS CURRENT.
PLEASE SEE CASE OF RECORD IN THIS ENTRY. YOU WILL HAVE A BETTER PERCEPTION OF
THE REAL REASON OF STILL BEING INCARCERATED, ON A CASE THE ORIGINAL BOOKING CHARGE
WAS 245(a). AFTER RITUAL, POLITICALLY, OFFERED TO PRE-MEDITATED MURDER, GO TO
MYSELF PLANNING TO GO TO THE FACT. BEFORE HAD THE DEATH WAS WALK TO ELEVEN YEARS.
NOW IT IS 31 YEARS LATER.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

JUSTICES ONCE AGAIN I AM HONORED, HUMOLED, AND ALWAYS UNDER EXTREME DURESS, TO MAKE LEGAL SENSE OF A MANIPULATIVE MIND. IN THIS CIVIL ACTION AGAINST CALIFORNIA BOARD OF PAROLE IN ITS OFFICIAL CAPACITY. I FEEL I HAVE CLEARLY STATED STATEMENTS OF FACTS, WHICH CLEARLY VIOLATES THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION. IT IS THE JUSTICES DUTY AS SUDOR IN CABINET MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, WHICH MEANS NO-ONE/ENTITY IS HIGHER THAN, WHERE THEY FEEL THEY DO NOT HAVE TO EXPLAIN OR ANSWER TO ANY-ONE. CLEAR VIOLATION OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION FIRST AMENDMENT.

JUSTICES, ON A PERSONAL NOTE, I HAVE NEVER PROCLAIMED TO BE A SAINT. I'M JUST NOT THAT PERSON THIS JUSTICE SYSTEM HAVE DECIDED TO SIT UP ON THEIR BUTTS AND PHYSICALLY WRITE MY LIFE OFF TO BE, BASED ON MANIPULATION, DECEPTION OF FACTS, FRAUD. AT THE TIME OF THE CRIME, I LIVED BY A CERTAIN CODE OF ETHICS, IN REGARDS TO LIVE-ING A STREET LIFE. AFTER THE PASSING OF MY MOTHER 12-7-84, A DEDICATED JEWELRY WITNESS. MS. JUDITH PRODHOMME. JUSTICES, YOU SEE HOW I WAS FORCED TO IMPLICATE, THOSE/ MY CODE OF STREET ETHICS. I HARSHLY SAY HONOR THOSE WHO HONOR YOU, RESPECT THOSE WHO RESPECT YOU. JUSTICES IT IS ETHICS, WHICH I AM HONORED, HUMOLED TO BE ABLE TO EXPRESS THE WRONG I HAVE ENCOUNTERED THROUGH-OUT THIS LEGAL PROCESS. I HAVE A FULL UNDERSTANDING OF NOT WANTING TO FACE FACTS, YOUR DIRTY LAUNDRY BEING BROUGHT FORTH TO THE PUBLIC. MY QUESTION IS, WHY CREATE SUCH MATTERS, YOU REFUSE TO ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY FOR? I HAVE BEEN HELD ACCOUNTABLE FOR THE PAST 31 YEARS, WHY AM I'M NOT BEING AFFORDED THE SAME ACCOUNTABILITY?

JUSTICES, YES I WAS WRONG TO RETRIEVE A CONCEALED WEAPON FROM MY VEHICLE, AFTER VICTIM, NOTED AS MY SON MOTHER TRIED TO STOP WITH A SCHOOL-DRIVER. "POINT" ASSIGNED PUBLIC DEFENDER, MS JENNY BROWN WAS REMOVED FROM MY CASE, WITH-OUT ANY LEGAL DOCUMENTATION OF REASONING. EXCUSE MY TONE, THE BOTTOM LINE IS I NEVER HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO TAKE THE WITNESS STAND TO DIS-CREDIT THE LIES THE PROSECUTION USED TO ENHANCE/CONNECT MYSELF FOR PRE-MEDITATED ATTEMPTED MURDER. I DID WRITE A REMORSE TO THE VICTIM APOLGIZING FOR ANY WRONG SHE FELT I HAD COMMITTED TO HURT HER. THE VICTIM IS BEING MY SON MOTHER WAS VICTIMIZED BY HER OWN CIRCUMSTANCES.

JUSTICES, I HAVE BEEN INCARCERATED FOR 31 YEARS FOR THIS MATTER. I HAVE BEEN LITERALLY STOPPED IN MY TRACK THREE TIMES, DIRECTLY IN MY HEART AREA, WITH A OBJECT SIMILAR TO A ICE PIC. BASICALLY PUT A ORGANIZE HIT CARRIED OUT ON MY LIFE, IN REFERENCE TO DIRTY LAUNDRY. WHICH CIVIL MATTERS HAVE CREATED. SEE MOST RECENT CIVIL ACTION FILED, WITH THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT. I HAVE LOSS CONSIDERABLE LOVE ONES TO DEATH, GREAT GRANDMOTHER, GRANDMOTHER, FATHER, AUNTS AND UNCLES. A GREAT DEAL OF LOST TIME, WITH KIDS WHICH CAN'T BE GOTTEN BACK. WHICH REFUSES TO BE PART OF MY LIFE AS LONG AS I AM INCARCERATED. THE SERIOUSNESS OF THE MATTER, I HAVE KIDS I DON'T EVEN KNOW NAME/ WHERE, DO TO THIS SYSTEM NOTED AS A JUSTICE SYSTEM. I HAVE AUNTS, UNCLES THAT ARE STILL ALIVE, I WOULD LIKE TO BE THERE WHEN THAT DAY COME.

JUSTICES, IN CLOSE-ING YOU LIVE YOU LEARN. I HAVE LEARNED THAT PEOPLE ARE NOT THE PEOPLE THEY PUT THEMSELVES OUT IN THE WORLD TO BE, AND ALWAYS OUT TO BE MORE THAN WHO THEY ARE. WHO'S EXPENSE? I HAVE EMPLOYED WHO I AM IN A GODLY SENSE. I AM READY TO UP-HOLD TO ALL THAT HAVE BEEN SET FORTH FOR TRUE AMERICAN PEOPLE. FREE FROM PROSECUTION IN DOING SO.

RESPECTFULLY,

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Carl Stevenson

Date: 2-4-24