

24-5448

No. \_\_\_\_\_

ORIGINAL

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

FILED  
MAY 27 2024  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

KARI DREW — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

vs.

STEPHEN SMITH — RESPONDENT(S)

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

KARI DREW H80484  
(Your Name)

PELICAN BAY STATE PRISON, P.O. BOX 7500  
(Address)

CRESCENT CITY, CA. 95532-7500  
(City, State, Zip Code)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- 1). Does Petitioner, Have The RIGHT To be PAROLED, WHEN THE LAW entails; AND STATE PAROLE?
- 2). Does Petitioner, Have The RIGHT TO HAVE ~~the~~ His Petition, JUDGED on THE MERIT?
- 3). WHAT CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTION Does A TIME CALCULATION SHEET HAVE, WHEN THERE'S A LOW TERM DATE; MID TERM DATE; AND MAXIMUM TERM DATE?
- 4). WHEN Does A "LIBERTY ISSUE" become PERTINENT; BEFORE, OR AFTER THE MAXIMUM DATE, HAS PASSED?
- 5). Do Petitioner, HAVE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS; AND CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTION?
- 6). Does Petitioner, INCARCERATION BEYOND THE MAXIMUM DATE VIOLATE THE CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT 8TH?
- 7). Do A PENALOGICAL SYSTEM HAVE THE RIGHT TO HOLD AN AMERICAN CITIZEN BEYOND A MAXIMUM DATE WITHOUT ANY CONSEQUENCE?
- 8). CAN A PENALOGICAL SYSTEM HOLD AN AMERICAN CITIZEN, BEYOND A MAXIMUM DATE WITHOUT A JUST; OR VALID CAUSE?

## 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:

CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT;  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA;  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

## RELATED CASES

In Re DAYAN (CAL. APP. 1ST DIST. 6-14-1991) 231 CAL. APP. 3D 184, 282 CAL. Rptr. 209, 1991 CAL. APP. LEXIS 672.,

In Re PALMER (2019) 33 CAL. APP. 5TH 1199, 245 CAL. Rptr. 3D 708- 2019 CAL. APP. LEXIS 314; In Re PALMER (2020) 2020 CAL. LEXIS 214.,

In Re YOUNG (CAL. APP. 1ST DIST. JAN. 13TH 2015) 232 CAL. APP. 4TH 1421, 182 CAL. RPT. 3D 360, 2015 CAL. APP. LEXIS 24 (CAL. APP. 4-15-2015).,

In Re MACIAS (CAL. APP. 6TH DIST. 11-09-2010) 189 CAL. APP. 4TH 1326, 117 CAL. RPT. 3D 727 2010 CAL. APP. LEXIS 1924 (Review GRANTED).,

In Re Lee (1918) 177 CAL. 690, 692.,

In Re FAUCETTE (CAL. APP. 2D DIST. 8-8-1967) 253 CAL. APP. 2ND 338, 61 CAL. RPT. 1967 CAL. APP. LEXIS 2353.,

In Re Poole (CAL. APP. 1ST DIST. 6-22-2018) 234 CAL. RPT. 3D 754, 24 CAL. 1.,

In Re McGee (2019) 2019 CAL. APP. LEXIS 453.,

Pearson v. Muntz (9TH CIR. CAL. 4-05-2011) 639 F.3D 1185, 2011 U.S. APP. LEXIS 6866.,

In Re Lynch (1972) 8 CAL. 3D 410 [105 CAL. RPT. 217, 503 P.2D 92].

## 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 CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT., Denial 7-20-2022

APPENDIX B U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
21-CV-01889-YGR DISMISSED WITHOUT

APPENDIX C U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
22-CV-05694-YGR Denied

APPENDIX D U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT  
No. 22-70187 TRANSFERRED back To DISTRICT COURT

APPENDIX E U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT  
No. 22-15447 Denied

APPENDIX F U.S. COURT OF APPEAL FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT  
No. 24-68

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
In Re DAYAN (CAL. APP. 1 <sup>ST</sup> DIST. 6-14-1991) 231 CAL. APP. 3D 184, 282 CAL. Rptr. 209, 1991 CAL. APP. LEXIS 672.,	
In Re PALMER (2019) 33 CAL. APP. 5 <sup>TH</sup> 1199, 245 CAL. Rptr. 3D 708- 2019 CAL. APP. LEXIS 314; In Re PALMER (2020) 2020 CAL. LEXIS 214.	
In Re YOUNG (CAL. APP. 1 <sup>ST</sup> DIST. JAN. 13 <sup>TH</sup> 2015) 232 CAL. APP. 4 <sup>TH</sup> 1421, 182 CAL. Rptr. 3D 360, 2015 CAL. APP. LEXIS 24 (CAL. APP. 4-15-2015).,	
In Re Lee (1918) 177 CAL. 690, 692.,	
In Re Poole (CAL. APP. 1 <sup>ST</sup> DIST. 6-22-2018) 234 CAL. Rptr. 3D 754, 24 CAL. APP. LEXIS 453.,	
PEARSON V. MUNIZ (9 <sup>TH</sup> CIR. CAL. 4-05-2011) 639 F.3D 1185, 2011 U.S. APP. LEXIS 6866.,	
In Re LYNCH (1972) 8 CAL. 3D 410 [105 CAL. Rptr. 217, 503 P.2D 92].	

### STATUTES AND RULES

P.C § 3041; P.C § 3041.5

PROPOSITION NO. 7

P.C § 3051

### OTHER

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

U.S.C. Amend. 8TH

U.S.C. Amend. 14TH

CALIFORNIA ARTICLE I § 17

P.C. § 1473(2)

P.C. § 3041

P.C. § 3041.5

PROPOSITION NO. (7)

P.C. § 3051

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 D 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 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 \_\_\_\_\_ U/A 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 7.24.2023.

[ ] 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: 3.1.2024, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix B.

[ ] An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including 7/1/24 (date) on 7/17 (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 7.20.2022. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix A.

[ ] A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: 7/1/24, 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 7/1/24 (date) on 7/17 (date) in Application No. A.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

PETITIONER, IS BEING HELD IN PRISON UNJUSTLY, THE LAW ENTAILS THAT PETITIONER, BE PAROLED. PETITIONER, SENTENCING SCHEME ENTAILS PAROLE; AND PETITIONER'S, TIME CALCULATION. SHEET ENTAILS PAROLE. EVERY DAY BEYOND (JUNE 2020), PETITIONER, IS BEING HELD IN CONFINEMENT, IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND UNJUST.,

#### REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

THE SOVEREIGNTY OF OUR NATION, IS EMBEDDED IN OUR GREAT CONSTITUTION. PETITIONER, HAS ENDURED THE CONSEQUENCE, OF VIOLATING THE LAW, WHILE UPON INCARCERATION. THERE HAVEN'T BEEN ANY OTHER IMPROPRIETIES IN REGARDS, TO THE LAW, THE SAME LAW THAT HELD PETITIONER, IN CONSEQUENCE, IS THE SAME LAW THAT AWARD PETITIONER, SAFEGUARDS; AND PROTECTION. PETITIONER'S, INCARCERATION BEGIN, (2020) HAS BEEN AN ABRIDGEMENT ON PETITIONER'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS; AND EGREGIOUS, AND THAT'S WHY THIS HONORABLE COURT SHOULD GRANT PETITIONER'S, WRIT.

## **CONCLUSION**

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Karl Drew

Date: 5-27-2024