

ORIGINAL

No. _____

24-5888

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

FILED

SEP 23 2024

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

TERRION D. HERMAN — PETITIONER (Pro-SE)
(Your Name)

vs.

WARDEN R. BROWN — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

United States Court of Appeals Fourth Circuit.
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

TERRION DEONDRE HERMAN
(Your Name)

F.C.I. - GILMER, P.O. BOX 6000
(Address)

Glenville, WV. 26351-6000
(City, State, Zip Code)

304-626-2500
(Phone Number)

RECEIVED

SEP 26 2024

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

14995026

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Area of a Apartment building. Should we now add Justice's that a Person Front-Door & Door Mat Area be Added to the Common "hang-out" Areas of Apartment buildings? #4. The Curtilage is intimately linked to the dwellings Especially the Door & its immediate Surroundings, both physically & psychologically, and is where privacy expectations are most heightened, will not this Right be given too United States Citizens who live in Apartment buildings? Justice's should Whitaker # 14-3290 be also "NATIONALLY" Controlled by ^(LIKE) Kylo. Jardines IS? → "Kylo" held that where the Government uses a device that is not in general public use, to explore details of the Home Dwellings that would

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Previously have been UNKNOWABLE without physical intrusion the SURVEILLANCE & K-9 SNIFF ON the Door's IS A "Search" AND IS Presumptively UNREASONABLE without A WARRANT would you NOT Agree THAT Whitaker #14-3290 Should BE Controlled by Kylllo AS JARDINES IS, AND MADE NATIONALLY LAW For the Millions of people who Live IN Apartment buildings, IS NOT the Fourth Amendment For All United States Citizens to have "Protection & Security" Inside AND Outside There Door's AND dwellings FROM trespasser's IN the Hallway "Snooping" INTO There Apartment using sensitive devices NOT Available to the general public?

Index of Appendices

#1). United States Court of Appeals For
The Fourth Circuit. CASE # 24-6152.
(Appendix A)

#2). In the United States District Court
For the Northern District of West Virginia
Martinsburg. CASE # 3:24-CV-12.
(Appendix A)

#3). Rehearing en banc Fourth Circuit
Court of Appeals CASE # 24-6152.
(Appendix A)

#4). Exhibit #1. KYILO V. UNITED STATES. 533 US 27.
KATZ V. UNITED STATES. 389 US 347. Exhibit #2
UNITED STATES V. WHITAKER # 14-3290.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

- TERRION HERMAN V. R. BROWN, # 3:24-CV-12, United States District Court For the Northern District of West Virginia Martinsburg. Judgment of that Judgment was Entered: 2-9-24 dismissing Petition. • TERRION HERMAN V. R. BROWN, # 24-6152 - 3:24-CV-00012-GMC-RWT U. S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. Judgment entered JUNE 28, 2024 Affirmed the district court Ruling. Rehearing EN BANC ALSO DENIED ON September 3, 2024.

Page 1-A.

Page # 1-B.

Page # 1-C.

STATUTES AND RULES

- Whitaker is the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals Ruling Attached to "Whitaker." Which serves as an "Extension" of "Jardines." Florida V. Jardines 133 S. Ct. 1409 (2013) A New Rule of LAW MADE Retroactive by the Supreme Court the highest Court in the Land. SEE USA V. Whitaker BL 113879 7th Circuit, # 14-3290 April 12, 2016

OTHER

With the Clear Ruling in Teague V. LANE (1989) 489 US 288, 103 L Ed 2d 334, 109 Sct 1060. ENLIGHTENING OF the Teague V. LANE Two Rule Exception of the Substantial Rule is the Watershed Rule Applies IN this INSTANT CASE with the Ruling of Whitaker.

Table of Authorities Cited

<u>CASES:</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
• 59(e) Motion → Terrion Herman V. P. Brown, # 3:24-CV-12, U.S. District Court For the Northern District of West Virginia Martinsburg.	<u>Page # 1-A. 59(e) Mot.</u>
• Terrion Herman V. Warden, USP McCrery, # 6:22-CV-00040-Der U.S. District Court Eastern District of Kentucky Southern Division. Judgment Entered 3-3-2022.	<u>Page # 2-A</u>
• Terrion Herman V. Warden, USP McCrery, # 22-5240. U.S. Court of Appeals For the Sixth Circuit Judgment entered Sept. 13, 2022.	<u>Page # 2-B</u>
	<u>Page # 2-C</u> <u>Rehearing En Banc.</u>

Statutes & Rules:

SAME LITIGATION IN the Sixth Circuit & Under the scope of "Florida V. Jardines"; Now, "Whitaker" which serves to Extend Florida V. Jardines, → To dog sniffs related to shared hallways in Apartment building. Especially to the Tenant "Door" & Actual "Doorway" That's Clear Trespassing, Investigating the "Inside" of a Dwelling From the "Outside" without a Warrant.

Other: "Poisonous Tree Doctrine" the Evidence used against Me was obtained from a tainted origin, NOT Right For use in any Form of Prosecution.

Table of Authorities Cited

<u>CASES:</u>	<u>PAGE NUMBER</u>
• TERRION HERMAN V. WARDEN, USP McCREARY # 22-5240. Rehearing EN BANC U.S. COURT OF APPEALS For the Sixth Circuit. Judge- MENT 11-7-22.	PAGE # 2-C
• TERRION HERMAN V. USP. WARDEN McCREARY # 1:21-CV-01153-SLD. U.S. District Court Central District of ILLINOIS. Judged 6-2-21. • TERRION HERMAN V. USP. WARDEN McCREARY # 21-2163 U.S. COURT OF APPEALS For the Seventh Circuit. Judge- MENT entered 1-4-22. • TERRION HERMAN V. WARDEN F.C.I. FLORENCE # 2:16-CV-02202-Jes. U.S. District Court Central Dist. of ILL. 2255 Judge- MENT entered 11-16-17.	PAGE # 3A PAGE # 3-B PAGE # 3-C

Statutes And Rules: ONE COUNT → 21 U.S.C. 841(CA)(1)³(B)(1)(CA),
For knowingly Possessing 50 grams or More Substance
CONTAINING COCAINE BASE CRACK. A Schedule II Controlled
Substance.

Other: A Declaration of truth From TERRION D. HERMAN
Attached with the Original (2255) # 2:16-CV-02202. How
(All) My Legal Paperwork was Illegally Seized, And
Never returned. That's how I Missed the 1-Year tolling
Time Frame.

Table of Authorities Cited

<u>CASE:</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
<u>TERRION HERMAN V. WARDEN. USP.</u> Terra Haute #10-cr-20003 U.S. District Court For the Central District of Illinois, URBANA Judgment entered 8-7-13. (Jardines 1338. ct 1409) (2013) Reopen Suppression Proceeding "GRANTED".	Page #4-A
Then Comes A Major blow to my Family & ME. My Judge Michael P. McCuskey "then" a few weeks later "Rescue" himself then his Colleague Illegally resentenced to 360 months for a Non-Violent Crack Case, what a Harsh Miscarriage of Justice to try to kill out Spirit's & break us from still Seeking Justice. • TERRION HERMAN V. WARDEN Master F.C.I. Mc. Dowell #2:10-cr-20003 / Appeal #13-3210 U.S. Court of Appeals For the Seventh Circuit. Judg- ment 10-10-14. • TERRION HERMAN V. U.S. #14-7972. The Supreme Court Certiorari. Judgment denied 2-23-2015. → NOT KNOWING the Full Scale Corruption in <u>this CASE.</u>	Page #4-B Page #4-C
<u>Statutes & Rules:</u> LAWS that "Pre-Dates" this CASE From the Supreme Court the highest Court & Judges in the LAND. KY110 V. U.S. #99-8508, 6-11-01 & KATZ V. U.S. #35, 12-18-67. <u>Other:</u>	

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 A 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.

1.

JURISDICTION

☒ For cases from federal courts:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was JUNE 28, 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: SEPTEMBER 3, 2024, 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).

I "SEEK" the INDEPENDENT ORIGINAL Jurisdiction OF the SUPREME COURT, which IN SOME CASES IS BASICALLY equitable IN NATURE.

☐ 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. Issue. The U.S. Court of Appeals For the Seventh Circuit ruled April 12, 2016 (United States - V. Whitaker, BL 113879, 7th Cir., #14-3290, 4-12-16). Which Serves As A Extension, ³ Applies Jardines. Supreme Court Case: Florida V. Jardines, 2013 BL 79684 (U.S. 2013) (92 CHL 781, 3-27-13). Also the, the Pre-Dated #1. "Controller" of these Issues IS (KY110 V. United States) 533 U.S. 27 #99-8508 Decided 6-11-2001. Also Supreme Court Rulings. A clear Violation of A MASS # of Individual Constitutional Rights Under the Provisional Scope of the Procedural Aspect of Due Process of AN Illegal Search, ³ Seizure Under the Fourth, Fifth, AND the Sixth Amendment Respectively.....

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Peace! Just Greetings to the Chief Justice Mr. John G. Roberts - 2005 of MD, And Associate Justices Clarence Thomas - 1991 of GA, Also Stephen G. Breyer - 1994 of MA, Samuel A. Alito Jr. - 2006 of NJ, Sonia Sotomayor - 2009 of NY, Elena Kagan - 2010 of MA, Neil M. Gorsuch - 2017 of CO, Brett Kavanaugh - 2018 of MD, Amy Coney Barrett - 2020 of IN, Mrs. Jackson - 2023 with All due Respect TOO ALL. Now COMES the STATEMENT of the CASE, AND I Pray you Justices overlook the Mistakes & Error IN this "Pro-Se Petition For Writs of Certiorari" the Procedural default I did my best. To establish clear "Prejudice" IN this CASE, AND the MASSES of CASE Just like For Overdue Equality & Fairness IN the Light of Seeking ^(THIS) Equal Justice. With the Aid of GOD I shall demonstrate that Anything Other than Freedom will be AN harsh Miscarriage of Justice, & that For Prejudice A defendant must "show" that the Error Worked to his or her's "Actual & Clear" "Substantial Disadvantage" For the MASS IN SIMILAR Circumstances.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The #1. Issue for the people is "Whitaker # 14-3290"

which applies & serves as an Extension to "Jardines";

Herman & the People is hereby seeking post-conviction relief

in relation to the instant case, under the provision scope

of the United States Supreme Court Ruling attached to

Florida V. Jardines 133 S. Ct. 1409, 185 L. Ed 2d 495

(2013). Also the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals Ruling

Attached to Whitaker # 14-3290 which applies "Jardines";

See U.S.A. V. Whitaker, 2016 BL 113879, 7th Circuit; #

14-3290 April 12, 2016. Both these two cases along with

Kylo # 99-8508 (2001) Supreme Court Case shall demand

rate that this instant Case Herman V. Brew # 24-6152

out of the Fourth Circuit Now is a Manifestation

of Inequalities & Clear Injustice, Going Against

Clear Supreme Court Laws & Appeal Courts ruling. In

the face of Plain Error how wrong & Bold are

some of these Low Courts. Wrongfully I & others

have been wrongfully in yokes & Bonds in "Violation"

of the United States Constitution for years.

Transparently & clearly the Substantive Rule of

The Supreme Court (Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288). Plus the "Watershed Rule" of Criminal Procedure. The Substantive Rule Applies in this instant case; other's like nature which then makes them retroactive to cases on Collateral Review. This new substantive change in law Whitaker #14-3290 should at the least be in the scope of Retroactive Treatment, because it alters the range of conduct for a "Group", or "Class" of people convicted in the 7th Circuit; other circuits the law does not make criminal. Also Whitaker #14-3290 is a new substantive rule that should be retroactive treated Id. at 1562 this includes decisions that "Narrow the Scope" of a criminal statute by interpreting its terms as well as "Constitutional Determination" that place particular conduct of a mass or party of people, or persons "covered" by the statute beyond the state's power to punish. Furthermore, the court established, that procedural rules of law are those that "Represent a Watershed Rule" of criminal procedure, implicating the fundamental fairness and accuracy of a proceeding. Thus a

Procedural rule is "One that raises the possibility that some people convicted with the use of an Invalidated Procedure, MAY have otherwise been Acquitted."

Therefore to qualify under this exception, the procedural Rule must NOT only "Improve Accuracy," but serve to Alter the "bedrock procedural" elements essential to the "Fairness" of the proceeding. Truly From the "Soul" Justices it is Corruption & Shameful that such a Clear & Plain Error situation should even have to make it to the Highest Court in the Land. Clearly the Lower Courts and Circuits "Judicial discretion". This Case #24-6152 Presents Issues of Importance beyond the particular facts and parties involved. Indeed this Case #24-6152 I pray is granted. Includes the "Existence" of a "Conflict" between the decision of which review is sought and a decision of another Appellate Court on the SAME ISSUE. An important function of the Supreme Court is to resolve disagreements among lower courts about specific legal questions. Another consideration of this High Court is the importance to the public of the issue.

I ASK For the SAKE OF the People, with All due respect. How? CAN it be IN A Just & Fair Society, that the Fourth and Fifth AMENDMENT Applies to Some AND NOT Righteously & equally too All. Just because She or He Lives IN A APARTMENT Building. HERMAN AND the people Still have A "Door with Locks" which I pray is still Protected & Respected AND the Outbounded Area whether it's inches or at least A Couple of Feet. They are payen rent Like the greater Number of AMERICANS that has the Supreme Court Case LAW OF Kylo # 99-8508 (2001) & Jardines # 133 S. CT. 1409. Should there Door & Dwellings be Secure to... HERMAN & the people has assumed this Position, based upon LAWS AND the FACT, that the SEARCH WARRANT used to Secure the evidence AGAINST him WAS obtained under the scope of the "Poisonous Tree Doctrine". And is therefore OF A "Tainted Origin", AND UNAVAILABLE For use IN ANY FORM OF A JUST Prosecution. Thus, HERMAN CONSTITUTIONAL rights to Protection AGAINST ILLEGAL SEARCH AND Seizure & Due Process

WAS VIOLATED IN THE FORM OF AN "ILLEGAL dog SNIFF."
THAT SERVED TO ALERT TO THE PRESENCE OF AN ILLEGAL
SUBSTANCE "BEHIND" A LOCKED APARTMENT DOOR. IN-
DEED THIS CASE & CASES OF LIKE NATURE CLEARLY DEMONST-
RATES EXTREMELY "WRONG DOING" AND "RECKLESSNESS" ON
THE OFFICERS PART TO BRING INTO A "SECURE" APART-
MENT BUILDING A "SUPER SENSITIVE INSTRUMENT"
A DRUG DETECTING DOG "OUTSIDE" AND "ON" AN
APARTMENT DOOR TOO "INVESTIGATE" THE "INSIDE"
OF AN APARTMENT (WITHOUT A WARRANT AT THAT
TIME.) ALSO JUSTICES MY APARTMENT BUILDING WAS
"LOCK & SECURE APARTMENT COMPLEX" WAS CERTAINLY OFF-
LIMIT TO THE PUBLIC YOU NEED A "CODE OR KEY" TO
HAVE OR GAIN ENTRANCE, OR PERMISSION THEREIN. THE RECKLESS
URBANA POLICE OFFICERS HAD "NO-RIGHT SNOOPING
AROUND" IN A LOCKED & SECURE APARTMENT COMPLEX
USING A "SENSITIVE DEVICES" NOT AVAILABLE TO THE GENERAL
PUBLIC "ESPECIALLY" IN A APARTMENT COMPLEX THAT LOCK'S
OUT UNWELCOME PARTIES. THE URBANA POLICE OFFICERS INDEED
VIOLATED MY RIGHTS ESPECIALLY MY FOURTH & FIFTH CONSTITUTIONAL
RIGHTS AS A UNITED STATE CITIZEN ON THE DAY OF FEB-
RUARY 3, 2010 "WITHOUT A CONTROL BUY," "WITHOUT CAUSE"
FROM ME (HERMAN) THE APARTMENT OWNER, NOR FROM THE
"LAND LORD," OR FROM ANY TENANT, OR ANY PROBABLE CAUSE."

Even Sergeant Morgan Admitted IN "TRIAL" too their
Trespassing & K-9 Sniff Intrusion "ON" My Door & the
UNLAWFUL ENTRANCE upon the Locked Outer Doors of the
APARTMENT Complex & My Own Locked Door. Sergeant
Morgan admitted IN trial they had too "SNEAK" ^(THE) IN Apt.
building behind AN "UNAWARE" RENT PAYER = TENANT.
Justice's it is truly SHAME the deeds that SOME
Police department do & Cover-up, this is clearly AN
VIOLATION OF "REASONABLE EXPECTATION OF PRIVACY"
"ENGAGED" IN A WARRANTLESS K-9 Sniff ON My Door.
I Pray by the position & Truth of the Supreme Court,
Pursuant to Teague: A New rule of Law Will be Applied
Retroactively IF it is "Either" "Substantive" or "Procedural"
IN NATURE. "Justice's" IN relation to this INSTANT CASE
#24-6152, AND MANY OTHERS SIMILAR LIKE throughout
this NATION with the SAME CASE MATTER'S & ISSUES. Both
Exceptions of "Teague" ARE MET IN CONNECTION with the
"Whitaker" ruling. IN that the "Substantive" element
of "Teague" IS MET, because the "Whitaker" ruling Attaches
to the Fourth Amendment IN relation to the elements
of procedure that Must be satisfied IN relation

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

to Search & Seizures Protocol. Thus "Whitaker" is a constitutional ruling in of itself, as it serves to interpret elements relevant to the Fourth Amendment. Furthermore I pray & stress to you Justices the "Whitaker" ruling serves as a "watershed" ruling, as it speaks directly to the procedure that must be followed in connection with the conduct attached to obtaining warrants. Thus it essentially serves to speak directly to the Fundamental Fairness of the criminal proceeding, and the procedure that must be followed in order to represent a legal and clean prosecution/proceeding. Therefore, Herman is of the opinion that for the aforementioned reasons the "Whitaker" ruling qualifies under both exceptions of the Teague Doctrine, and must be applied "retroactively in a full capacity the people pray.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

I truly Pray that the highest Court in the Land Find Compelling reasons exist for the exercise of the Court discretionary Jurisdiction. This Petition shows NOT only why the decision of the Lower Court is Erroneous, but this CASE # 24-6152 demonstrates AN NATIONAL IMPORTANCE OF HAVING the Supreme Court decide the question involved. I show in this Writ of Certiorari Petition the decision of the Fourth Circuit Court, other Courts that decided this Case and erroneous was there decision, with NO respect for Sister Circuit's Appellate decisions, Not Pre Supreme Court decisions take Kylo (2001) for evidence. Clearly the decision of the Now Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals "Conflicts" with the decisions of other's Appellate

Court. This Case is Very Important NOT only to ME, but to the Nation of Freedom, Justice, AND equal Rights For All in similar Situation. Justice's this is indeed AN ON going Conflict between the decision

OF WHICH REVIEW IS SOUGHT AND A DECISION OF ANOTHER APPELLATE COURT ON THE SAME ISSUE. ALTHOUGH WHITAKER # 14-3290 COULD ANTICIPATE THAT OTHER TENANTS AND THEIR DOGS WOULD WALK PAST HIS OR HER DOOR, THEY HAD THE RIGHT TO EXPECT THAT THEY WOULDN'T "SET UP CHAIRS AND HAVE A PARTY IN THE HALLWAY OUTSIDE THEIR DOOR. THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT ALSO ADDED, IT CHARACTERIZED AS "TROUBLING" THE SUGGESTION THAT APARTMENT DWELLERS DON'T HAVE THE SAME EXPECTATION OF PRIVACY AS THE OWNERS OF SINGLE FAMILY HOMES, "BECAUSE IT WOULD "APPORTION" FOURTH AMENDMENT PROTECTIONS ON GROUNDS THAT CORRELATE WITH INCOME, RACE, AND ETHNICITY." THE 7TH CIRCUIT FOUND GUIDANCE IN JUSTICE ELENA KAGAN'S CONCURRING OPINION IN JARDINES. KAGAN ARGUED THAT THE OUTCOME THERE WAS DICTATED BY KYLLO V. UNITED STATES, 533 U.S. 27 (2001), WHICH HELD THAT USING A THERMAL-IMAGING DEVICE FROM A PUBLIC VANTAGE POINT TO MONITOR THE RADIATION OF HEAT FROM A HOME QUALIFIED AS A SEARCH WITHIN THE MEANING OF THE FOURTH AMENDMENT. JUST AS AN OFFICER WOULDN'T BE ALLOWED TO PLACE A STETHOSCOPE "ON" AN APARTMENT DOOR TO LISTEN,

So too are the police barred from intruding
into a person's privacy on the "super-
sensitive" nose of a dog, it said. The 7th Cir-

Cit also rebuffed the government's argument
that the good-faith exception to the exclusionary
rule saved the search because prior Seventh Circuit

precedent suggested there was no recognized
expectation of privacy in common areas of Multi-
unit apartment complexes. Truly the Seventh Circuit is

other sister Circuit been in error. Think a rent payer
tenant "front door" too his or her dwell and the close
area "door mat" is a common area. Justice's seriously

the common area is not paying the rent "like" the
strawell or the clothing & laundry room, but a person
with protection & rights. My family and people who

newly was floored & crushed not only questioning
the apartment less K-9 suit. But also the fact I

received 80-80 much time for a non-violent
Crack Case. My mom has passed on too the next

life in the midst of this struggle with me & my
5-children misses me sincerely & deeply, and
a person mom is the closes lady person a man

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

HAVE IN LIFE. Also the Federal Judge that Sentenced ME Michael P. McCuskey WAS Force to resign 2 to 4 years AFTER my sentence, Perchance other Misconduct. None of this "harsh Oppression" For the LAST 14 1/2 years of Our Lives would've HAVE happen IF "ONLY" these "Lower Court" whole-Heart-ily regulate with "the Clear LAWS & Orders of the Supreme Court." The existing LAW under "Kyllo"

99-8508 (2001) established that Police CAN "NOT" use A Sophisticated device to learn Facts about the Inside of A residence that would otherwise be UNKNOW-able without physical Intrusion → Trespassing. I Pray this is well enough reasoning For GRANTING this Petition For the NATION. The Aforementioned events Falls under the provisional scope of the "Fruit of the Poisonous (TREE) Doctrine". As they serve to detail an illicit Action ON the PART OF LAW ENFORCEMENT, that

Reasons For Granting the Petition

Further serves to Violate HERMAN'S & MANY other's Constitutional rights IN A "Significant Manner" Under the Provisional Scopes of both our Fourth Amendment right to protection against ILLEGAL Search & Seizures, & Our Due process Rights.

Pursuant to the Aforementioned doctrine of LAW ("Fruit of the Poisonous Tree Doctrine") which has been Firmly Established. Evidence derived from AN ILLEGAL Search, Arrest, or Interrogation IS INADMISSIBLE, because the evidence ("the Fruit") WAS tainted by the ILLEGALITY of the poisonous Tree rooted IN Error. So IN relation to the INSTANT Case & Cases the ILLEGALITY results from the "illicit dog Sniff," Utilized to obtained the Search WARRANT leading to the recovery of the evidence used against HERMAN & other's LIKE Nature. Furthermore, because the WARRANT WAS Obtained by illicit Means, It serves to represent A "Significant" element of the Poisonous Tree Doctrine. I Put Forth this Petition too the Highest Court IN the Land, And Pray that Our Justice's settle this on going Conflict Against the Lower Court's Amongst themselves, & MAY GOD bless the Justice's IN Heaven & ON EARTH! THANKS

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Jerry H. H.

Date: 9-22-24