

24-6053

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

IN THE


ORIGINAL

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Torrence Belcher- PETITIONER, Pro Se

VS.

Ron Neal et al – RESPONDENT



Represented by: David E. Corey

Indiana Government Center South, 5<sup>th</sup> floor

302. West Washington St

Indianapolis, In 46204-2770

ON PETITION FOR *WRIT OF CERTIORARI* TO

The court of the Northern District of Indiana.

&

U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

Torrence L. Belcher

1 Park Row

Michigan City, IN 46360

## Questions

1. How can one argue their position on a matter without being argumentative?
2. How are precedents created?
3. Can evidence be materially relevant and non-material at the same time?
4. What is the definition of “Adverse” according to the black law dictionary
5. If some evidence is consider inconclusive and neither material nor exculpatory then wouldn’t the evidence, that it is consistent with, be consider non-material and exculpatory as well?
6. This is one question but it will be asked two different ways; How is evidence that is contain within exhibits consider additional grounds though it wasn’t mention in the petition as one/ How is evidence that wasn’t mention in the petition as a ground not relevant when this evidence is contain within exhibits?
7. Shouldn’t a decision makers ruling be practical and not in opposition to one party or the other?
8. If the evidence never existed?
9. If J.Anton, the DHO made a false and misleading statement pertaining to when and where DNA testing was appropriate that went against the policy and procedure at that time. How is she not bias or prejudices toward me or this particular situation?
10. 28 USCS § 455 (b) (1). If a judge has knowledge of a parties misconduct and decides to ignore or disregard it like it didn’t happen, doesn’t that indicate some kind of personal bias towards the opposing party or favorable of some sort toward the other??
11. If not, how not so? Please elaborate.
12. Shouldn’t our judges and enforces of our laws be trustworthy?
13. What is a few sure ways to lose the publics respect and trust?
14. What does, in the interest of justice mean??

LIST OF PARTIES

Ron Neal

Lydia Bloom

J. Anton

Represented by: David E.Corey

Indiana Government Center South, 5th Floor

302 West Washington Street

Indianapolis, In 46204-2770

RELATED CASE

Belcher v. Milligan et al (3:23-cv-00650-PPS-MGG) The U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Indiana. Entry of Judgment 12-1-2023

Belcher v. Ron Neal et al (3:23-cv-01062-MGG) The U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Indiana. Entry of Judgment May 31,2024

Belcher v. Ron Neal et al, (No 24-1935) U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. Entry of Judgment Aug 30,2024

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLED.....	2
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	3
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....	4
CONCLUSION.....	

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A – Decision of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Indiana. Belcher v. Milligan et al

APPENDIX B – Decision of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Indiana. Belcher v. Ron Neal et al

APPENDIX C – Decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. Belcher v. Ron Neal et al

**Appendix A:** Belcher v. Milligan et al, No 3:23-cv-00650-PPS-MGG, U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Indiana

Judge Phillip P.Simon made the ruling on document #19 referring to" *Edward v. Balisok*, 520 U.S. 641 (1997)", the United States Supreme Court made it clear that the principles of " *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477,481 (1994)" , also applies to prison disciplinary proceeding, that is to say, if a judgment for monetary damages would necessarily imply the invalidity of the finding of guilt in his prison disciplinary proceeding, he may not proceed with a lawsuit unless he can demonstrated that the conviction of sentence has previously been invalidated." Edwards, 520 U.S. at 643, Here Belcher's guilt finding have not been invalidated and judgment in his favor would necessarily imply those findings of guilt were invalid. Therefore this case must be dismissed without prejudice. On Dec 1, 2023

**Appendix B:** Belcher v. Ron Neal et al, No. 3:23- cv- 01062- MGG, U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Indiana

Magistrate Judge Michael G.Gotsch sr, made the ruling that I, the petition hadn't asserted a valid claim for habeas relief and denied my petition on document #25.

**Appendix C:** Belcher v. Ron Neal et al, No 24-1935, U.S. Court appeals for the Seventh Circuit. This cause, docketed on May 29, 2024, is dismissed for failure to timely pay the required docket fee, pursuant to circuit rule3(b)

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 C 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.

**JURISDICTION**

[ ] For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was Aug 30, 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 \_\_\_\_\_.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C § 1254(1).

Pg.2

**CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED**

**“Attached to this page are what I believe is asked for”**

**15 pages front and back.**

1. Document #19, 3:23-cv-00650-PPS-MGG
2. Document #25, 3:23-cv-01062-MGG
3. Document #33, 3:23-cv-01062-MGG
4. Document #34, 3:23-cv-01062-MGG
5. Document #37, 3:23-cv-01062-MGG (24-1935)

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

pg.3

The fact of the matter is, I, the petitioner, pro se, Torrence Belcher, was lied on deliberately for reasons I can only speculate. My best guess is this correctional official, Lydia Bloom, was doing something inappropriate and it got messy and she didn't know how to explain the mess on her leg. And didn't want to bring awareness to the true culprit because that could potentially implement her part in the mess. So because of my already bad reputation she choose to use me as a shape goat and put the incident off on me. But I, Torrence Belcher, actually did no such thing.

The fact of the matter is, that the picture took of her leg with the stain on it doesn't link me to the crime at all. And the fact that J.Anton, the DHO, lied and gave false and misleading statements regarding to DNA testing, when I , the petitioner encouraged it says a lot about her character and the temperature of the facility I'm doing detention at. J.Anton said "The Indiana State Prisons doesn't do DNA testing unless it is an outside case." An absolute lie. When in fact if us inmate don't comply with the request to provide DNA sample we can be subject to a conduct report.

The fact of the matter is the camera footage doesn't show me doing anything inappropriate and is NOT consistent with the conduct report. It doesn't show me at the bars calling her to my cell location or touching on myself. So the camera shouldn't need to see inside my cell location and neither does it show her react when the alleged incident so-called occurred. But to my surprise I, the petitioner, Torrence Belcher, pro se, was found guilty of these bogus charges with no evidence to support the crime. The penalty was not supported by evidence. And I am innocent! My appeal was denied and my second appeal was never responded too. On July 5<sup>th</sup> 2023 almost seven years later, I , the petitioner, initiated a lawsuit against Bloom and several other correctional officers and a mental health doctor, dispute my indigent status and after tiring from playing the fall guy and reaching my wits end.

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

pg.4

My faith in the system has been lost and needs to be restored. It is safe to consider a judge a god or standing in the place of god. The highest of regard. My eternal destination is at your discretion. But I can't put my hopes in the afterlife! That would be a form of giving up and I would like to not give up on living this life. All I have is this life and you judges are but mortal men as well, hindered and restrained by emotions and desires, exhaustion and fears. Who really knows if your intentions are pure but the actual deities, the higher powers themselves? All I can ask of you mortal men is to treat me as you would want yourself to be treated. Fair and just. IF your moral compass guilds you to rule against me beyond a **reasonable doubt** that I believe should be harassing the good in your conciseness then so be it. I thank you and encourage you to continue in the legitimacy's of your serves as you rightly wear the title of honor. May the MOST HIGH be with you?


In *Crawford v. Little John*, 963 F. 3d 681, 683 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2020) the penalty was not supported by the evidence. Soo Magistrate Judge Michael G. Gotsch, Sir's opinion is ridiculous, that the right to procedural due process does not require correctional staff to comply with federal rules of evidence in prison disciplinary proceedings is untrue. They absolutely have to comply with the federal rules of evidence. The penalty wasn't supported by evidence in my case either and should be overturned.

The footage doesn't show me doing anything she alleged and the DHO Lied pertaining to DNA testing!

## CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully Submitted,



Date: 11.13.24

Torrence L. Belcher, Plaintiff, *pro se*  
1 Park Row  
Michigan City, IN 46360