

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

24-6181 ORIGINAL

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCT 01 2024

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

FILED

Richard Grier, "pro se" — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

vs.

Patricia Corwin McLane, "et al" — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT  
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Richard Lewis Grier JR.  
(Your Name)

14100 McMullen Hwy S.W.  
(Address)

Cumberland, MD 21502  
(City, State, Zip Code)

Mother: 443-531-3572 / Sister: 410-499-1086  
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. DID THE (Magistrate) COURT ABUSE ITS DISCRETION WHEN IT DENIED (Grier's, pro se) Motion To Receive DISCOVERY FILES.
2. DID THE (magistrate) COURT ERR And COMMIT MISCONDUCT BY FORCING (Grier, pro se) To Rely ON The COUNSEL (C. PURPURA) [AFTER], THE (magistrate) COURT DISMISSED [HIM] ON DECEMBER 19<sup>th</sup>, 2022, IF HE (Grier, pro se) WANTED TO REVIEW THE DISCOVERY.
3. DID THE SENTENCING (district) COURT ERR IN ACCERTING (Grier's) GUILTY PLEAD [PURSUANT to The written agreement].

## 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:

- JAMES K. BREDAR, Senior District Judge;
- Christopher J. PURPURA, (Appointed, Dismissed, Appointed STANDBY)
- Matthew J. Maddox, United State Magistrate Judge

## RELATED CASES

See, United State v. Jacobs, 2024 U.S. APP. LEXIS 9788 - HN1 -

Headnote: HN6 - Adams, v. United States ex Rel. McCANN, 317 U.S. 269

United States v. Knight, 56 F. 4th 1231 - HN1 -

FOOTNOTE: ONLY the Headnotes Related

IN JESUS NAME AMEN.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |      |
|---|------|
| OPINIONS BELOW.....                                   | 1    |
| JURISDICTION.....                                     | 2    |
| CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED..... | 3    |
| STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....                            | 4-6  |
| REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....                    | 7-11 |
| CONCLUSION.....                                       | 12   |

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A UNPUBLISHED OPINION "FROM the COURT OF APPEALS"

APPENDIX B MEMORANDUM ORDER "FROM MATTHEW J. MADDOX"

APPENDIX C ORDER [REDACTED] "denying Rehearing" AS A [MANDATE]

APPENDIX D PRO SE DEFENDANT ENTRY OF APPEARANCE

APPENDIX E THE PLEA "SENT To Christopher PURPURA, Esq [well dismissed]

APPENDIX F TRANSCRIPT "Pages 50-51 of 12-19-22 Hearing"

APPENDIX G RESPONSE TO APPELLANT'S PRO SE MOTION TO SELF-REPRESENT "FROM Christopher J. PURPURA"

APPENDIX H ORDER "FROM James K. BREDAR October 18th 2022"

APPENDIX I ORDER "FROM CATHERINE C. BLAKE November 2021, 29th"

APPENDIX J MOTION TO RECEIVE DISCOVERY FILES

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

| CASES   | PAGE NUMBER |
|---|-------------|
| <u>United State v. Jacobs, 2024 U.S App. Lexis 9788- HN1-</u> (9) |             |
| <u>HN1-ADAMS V. United ex Rel. McCANN, 317 U.S 269</u>            | (10)        |
| <u>United State v. Knight, 56 F. 4th 1231 -HN1-</u>               | (11)        |

### STATUTES AND RULES

Rule 5(F) : the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure

### OTHER

The United..is ordered to produce All exculpatory evidence to the defendant pursuant to BRADY V. MARYLAND and its progeny . . . stated by : "M-Maddox" on December 19, 2022

\* The Nature of this case is like [No] others.

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 MEMORANDUM ORDER Filed: April 20<sup>th</sup>, 23; 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 August 8th, 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 10, 2024, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix A C.

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**

Amendment 5 "Rights of the Accused"

Amendment 6 "CRIMINAL Proceedings"

Amendment 14 "Rights of Citizens"

Article VI "GENERAL PROVISIONS"

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

BACK IN "2018", the U.S Attorney's office for the district of MARYLAND, FILED AN INDICTMENT ACCUSING [REDACTED] (GRIER) OF "CONSPIRACY TO DISTRIBUTE AND POSSESSION WITH THE INTENT TO DISTRIBUTE CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES" AS [COUNT ONE] AND CONSPIRACY TO POSSESS A FIREARM IN FURTHERANCE OF DRUG TRAFFICKING AS [COUNT TWO].

Appointed to represent (GRIER) WAS : Christopher PURPURA, Esq.

\* \* \*

AN INITIAL APPEARANCE, AND AN ARRAIGNMENT WAS HELD, WHEREBY, (GRIER) PLEAD "NOT GUILTY". IN "2019" THE INDICTMENT WAS REFILED UNDER A "SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT". AN ARRAIGNMENT WAS HELD, WHEREBY, (GRIER) PLEAD "NOT GUILTY" . . . IN "2021" THE INDICTMENT WAS REFILED, AGAIN, BY WHICH AN ARRAIGNMENT WAS HELD (GRIER) PLEAD "NOT GUILTY" . . . PRIOR TO THE FORTH SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT, APPELLANT/PETITIONER (GRIER) FILED SEVERAL MOTION(S) "PROSE" . . . NAMELY, MOTION FOR DISMISSAL, MOTION TO FIRE APPOINTED COUNSEL, MOTION TO RECEIVE DISCOVERY, AND A MOTION TO PRODUCE CLIENT(S) FILE . . . CONSEQUENTLY (3) WAS DENIED, FOR SIMILAR REASONS. [SEE.. APPENDIX H AND I] GRIER WAS REPRESENTED BY COUNSEL.

\* \* \*

ON NOVEMBER 16<sup>th</sup>, 2022, GRIER MAILED OFF THE FOLLOWING : PRO SE DEFENDANT ENTRY OF APPEARANCE. ID. (APPENDIX D) . . . ON DECEMBER 19<sup>th</sup> 2022 (GRIER) WAS BROUGHT BEFORE ; (MATTHEW J. MADDOX U.S MAGISTRATE [REDACTED] JUDGE) [REDACTED]

\* \* \*

ON [11-09-22], THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FILED ITS FOURTH SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT . . . THEREIN GRIER WAS NOW BEING CHARGED WITH ; (CONSPIRACY TO PARTICIPATE IN A RACKETEERING ENTERPRISE) AS "COUNT ONE", WITH "COUNT TWO" BEING (CONSPIRACY TO DISTRIBUTE AND POSSESSION WITH THE INTENT TO DISTRIBUTE CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES), AND WITH "COUNT 3" NOW BEING (CONSPIRACY TO POSSESS A FIREARM IN FURTHERANCE OF DRUG TRAFFICKING).

\* \* \*

ON [12-19-2022], GRIER WAS BROUGHT INTO THE DISTRICT COURT FOR AN INITIAL APPEARANCE AND ARRAIGNMENT, ATTORNEY INQUIRY, AND FARETTA HEARING . . . TO THIS END, GRIER PLEAD NOT GUILTY, PENDING WITH THE COURT WAS "PRO SE DEFENDANT ENTRY OF APPEARANCE" ID. (APPENDIX D), WHICH, WAS GRANTED BY - MATTHEW J. MADDOX U.S MAGISTRATE JUDGE - ; ACCORDINGLY, MADDOX DISMISSED . . . APPOINTED COUNSEL - CHRISTOPHER J. PURPURA - . (SEE, APPENDIX B) "MEMORANDUM ORDER", GRIER WAS NOW SUPPOSED TO BE REPRESENTING HIMSELF . . . UPHOLDING HIS 6<sup>th</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT.

THEREIN, PETITIONER (GRIER) PRO SE ENTRY OF APPEARANCE ; STATED CLEARLY FOR THE COURT, BEFORE, M. MADDOX GRANTED SAID REQUEST . . . " THIS DEFENDANT DOES NOT REQUIRE THE SERVICE OF THE PUBLIC DEFENDER AND/ OR APPOINTED COUNSEL " ATTORNEY CHRISTOPHER J. PURPURA ]

\* \* \*

ON [1-6-2023], GRIER, pro se, was brought back to "M. MADDOX", AFTER being told by M. MADDOX; The discovery matter WAS to be taken up with the TRIAL Judge. Id. PAGES 50-51 of [12-19-22] Appendix F. However, on JANUARY 6th 2023 ... The STATE Attorney's, The DISMISSED COUNSEL (C. PURPURA), AND The COURT ... CONSPIRED against "GRIER", in-order to get AN ill-conceived GUILTY PLEA. Accordingly, GRIER who proceeded PROSE ON ONE'S OWN BEHALF: WITHOUT AN ATTORNEY ... ON THE APPEAL, NOW proceed(s) PROSE ON this Petition.

Nevertheless, ON JANUARY 6th 2023, GRIER WAS CONFRONTED by - CHRISTOPHER J. PURPURA - WHO DISCOURTEOUSLY HANDED GRIER, pro se, THE WRITTEN AGREEMENT ID. [APPENDIX E] DATED: JANUARY 3rd, 2023

\* \* \*

Consequently, 2-3 MINUTES go by, then (Judge M. MADDOX) comes to the BENCH "NOW COURT WAS IN-SECTION" ... STRAIGHTAWAY, M. MADDOX BEGAN TO DISCUSS THAT ... He HAS APPOINTED C. PURPURA AS A STANDBY COUNSEL [despite the COUNSEL Wavier]. Moreover, continued to tell GRIER THAT IF HE wanted to even see the DISCOVERY HE (GRIER) would have TO WORK alongside - C. PURPURA -. INSIDIOUSLY, "MADDOX" WAS DEPRIVING GRIER, pro se OF HIS RIGHT TO REPRESENT HIMSELF, BY WITHHOLDING THE EVIDENCE. THEREUPON, THE COURT M. MADDOX DENIED GRIER'S MOTION TO RECEIVE DISCOVERY FILES ID. [APPENDIX J] UNARGUABLY, M. MADDOX WAS COMMITTING MISCONDUCT; GRIER NOT BEING GULLIBLE STARTED TO COMPROMISE ... TO AVOID BEING PUT ON TRIAL UNFAIRLY BY A SECRET TRIBUNAL. [MOMENTS LATER THE HEARING ENDED]

\* \* \*

GRIER PROSE, WAS THEN TAKEN TO THE "BULLPEN", WITHOUT THE DOCUMENT ... THE COURT DOES NOT ALLOW ANY PAPER INSIDE THE "BULLPEN" GRIER NEVER READ THE AGREEMENT. SUBSEQUENTLY, "15-20" MINUTES go by ...

GRIER, WAS CALLED BY THE SHERIFF TO GO BACK UP ... UNSURE OF WHY.

\* \* \*

THEREUPON, GRIER WAS IN A WHOLE NEW COURT ROOM ... C. PURPURA, WAS THERE WITH THE - ULTIMATUM - ID. [APPENDIX E].

FURTHERMORE, THE STATE "P. McLANE" WAS THERE; THE [15 yrs] WAS NOW WITHIN [APPENDIX E] ... WAITING FOR THE JUDGE TO APPEAR ...

C. PURPURA, BEGAN TO SHOW - GRIER - HOW THE 240 MONTHS WAS ALTERED TO 180 MONTHS [SHOWING GRIER THE GOVERNMENT ACCEPTED THE COMPROMISE BY GRIER PROSE] YET, GRIER REFUSED TO LISTEN TO THE "DISMISSED COUNSEL" UNTIL, C. PURPURA STARTING STATING: "The JUDGE WON'T COME OUT UNLESS YOU SIGN IT, TAKE THE DEAL ... ALL THE OTHER CHARGES WILL BE DROPPED!" [COUNT 2 AND 3 WAS LATER DROPPED]

\* \* \*

GRIER, even started crying stating: "But, I'M NOT Triple C's WHY  
[I] got to sign this?"

STANDBY COUNSEL-C. PURPURA - replied stating: "Well the Judge wont come out unless this is signed first!"

\* \* \*

SOON, GRIER did sign it... [He] wanted the Judge to come out and explain why he was back in court. UNKNOWINGLY, GRIER WAS MANIPULATED by - STANDBY COUNSEL "C. PURPURA" - into agreeing GUILTY to SEVERAL CRIMES [He] GRIER KNOWS NOTHING ABOUT. [WHEN SIGNED]

\* \* \*

Indeed, GRIER WAS COERCED [STRENGTH OR POWER THAT WAS NOT PHYSICAL], into signing the [VOID AND NULL] document under "FALSE PRETENSE" AND/OR "PRETENSE!" Afterward, C. PURPURA gave the document to the COURT ROOM CLERK... who took it to the Judge (NOW KNOWN to be J. BREDAR) MINUTES LATER - J. BREDAR - CAME OUT AND the RULE 11 HEARING STARTED.

\* \* \*

GRIER, HELD: ON [1-6-2023] The COURT "M. MADDUX" COMMITTED MISCONDUCT by even FORCING GRIER to WORK BACK with COUNSEL - C. PURPURA - AFTER DISMISSING HIM... plus ABUSED He's DISCRETION... AND - J. BREDAR - ERRED in ACCEPTING the WRITTEN PLEA.

\* \* \*

[THE DOCUMENT SHOULD HAVE NEVER BEEN SENT TO C. PURPURA]

FOR C. PURPURA, to be around the CASE... [He] received pre-MISSION from the COURT. FOR P. McLANE, to even EMAIL AN AGREEMENT to C. PURPURA AND NOT MAIL IT TO - GRIER PROSE - Although, she understood C. PURPURA WAS dismissed AS GRIER'S COUNSEL... SHE CONSPIRED... WITH THE COURT FOR 19 DAYS to complete a STRATEGIC PLAN. NAMLY, EXERCISED AUTHORITY to VIOLATE ONE'S - GRIER'S - Right's [RACKETEERING ENTERPRISE]

Yet, [GRIER] FORGIVE THEM ALL. IN JESUS NAME AMEN.

furthermore, does NOT wish THAT THEY BE PROSECUTED ANY FURTHER... IN JESUS NAME AMEN. - TRULY -

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

GRIER, PRO SE, timely Filed AN APPEAL; within the DISTRICT COURT, plus respectfully, Filed in the APPEALS COURT... A SAMPLE BRIEF Filed: [2-15-2023]; alongwith, were EXHIBIT(S); also Filed: [3-20-2023] AN INFORMAL BRIEF, AND [REDACTED] WAS Filed: [6-16-2023] AN INFORMAL Reply BRIEF... THE USCA4 Appeal's: 23-4027, ruled, quoting (IRRELEVANT CASE LAWS to try to JUSTIFY; the DISTRICT COURT'S...) MALFEASANCE; likewise try to CONVINCE "GRIER, PRO SE" the MATTER WAS (CLEANED up). Yet, NEVER STATED "M. MADDUX" did NOT "COMMIT" MISCONDUCT AS "HE FORCED -C. PURPURA- ON GRIER 19 DAYS AFTER; DECLARING "SO I'LL ENTER AN ORDER PERMITTING MR. PURPURA TO BE EXCUSED FROM THIS MATTER AND THEN FROM THIS POINT FORWARD, MR. GRIER WILL REPRESENT HIMSELF PRO SE!" See. [APPENDIX F] pg 50

\* \* \*

THE USCA4 APPEAL: UNPUBLISHED OPINION [APPENDIX A] pg 4... STATED: MOREOVER, A DEFENDANT DOES NOT HAVE A RIGHT TO DECLINE HAVING STANDBY COUNSEL APPOINTED... Thus, THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE DID NOT ABUSE HIS DISCRETION BY APPOINTING STANDBY COUNSEL. ETC. THE RULING WAS AND IS [REDACTED] INCORRECT. (1) GRIER WAIVED HIS RIGHT TO COUNSEL. (2.) THE ISSUES WAS "THE COURT DID ABUSE ITS DISCRETION WHEN IT DENIED APPELLANT(S) MOTION TO RECEIVE DISCOVERY FILES" AND "THE COURT ERRED AND COMMITTED MISCONDUCT BY FORCING APPELLANT TO HAVE TO RELY ON THE COUNSEL, THE COURT DISMISSED ON DECEMBER 19TH 2022, IF HE WANTED TO REVIEW THE DISCOVERY. THE RULING IS CLEARLY ONE OF FAVORITISM, AS THE COURT FAILED TO KEEP THE [QUESTIONS] IN CONTEXT. INSTEAD, THE USCA4: TRY TO DISMANTLE THE QUESTIONS AND MERIT(S) TO REACH AN UNFAIR AND INACCURATE RULING. IN ORDER TO TRY TO CONVINCE GRIER THE MATTER WAS LEGALLY DONE. (MESSED UP)

\* \* \*

THE USCA4, EVEN USED GRIER'S TIMELY APPEAL TO CORRECT [A] (CLERICAL ERROR) MADE [REDACTED] BY THE DISTRICT COURT WHICH, ALSO MADE THE CONVICTION INVALID. BUT TOLD GRIER, PRO SE "WE AFFIRM THE CRIMINAL JUDGMENT. WE DENY GRIER'S MOTION TO VACATE HIS CONVICTION, WE DENY AS MOOT HIS MOTION FOR THIS [THAT] COURT TO DECIDE HIS APPEAL". A TIMELY REHEARING WAS FILED BUT DENIED

\* \* \*

UPON CONSIDERATION of the BRIEFS), in context, ANY RATIONAL COURT would've come away with [oo] "The ERROR and Misconduct [IN this CASE] constructed in the District Court of MARYLAND, by [M. Maddox U.S MAGISTRATE] [REDACTED] Judge, AS [He] allowed -C. PURPURA- to become active again, in this MATTER, AFTER, [He] dismissed HIM [oo] WAITING 19 days to; ORDER - C. PURPURA - back AS A STANDBY COUNSEL FOR GRIER", To NOT Allow Grier The Discovery. [PROVED Prejudice]

\* \* \*

BECAUSE, GRIER pro se, ON December 19th, 2022, ALREADY MADE SEVERAL REQUESTS "ORALLY" TO OBTAIN The Discovery, IN-ORDER that He COULD PREPARE FOR TRIAL; however although GRIER WAS PRESUMED to be his OWN COUNSEL.oo M.Maddox, Denied SAID request(s), ended with the MATTER would be taken up with the TRIAL Judge.

\* \* \*

ON [1-6-2023], M. Maddox, did ABUSE He's discretion AS ... He KEPT the WHOLE discovery AWAY FROM -GRIER-; despite the FACT that [HE] GRANTED GRIER His Right to be [REDACTED] COUNSEL FOR himself. The Action WAS indeed a BIAS ONE, it MADE; -GRIER -HANDICAP AS A PRO SE PERSON. [M.Maddox], HAD to HAVE dialogue with - Judge BREDAR - AS to GRIER's Access To His Discovery. (Noting, let the "Record Reflect" that AFTER, the dialogue ... Maddox 19 days later [12-19-22] thru [1-6-23], ORDERED - C. PURPURA - AS A STANDBY "COUNSEL" with A prepared DOCUMENT dated JANUARY 3rd, 2023.

\* \* \*

The District COURT (Judge BREDAR) ERRED because ... [HE] ACCEPTED the "WRITTEN AGREEMENT" FROM -C. PURPURA-, AI- thought the PLEA deem's VALID the DOCUMENT that MAKE's the PLEA WAS INOPERATIVE, INASMUCH AS, IT WAS OBTAIN BY the COURT, thru illegal behavior. [REDACTED] AND -Judge BREDAR - KNEW this but still Failed to reject the DOCUMENT AS A WHOLE. [THE DATE ALONE PROVED ILLEGALIZATION] "GRIER WAIVED his Right to the ASSISTANCE of COUNSEL -C. PURPURA - M.Maddox ... DISMISSED HIM AS A PROPER RESULT ... C. PURPURA, NOTWITHSTANDING the DISMISSAL WAS STILL BEING ACTIVE [IN THE CASE] DISREGARDING He's DISMISSAL"

\* \* \*

Besides, during the Rule 11 - Judge BREDAR - even denied the DOCUMENT, "IN CONTEXT" ... The DOCUMENT, told Judge BREDAR - IF He READ it .. GRIER, COULD NOT APPEAL HIS CONVICTION ...

However, after he accepted the document and sentence Grier to the 15 yrs ... Judge BREDAR, told Grier [he] had 14 days to appeal the conviction.

\* \* \*

MOTING: the document (written agreement) and - C. PURPURA - being placed as a standby "counsel," although Grier waived his right to counsel; clearly affected - Grier's - ~~the~~ Constitutional Right to Proceed pro se (without an attorney); The error affected the fairness, integrity, and the public reputation of judicial proceedings.

\* \* \*

INFERENCE, the District Court created a structural error. Forthwith, (in this case) on Grier's behalf. The Court, lead the A.S.A. of the government - P. McLane - to secure a ill-conceived guilty plea, as it allowed - C. PURPURA - to control and play upon by artful, unfair and insidious mean(s) especially to one's advantage ... It lead Grier who was supposed to be proceeding pro se to NOT proceed: without an attorney.

\* \* \*

(Let the Record Reflect) Id. HEARING(S) [12-19-22], M. Maddox [on] [1-6-2023], and "Judge BREDAR" on [1-6-2023].

\* \* \*

With all the above in mind, [if] M. Maddox never allowed - C. PURPURA - back JANUARY 6, 2023 ... The written plea agreement NEVER MAKES it to Grier or gets signed by Grier. therefore Grier would NOT have pled guilty pursuant to it. M. Maddox, failed to HONOR - Grier's waiver - of counsel.

\* \* \*

See. United State v. Jacobs, 2024 U.S. App. LEXIS 9788-HN1- The Sixth Amendment guarantees to a criminal defendant the right to the assistance of counsel ... but, it also guarantees a defendant's right to self-representation. Thus, a defendant MAY relinquish the right to counsel upon a valid waiver.

A waiver of the right to counsel is valid if it is (1) clear and unequivocal, (2) knowing, intelligent, and voluntary, and (3) timely.

\* \* \*

\* \*

(Noting that "... the district COURT'S SUPERIOR position to observe and understand, AN APPELLATE COURT accord the district COURT considerable discretion AS IT NAVIGATES A thin line between IMPROPERLY allowing the defendant to proceed pro se, thereby VIOLATING his Right to COUNSEL, and IMPROPERLY HAVING the defendant to proceed with counsel, thereby VIOLATING his Right to SELF-REPRESENTATION.)

\* \* \*

Here, the district COURT MADE "GRIER" proceed with [COUNSEL C. PURPURA] ... The COURT, KNEW GRIER NOT TRUST C. PURPURA. As A RESULT The COURT dismissed him but 19 days, later still ORDERED him AS A STANDBY COUNSEL, IN-ORDER to withhold the NEEDED DISCOVERY; even tried to OFFER (GRIER, PRO SE) A PLACE TO STAY closer to "C. PURPURA"!

\* \* \*

Note: GRIER, denied the offer, CAUSE "M. MADDOX" WAS IMPROPERLY FORCING C. PURPURA - ON GRIER; DEPRIVING GRIER OF HIS RIGHT TO PROCEED PRO SE, plus CREATED THE SAME CONFLICT OF INTEREST. (M. MADDOX), MADE (GRIER PRO SE) HANDICAP, FORCING HIM TO RELY ON C. PURPURA. Moreover, "NO COUNSEL COULD PREPARE AN ADEQUATE DEFENSE WITHOUT PROPER ACCESS TO THE DISCOVERY!" Id.

\* \* \*

See... The Right to assistance of COUNSEL AND the CORRELATIVE Right to dispense with a LAWYER'S Help ARE NOT legal FORMALISMS. They REST ON CONSIDERATIONS that go to the SUBSTANCE of AN ACCUSED'S [REDACTED] POSITION before the LAW. The PUBLIC CONSCIENCE MUST be satisfied that FAIRNESS DOMINATES the ADMINISTRATION [\*\*\* 275] of JUSTICE. AN ACCUSED MUST [REDACTED] HAVE the MEANS of PRESENTING his BEST DEFENSE. He MUST HAVE TIME and FACILITIES for INVESTIGATION [\*\* 242] and for the PRODUCTION of EVIDENCE. But EVIDENCE [\*\*\* 18] and TRUTH ARE OF NO AVAIL unless they CAN be ADEQUATELY PRESENTED. ESSENTIAL FAIRNESS IS LACKING if AN ACCUSED CANNOT PUT HIS CASE EFFECTIVELY IN COURT. But the CONSTITUTION does NOT FORCE A LAWYER UPON A DEFENDANT. He MAY WAIVE his CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL if he "KNOWS" what HE is doing AND his CHOICE is MADE WITH EYES OPEN. [HEADNOTE:- HN6-ADAMS vs. UNITED STATES ex rel. [REDACTED] McCANN, 317 U.S 269]

\* \* \*

[UNITED STATES V. KNIGHT, 56 F. 4th 1231] - HN1-

STRUCTURAL ERRORS infect the entire trial process, AND NECESSARILY RENDER A TRIAL FUNDAMENTALLY UNFAIR. They ARE ALSO RARE. The COMMISSION OF A CONSTITUTIONAL ERROR AT TRIAL ALONE does NOT entitle A DEFENDANT TO AUTO-MATIC REVERSAL. Indeed, IF the defendant HAD COUNSEL AND WAS TRIED BY AN IMPARTIAL ADJUDICATOR, there IS A STRONG PRESUMPTION that ANY OTHER CONSTITUTIONAL ERRORS THAT MAY HAVE OCCURRED ARE NOT STRUCTURAL AND ARE SUBJECT TO THE HARMLESS-ERROR ANALYSIS OF Fed. R. Crim. P. 52 (a).

The limited CIRCUMSTANCES in which STRUCTURAL ERROR(S) HAVE BEEN FOUND include A BIASED TRIAL JUDGE, ... DENIAL OF SELF-REPRESENTATION, ... DIRECTING ENTRY OF JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF THE PROSECUTION ...

DEFINING FEATURES of a STRUCTURAL ERROR include THAT (1) it DEPRIVES defendant(s) of the BASIC PROTECTIONS without WHICH A CRIMINAL TRIAL CANNOT ... RELIABLY SERVE ITS FUNCTION AS A VEHICLE FOR "DETERMINATION" OF GUILT OR INNOCENCE, AND (2) it DEFIES ANALYSIS by HARMLESS ERROR STANDARDS BECAUSE (A) the ... RIGHT AT ISSUE PROTECTS SOME INTEREST OTHER THAN AVOIDING ERRONEOUS CONVICTIONS, (B) the EFFECTS OF THE ERROR ARE DIFFICULT TO IDENTIFY OR MEASURE, AND/OR (C) THE ERROR IS OF A NATURE THAT ALWAYS RESULTS IN FUNDAMENTAL UNFAIRNESS. *Id.* (CITATION AND INTERNAL QUOTATION.)

\* \* \*

(NOTING THAT ... GRIER PLEADING GUILTY [1-6-2023] HELPED PRESERVE THE ISSUES "IN A SENSE" INASMUCH AS, (C) AROUSED AS A RESULT OF (A) AND (B) THUS GRIER DID NOT WAIVE THE NAMED ERROR(S) ... [HE] SHOULD HAVE NEVER BEEN PLACED IN A POSITION TO HAVE TO MAKE SUCH A "RASH DECISION" TO AVOID GOING TO TRIAL BY A SECRET TRIBUNAL.)

\* \* \*

WITNESSING, [U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE M. MADDOX] MISCONDUCT "LACK OF INTEGRITY" ... LEAD (GRIER) TO PLEAD GUILTY; TO AVOID BEING PUT ON TRIAL, WITH (COUNSEL C. PURPURA) AND WITHOUT PROPER ACCESS TO THE DISCOVERY; NEVERTHELESS, GRIER'S PLEA IS PURSUANT TO AN INVALID [WRITTEN PLEA AGREEMENT.]

THE DOCUMENT, IS AND WAS, NULL AND VOID WHERE PROHIBITED BY LAW AND ANY WELL-FOUNDED COURT WOULD'VE REJECTED THE DOCUMENT, DUE TO IT BEING, OUT OF DATE (INOPERATIVE).  
THEREFORE, THE COURT ERRED IN ACCEPTING GRIER'S "GUILTY PLEA"!

WHEREFORE, PETITIONER (GRIER, PRO SE), RESPECTFULLY ASK FOR THIS HONORABLE COURT TO VACATE/DISMISS THE CONVICTION WITH PREJUDICE. IN JESUS NAME AMEN.

#### CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.  
AND ANY OTHER RELIEF AS LAW AND JUSTICE MAY REQUIRE.

Respectfully submitted,

R. Grier [Richard Grier]

Date: October 21<sup>st</sup> 2024