

No. 24-6456

**ORIGINAL**

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Supreme Court, U.S.  
FILED

SEP 13 2024

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

Doran Smith — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

vs.

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

Mississippi Court Of Appeals  
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Doran Maurice Smith  
(Your Name)

120 Cemetery Street  
(Address)

Mendenhall, Miss [39114]  
(City, State, Zip Code)

801/A  
(Phone Number)

## Questions Presented

1. Did the Circuit Court of Madison County violate Smiths' rights by failing to hold a Rule 7.1 (c) hearing, in accordance with the Mississippi Rules of Criminal Procedure, M.R.C.P.?
2. Did the Circuit Court of Madison County violate Smiths' rights by holding an arraignment at trial, not in accordance with Rule 15.1 of the Mississippi Rules of Criminal Procedure, M.R.C.P.?
3. Did the Circuit Court of Madison County violate Smiths' rights by failing to give Smith notice of the August 5, 2022 trial date prior to trial?
4. Did the Circuit Court of Madison County show bias.
5. Did the Circuit Court of Madison County violate Smiths' rights by failing to inform Smith of the nature of the accusations?
6. Did the Mississippi Court of Appeals error in its rulings, decisions or opinions?
7. Was Counsel on appeal ineffective?

# List Of Proceedings

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

v.

DORAN SMITH

Trial Court Cause # 45CL1:21-CR-00302-JM  
Court Of Appeals case # 2022-CT-00852-COA

- Friday, 5th day of August 2022 - verdict by jury : Guilty. Order entered 08/10/2024.
- Tuesday, 20th day of February 2024 : Affirmed
- Tuesday, 14th day of May 2024 : The motion for rehearing denied.
- Thursday, 22nd day of August 2024 : The Disposition of the Mississippi Supreme Court -  
- Petition For Certiorari filed by Doran Maurice Smith, denied. To deny : All Justices.  
Order entered 08/13/2024.

# Table Of Contents

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| • Cover and Caption                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | i   |
| • Questions Presented                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | ii  |
| • List Of Proceedings                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | iii |
| • Table Of Contents                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | iv  |
| • Table Of Authorities                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | iv  |
| • Citations Of The Official Reports                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | v   |
| • Jurisdiction                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | 1   |
| • Provisions Relied On                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | 1   |
| • Statement Of The Case                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 2   |
| • Reasons For Granting The Writ                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 2   |
| • Contentions                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | 3   |
| • Appendix                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 14  |
| - Mississippi Electronic Court Docket, Affidavit Of Threat, Duress and Coercion, Notice and Demand, Affidavit And Notice To Judge Brad Mills, Notice To Appellate Counsel, Letter To Appellate Counsel, Letter To Appellate Counsel, Pro Se Brief and Appeals Court Decision. |     |

## Table Of Authorities

- Sullivan, 446 U.S. 340, 100 S. Ct. at 1714 (citing Walker v. United States, 422 F.2d 374, 375 (3rd Cir. 1970).
- Johnson v. Zerbst, 304 U.S. 458, 58 S. Ct. 1019, 82 L. Ed. 1461 (1938).
- Von Moltke v. Gillies, 332 U.S. 708, 68 S. Ct. 316, 92 L. Ed. 309 (1948).

## Citation of the Official Reports

- Sandoval v. State, 315 So. 3d 469, 474 (¶ 17) (Miss. 2021)
- Moore v. State, 287 So. 3d 189, 196 (¶ 21) (Miss. 2020)
- Pitchford v. State, 240 So. 3d 1061, 1068-69 (¶¶ 37-42) (Miss. 2017)
- Sanders v. State, 9 So. 3d 1132, 1142 (Miss. 2009)
- Smith v. State, 149 So. 3d 1027 (Miss. 2014)
- Hollie v. State, 174 So. 3d 824, 830-32 (Miss. 2015)
- Robinson v. State, 301 So. 3d 577, 580 (¶ 16) (Miss. 2020)
- Malone v. State, 375 So. 3d 713, 720 (¶ 18) (Miss. Ct. App. 2023)
- Davis v. State, 242 So. 3d 942, 944 (¶ 5) (Miss. Ct. App. 2018)
- Bateman v. State, 267 So. 3d 793, 796-97 (¶ 10) (Miss. Ct. App. 2018)

# Jurisdiction

Petitioner seeks review of the Circuit Court of Madison County, order entered on August 10, 2022. Also seeks review of the order of the Mississippi Court of Appeals, entered on February 20, 2024. The jurisdiction of this court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1257.

## Provisions Relied On

- Constitution for the United States of America
  - Article six clauses two and three
  - Amendment five, six and fourteen
- U.S. Reported Case Citations
  - Johnson v. Zerbst, 304 U.S. 458, 58 S.Ct. 1019, 82 L. Ed. 1461 (1938).
  - Von Moltke v. Gillies, 332 U.S. 708, 68 S.Ct. 316, 92 L. Ed. 309 (1948).

See appendix for pertinent parts of these provisions set out verbatim

## Statement Of The Case

Smith has included in this petition a court clerk document that will show Smith was never given notice of trial prior to trial which also violates public trial, that must remain inviolate. Smith was denied the Record on appeal in which further violates the right to make sure the Record is correct and complete. Smith did not knowingly and voluntarily waive right to Counsel in accordance with the Mississippi Rules of Criminal Procedural, Rule 7.1 (c). Court rules are promulgated to ensure Constitutions are not violated. If court rules can be ignored, there are no court rules. Smith endured a mock court.

Smith was deprived of the knowledge of each step or stage of the proceedings and therefore, can only state that the federal questions were raised in the pre-trial and trial stage of the proceedings of the Circuit Court of Madison County. The questions were raised orally and in the form of Affidavits and Notices in the Circuit Court of Madison County and in the Pro Se Brief in the Mississippi Court of Appeals. See List of Proceedings to see how the questions were passed on by these courts and as stated above, Smith was denied the Record from Counsel on appeal. Smith will be using the opinion of the court of appeals. The documents that were filed into the record will show federal questions were raised.

## Reasons For Granting The Writ

If this Court will not grant this writ it will

have allowed the Mississippi Courts violations of the Constitution to go unchecked and in turn encourage further violations in the future. The County of Madison has stated that they make their own laws, this will have become true. Are court rules important?

## Contentions

1. Defendant Smith did not have a Rule 7(c) hearing, Mississippi Rules of Criminal Procedure, M.R.C.P.

Looking to the Mississippi Electronic Courts, Twentieth Circuit Court District, Madison Circuit Court Criminal Docket as evidence of support for this contention. There is not an entry of a Rule 7(c) hearing in the Criminal Docket. The Circuit Court had no way of knowing that the rejection of Counsel was knowingly and voluntarily. This omission of the Circuit Court deprived the defendant Smith of warnings and rights cited under Rule 7(c) 1-5. See exhibit A

2. Defendant Smith was not given a complete or sufficient arraignment with proper time to prepare after arraignment in accordance with Rule 15.1 of the Mississippi Rules of Criminal Procedure.

Smith is not sure if the reading of the indictment on the 5th of August 2022 was an arraignment but, if it was, the Circuit Court and Court of Appeals have deemed it proper or sufficient to have arraignment and trial on the same day, to wit, August 5, 2022. See exhibit I

Defendant contends that a sufficient



arraignment is notice, which is delivery of indictment, the reading of indictment, the right to be heard i.e., ask questions in order to clear up any misunderstandings so that a defendant will have sufficient information before entering a plea along with sufficient time to prepare a defence that will meet the deadlines that should be set in accordance with Rule 15.1 (b)(6), M.R.Cr.P. .

The Circuit Court should have adhered to the law and rules of the court and refrained from rebutting the Affidavit of Threat, Duress and Coercion, which shows bias, and should have set another date for arraignment well in advance of trial.

3. Defendant never had notice of a trial date consistent with August 5, 2022.

The Criminal Docket for cause number 45CL1 :21-cr-00302-JM does not show a trial date scheduled for August 5, 2022. See Mississippi Electronic Courts, Twentieth Circuit Court District, Madison Circuit Court Criminal Docket. See exhibit A

The evidence show that the defendant was denied notice of a trial date which also denied the right to a public trial. A Defendant can not have the support of family and spectators if he is denied notice of the trial date prior to trial.

**Note:** Only one date lines up with a date actually attended that would give notice of the step or stage in the proceeding, which is June 20, 2022. Although even that day still lacks notice being that it was used as

a day to release the attorney from the case and not as a settlement conference as stated in the Criminal Court Docket.

#### 4. The Circuit Court of Madison County showed bias?

On January 11, 2022 the Circuit Court revoked the appearance bond without any justification to do so. There were no papers or any evidence that could be produced to justify revoking the bond.

The affidavit of threat, duress and coercion was rebutted by the Circuit Court on July 25, 2022 stating: "that's just You saying something" and rebutted again on August 5, 2022 stating: "We don't do that here".

A defendant cannot be heard if the Court, who is represented by the judge, rebutted affidavit of threat duress and coercion, gesture to the bailiff to remove the defendant Smith if he ask about due process and fail to follow multiple court rules.

These acts and omissions are also stated in the Pro Se Brief and made by a declaration due to being denied the Record. See exhibit H

#### 5. Defendant Smith was denied the right to be informed of the nature of the accusations.

On June 22, 2022, Judge Mills stated that he will be trying cause number 45CL1:21-cr-00302 under a statutory jurisdiction. Smith was denied any clarification of this unpublished jurisdiction an affidavit was entered into the Record stating;

he would be trying said cause under a statutory jurisdiction. This document titled: Affidavit And Notice To Judge Brad Mills was read into the record on July 25, 2022 and also on August 6, 2022. See exhibit D

Judge Bradley Mills never attempted to rebut this Affidavit, therefore acquiescing.

Note: Judge Mills did rebut the affidavit of threat, duress and coercion.

So, if a defendant is tried under an unpublished jurisdiction, he is therefore denied the chance to raise proper defenses before trial, nor could a defendant make an intelligent plea to the court. No right should ever be deliberately denied to a defendant.

6. Mississippi Court of Appeals errored.

The Appellate Court states:

As set out in the scheduling order, the Circuit judge inquired as to Smith's intentions regarding whether he would plead guilty or continue to trial. See Smith v. State, 2022-KA-00862-COA (115). Exhibit I

If Appellate Court accepts as true, as stated:

... "with the assistance of appointed counsel, Smith then waived arraignment and signed a setting order all on September 8, 2021, ... See Supra (112)

How is it that Smith is then asked whether He would plead guilty or continue to trial on

January 11, 2022, Supra (¶ 4-¶ 5). If an arraignment is waived, a not guilty plea is entered. See M.B.C.P., Rule 75.1 (d). Should the trial court have responded to the Affidavit of Threat, Duress and Coercion, and then conducted or scheduled an arraignment? When Smith presented said affidavit on January 11, 2022, it was ignored. Smith was then called incompetent and accused of violating conditions of appearance bond while presenting said affidavit. The court should keep in mind that the judge of the Circuit Court had no evidence that would have justified the actions of revoking the appearance bond. The appearance bond had no conditions.

- The Appellate Court barred issues raised in Smiths' brief, Supra (¶ 16), after receiving documents stating that Smith was unable to receive the Record for appeal. See exhibit

- The Appellate Court stated that Smiths' claims are without merit after altering what was stated in Smiths' brief. See Supra (¶ 17), as stated:

"Smith contends that he was "deprived of the right to know the nature of the accusations, because the course of the proceedings was in secrecy all the way up to the trial on August 5, 2022, in which no prior notice of the trial date was given." Supra (¶ 17)

Smiths' brief does not have those quotations nor does the word because appear in Smiths' brief. This action has altered the dialogue being conveyed. See Appellate Pro Se Brief exhibit H page 3

These quotation marks gives the impression that the statements made are one complete statement, when in fact it is three separate statements. The Appellate Courts adding of the word because has altered Smiths' contentions. The Appellate Courts' opinion is based off false analysis.

- The Appellate Court fails to understand what under duress means. The Appellates' Court states:

"He alleges that he was coerced into waiving arraignment on September 8, 2021. However, the Record shows that Smith was served with a copy of the indictment on that date, requested a court-appointed attorney, and signed the first scheduling order containing the trial date." *Supra* (¶17)

The Appellate Court fails to understand that any contract of any kind done under duress is void, not just parts of it.

- The Appellate Court has failed to notice an error. The Appellate Court states:

"The Clerks' records reflects the changes in the trial date and the transcripts show that he was given notice of the trial date." *Supra* (¶17).

The Clerks' records do reflect that court dates were changed but, does not reflect a trial date of August 5, 2022. Smith was denied the opportunity to examine the Record, although, if the trial court ordered or set a trial date at any hearing for August 5, 2022, it would reflect in the Clerks' records.

- The Appellate Court failed to understand the importance of arraignment, and why it should be held in advance of trial and what an arraignment consist of.

The Appellate Court States:

'Out of an abundance of caution, Smith was formally arraigned prior to trial. Supra (¶17).

If formally arraigned means in accordance with M.R.Cr.P., Rule 15.1, Smith was denied this arraignment. If prior to trial means a date well in advance of August 5, 2022, then the Appellate Court has misread documents or the trial court has falsified the document it presented to the Appellate Court. This, so-called, arraignment was held the same day of trial. A formal arraignment would consist of M.R.Cr.P., Rule 15.1 procedures.

- The Appellate Court failed to see the meaningful arguments made.

The Appellate Court States:

"Smith make vague accusations concerning an "unknown jurisdiction" and the trial courts' alleged failure to advise him as to "what step in the proceedings we were in". He also contends, "I could not proceed because there is no published rules for criminal procedure in a statutory jurisdiction". Smith makes no meaningful argument regarding these contentions; ... Supra (¶19)

If a judge states that a cause will be tried "under" a statutory jurisdiction, that

is an unknown jurisdictional power in which to try a cause under. The reason it is unknown is because it is not published, therefore secret or private. If there is no known jurisdiction, published, called statutory in which to try a cause "under," a defendant cannot raise proper and effective defenses being denied the nature of the accusations.

- The Appellate Court failed to make or take notice of Appellants' documents that were filed into the Record. These documents are part of the Record. Though Appellant was denied the Record, Appellant did point to the document titled: Affidavit And Notice To Judge Brad Mills. See Pro Se Appellant Brief page 5. exhibit H page 5

## 7. Counsel was ineffective on appeal.

### Counsel on appeal:

- Failed to ascertain, with the Appellant, that the Record was correct and complete, which includes pre-trial proceeding, being that pre-trial proceedings (transcripts) were used against Appellant during appeal process. Appellate Counsel did not know with certainty that the Record was correct and complete. "Arm-chair" Counsel never attended any pre-trial proceedings. See Mississippi Rules of Appellate Procedure, Rule 10 (b) (5).

- Failed to assist Appellant with a paper copy of the Record, being that Appellant is incarcerated and can not receive a disk that was said to contain the Record.

- Failed to give the court notice that Appellant is unable to be properly assisted, due to not being able to receive the "disk form" of the Record for appeal, even after Counsel had received letters from Appellant stating these facts. See Exhibits E, F, G

- Failed to raise the issue of Appellant not being given a Mississippi Rules of Criminal Procedure, M.R.Cr.P., Rule 7.1 (c) hearing, which would inform the Defendant of the options enumerated in Rule 7.1 (c) 1 through 5. The trial court did not ascertain, on the record, that rights were knowingly and voluntarily waived. See *Johnson v. Zerbst*, 304 U.S. 458, 58 S.Ct. 1019, 82 L.Ed. 1461 (1938), also *Von Moltke v. Gillies*, 332 U.S. 708, 68 S.Ct. 316, 92 L.Ed 309 (1948) also *Bradley v. State*, 58 So. 3d 1166, 1170 (Miss. 2011).

- Failed to raise the issue of Appellant being tried "under" a secret jurisdiction. Appellate Counsel stated, but never raised it as an issue in her brief, that objection was made. Not sure if appellate Counsel understands jurisdiction i.e., territorial jurisdiction, which is the geographical area which a case or cause is tried "in" and jurisdictional power, which is the power a cause or case is tried "under."

If Appellate Counsel did not understand jurisdiction it will further show ineffective assistance of Counsel. See exhibit J page 6.

- Failed to raise the issue that Appellant was never given notice of trial prior to trial, which also denies the right to a public trial. See Mississippi Electronic Courts, Twentieth

11 of 18



Circuit Court District (Madison Circuit Court) criminal docket for cause number 4541:21-CR-00302-JM. There is no entry stating a trial date set for August 5, 2022. See exhibit A

- Failed to raised the issue of Smith never pled at arraignment, to wit, never disputed any facts contained in the charging instrument. Smith never refuse to pled at the arraignment and there is no indication of refusal. This arraignment that the Appellate court says took place prior to trial, See Smith v. State, 2022-KA-00882-COA (717), would not be sufficient to give notice of court dates and motion deadlines, See M.R.Cr.P., Rule 15.1(b)(6). For clarity, prior to trial, as stated in the appellate Courts' opinion, means at trial on August 5, 2022.

- Failed to raise the issue of Defendant Smith never being convicted of a felony. No plea agreement to business burglary, nor verdict by trial.

- Failed to raise the issue of a incompetent or bias court due to the multiple errors of the Circuit Court, to wit, revoking appearance bond arbitrarily and capriciously. Never holding a Mississippi Rules of Criminal Procedure, M.R.Cr.P., Rule 7d hearing. Never holding M.R.Cr.P., Rule 8.6 hearing. Never holding a M.R.Cr.P., Rule 15.1 hearing in advance of trial, whereas, Smith would have notice of deadlines for motions, and documents. Never had notice of the August 5, 2022 trial date. There is only one court date that line up with dates actually attended, June 6, 2022, which was use as a day to remove Bentley E. Conner from the case, and

not as settlement conference as it states in criminal docket, See Mississippi Electronic Court, Twentieth Circuit Court District, Madison Circuit Court, Criminal docket for cause number 45L1821-CR-00302-JM, Smith had no way of knowing what step in the proceedings were taking place or how to be prepared or when to be prepared. Smith was not given notice of any hearing that took place beforehand.

• Appellate Counsels' actions or omissions has caused Appellant to inadvertently waive rights or cause errors not to be raised. Smiths' right to review the Record and make sure it is correct and complete. See Mississippi Rules of Appellate Procedure, Rule 10 (b) (5), to participate in the appellate process with Counsel could have refreshed or brought to mind and made certain that all viable issues would be raised in Counsels' or Pro Se Brief.

Pro Se brief would not have been barred due to not pointing to the record.

## Conclusion

The United States Supreme Court has held that a criminal defendant is entitled to reversal of his conviction whenever he makes some showing of a possible conflict of interest or prejudice, however remote, *Coyler v. Sullivan*, 446 U.S. 340, 100 S.Ct. at 1714 (citing *Walker v. United States*, 422 F.2d 374, 375 (3rd Cir 1970).

This writ should be granted in order to establish that court rules are promulgated to

ensure Constitutional rights are not violated. To let it be known that pre-trial process is important to assure a fair trial will occur. That Mississippi Courts can not have mock trials and be confident that the Mississippi court of Appeals will show extreme deference, though many errors are plain to see.

It is Smiths' belief that the Circuit Court of Madison County and the Mississippi Court of Appeals has deliberately overlooked these Constitutional violations knowing that it will take years to get judgment overturned, and so, Smith would make parole and be left without a remedy. This is why this Supreme Court shall grante the Writ.

## Appendix

- Mississippi Electronic Courts, Twentieth Circuit Court District (Madison Circuit Court) ..... A
- Affidavit of Threat, Duress and Coercion ..... B
- Notice and Demand ..... C
- Affidavit And Notice To Judge Brad Mills ..... D
- Notice To Appellant Counsel ..... E
- Letter To Appellant Counsel ..... F
- Letter To Appellant Counsel ..... G
- Pro Se Brief ..... H
- Appeals Court Decision ..... I

- Article six clauses two and three of the United States Constitution states:

This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall

be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States.

- Amendment five states, in pertinent part;  
... nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law;...

- Amendment six states, in pertinent part;  
... and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusations; ... and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence.

- Amendment fourteen states, in pertinent part;  
... nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

- Article three, section fourteen of the Mississippi State Constitution states:

No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property except by due process of law.

- Article three, section twenty-six of the Mississippi State Constitution state, in pertinent part;

In all criminal prosecutions the accused shall have a right to be heard by himself or counsel, or both, to demand the nature and cause of the accusations.

- Mississippi Rules Of Criminal Procedure states in pertinent part; Rule 7.1 (c);

When the court learns that a defendant desires to act as his/her own attorney, the court shall conduct an on-the-record examination of the defendant to determine if the defendant knowingly and voluntarily desires to act as his/her own attorney. The court shall inform the defendant that:

1. The defendant has a right to an attorney, and if the defendant cannot afford an attorney, then the court will appoint one free of charge to defend or assist the defendant in his/her defense.

2. The defendant has the right to conduct the defense and may elect to do so and allow whatever role(s) he desires to his/her attorney.

3. The court will not relax or disregard the rules of evidence, procedure or courtroom protocol for the defendant and that the defendant will be bound by and have to conduct himself/herself within the same rules as an attorney, that these rules are not simple and that without legal advice his/her ability to defend himself/herself will be hampered.

4. The right to proceed pro se usually increases

the likelihood of a trial outcome unfavorable to the defendant.

5. Other matters as the court deems appropriate.

After informing the defendant and ascertaining that the defendant understands these matters, the court will ascertain whether the defendant still wishes to proceed pro se or if the defendant desires an attorney to assist him/her in his/her defense. If the defendant desires to proceed pro se, the court should determine whether the defendant has exercised this right knowingly and voluntarily and, if so, make the finding a matter of record. At the time of accepting a defendant's waiver of the right to counsel, the court shall inform the defendant that the waiver may be withdrawn and counsel appointed or retained at any stage of the proceedings. Additionally, the court may appoint an attorney to assist the defendant on procedure and protocol, even if the defendant does not desire an attorney. Such advisory counsel shall be given notice of all matters of which the defendant is notified.

- Mississippi Rules of Criminal Procedure, Rule 15.1 (b) states;

1. ensuring that the defendant has a copy of the indictment;
2. reading the indictment to the defendant or stating to the defendant the substance of the charge;
3. asking the defendant to plead to the indictment;
4. determining whether the defendant is represented by counsel and, if not, appointing counsel, if appropriate, under Rule 7;
5. reviewing the bond previously set, if appropriate; and
6. setting reasonable deadlines for the filing and

hearing of all pretrial motions. Pretrial motions shall include, but are not limited to, motions: to dismiss, to suppress evidence, to request discovery for continuance, for severance, for appointment of experts, for mental examination, or for any other matters which may delay the trial.

- Mississippi Rules of Appellate Procedure, Rule 10 (b)(5) states in pertinent part;

For fourteen (14) days after service of the clerks' notice of completion under Rule 11 (d) (2), the appellant shall have the use of the record for examination. On or before the expiration of the period, appellant shall return the record to the trial court clerk, and shall append to the record (i) a written statement of any proposed corrections to the record, (ii) a certificate that the appellant or the appellants' attorney has carefully examined the record and that with the proposed corrections, if any, it is correct and complete, etc.

Respectfully Submitted this the 13<sup>th</sup> day  
of September 2024

Signed:   
Doran Maurice Smith