


NO: _____

ORIGINAL

24-6496

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES



IN RE MAESTRO MATTHEW FAISON—PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF FLORIDA—RESPONDENT(S)

**ON PETITION FOR EXTRAORDINARY WRIT OF MANDAMUS
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS, ELEVENTH CIRCUIT**

**PETITION FOR EXTRAORDINARY WRIT OF MANDAMUS
OPPOSING UNITED STATES APPEALS COURT ELEVENTH
CIRCUIT PANEL DECISION**

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- 3). The United States Appeals Court, Eleventh Circuit, has created a “. Certified Questions ” resolving clause [?] :
- 4). The United States Appeals Court Eleventh Circuit has stated inside a title 28 U.S.C. 2244(b). Of the recent decision, Erlinger V. U.S., 144 S.Ct. 1852-53 (2024). Saying for a new rule to be retroactive under § 2254 or 2255, the Supreme Court itself must expressly hold that the new rule is retroactively applicable to cases on collateral review, or the Supreme Court’s holdings in multiple cases can, together, “necessarity dictate retroactivity of the new rule. as the Eleventh Circuit reliance was Tyler V. Cain, 533 U.S. at 666 :
- 5). The Eleventh Circuit U.S. Appeals Court voiced the Supreme Court did not address whether Erlinger is retroactive applicable to cases on collateral review.
- 6). Respect to recent decision inside Supreme Court on Erlinger, decision when the Jurists voiced the TEAGE, rule does not bar, because of today’s new rule in collateral proceedings. cf. Stanely V. State, 934 So.2d 562 (Fla. 4th DCA 2006).
- 7). In the United States V. Haymond, 588 U.S. 634, 645-646 (2019). Court Room on the contrary other constitutional cases that the court similarly did not involve the recidivism “tes[t].”

LIST OF PARTIES

8. . PETITIONER :

Maestro Matthew Faison, FDOC #038634.
(WCI) 110 Melaleuca Drive
Crawfordville, FL 32327-4963 :

9. . RESPONDENT(S) :

Mrs. Ashley B. Moody, Attorney General and Assistant Attorney Mrs.
Lisa Martin.
107 West Calhoun Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32339-1050

RELATED CASES

10. *ERLINGER V. UNITED STATES*, 144 S.Ct. 1852-53 (2024).

TABLE OF CONTENTS	
OPINIONS BELOW	4
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED	5
JURISDICTION	5
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED..	8
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	3
ARGUMENT	6
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	7
CONCLUSION	9

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX “A” United States Appeals Court reliance was in re Hill, 715 F.3d 296-97 (11th Cir. 2013).

APPENDIX “B” Erlinger v. United States, 144 S.Ct. 1852-53 (2024).

APPENDIX “C” The Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals Panel Decision; Before Jill Pryor, Branch, and Grant Circuit Judges; The Judges inside the decision of the 28 U.S.C. 2254; Application has created a certified question prones to be resolve by Supreme Court Justices . Via Rule 19 (SCUS).

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR EXTRAORDINARY WRIT
OPINION BELOW

. This is Federal Court Review :

The opinion of the United States Court of appeals at Appendix A to the petition and is

[X] reported at in re Hill, 715 F.3d 296-97 (11th Cir. 2013); or

[X] has been designated for publication is now reported :

. This is opinion of the Supreme Court “Erlinger” Court. Appears at Appendix B to the petition, and is [X] reported at 144 S.Ct. 1852-53 (2024). Has now, is in the designated file for publication.

. TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED :

Erlinger v. United States, 144 S.Ct. 1852-53 (2024).

Stanley v. State, 934 So.2d 562 (Fla. 4th DCA 2006).

MAESTRO MATTHEW FAISON JR. 038634

(WCI) 110 Melaleuca Drive

Crawfordville, FL 32327-4963

(850) 410 - 1892

. THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS CREATED A UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT RULE 19; PROCEDURE ON A CERTIFIED QUESTION :

1). This Writ (at all times), will show, said writ is in aid of the U.S. Supreme Court appellate jurisdiction and at (all time), the circumstance that in the argument section of this writ warrant the exercise of the court's discretionary powders, and that no adequate relief can't be obtained in any other form or from any other court.

JURISDICTION OF THE COURT

2). 28 U.S.C. S 1651(a) :

Article I, Section 9; Privilege of writ of Habeas Corpus, and via to no bill of attainder or ex post facto Law shall be passed.

CONSTITUTION AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Article XIV Section 1 of the United States Constitution

28 U.S.C. 1251

28 U.S.C. 1651

Rule 19

Rule 20

Rule 21

Supreme Court Rules of the United States :

ARGUMENT

Pending before the U.S. App. Ct. 11th Cir. is a .("PETITION FOR PANEL DECISION") : File on the 9th of September received and filed in the U.S. App. Ct. Clerk of Court, on the 12th of Sep. 2024. Which the Appellant Matthew L. Faison moved the court the Rule governing Fla.. R. Evid. 403 :

At Section [A], of above mentioned Court, the movant, told the U.S. Appeals Court that "ERLINGER," inside Supreme Court ruling on the NEW RULE CONSTITUTIONAL LAW PUZZLE MADE DIFFICULT TO BE RESOLVE., when the Court panel judges voiced the Supreme Court Justice must expressly state that the new rule is held retroactively.

Whereas, to the court's understanding the purpose to said motion ("Petition for PANEL DECISION"). In this motion the Petitioner Matthew Faison, ask the United States Court of Appeals to certify to this Supreme Court, a question or proposition of law on which it seeks instruction for the proper decision of the case.

REASON FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

Article XIV, Section 1. No person of life liberty or property to be deprive without due process of law in the event they are deprive the United States Constitution guarantee relief subjecting any presons, this would amount to a violation of equal protection of the law. Whereas, the language inside that teaches on the elements of ("Nuts and Bolts") Screwed by means of to set any person free from false imprisonment of being restrained.

CONCLUSION

This petition Officer writ [via] Petition for Extraordinary Writ should be granted.

Respectfully Submitted,

Maestro Matthew Taison

Date: 11-27-2024 Redated 1/15/2025