

24-6712

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

ORIGINAL

FILED

JAN 21 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

David C. Lettieri — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

vs.

Paul E. Bonanno — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

Second Circuit  
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

David C. Lettieri

(Your Name)

P.O. Box 879

(Address)

Anyot, MA 01432

(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

Questions  
23-cv-1307

1. What can a habeas corpus be used for?
2. Can a Bivens Cause of action be used to get Documents?"
3. Can a habeas be used for a Title 5 United States Code 706 matter?
4. Can a judge advise to do a different vechile?
5. Neitzke v williams, 490 U.S. 319 is a correct method?

## 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:

## RELATED CASES

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....	
CONCLUSION.....	

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A 24-704 decision

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

### STATUTES AND RULES

Due process  
7,718 28 United States code 1915A  
7,718 28 United States code 1915  
7,718 28 United States code 2241

OTHER

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 is unpublished.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 \_\_\_\_\_ 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 is unpublished.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.

## JURISDICTION

For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was October 24, 2021

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 \_\_\_\_\_.

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 Statutory Provising Involved  
23-cv-1307

1. Due Process
2. Title 28 United States Code 1915A
3. Title 28 United States Code 1915
4. Title 28 United States Code 2241.

Statement of Case  
23-cv-1307

This stems from a matter of a piece of eviendce that was not properly given to the petitioner. The matter is an injuction relief in which doesn't comply with Bivens v Six unknown Agents, 403 U.S. 388. Since the only type of relief is montary. The petitioner is using the vechile of the habeas to be granted since the petitioner is "In custody" on the federal charge and the respondent is one that has authozity of custody of the petitioner since the respondent is a worker for the department of justice.

The judge Lawrence Joesph Vilardo had done this quick desicion because of an attempt to have a writ of mandamus. When Lawrence Joseph Vilardo saw such quickly had made the claim of it being a Bivens cause of action to squash any attempt of the writ of mandamus.

This is clearly a writ matter from thje great writ side in which it is a habeas corpus or a write of mandamus for a federal agent to do their job and stop breaking the laws.

Reason to grant writ  
23-cv-1307

It is in order to guide judges on what Title 28 United States Code 2241 is and structure in order to know what type of vechile it is and not to mislead a pro se litigant into a matter.

## CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

John Doe

Date: January 6, 2024