

24-6714

No. _____

ORIGINAL

FILED

JAN 22 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

David C. Letteri — PETITIONER

(Your Name)

Joell, Daniels^{vs.}

Cheryl Meyer Roth — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

Second circuit of appeals

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

David C. Letteri

(Your Name)

P. O. Box 874

(Address)

Ayer MA

(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

Questions
23-cv-487

1. How does a "class of one" apply?
2. Does private have more of an element to be under Title 42 United States Code 1985(3)?
3. Is disability a class animus"
4. How many does it take for a conspiracy under Title 42 United States Code 1985(3)?
5. Can ineffective counsel apply to the constitutional element to Title 42 United States Code 1985(3)?

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 *Second circuit 24-740 document 28.1*

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
-------	-------------

STATUTES AND RULES
7, 8/4 72 United States Code 14.85(3)

OTHER
Due process
Ineffective counsel

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 4 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 is unpublished.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 is unpublished.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 is unpublished.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, 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 _____.

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 provision involved

1. Title 42 United States Code 1985(3)
2. Ineffective Counsel
3. Due Process

Statement of Case
24-cv-487

This stems from a private conspiracy of a Title 42 United States Code 1985(3). If not mistake a conspiracy is two or more people. There is a violation of equal protection of rights because the class animus is three different ones sex, age, and disability and then the constitutional rights are due process and ineffective counsel.

The judge, lawrence joseph vilardo sees to not understand the nature of the statue since he claims its a "Bivens cause of action" but since a state official was involved which was clothed with new you state law had made it also a Title 42 United States Code 1983 not a "Bivens Cause of action" since it is a state agent not a federal agent.

Then the Heck v humprey, 114 SCT 2364 that claim there was two charges in which one was throw out because of no probable cause which the matter of the charge was Title 18 united states code 2423(b). That is what bypasses the Heck rule since the respondents claimed the indictment on both which brings to a breach of contract or maybe even fraud. but the fact is that charge bypasses the heck rule since the issue was about filing an appeal for bail since it has no bearing on the case only that its just a poor excuse.

Reason to Grant Writ
23-cv-487

Since this becomes an issue under what can be under the civil rights laws a review is necessary to determine the full extent of Title 42 United States code 1985(3).

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

John
Date: January 17, 2015