

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Edward Greeman,

Petitioner,

v.

Edward Burnett, Supt., of Fishkill
Correctional Facility

Respondent,

" Petition for Rehearing"

Pursuant to Rule 28 U.S.C.A.
1292(b) & F.R.A.P. Rule 44(a) 28
U.S.C.A.

Case No. 24-6910

- S.Ct.-2025 WL 1549871. DATED: JUN.
02, 2025.

State of New York)
Dutchess County) ss:

① I, Edward Greeman, an incarcerated inmate and a Pro
Se Defendant, housed at Fishkill C.F., swears, under penalty of per-
jury.


Edward Greeman

Pro Se Def. 7/1/25

②

LEGAL STANDARDS

A document filed Pro Se is to be liberally construed,
'and a pro se complaint, however inartfully pleaded, must be held
to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by law-
yers.' ERICKSON v. PARDUS, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (quoting ESTELLE v.
GAMBLE, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976). Cf. Fed. Rule Civ. Proc. 8(f) (All plea-
dings shall be construed as to do substantial justice").



③

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL

I, EDWARD GREEMAN, A PRO SE DEFENDANT HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PETITION FOR REHEARING, IS PRESENTED IN GOOD FAITH AND NOT FOR DELAY.

EDWARD GREEMAN
~~PRO SE DEF.~~
7/1/25

④

GROUND'S FOR RELIEF SOUGHT

(a) I, EDWARD GREEMAN, HEREBY MAKE A TIMELY APPLICATION TO APPEAL THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S DECISION, DENYING MY MANDAMUS MOTION, DATED JUN. 02, 2025, PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C.A. 1292(b).

(b) PURSUANT TO FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE RULE 44(a) 28 U.S.C.A. I, EDWARD GREEMAN, RESPECTFULLY MOVE THIS COURT TO CERTIFY THE FOLLOWING THREE QUESTIONS OF LAW:

"It presents important issues that have significant practical consequences, and resolution of questions would resolve case before Federal Court."

1. Whether the plain-clothes, arresting officers, who were employed by New York City, Metropolitan Transit Authority, were authorized to execute a warrantless arrest, in violation of my Fourth Amend. Rights of the U.S. Const.
2. Whether the plain-clothes, arresting officers, who were employed by N.Y.C., M.T.A., had jurisdiction to execute an arrest at Pearl Street Garage. In violation of my Fourteenth Amend. 'THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE', of the U.S. Const.
3. Whether the ADA, AFTER DISMISSING the top charge, a class C Felony, and failing to disclose the dismissal of same to the Grand Jury, was a BRADY v. MARYLAND, violation, and my Fourteenth Amend. Rights of the U.S. Const.

⑤

DISCUSSION

Relief Sought; (a) F.R.A.P. Rule 27(a)(2)(A), pursuant to this Rule; I, Edward Greeman, respectfully moves the Court to vacate this judgment.

(b) I, Edward Greeman, petition this Court to review this case, on the merits, pursuant to U.S. S.Ct. Rule 22, 28 U.S.C.A.

Since there are numerous constitutional violations that must be addressed, not only to ensure justice is preserved, but mainly, to abort an egregious miscarriage of justice.

Where, for example, the plain-clothes, arresting, M.T.A. Officers executed a warrantless arrest, and also without jurisdiction to arrest me at Pearl St. Garage. In violation of my Fourth Amend. Rights of the U.S. Const. See *Wong Sun v. U.S.* 83 S.Ct. 407 (Jan. 14, 1963).

Assuming this Court's familiarity with case, just to highlight one more, of the numerous constitutional violations. The ~~ADA~~^{*} withheld exculpatory evidence from the Grand Jury, intentionally: The fact that my top charge, a class C Felony, was dismissed but was withheld from the GJ's Indictment Hearing, and since this information was impeachable and prejudicial to my defense. And, had the GJ been privy to this information, the verdict would have been different. Therefore, this is a BRADY violation. And as such, this Court should reverse the decision as this Court did *BRADY v. MARYLAND*, 373 U.S. 83, 83 S.Ct. 1194 (May 13, 1963). See also *U.S. v. BAGLEY* 105 S.Ct. 3375 (Jul. 02, 1985).

CONCLUSION

⑥ These three questions were raised in my Writ of Mandamus motion, (24-6910) and also my Writ of Certiorari motion, (24-5935), which were both presented to this Court. But the respondent, the Attorney General of N.Y.S., Ms. Letitia James, the attorney for the respondent. Who refused to contest both of my motions. PLEASE NOTE that the A.G. submitted an 'Express Waiver' to this Court, in response to my Certiorari motion, (24-5935). Surprisingly, it was denied on Dec. 16, 2024, Id. at S.Ct. 145 S.

* = ASSISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEY

Ct. 992(Mem). Then in response to my Mandamus motion, the A.G. submitted a 'No Response' to this Court. And this was also denied on Mar.10,2025. Id.at S.Ct. 145 S.Ct. 1350(Mem),2025 WL 746416.

So the question now, is there a published opinion, on both motions, available to me, an Incarcerated Inmate? If so I humble beg this Court to forward same. Also why is five pages of my Mandamus motion, 24-6910, redacted or left blank, before being submitted to the Justices for review? And another discrepancy is the discarding of page 4 of 5 of my motion and replacing it with a duplicate copy of page 2 of 5. See case number 23-7761, 01/23/2025, DktEntry: 28.2, Page 1-7.

Therefore, I humbly plead to you, YOUR HIGHNESS, THE CHIEF JUSTICE, JOHN ROBERTS, to abort this most Egregious Miscarriage of Justice.

Edward Greeman

Pro Se/Def.

7/1/25

AFFIRMATION OF SERVICE BY MAIL

STATE OF NEW YORK)
) ss.:
COUNTY OF DUTCHESS)

On the 1st day of JUL., 2025, I, Edward Greeman
served a true copy of the annexed PETITION FOR REHEARING ~~OF~~ Mandamus Motion
pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. 1292(b) and F.R.A.P. Rule 44(a) 28 U.S.C.A.
case no. 24-6910. [ORIGINAL COPY]

on the following addressee(s): by placing (a) sealed, postage-paid
, properly-addressed envelope(s) containing the said document(s)
into an official depository box for outgoing First Class United
States Mail at Fishkill Corr. Fac. within the State of New York:

TO: U.S. Court of Appeals
Second Circuit
40 Foley Sq.
New York, NY 10005

TO: Dep't. of Justice
Civil Rights Dept.
950 Pennsylvania Av.
Washington, D.C. 20530

To:

U.S. Supreme Court
U.S. Supreme Courthouse
1 First St. N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20543

Pursuant to C.P.L.R. 2106 (eff. Jan. 1, 2024) I affirm this
1st day of JUL., 2025, under the penalties of perjury
under the laws of New York, which may include a fine or imprison-
ment, that the foregoing is true, and I understand that this
document may be filed in an action proceeding in a court of law.

Edward Greeman
Pro Se Def.
7/1/25
Fishkill Corr. Fac.
P.O. Box 1245
Beacon, NY 12508