

Orig.

1 OF 4

24-6928

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

**ORIGINAL**

Supreme Court, U.S.  
FILED  
FEB 27 2025  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

In Re STANLEY HOWARD SOLVEY — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

STANLEY HOWARD SOLVEY

(Your Name)

4001 KING AVENUE

(Address)

CORCORAN, CA 93212-8800

(City, State, Zip Code)

NOT AVAILABLE

(Phone Number)

RECEIVED  
APR - 3 2025  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

RECEIVED  
MAR 10 2025  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

## QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- (1) Whether Petitioner is situated in a position, whereupon, "circumstances exist that render such process (State Court Exhaustion) ineffective to protect the rights of applicant". 28 U.S.C. §2254(b)(1)(B)(ii).
- (2) Whether Petitioner's position in State Court on pending Habeas Petition will provide a full, fair, adequate adjudication on the merits of his Constitutional violations contentions in Habeas proceedings, in light of ongoing conspiracies to deprive him of numerous Constitutional Rights, both State and Federal. "Ineffective".
- (3) Whether a 'prima facie' (or higher burden) showing exists of an ongoing conspiracy to deprive and violate Petitioner's State and Federal Constitutional rights, resulting in a 'continual' miscarriage of justice.
- (4) Whether this 'continual' "miscarriage of justice" (conspiracy) amounts to "exceptional circumstances" warranting the exercise of U.S. Supreme Court's discretionary powers (Rule 20.4(a)) on an Original Habeas Corpus Petition. 28 U.S.C. §2241(a).
- (5) Whether this conspiracy of constitutional violations (continuous), by fraud, deceit and misrepresentations (Cal. Gov. Code §822.2), amounted to I.A.C. and an illegal contract (plea) (Gov Code §814), resulted in Human Trafficking (P.C. §236.1 (a) & (h)), and False Imprisonment by 'abuse of process' and 'coercion'. In a civil and criminal conspiracy. (Fact Finding Requested)

### QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- (6) Whether the Judicially Noticeable facts of "conspiracy" to falsely Imprison/Human Traffic; Petitioner (NA049324), has the 'Asylum's' Claim' burden "Reasonable Showing" of persecution/torture (medical),... and a reasonable nexus to: Political; Religious; and Racial basis for such, compromising various Branches, Entities, Agencies of both State and Federal Governments, a prima facie showing (burden), by either direct or circumstantial evidence, that: "Adequate relief cannot be had in any other (State or Federal) Court, warranting review by the High Court", in an Original Habeas Petition. 28 U.S.C. §2241(a).
- (7) Whether Petitioner's maximum exposure (punishment) upon a just, fair and proper legal relief on pending Habeas Petitions and ameliorative resentencing laws, places Petitioner 4 or 9 years overdue for release (mid-term presumptive, 4 years with nickel prior, 9 years without), or calculating the Low-Term based on P.C. §1170(b)(6) mitigating factors meaning either 7 or 12 years overdue for release, depending on Nickel Prior imposed. This "Overdue" for release on current conviction (banks) amounts of a substantial right of Petitioner, being violated, within the meaning of: 28 U.S.C. §2254(b)(1)-(B)(ii).
- (8) Whether Petitioner's "Application For Successive Petition" (28 U.S.C. §2244(b)(2)) and underlying "Petition For Habeas Corpus" (28 U.S.C. §2254) denial was proper or abuse of discretion or the Standard of Review for such Denials, as the narrow exception to Successive Petitions was shown: New Evidence "Hypoglycemia" established Legal Innocence; P.C. §26(4), Blackout/Unconsciousness, not raised in trial. 9th Cir. #23-1006.

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
Barron v. Superior Court, 90 Cal. App. 5th 628.....	22
Belton v. Superior Court, 19 Cal. App. 4th 1279.....	13
People v. Anderson, 9 Cal 5th 946.....	23
People v. James, (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 1147.....	11, 28
People v. West (1984), 154 Cal. App. 3d 100, 108.....	100, 108
<u>FEDERAL CASES:</u>	
Chiaverini v. City of Napoleon (U.S. S. Ct.) #23-50.....	25
<u>CALIF. RULES OF COURT:</u>	
3.350.....	12
4.551(b)(2), (c)(1), (c)(2).....	20, 25
<u>HEALTH &amp; SAFETY:</u>	
§ 11351.....	12
§ 11377.....	11
§ 11378.....	11
<u>GOV. CODE:</u>	
§ 814.....	2, 11, 14, 26
§ 821.6.....	2, 11, 14
§ 822.2.....	15, 26
<u>CIVIL CODE:</u>	
§47(b).....	15
<u>PENAL CODES:</u>	
§ 17(b).....	19
§ 26(4).....	3, 24
§ 211.....	7, 11, 16, 20, 22
§ 236.1(a) & (h).....	2, 14, 19, 22, 28
§ 245(a)(2).....	7, 11, 19, 22, 23, 28
§ 261.5(d).....	11
§ 288A(b)(2).....	11
§ 288(a).....	6, 11, 13, 15, 16, 19, 26, 27
§ 288(c)(1).....	11
§ 289(i).....	11
§ 422.....	11, 28
§ 644.....	10
§ 664/211.....	16, 17, 22
§ 667(a).....	16, 20, 22
§ 667(B)-(i).....	16, 17
§ 667.5(b).....	17
§ 735.....	14, 27
§ 859b.....	12, 22
§ 856(b).....	14
§ 995.....	13, 22, 28,
§ 1054.9.....	6, 18, 21
§ 1170(b)(6).....	3
§ 1170.1(e).....	16, 17
§ 954.....	12
§ 1368.....	12
§ 1385(a) & (c)(2).....	12, 20, 22, 23, 27
§ 1387.....	13, 22, 27
§ 1387.1.....	13, 22, 27
§ 1404.....	27
§ 1424.....	21
§ 1476.....	6, 19, 21, 23, 25

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of habeas corpus issue.

**OPINIONS BELOW**

For cases from **federal courts**:

NOT APPLICABLE

The opinion of the United States court of appeals 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 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**:

Petitioner contends that; 28 U.S.C. §§2241(a) & 2254(b)(1)(B)(ii) exception applies.

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.

B

5

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

QUESTIONS PRESENTED.....2, 3

OPINIONS BELOW.....5

JURISDICTION.....8

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....9

STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....10-24

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....25-29

CONCLUSION.....30

**INDEX TO APPENDICES**

APPENDIX A : COPIES OF 3 HABEAS PETITIONS TO STATE COURTS, ONE NOT FILED

APPENDIX B: HON. CHET TAYLOR'S ORDER ON PETITION NAO49324, SERVED 36 DAYS LATER

APPENDIX C : MARSDEN MOTION TO SUBSTITUTE COUNSEL (MR. PETERS) DEFICIENT PERFORM.

APPENDIX D: P.C. §1054.9 DISCOVERY MOTION, 2nd FILED ON 2-13-2025, WITH REQUESTED.

APPENDIX E: CALIF. D.O.J. PUBLIC RECORDS REQUEST AS TO PUBLISHING P.C. §288(a)

APPENDIX F: U.S. D.O.J. F.O.I.A. RECORDS REQUEST AS TO PUBLISHING OF P.C. §288(a)

APPENDIX G : IDCO APPINTED ATTORNEY MR WEINBERG REFUSING TO FILE BAIL/O.R MOTION

APPENDIX H : IDCO APPOINTED (NOW RELIEVED) ON P.C.§1476 BAIL MOTION (FILED 1-29-25)

APPENDIX I : CALIF. BOARD OF GOVERNMENT CLAIMS FORM FILED BY PETITIONER

APPENDIX J: DENIAL BY CALIF. COURT OF APPEALS, ON P.C.§1054.9 MOTION DENIAL

APPENDIX K: PETITIONER'S FIRST LETTER TO U.S. SUPREME COURT ON SUCCESSIVE ISSUE

## 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:

JEFFERY MACOMBER, SECRETARY OF CDCR

[REDACTED]  
ED SILVA, WARDEN C.S.P. CORCORAN

ROB BONTA, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CALIFORNIA,

RESPONDENTS.

## RELATED CASES

NA049324, SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, LONG BEACH

SA083379, SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, AIRPORT/LAX

1:07-cv-00182-LJO-GSA, U.S.D.C., E.D. CAL, FRESNO DIVISION (CIVIL)

2:15-cv-07827-DOC-AJW, U.S.D.C., C.D. CAL, (HABEAS)

1:19-cv-01444-JLT-GSA, U.S.D.C., E.D. CAL, FRESNO DIVISION (CIVIL)

2023 U.S. DIST. LEXIS 197754, SOLVEY V. GATES, (CIVIL)

1:23-cv-00682-KES-CDB, U.S.D.C., E.D. CAL, FRESNO DIVISION (CIVIL)

2:23-cv-00745-DOC-JC, U.S.D.C., C.D. CAL, (HABEAS 2nd) removed to 9th.

23-1006, 9th CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEAL (APPLICATION FOR SUCCESSIVE PETITION)

24CV003452, SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIF., SACRAMENTO COUNTY, REMOVED TO FEDERAL

2:24-cv-01756-DC-JDP, U.S.D.C., E.D. CAL, FRESNO, (CIVIL)

J260568, LONG BEACH JUVENILE COURT, PETITION (P.C. §245(a)(2) ADW w/ FIREARM.

NA022865, SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, (CRIMINAL) (P.C. §211 prior))

## JURISDICTION

For cases from **federal courts**:

**NOT APPLICABLE**

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was \_\_\_\_\_.

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. § \_\_\_\_\_.

For cases from **state courts**:

28 U.S.C. §2254(b)(1)(B)(ii), "Circumstances exist that render (state exhaustion) such process ineffective to protect the rights of applicant." Conspiracy.

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. § **2241(a)** and 28 U.S.C. §2254(b)(1)(B)(ii) and 28 U.S.C. §1651(a).



## CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

### CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS:

AMENDMENT I (CONSPIRACY, DEFAMATION)  
AMENDMENT IV (FALSE IMPRISONMENT/SEIZURE)  
AMENDMENT V (DUE PROCESS, FAIR TRIAL)  
AMENDMENT VI (COUNSEL, COMPLUSORY)  
AMENDMENT VII (JURY TRIAL)  
AMENDMENT VIII (CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT)  
AMENDMENT XIV (DUE PROCESS, EQUAL PROTECTION)

### FEDERAL STATUTES:

18 U.S.C. §1595 (HUMAN TRAFFICKING)  
18 U.S.C. §1961(a) (RICO ACT)  
18 U.S.C. §1341 (WIRE FRAUD)  
18 U.S.C. §1343 (MAIL FRAUD)  
18 U.S.C. §471 (FORGERY)  
28 U.S.C. §1651(a) (HABEAS CORPUS WRIT)  
28 U.S.C. §2241(a) & (b) (NO ADEQUATE REMEDY EXISTS)  
28 U.S.C. §2254(b)(1)(B)(ii), (CIRCUMSTANCES EXIST THAT RENDER SUCH PROCESS INEFF.)

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE  
& RULE 20.4(A) STATEMENT**

1. Since age 12, I have been diagnosed with a mental health disability, having been committed to Long Beach Neuropsychiatric Insitutie stemming from parental physical abuse, and have been intermittenly on medications since. Disabled Class.

2. Age 13, I was trafficked and groomed into an I.V. drug adict and child prostitute constituting childhood trauma and sexual abuse. Mitigating and contributive factors of crimes and defense of others syndrome.

---

3. Age 14, I was charged in a juvenile petition for Grand Theft Auto, which I did not commit (police reports), however, in a custom, Disabled Juvenile mental Health, admitted the petition. IAC, Conspiracy. Custom. Coercion. Sent to L.A. County Camp Minz for 42 weeks, further compromising my adolescent development with violence trauma.

4. Age 16, 1984, I was charged in a juvenile Petition for Cal. Penal Code (P.C.) §245(a)(2)), ADW W/ Firearm, (J260568) in Long Beach Court, whereupon, the facts (police reports) do not meet the elements (CalCrim 875), again, IAC, Coercion, Conspiracy. Custom., with "promises" to juvenile, in plea negotiations: "No future enhancements (P.C. §667), or Habitual Offender Act (P.C. §644 former), advised admitting juvenile petition." The facts are: 'in defense of other', and Brandishing Weapon (P.C. §417(a)) at most, a misdemeanor or wobler (P.C. §17(b)), and in 'defense of other', as lesser (CalCrim 983). IAC, Coercion. Conspiracy. Custom. Discrimination.

5. Age 21, 1989, I was charged with Drug Transportation (H&S §11378) and Possession for Sale (H&S §11377) (NA004426) Long Beach, hired private Counsel, Joseph Beason, who advised me to enter an open plea (LID) to allegations which resulted in a conviction of 2 crimes (P.C. §654 Stay) when elements of transportation not meeting facts (Police Reports) (CalCrim 2300). IAC. Coercion, Conspiracy. Custom. I served 1 year in L.A. County Jail and 3 years probatrion.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE  
& RULE 20.4(A) STATEMENT

6. On 1-5-1995, I was charged for Robbery (P.C. §211) against a man who ran up behind a minor child, just 16, and began to batter and assault minor. I came to minor's aid, and a melee ensued: 2 on: 1 fight, in liquor store parking lot. Man (victim) lost his ball cap and chain in altercation. No intent to rob prior or during force (fight). No asportation. Therefore, no robbery elements (Police reports). IAC. Coercion. Conspiracy. Custom. Was told 'No Defense', to plead guilty. 2 years in prison and a strike. (CALCRIM 1600). (NA022865)

7. On 3-15-2000, a warrant was issued for my arrest for incident that occurred on 1-17-2000, before Prop 21 came into effect on 3-8-2000. The felony complaint listed 5 counts alleging: (1) P.C. §288(c)(1); (2) P.C. §289(I); (3) P.C. §288A(B)(2); (4) P.C. §261.5(d); and (5) P.C. §422. PRIOR Convictions charged: [Note: the case in #5 above charging 2 crimes were some how split into 2 cases with different case numbers A043938 & NA004426, when this was one case occurring from one incident/arrest: (1) Poss For Sale (H&S §11377); and (2) Transporting (H&S §11378)]. This split of case numbers and different conviction dates is CUSTOM, CONSPIRACY, COERCION, IAC. This case (NA044292), filed on 3-15-2000, would later be illegally consolidated into NA049324, with case NA044414. (See: Appendix A at Exhibit A:2-1)

8. On 3-26-2000, I was arrested on 5 counts (above) in case number NA044292, with 2 prior prison term allegations. (APPENDIX 'A' AT EXHIBIT A-2)

9. On 3-8-2000, Prop 21 became the law codified at P.C. §667(b)-(i), listing ADW w/ Firearm a Strike for 3-Strike Alternative sentencing scheme (P.C. §245(a)(2)). Juvenile Adjudications are applicable to this Scheme. #J260568 (§245(a)(2)) prior adjudication did not apply to case number NA044292: 5 Counts. People v. James (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 1147 (Same Courthouse in Long Beach, James occurred on §245(a)(2)) decided 2 months before I entered plea Nolo Conteste. (APPENDIX "A" AT A-2)

10. On 3-26-2000, during the arrest/search, L.B.P.D. discovered 26 grams of heroin inside a jacket pocket in Mother's Apartment closet, and 2nd Felony Complaint

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE  
& RULE 20.4(A) STATEMENT**

was filed on 3-29-2000 (NA044414), Once Count of Poss. For Sale (H&S §11351).

This (1) Count could be plead as 3-Strikes case with fair notice occurring, however, in the conspiracy and custom I allege and contend, the Felony Complaint as filed (NA044414) alleges the Robbery occurring on 1-5-1995 twice as Violent Priors, and the District Attorney changed the case numbers slightly: NA033865 and NA022865 (~~Appendix A~~, at Exhibit A:1-1). ~~IAG on attorney for not clarifying and asking for amendment. Custom. Conspiracy. Fraud. Coercion.~~

11. On 12-19-2000, I was found incompetent to stand trial and sent to DMH Patton for 6 months (P.C. §1368). (APPENDIX "A", AT A:1-7 & A:2-8)

12. On 5-31-2001, I was found competent and Criminal Proceedings were reinstated, triggering the Speedy Trial statute (P.C. §859b), in both cases NA044414 and NA044292. (APPENDIX "A", AT A:1-9 & A:2-10)

13. On 6-14-2001, the charges were dismissed (P.C. §1385) for lack of witnesses on both cases, and I was ordered released on 'Own Recognizance', which never happened. Warrant? Detainer? Still seeking discovery on that one. This is where the Constitutional violations become egregious and the custom and conspiracy (civil and criminal) become Malicious Prosecution and False Imprisonment and Human Trafficking.

14. On 6-28-2001, Jodi B. Castano, D.D.A. of Los Angeles County, filed a Charging Information (P.C. §859b) consolidating the 2 cases (NA044414 and NA044292) illegally and without motion to court (P.C. §954/C.R.C., Rule 3.350), deliberately indifferently using fraud and misrepresentations (C.Gov. Code §822.2), to falsify charges that were statutorily innocent of committing P.C. §288(a) Lewd and Lascivious act on minor under 14 years of age, when the alleged victims, Shirley Sweeney and Suzie hart were 15 and 14, respectfully (judicial notice on Minute orders and D.O.B.)

Appendix 1 at Exhibit A:3-5), the Information signed under oath and certified to Superior Court when no preliminary probable cause hearing held in municipal or (APPENDIX "A", AT A:3-1)

STATEMENT OF THE CASE  
& RULE 20.4(A) STATEMENT

order by the magistrate judge and the evidence found to meet the probable cause burden to 'Bound' the case over to superior court. Ministerial duty and Mandatory to conform and comport with Due Process in certifying case to Superior Court. No discretionary decision making allowed. Malicious Prosecution & False Imprisonment.

15. On 7-9-2001, D.D.A. Jodi B. Castano, further filed 2 transcripts purporting to be the Preliminary hearing Transcripts held in NAO44414 and NAO44292, when none held. Certifying a Consolidated Charging Information not based on evidence shown at any Preliminary Hearing. Belton v. Superior Court, 19 Cal. App. 4th 1279. IAC Conspiracy. Custom. Coercion. Disabled Class. Discriminatory prosecution and Malicious Prosecution. (See Appendix 1 at Minute Orders of Case # NAO49324 at Exhibit A:3-1). U.S. CONST. AMEND. I, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, XIV VIOLATIONS.

16. On 7-12-2001, I was arraigned and pled 'not guilty' to the fraudulent Charging Information, before Hon. Richard Romero, (who was Judge on previous Drug case NAO04426.) This arraignment began the Jury Trial time of 1 Of 60 to trial. I also instructed D.P.D. Joe E. Gualano, not to waive any time for Jury Trial, yet time waivers appear on minute orders. Unknowingly. IAC. Conspiracy. Coercion. No Preliminary Probable Cause hearing held, and 10 day speedy trial violation by California's statute was violated (P.C. §859b). IAC when D.P.D. counsel Joe.E. Gualano did not make an Oral Motion to set aside the information based on several grounds (Fraud, Speedy Trial, Expost Facto, Due Process) based on the 10 day violation of P.C. §859b. P.C. §995 motion to set aside pursuant to P.C. §1385, would have created a Double dismissal bar to refileing a 3rd time. Conspiracy. IAC. Custom. Coercion. Due Process. Speedy Trial. However, the D.D.A. had preplanned this strategy anticipating a Double Dismissal bar (P.C. 1387) and to prevent a bar to 3rd refileing filed fraudulent charges, from wobbler (P.C. §288(c)(1)) to violent 'SuperStrike' felony for an exception to double dismissal bar (purview of P.C. §1387.1) of P.C. §288(a), L&L on child under 14. A one strike you're out charge of 15 to life. Then used

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE  
& RULE 20.4(A) STATEMENT**

threats and coercion to extract a illegal contract based on fraud plea deal from me (Gov. Code §814), that was deliberately indifferent to my constitutional rights and caused severe prejudice and injury. Preliminary Hearings purpose is to determine if probable cause is evident a crime was committed (P.C. §866(b)).

17. On 11-19-2001, after months of coercion and pressure by D.P.D. Counsel Joe E. Gualano, in conspiracy with D.D.A. Jodi B. Castano, in IAC, Constitutional Violations, custom, Threats of 200+ years exposure at trial loss with repeated assertions, "You have no defense to charges", "you will rot in prison", "mistake of age is not a defense"....I pled Nolo Contendere to the charges (that were false and fraud) for 10 years in prison, based on illegal fraudulent contract (Gov. Code §814; §822.2) whereupon the D.D.A. moved beyond prosecutorial role and was a witness when certifying and swearing oath the Charging information was accurate and based on Evidence Shown To Magistrate Judge (P.C. §735). Administrative and Misnisterial functions.

18. In December, 2001, I was shipped to CDCR where I would be forced to perform services and labor without pay pursuant to U.S. Const. Amend 13, in a scheme to falsely imprison me and human traffick me within the meaning of P.C. 236.1(a) and (h). CDCR took money sent to me and earned at low rate to satisfy restitution based on fraudulent contract that was illegal. I was raped, beat, pressured, abused, trafficked, forced labor, forced services, lost all family and friends, lost everything, due to being a child molestor of a "13 year old girls". Egregious and this trafficking is a continuous violation, where the same violence and abuse is occurring, due to stigma on sex offenders. Human Trafficking with violence by proxy with knowledge this occurs to sex offenders. While in P.V.S.P., I was further subjected to toxic environment Coccididmyocosis Valley Fever and became seriously ill.

Long term effects of this Valley Fever are seizures for life, headaches, joint pains, loss of life expectancy. Due to trauma of this, exacerbating mental illness, taking ;

STATEMENT OF THE CASE  
& RULE 20.4(A) STATEMENT

PSYCH medications Respirol and Zyprexa, that caused me to become type 2 diabetic, requiring me to be on insulin and medications for life. Damage and Injury.

This human trafficking was effectuated by Abuse of Process and Fraud (mail and wire), Federal Crimes. Depriving me of my own right to start a family or career.

19. The False Fraudulent charges of P.C. §288(a) L&L with Minor Under 14, were published to State D.O.J. sex offender registry in defamation and libel. The DOJ apparently kept that libel publication up for 2001 to 2012? Still waiting on discovery on that issue. Then the Federal Government published on SORNA in 2006 when that became law. FOIA has been sent for discovery on that. This is not Litigation privilege within meaning of Cal. Civil Code §47(b)(4), has no logical connection to the case. No immunities should lie on this issue under Gov. Code §821.6, especially when fraud is involved. (APPENDIX "E" & "F")

20. On 1-29-2003, Superior Court of Long Beach, Dep't 'E', Nunc Pro Tunc ("Clerical error" corrections- not "judicial error" corrections) was utilized to correct Abstract of Judgment, without notice or due process to withdraw plea or consult with counsel. IAC, Conspiracy, Coercion. Custom. HumanTrafficking. Slavery, by abuse of process. Egregious structural errors. DUE PROCESS: U.S. CONST. AMEND. V & XIV.

21. On 12-17-2007, after 7 years 8 months of actual custody time, I completed my 10 year prison sentence, not before being subjected to 2 different psych interviews to determine if I was an SVP eligible person for civil committment. Imagine? Trauma. Imagine if this were Alabama State with new castration laws or chemical castration requirements. Trauma. Released to Parole with sex offender registration requirements, ankle monitor GPS, Housing restrictions close to schools parks, not allow to social media, family abandonment. U.S. CONST. AMEND. I: FAMILIAL ASSOC.

22. During this parole period, I suffered discrimination by parole agents and had stigma of sex offender with me always. 3 parole violations of 12 months (3-25-2008); 8 months (8-20-2009); and 30 days (10-31-2011), maxing out the 4 year parole term. The second violation was based on special condition for Sex Offenders:

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

& RULE 20.4(A) STATEMENT

No Access to Internet or Computers. Total violation custody actual time: 21 months.

23. In 2001, Bank of America denied a fraud claim I presented to bank. I discontinued banking there and went to Washington Mutual, which was eventually bought by Chase Bank. I again experienced Check Fraud on my account in 2012, and presented a claim to Chase, which was denied with the assistance of automated robocall. I became angry, twice denied, and closed my Chase account and went to U.S. Bank, with

---

my SSI direct deposit. I began to criminally think of robbing banks, due to the Conspiracy I have been experiencing with Courts: NA049324 and Federal lawsuit on valley Fever 1:07-cv-01444-LJO-GSA. I could not bring a small claims action in Long Beach courthouse after the trauma I suffered there on NA049324, and be confident I would get justice. Psychological factors related to trauma. I decided in January 2013, to 'let it go' on banks, yet on 2-12-2013, when blood sugar was low, I lost cognitive function and blacked out robbed 2 banks on west Los Angeles (SA083379). I believed that the reason the banks denied my claims were due to criminal background checks and the P.C. §288(a) was there. with others.

24. On 2-12-2013, I robbed (P.C. §211) a bank and 40 minutes later I attempted to rob (P.C. §664/211) another bank, while in a hypoglycemic diabetic blackout. Cases: 2:15-cv-07827-DOC-AJW First Habeas; 2:23-cv-00745-DOC-JC & 9th Cir. 23-1006.

25. On 2-22-2013, I was arrested for the robbery offenses, however, the D.D.A. never pleaded or gave fair notice of the Prior Juvenile Adjudication as a Prior Conviction (P.C. §1170.1(e)) case #J260568, as 5 year enhancement or 3-Strike (P.C. §667(a)-(b)(i)), either on the Felony Complaint (municipal) or the Charging Information (Superior), and this Juvenile Adjudication was never certified or proven (by admission) to the court in bifurcated proceeding on priors. Therefore, waived and statute of limitation and double jeopardy. However, the prior was illegally used to enhance my punishment (P.C. §667(a)), in a second Abstract of



STATEMENT OF THE CASE  
& RULE 20.4(A) STATEMENT

Judgment, again with Nunc Pro Tunc (clerical or judicial), as the original Abstract showed the Plead Prior Prison Terms (P.C. §667.5(b)) for 5 years, but CDCR notified Court, I only had 4 Prior Prison Terms, and the Court changed the penal code from 667.5(b) to 667(a) to allow the extra year to stand at 65 to life. The Second Abstract was in error due to the Juvenile Adjudication not plead or certified to court as true. (SA083379)

26. On 2-3-2014, I was found guilty in jury trial of 2 counts (P.C. §§211 & 664/211) and the bifurcated trial on Priors occurred. The juvenile Adjudication (J260568) was never introduced or proven true. (SA083379). NO FAIR NOTICE §1170.1(e)

27. On 2-26-2014, I was sentenced as follows: 25 to life for P.C. §211 purview of P.C. §667(b)-(i); 25 to life for count 2, P.C. §664/211 purview of P.C. §667(b)-(i); 2 enhancements purview of P.C. 667(a) Nickel 5 Year priors for 10 years; and , 5 enhancements purview of P.C. §667.5(b) 1 year prior prison terms; for 5 more years...total of 65 years to life indeterminate. (SA083379)

28. On 5-16-2014, the Superior Court of California, Airport Courthouse Los Angeles County in a Nunc Pro Tunc order modified the Abstract of judgment, changing the statute on P.C. §667.5(b) to §667(a) enhancement. which incorporated Juvenile Adjudication that was not plead or certified to Court, and Illegal as well. People V. West, (1984) 154 Cal App 3d 100, 108. Juvenile adjudications are not. California Constitution Art. I, §28(f). Only convictions, not adjudications can be used to enhance pursuant to P.C. 667(a), West, 154 Cal. App. 3d at 108. (Appendix 1 at Exhibit a:7-19 & A:7-20) Changing enhancement from §667.5(b) to §667(a). (SA083379)

29. In mid July 2024, I began a journey of compiling documents to prepare for an "application for recall and resentencing" pursuant to A.B. 600 and new statute P.C. §1172.1. During the process, I noticed the anomaly in Abstract of Judgment SA083379 LAX case. (Banks). The illegal §667(a) 5 year enhancement, which I remembered was never introduced. (SA083379)

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE  
& RULE 20.4(A) STATEMENT**

(Exh. A:7-1)

30. On 7-19-2024, I filed a Petition For Writ of Error Corum Vobis, attacking the illegal enhancement and Judgment. Shortly there after, the Cal. Court of Appeal Second Appellate District, Division Seven, denied my Writ of Error Corum Vobis with post card denial. However, by law, I was required to serve the Superior Court the Petition for Corum Vobis, and on 9-30-2024, Hon. Lauren Weis-Birnstein, Dep't 82, issued the Writ converted to Habeas Petition. (Appendix 1 at Exhibit A:6-1 to 4). The way the Court of Appeal denied the Corum Vobis, leads me to believe he will not get a fair and impartial hearing on any action filed in that Court, when a simple case of illegal enhancement that was not introduced and facts that are judicially noticable court records, that "Adequate Relief Cannot Be Had In Any Other Court (State Or Federal)," purview of 28 U.S.C. §2241(a), was wanting review by this Court. I cannot get past the Court of Appeal State level, therefore, circumstances exist that render the state exhaustion process ineffective to protect the rights of applicant. 28 U.S.C. §2254(b)(1)(B)(ii).

31. To support the contention in ¶30 above, the following court hinderances have occurred:

(a) On 4-30-2023, I filed a Motion for Discovery pursuant to P.C. §1054.9 that was denied arbitrarily. I attempted to appeal the denial and that was denied. (Appendix 1 at Exhibit A:7-25 to A:7-29). SA083379. Remittitur o appeal denial was sent to Superior court. Could not get Discovery on this Fraud and illegal enhancement.

(b) I wrote appellate attorney to try and secure discovery on issues, and he indicated he has no records of mine (Appendix 1 at Exhibits A:7-30 to A:7-42). I wrote the Court of Appeals to attempt to secure records. Denied. Once I wrote and they would reply with, "that case number is a name change, documents destroyed"...etc.(See A:7-30 to A:7-42) Also, see the Custom

STATEMENT OF THE CASE  
& RULE 20.4(A) STATEMENT

OF THE BLATANT DUE PROCESS VIOLATIONS BY District Attorney's Office on  
Charging Informations/Felony Complaints charging me with the same fraud P.C.  
§288(a) that was Nunc Pro Tunc changed on 2-19-2003 (NA049324) on the bank  
robbery case (SA083379) (at Appendix 1 at Exhibit D-1), alleged to strike me  
out. Not even a strike (serious or violent), P.C. §288(c)(1), is a wobbler  
felony or misdemeanor. (P.C. §17(b)). Conspiracy. Custom. No Adequate  
Relief.

32. On 9-24-2024, I received the Minute Orders, not from Superior court of Long  
Beach, whom I had attempted to obtain these documents for months, but from Superior  
Court of California, Stanley Mosk Courthouse. These Minute Orders of NA049324  
show the egregious constitutional and structural violations, conspiracy, coercion,  
custom, IAC, that led to a False imprisonment and Malicious prosecution based on  
fraud. (Appendix 1 at A:3-1 to A:3-7). No Preliminary Hearing, No Transcript  
of Preliminary filed in Superior, No Magistrates Judge's order of probable cause,  
illegal consolidation of charges with ex post facto on P.C. §245(a)(2) alleging  
as 3-Strikes as to not just: NA044414 count 1; but all other 5 counts: NA044292,  
consolidated at NA049324.<sup>4</sup> Speedy trial violations. All amounting to Human  
Trafficking of a person related to the 10th Chief Justice, and that human Traffic-  
king is a continual violation. Bombshell. (P.C. §236.1(a)-(h)). The maximum  
exposure on Banks without NA049324, is 9 years. I have 12 years actual time  
served. (see below). With 12 years actual and 66% credit earning, I am 9 years  
overdue for release. Yet, the Superior Court cannot grant me Bail/O.R. Hearing  
pursuant to P.C. §1476. No Adequate Remedy Exists to protect my rights.  
Conspiracy; Coercion ( to attempt to persuade me to negotiation some other deal).  
A District Attorney has not even been appointed yet on either Habeas Petitions  
(Below). (SA083379 BAIL HEARING ON 2-5-2025)  
1: SEE PENAL CODE §735

STATEMENT OF THE CASE  
& RULE 20.4(A) STATEMENT

33. On 9-26-2024, I constructively filed an Original Petition for Habeas Corpus. On 10-10-2024, I constructively filed a supplement to Petition for Habeas Corpus, On 11-7-2024, I constructively filed an Amended Petition for Habeas Corpus, contending IAC on 11-19-2001 plea of Nolo Contendere, based on fraud, duress, coercion, conspiracy and human trafficking (NA049324) in Superior Court of Calif., County of Los Angeles, Long Beach Courthouse (L.B.)

34. On 12-2-2024, Hon. Chet Taylor, Dep't S23, LB Courthouse, in NA049324 (#33 above) issued an order: Respondent to file Informal Response ("IR") (Cal. Rules Court, Rule 4.551 (b)(2)) due in 45 days (apparently sua sponte extension of 30 days); Appointment of Counsel from IDCO conflict panel; and Court date of 1-23-2025 for status conference. This petition's facts (attached appendix "A") are all court records, judicially noticable with law being substantive and constitutional, equating to meeting the highest burden: "Beyond Reasonable Doubt" as to violations that were constitutionally egregious and structural. Yet, Hon. Taylor's request for Informal briefing, and not the next higher level of Order To Show Cause as required by CRC Rule 4.551(c)(1)-(2). Prima Facie burden well met. Conspiracy. No adequate remedy exists. 28 U.S.C. §§2241(a) & 2254(b)(1)(B)(ii). [Note: the clerk did not serve the Order (12-2-2024) upon Petitioner in NA049324, until 1-8-2025, 37 days after the order, and no time to object to sua sponte extension of time] (See Appendix "B").

35. Further, the due date on the Informal Response ("IR") in NA049324 LB case was 1-16-2025, (45 days), as of today (2-26-2025), no IR has been filed, or D.A. even assigned to my Petitions response. No adequate remedy exists to protect my rights. Already 4 years or 9 years overdue for release, depending on P.C. §667(a) enhancement being stricken purview of P.C. §1385(c)(2), mitigating factors: 5 years old and/or childhood trauma factors contributive to offense. robbery (P.C. §211) in case NA022865, defense of minor. (See Below)

STATEMENT OF THE CASE  
& RULE 20.4(A) STATEMENT

36. I had 2 attorneys appointed (NA049324 & SA083379) by the IDCO conflict panel: Paul Richard Peters; and Allen Weinberg (LB). Due to prevailing law on "No self-representation on post-conviction proceedings", my advocates have joined the conspiracy fray. Or Incompetent? As follows:

(a) Attorneys (both) refusing to provide requested discovery. I had to file a 2nd Motion for Discovery (P.C. §1054.9) on 2-13-2025 (constructively) <sup>Appendix "D"</sup>

(b) Attorneys refusing to accept my calls (occasional) or reply to correspondence as to discovery/motions requests, by mail.

(c) Attorneys refusing to file motions: Recuse D.A.'s Office (P.C. §1424); <sup>(Appendix "E")</sup> Bail/O.R. Hearing (P.C. §1476); Discriminatory Prosecution Murgia Motion; Or Self-representation requests. On 1-22-2025, I called Mr. Peters 3-way, as refused to accept free prison call, and had discussion about why refused to file P.C. §1476 Bail/O.R. Motion when I am 4 or 9 years overdue for release, "no such thing for habeas", was his response. I had sent him requests with Statute §1476 clearly listing precedent and facts of overdue release.

This phone call was recorded on my PID # 11685412 CDCR # AT6172 occurred at 1-22-2025 at 2:00- 2:15 pm. Incompetence or Conspiracy. Priscilla Williams C.S.P. Corcoran's Litigation Coordinator can facilitate the evidence of call for any court proceedings. Finally Peters filed a bare bones Bail Motion.

(d) Due to ongoing conspiracy and covert Custom IAC and Human Trafficking, I filed a Marsden Motion for Substitute Counsel or Self-'Representation.

(Appendix "C")

37. On 11-18-2024, I filed (constructively) a Habeas Corpus Petition in Long Beach Superior, which I also served upon: LAX Superior; Attorney General's Office (Sacramento); and Mr. Peters, all whom received their copies. However, the Long Beach Superior Court never filed or responded to the petition (procedural errors)

STATEMENT OF THE CASE  
& RULE 20.4(A) STATEMENT

This Petition attacks the Juvenile Adjudication (J260568) P.C. §245(a)(2) ADW w/ Firearm case on contentions of IAC and Plea (admission) promises breached.

This Petition was never filed, yet other received. Conspiracy. Custom. Human Trafficking. No Adequate Remedy. Cant get past Superior Court stage of proceedings. 90 days later, on 2-17-2025, I sent a letter of inquiry to Long Beach Superior as to Petition J260568. On 2-20-2025, I resent the same petition.

28 U.S.C. §2254(b)(1) (B)(ii)"Circumstances exist that render such process (state exhaustion) ineffective to protect the right's of applicant" that is the case with Petitioner/Applicant Solvey here today. 28 U.S.C. §2241(a) No Adequate remedy exists in state courts (Due to risk mitigation and damage control on Human Trafficking (P.C. 236.1(a)-(h)) by abuse of process and fraud by malicious prosecution)) Of a relative?

38. The illegal fraudulent contract (Judgment) will be vacated, placing me "Status quo Ante", position prior to entering plea. Due to lack of due process, Speedy trial, No Preliminary Hearing held within 10 days (or 60 for good cause) purview of P.C. §859b, a simple oral motion to Set Aside the Information (P.C. §995), remedy for no Preliminary Hearing, (or Writ of Mandate if §995 denied), would be a dismissal by Statute (P.C. §1385) triggering the Double Dismissal Bar to refiling 3rd time. Barron v. Superior Court. 90 Cal. App. 5th 628, P.C. §1387. The reason D.D.A. committed this Civil and Criminal Deliberate Indifference Fraud was to avoid this §1387 bar to refiling. Alleging a Superstrike purview of P.C. §1387.1, in Fraud. Conviction erased. Expungement. NA049324 will disappear, leaving me in the punishment range as a 2nd striker, rather than 3rd, facing doubled-up term with exposure as follows:

Count 1 (SA083379): P.C. §211: 2-3-5, mid presumptive doubled= 6 years

Count 2 (SA083379), P.C. §664/211: 1-1.5-2.5, midterm presumptive doubled=3years

Enhancement 1 (SA083379) P.C. §667(a): 5 years, if not stricken (1385(C))= 5 years  
(NA022865) ↗

STATEMENT OF THE CASE  
& RULE 20.4(A) STATEMENT

For a total of 14 years, with enhancement, and 9 years without, maximum, exposure. The 5 year enhancement should be stricken pursuant to P.C. §1385(c)(2) mitigating factors 5 year old prior or childhood trauma contributing to crime, of robbery protecting a 16 year old minor being attacked (NA022865), leaving a 9 year maximum exposure on resentencing. I have 12 years actual custody time, with 66% credit good time (2 for 1) adds 6 years to that actual 12 for 18 years. I am way overdue for release. Attorneys are not listening to my reasoning, conspiracy and IAC highest. Mr Peters, who filed the P.C. §1476 bail motion that was denied (filed 1-29-2025, after phone call; and denied in Court 2-5-2025), has been relieved from case due to Marsden Motion, and Mr. Weinberg, who is more deficient in performance than Peters, has been assigned to both Long Beach (NA049324) and LAX Airport (SA083379), who says he will not even entertain the filing of Motion for Bail/O.R. (see Appendix "E"). U.S. CONST AMEND: I. CONSPIRACY; IAC VI

39. The reason for the current Conspiracy is: Risk Mitigation of the Egregious Constitutional Errors by the officers of court from 6-14-2001 to 2-21-2003 Nunc Pro Tunc correction, and an attempt to coerce me into some new Plea Deal by confinement in Prison with Sex Charge as leverage to entice inmates to further coerce or use violence to intimidate and duress me into signing a new plea deal to those charges. The conspiracy does not reach only Respondent, but the IDCO and Public Defender's office. who are advocating for me...to rot in a human trafficking scheme. Their tactic is, if they cannot get a deal on the NA049324 case (new Plea), Respondent/Court is intent on using the Uncharged, not pleaded, No fair Notice Prior Conviction of ADW w/ Firearm, (J260568), which is also against Precedent: People v. Anderson, 9 Cal. 5th 946 HN 1 & HN2. This conspiracy will fail!!

I, Stanley Solvey, Declare these above facts in Statement of the Case and the attached Appendices (exhibits and Statement of facts therein) as true and correct under penalty of perjury.

EXECUTED BY: Stanley A. Solvey 2-26-2025 IN CORCORAN, CALIF.

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE  
& RULE 20.4(A) STATEMENT**

40. Lastly, the reason I am pursuing this Petition for Habeas Corpus with the U.S Supreme court is that I cannot get past this State Level of review, and the Litigation I do file in Federal Court is handled without regard for the Law or clearly established Federal Law. This Judicial protection by the Federal Court is empowering these tactics of Medical Torture and Human Trafficking.

Read the cases filed in litigations to determine is there validity and merit to my litigation: *DUE PROCESS VIOLATION: U.S. CONST AMENDS: V & XIV  
I.A.C. AMEND VI*

1:19-cv-01444-JLT-GSA on appeal to 9th Cir. #24-251 Solvey v. Gates

24CV003452 Superior Court Sacramento County Removed 2:24-cv-01756-DC-JDP

1:23-cv-00682-KES-CDB pending screening for 2 years now on FAC filed on 10-23-2023

2:23-cv-00745-DOC-JC sent to 9th for Successive Habeas Proceedings #23-1006

I may be perceiving the law in a biased manner, however, I have researched the applicable laws, and this is judicial protection of human trafficking and medical torture, that an asylum seeker would get citizenship for persecution and torture (medically). Really? Soon as this is over, I will do the same, become a refugee from this country my relatives have build. Even the U.S. Supreme Court (Uncle Taft) and the Oval Office (Taft). I am even related to Grover Cleveland if that makes the Minority Blue 3 feel sympathy. Am I delusional here?

41. Petitioner further contends that his Second Federal Habeas Corpus Petition, raised new evidence of source of P.C. §26(4) Legally Innocent unconsciousness defense caused not by Rohypnol medications, as presented in jury trial, but rather, "Hypoglycemia" (Low Blood Sugar) caused by diabetes. Petitioner had recently been diagnosed with diabetes when bank robberies occurred, did not know the symptoms of hypoglycemia, or that that condition could cause blackouts and cognitive impairment. Petitioner determined these facts by medical diagnosis occurring on JANUARY 2020 by PVSP Prison Doctor Dr. Wayne Ulit. Habeas followed.

*9TH CIRCUIT'S DENIAL OF SUCCESSIVE APPLICATION WAS ABUSE.  
#23-1006.*



## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

The reasons for granting this Original Petition submitted pursuant to Rule 20.4 and 28 U.S.C. §§2241(a), 2254(b)(1)(B)(ii), 1651(a), is clear...Petitioner faces severe prejudice and impartiality producing damage and injury of incarceration many years beyond his maximum exposure punishment upon the "eventual" adjudication of these Habeas Petitions: NA049324; SA083379; J260568. This injury of false imprisonment on fraudulent charges, to coerce an illegal contract plea on 11-19-2001, amounts to human trafficking, by way of fraud and abuse of process. The facts presented to the Long Beach court are court records, judicially noticeable, not some declaration on innocence, with a partial favorable termination having occurred on 2-21-2003 (NA049324). Chiaverini v. City of Napoleon, #23-50 (this Court). How can respondent rebut judicially noticeable facts that show structural and egregious constitutional errors and violations, that are both criminal and civil conspiracy? Hon. Chet Tayloy gives the Respondent 'due process' to rebut and do damage control, when an Order to Show Cause was required on showing of prima facie (CRC, Rule 4.551(c)(1)-(2)). Court should have granted the writ outright (P.C. §1476), or granted Petitioner's Prayer for Relief in Bail Hearing or O.R. release. Conspiracy.

Petitioner has adequately demonstrated direct evidence of a conspiracy is in full force right now. The State Superior Courts (LB & LAX) are conspiring with Respondents' Attorneys, the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office, along with the 2 appointed Defense Attorneys (1 now), from Independent Defense Counsel Office (IDCO) to further deprive Petitioner of substantial rights (constitutional and substantive) in an attempt to further coerce him to accept their: deals; terms; representations; advocacy; procedures; customs; and Human Trafficking criminal enterprise which is RICO violations and criminal and civil conspiracy, with both state and federal laws being violated in the process. Wire and Mail Fraud. Perjury. Forgery. and other crimes as determined by Kush Patel.

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Petitioner cannot get a fair proceeding before the State Court in L.A. County or California for that matter, in this conspiratorial attempt to conduct 'damage control', at the expense of Petitioner's: freedom; family; health; wellbeing; finances; mental health and reputation. How does Petitioner recover from such persecution and medical torture, by government? Renunciation of citizenship? 8 U.S.C. §1481? Refugee 'stateless' status? Asylum? What conspiracy does the California State Government have for Petitioner upon his release, and his imminent civil rights lawsuit and his Political Republican Activism thereafter? RNC here I come. This threatens political careers, when I notified Gov. Newsom of this situation last month in request for clemency/commutation. Should Petitioner be paranoid?

Simple terms, there was a conspiracy from 6-14-2001 to 2-21-2003 (Nunc Pro Tunc) in Long Beach Superior Court, Dep't E, that resulted in Chief Justice Taft's distant Nephew being trafficked, in a conspiracy that is continuing today. For over 12 years of prison time, 4 years of ankle monitor parole, struck-out on 2 bank robberies that occurred when background checks pegged a fraudster (criminal) and denied claims. Family gone. Financial position gone. Friends gone. Then, the LAX court DDA alleges the same fraud (P.C. §288(a)) as an enhancement that killed any chance of a reasonable plea negotiation between Defendant and People. 25 to life was the only offer. Conspiracy. Custom. Coerced to pled Nolo Contendere on fraud and misrepresentations by our own Government, illegal contract (Gov. Code §814-that erases any immunities for fraud in contracts, including §821.6), to traffick a disabled mentally challenged person, who just returned from Dep't Mental Health, Patton State Hospital from Incompetency proceedings. No mistake in pleading. Exhibit (a)!!!

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Egregious conduct that is abhorrant. That conspiracy continues today, across time, to enforce the terms of an illegal plea contract, through a 2nd coercive negotiation based on the 1st illegal contract made in fraud. Aggregated Fraud. The curent lack of due process on due dates, procedure, representation, motions, rulings is indicative of a further and widening conspiracy, a continuous violation of human trafficking laws, both state and federal.

The prosecutor or D.A.'s Office cannot simply aver that the Charging Information was not fraud, but a mistake (P.C. §1404), that did/did not affect the substantial rights of defendant. When the first 2 cases were dismissed (NA044414 & NA044292) on 6-14-2001 pursuant to P.C. §1385, the prosecutor only had one more chance at prosecution, purview of P.C. §1387, and decided to charge an exception to this double dismissal bar charging instead a crime Petitioner was statutorily incapable of committing (P.C. §288(a)), to avoid the bar and give an 3rd refiling (P.C. §1387.1) chance, D.D.A. Jodi B. Castano, exercised her non-discretionary function (Ministerial and Administrative) to fraudulently aver under oath, that the information shown at 2 Preliminary Hearing probable cause shown Defendant has committed offenses charged, when no Preliminary hearings were held on either 2 cases, certify this Charging Information to the Superior Court to Hold Defendant to answer (bound over) to Superior Court, then on 7-9-2001, file 2 sets of fake preliminary hearing reproter's transcripts or clerk's transcripts and the false magistrates order indorsed finding 'probable cause' evidence in Prelim. Then, illegally, without leave of the court in written motion, consolidate the 2 cases into 1 charging Information alleging 6 counts, all felonies with allegations of 2 prior stikes (serious/violent) felonies that was unconstitutional by Ex Post Facto, exposing Petitioner to over 200~~8~~ years to life in prison. Petitioner was bound over to Superior court on Consolidated (P.C. §735) fraudulent Informa-tion, not by mistake (P.C. §1404), but by Malicious and deliberate indifference to Petitioner's constitutional rights.

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

The D.A.'s Office in Long Beach Court all knew that Prop 21 had come into effect on 3-8-2000, making P.C. §245(a)(2) ADW W/ FIREARM a strikeable offense, and what that Ex Post Facto clause meant to them. People v. James (8-27-2001), 91 Cal. App. 4th 1147, as this case stemmed from an illegal judgment based in Long Beach Courthouse, before one of their Superior Court Judges, Hon. Joan Comparet-Cassani. Yet, the D.D.A. Jodi B. Castano, decided to charge the J260568 Juvenile Adjudication for P.C. §245(a)(2) as a Serious Prior felony on all 6 counts. No mistake. Then on 7-9-2001, DDA Castano filed fictitious transcripts to Superior Court on 2 cases that Prelims were never even held on. Mistake? Committing abuse of Process, to effectuate deliberate indifference to Petitioner's numerous Stat and federal Constitutional rights, and commit the civil and criminal conspiracy of human trafficking with Petitioner's Public Defender, D.P.D. Joe E. Gualano, who engaged in this conspiracy to traffic a human being, when a simple P.C. §995 motion made orally would have gotten the case dismissed a second time (Double Dismissal bar), and Petitioner/Defendant would be released. Not only this, but the 6-14-2001 order by Magistrate judge: Release on Own Recognizance, that never happened!!! What kind of documents were filed to keep the L.A. County Sheriff's Dep't County Jail from releasing Peitioner/Defendant that night??? No mistake, just Human trafficking, P.C. §236.1(a) & (h) by legal coercion and abuse of process.

Damage control of their "Comrades" is in full effect: judges; attorneys; Prosecutors; Clerks: etc. There is a conspiracy to further use false imprisonment (struck out on fraud prior P.C. §422 was count 6 on Consolidated NA049324) when Petitioner should have been granted OR or Bail, to coerce and in duress to force plea negotiations to absolve this human Trafficking. Politicians too? Attorney General? Petitioner sent the Governor a Clemency based on this Petition. Petitioner

REASON FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

~~further sent to~~ the Department Of Justice, Attorney General's Office California public Records Requests seeking to get discovery on how and when the "Exhibit (a)" was published and used to ruin Petitioner's Family, Reputation, Financial Prospects, and social life, not not mention the violence to occurred to Petitioner over the last 25 years based on Sex Offender stigma and attitudes. Clemency went unanswered. Or is it being answered with more weight behind the damage control? Records requests were met with same damage control, out-of-scope responses and evasive responses, when requests were specific, Policy, Procedures, practices, customs, directives, and employees. (See Appendix "F"). Specifically asked/requested for the Actual Abstracts the DOJ used to publish Petitioner's Fraudulent charges on the Sex Offender Registry. Who transmitted them? Evasive Responses. Conspiracy. "Damage Control." No adequate remedy exists for or cannot be had in any other court, warranting review by this court. *U.S. CONST. AMEND VIOLATED: I, II, V, VI, VIII, XIV*

Petitioner set out to get discovery on his Priors with a Motion for Discovery in April 30, 2023, in attempt to understand the anomaly in Abstract on SA083379. The Courts and Clerks subsequent have repeatedly denied Petitioner documents: Appendix A:7-1 to A:7-42, Petitioner sought documents. one instance, the Clerk replied the case records were destroyed, were a "name change" and not available. (See: A:7-40).. NO AVAILABLE REMEDY EXISTS IN STATE COURT.

Petitioner contends that he cannot get a fair and impartial adjudication of his Petitions, especially when the Court is not filing some and not providing due process on others. This process is not allowing the Just, speedy, and impartial adjudication of his contentions, purview of 28 U.S.C. §§2241(a), 2254(b)(1)(B)(ii). which are exceptions to the State-Federal district court exhaustion rules, if shown to exist. This is a conspiracy, this is egregious constitutional violations fitting squarely into legislatures/congresses' intent on jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court on Habeas Petitions when relief cannot be had in inferior courts.

Accordingly, based on the judicially noticable facts giving rise to this criminal and civil conspiracy to deliberately indifferently deprive Petitioner of many of his U.S. Constitutional rights, amounting to Human Trafficking, the continuous violations of his due process rights and incarceration as coercion to relinquish more of his Constitutional Rights, Petitioner's Fair Trial rights to impartial tribunal is severely compromised, and his ability to speedily exhaust these claims in State Court are rendered ineffective, requiring the U.S. Supreme Court's highest authority to protect Petitioner's rights. Wherefore, Petitioner prays this Court exercise Its authority to entertain this Petition pursuant to 28 USC §2241(a).  
**CONST. RIGHTS VIOLATED: AMEND I; IV; V; VII; VIII; XIV**  
**CONCLUSION**

The petition for a writ of habeas corpus should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley Howard Solvey

Date: 2-27-2025

STANLEY HOWARD SOLWEY  
PETITIONER IN PRO PER

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

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

STANLEY H. SOLVEY — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

VS.

JEFFERY MACOMBER *et al.* — RESPONDENT(S)

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

I, STANLEY H. SOLVEY, do swear or declare that on this date, FEBURARY 27, 2025, as required by Supreme Court Rule 29 I have served the enclosed MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS* and PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS on each party to the above proceeding or that party's counsel, and on every other person required to be served, by depositing an envelope containing the above documents in the United States mail properly addressed to each of them and with first-class postage prepaid, or by delivery to a third-party commercial carrier for delivery within 3 calendar days.

The names and addresses of those served are as follows:

<u>U.S. SUPREME COURT</u>	<u>CALIF. DEPT OF JUSTICE</u>
<u>1 FIRST STREET N.E.</u>	<u>ATTORNEY GENERALS OFFICE</u>
<u>WASHINGTON, DC 20543</u>	<u>1300 'I' STREET</u>
	<u>P.O. BOX 944255</u>
	<u>SACRAMENTO, CA. 94244-2550</u>

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on FEBURARY 27, 2025

Stanley H. Solvey  
(Signature)