

No. 24-713

ORIGINAL

FILED

DEC 18 2024

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

In the Supreme Court of the United States

BRADLEY E. KING, ROBIN KING AND SARAH
KING,

Petitioners,

vs.

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Respondent(s).

On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari To The Florida
Third District Court of Appeals

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Bradley King
Robin King
Sarah King
137 South Courtenay Pkwy,
Unit 626
Merritt Island, FL 32952
MyJehovah777@mail.com

Pro Se

RECEIVED

DEC 26 2024

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

In Monroe County, FL, Judge Luis Garcia of the Sixteenth Circuit issued a denial order refusing to hear Petitioners and made a "sweeping" pardon of multiple parties from their legal duties and escape from damages after Mr. Bradley King, the Petitioner charged by the State, was fully acquitted. This "cover up" by the State Attorney's Office, was in conjunction with the Petitioners' attorney, and an arresting officer dismissed by Internal Affairs from the Police Force, who accommodated a wealthy drug runner in the FL Keys from Miami, against Mr. King, after he "blew the whistle" on the drug runner and his Enterprises. This implicates important constitutional and statutory concerns arising from 1st Amendment Freedom of Speech, Landlord-Tenant Law, government overreach, and rights for damages in "Stand Your Ground" cases, such as for "whistle blowers". Nevertheless, the Third District Court of Appeals (D.C.A.) in Miami incorrectly denied jurisdiction. This was timely reported to the Florida Supreme Court, which gave a No. SC2024-1479, but denied discretionary review the same day Petitioners filed, stating, "No motion for rehearing or reinstatement will be entertained by the Court", rendering Petitioners unable to submit their brief within the normally allotted ten days. This stifling of Petitioners' Freedom of Speech, avoiding damages and due process will continue, absent court intervention.

The questions presented are:

1. Whether the Supreme Court should compel the Third D.C.A. to overturn Judge Garcia's Order filed

Questions Presented

July 8, 2024, that it be disannulled, and that an evidentiary hearing date be reset, so that Petitioners will have a chance to be heard in their entirety in the Sixteenth Circuit and/or Third D.C.A. ("3rd D.C.A.").

2. Whether Judge Garcia using fraudulent documents in order to incorrectly deny that the State has imposed damages on Mr. King, and to pardon just about everybody involved concerning damages in his July 8, 2024 order, violates State laws entitling Petitioners to damages.

3. Whether the State, Sixteenth Circuit Court, and Petitioners' attorney were in misconduct to take exactly two full years (rather than 120 days) after the unlawful arrest (November 31, 2021) of Mr. King, in order to accomplish Mr. King's trial and full acquittal for the same and/or closely related conduct that underlies the criminal and misdemeanour charges.

4. Whether the state and Sixteenth Circuit were in misconduct to attempt to run out certain statutes of limitations for Petitioners to file for malicious prosecution, especially after Mr. King's arresting officer was found to be doing favours for a group of Landlords: a well-known, wealthy drug runner, his wife, and adult daughter (the "Chico Enterprises"), who all three were found falsely, maliciously alleging heinous crimes against Mr. King in court.

Questions Presented

5. Whether Mr. King should be able to charge the State for not receiving a speedy trial, and for nearly two or more unnecessary additional years of such continuing damages on Mr. King and his family after the case and all charges should have been dropped completely and closed as soon as the unlawful arresting officer was dismissed, known to the State.
6. Whether police officers' and any others' video and audio devices' recordings from the date of the arrest, November 31, 2021, are still within the statute(s) of limitations for Mr. King to use in court for purposes regarding damages.
7. Whether abused tenants acting in good faith should have right to warrants for the arrest of harassing Landlords.
8. Whether the State Attorney Office of Monroe County is using fully acquitted cases, such as Mr. King's, to indemnify other men's crimes, specifically, for such as the case number, 20-CF-59-AP of another man, Juan Gonzalez, issued wrongly to Mr. King, filed on legal record January 9, 2023, as a drop to county court from the No. 21-CF-310-A-P, months after Mr. King's arresting officer was dismissed (in or about November 2022). The corrected number used for later acquittal was 2023-MM-59-AP.
9. Whether Mr. King has a right to claim damages against the State for this wrong 20-CF-59-AP felony

Questions Presented

issuance showing on Mr. King's record for about 2 years now, inhibiting his ability to get jobs; and whether it should be erased by court order from Mr. King's record, which was clean for 62 years with security-clearances and a NASA engineering job offer.

10. Whether Mr. King has a right to claim damages for his cases, which upon dismissal of the arresting officer, charges were not fully dropped due to the unlawful arrest, nor was Mr. King notified by anyone (the State, the Judges, nor Mr. King's own hired Attorney) of the dismissal of the arresting officer, nor was Mr. King's case dropped completely, nor was he fully acquitted in the Sixteenth Circuit *until exactly* 2 full years after the unlawful arrest.

11. Whether Mr. King's prior attorney David Hutchison should be reprimanded by the Bar, and/or disbarred, and also recompense for damages to Mr. King, for malpractice by playing along with the State, and dirty cop to accommodate and protect a well-known, wealthy, malicious drug runner and the rest of "Chico Enterprises" for nearly three years from lawful justice.

12. Whether prior convicted-felon drug runners and their Enterprises should be able to continue personally leasing property as landlords to American families without first informing tenants of their felonious background, since landlords require background checks of tenants.

**PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING AND RELATED
PROCEEDINGS**

The parties to the proceeding below are as follows:

Petitioners are Bradley E. King ("Mr. King"), Robin King, and Sarah King. The respondent is the State of Florida ("The State"): Florida Attorney General.

The related proceedings below are:

In the Sixteenth Circuit Court, Monroe County, FL:

1. *Charla Cae Chico and Bradley Eugene King*, 2021-DR-423-P (Order of TROs Dismissal, March 7, 2022)
2. *State of Florida v. Bradley King*, No.2021-CF-310-AP (State dropped charge January 9, 2023, giving incorrect No. 20-CF-59-AP)
3. *State of Florida v. Bradley King*, Correct No. 2023-MM-59-AP (Immunity order, Oct.31, 2023)
4. *Bradley E. King v. State of Florida*, No. 21-CF-310-A-P (order issued May 7, 2024)
5. *Bradley E. King v. State of Florida*, 21-CF-310-AP / 20-CF-59-AP (order issued July 8, 2024)

In the Third District Court of Appeals in Miami, FL:

6. *Bradley E. King v. State of Florida*, No. 3D2024-1359 (order issued Sept. 18, 2024)

In the Florida Supreme Court:

7. *Bradley E. King v. State of Florida*, No. SC2024-1479 (order dated Oct. 17, 2024)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
QUESTIONS PRESENTED	i
PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING AND RELATED PROCEEDINGS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
TABLE OF APPENDICES	ix
TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES	xi
OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	1
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	2
INTRODUCTION	2
I. The lower courts' orders are facially invalid	3
A. The 3rd D.C.A. incorrectly denied jurisdiction to hear the case and the Florida Supreme Court incorrectly denied review and conflict with the trial court	3
B. Mr. King's Freedom of Speech and 14th Amendment have been imposed upon unconstitutionally	8

Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
STATEMENT	8
I. Background	8
II. Proceedings Below	9
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION	10
I. The lower courts' opinions raise important, novel questions of law that the Court should resolve	10
A. The State issued the wrong case No., indemnifying another man's felonies	10
B. Long after the dirty cop was dismissed from the Force, all charges on Mr. King were dropped per FL Statute 776.031, then Mr. King was informed of the officer's dismissal and that it was beyond statutes of limitations for Mr. King to pursue certain damages inflicted by the State, Petitioner's attorney and the Chicos.	13
C. Judge Garcia incorrectly denied Mr. King's damage claims per an order, using fraud- ulent docs, refusing hearing, all after Judge Garcia's order of 'lack of jurisdiction'	15
ENDING REASONS	17

Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
I. There Is a Significant Possibility of Inadequate Expungement due to State-inflicted damage.	
II. There is a likelihood of irreparable harm absent Court intervention.	
III. Absent the overturn of the Third DCA's order denying hearing Mr. King regarding Judge Garcia's July 8 th Order, Mr. King and his family may be required to bear the burdens of damages never to be recompensed.	
IV. State Attorney Offices continuing in said conduct, will inflict grave injuries/damages on thousands of American families.	
V. The balancing of equities strongly favors Court intervention.	
VI. This case presents an appropriate vehicle to resolve these lofty issues.	
CONCLUSION	18

TABLE OF APPENDICES

	<i>Page</i>
APPENDIX A – OPINION OF THE THIRD DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS (“3RD D.C.A.”), FILED SEPT. 18, 2024	1a
APPENDIX B – OPINION OF THE FLORIDA SUPREME COURT, FILED OCT. 17, 2024	3a
APPENDIX C – ORDER DENYING MOTION TO COMPEL IN THE 16TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT (“CIR.”) IN MONROE COUNTY, FILED JULY 8, 2024	6a
APPENDIX D – ORDER OF HEARING CANCELLATION IN THE 16TH JUDICIAL CIR., FILED MAY 7, 2024	16a
APPENDIX E – ORDER OF 16TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT FOR IMMUNITY GRANTED OCTOBER 31, 2023 AND CERTIFIED, DECEMBER 15, 2023	18a
APPENDIX F – ORDER OF THE 16TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT FOR DISMISSAL OF RESTRAINING ORDERS, FILED MARCH 7, 2022 (Hearing transcript available upon request)	25a

TABLE OF APPENDICES

	<i>PAGE</i>
APPENDIX G – NOTICE OF TRANSFER AND AMENDED INFORMATION CF ERROR IN MONROE COUNTY STATE ATTORNEY OFFICE, FILED JANUARY 9, 2023	29a
APPENDIX H – CERTIFIED DISPOSITION (RED- STAMPED, ALTERED AND INITIALLED BY CLERK ON JAN. 29, 2024) AMENDED INFORMATION CF ERROR IN MONROE COUNTY STATE ATTORNEY OFFICE, DATED JAN. 9, 2023	34a
APPENDIX I – CHARGES INFORMATION BY STATE ATTORNEY DENNIS WARD, FILED DEC. 20, 2021	37a
APPENDIX J – MOTION OF FLORIDA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE IN THE 3RD D.C.A., FILED AUGUST 14, 2024	40a
APPENDIX K – NOTICE TO INVOKE DISCRETIONARY JURISDICTION OF THE FLORIDA SUPREME COURT, FILED OCT. 17, 2024	43a
APPENDIX L – NOTICE GIVEN NOV. 21, 2022 OF EVIDENTIARY HEARING SET FOR JAN. 9, 2023 IN THE 16TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT	48a

TABLE OF APPENDICES

	<i>PAGE</i>
APPENDIX M – MOTION TO COMPEL (FIRST PAGE ALTERED) IN THE 16TH JUDICIAL CIR., DATED JUNE 17, 2024	50a
APPENDIX N – UNALTERED MOTION TO COMPEL IN THE 16TH JUDICIAL CIR., FILED JUNE 17, 2024	51a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

<i>Hillman v. Maretta</i> , 569 U.S. 483, 489 (2013)	7
<i>Justin Hopson vs. New Jersey State Police</i> , (2007 Case #1:03-CV-5817)	10
<i>King v. Chico and Chico Enterprises</i> , 16th Cir., Monroe County, FL, 2021-2023 ...	4,13,14
<i>Massachusetts v. Env't Prot. Agency</i> , 549 U.S. 497, 505-06 (2007)	7

U.S. CONSTITUTION, STATUTES, RULES

28 U.S.C. § 1257(a)	1
U.S. Const. First Amendment	1
U.S. Sup. R. P. 10(a)	6
U.S. Sup. R. P. 14(b)(iii)	4
Fla. Stat. § 776.031	2
Fla. Const. art. IV, § 1(c)	2
Ch. 83 - Florida Landlord & Tenant Act & Laws	2-3

Cited Authorities

Page

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Gerald Kogan & Robert Craig Waters, <i>The Operation & Jurisdiction of the Florida Supreme Court</i> , 18 Nova L. Rev. 1151 (1994).....	2, 6
Anstead, Kogan, Hall & Waters, <i>The Operation & Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of Florida</i> , Reprinted from 29 Nova L. Rev. 431 (2005).....	2, 6
McGimsey and Littleton, <i>Expert Q&A on Seeking or Opposing Certiorari in US Supreme Court</i>	7
Michelle Maxwell, Internal Affairs Office	14
Monroe County Sherriff Rick Ramsey and Captain Derek Paul	14

Petitioner respectfully prays a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgement of the Third District Court of Appeal in Miami, FL for the Florida Supreme Court, in regards to a 16th Judicial Circuit Court order.

OPINIONS BELOW

In these cases from the state courts, none have been found publically “published” or “reported”:

The district court’s opinion denying to hear the motion in *King v. State*, case No. 3D2024-1359, on Sept. 18, 2024, is reproduced at Appendix (“App.”) A, at 1a-2a. The Florida Supreme Court’s opinion affirms a like denial to hear the motion per a final order in *King v. State*, case No. SC2024-1479, dated Oct. 17, 2024, reproduced at App. B, at 3a-5a.

JURISDICTION

The date on which the FL Third District Court made a decision on Petitioners’ case was September 18, 2024 (App. A). The timely appeal for a hearing in the 16th Circuit or 3rd D.C.A. was therewith denied. A timely Notice to Invoke Discretionary Review along with the D.C.A order was timely filed within 30 days in the Florida Supreme Court, dated October 17, 2024. Just hours after, the Florida Supreme court dismissed the notice without allowing the normally allotted 10 days within which to submit a brief, contrary to Fla. R. App. P. 9.120(d), nor should the court have issued an opinion that early. The opinion/final order is at App. B. Petitioners now bring this petition this 85th day after the 3rd D.C.A, Sept. 18, 2024, decision. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C.§1257(a).

Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved

The constitutional and statutory provisions involved in this case are: U.S. Const. 1st, 5th, 6th and 14th Amendments and the Due Process Clauses; Fla. Const. art. IV, § 1(c); Fla. R. App. P. 9.030(a)(2)(a)(i) and (v); Fla. R. App. P. 9.120; F.S. §776.031; Chapter 83 - Florida Landlord and Tenant Act and Laws.

INTRODUCTION

The rule of law comprised within this Court's binding precedent and our U.S. Constitution's Freedom of Speech and upholding of due process laws preserve uprightly ordered liberty and protection for all Americans. Petitioners' case involves important limits of constitutional, statutory, and precedential concerns, now, after Mr. King's recent victory of full acquittal in a landmark 'Stand Your Ground' case, *State v. King* (No. 2023-MM-59-AP), that was dropped from criminal to misdemeanour charges in the Sixteenth Circuit Court, Monroe County, FL. The case was based on the Florida Supreme Court's coinciding landmark decision in *Falco v. State*, 407 So.2d 203 (Fla. 1981) and the legislative intent described by the House and Senate committee notes regarding F.S. §776.031. This case was thrown out of court, but not before a very long, hard, unlawful mess was made for Petitioners' (having acted in good faith) to now recoup from mentally, physically, financially and diplomatically, seeking from this Court lawful

restitution and to report unjust and malicious process, that due process may be vindicated in Florida, so that thousands of other Americans may not suffer as we Petitioners have by corrupt Landlords who refuse to abide by Chapter 83 - Florida Landlord and Tenant Laws, and by associated local government officials dealing with wealthy drug runners from the Miami and Monroe County areas. As our 14th Amendment of the U.S. Const. goes, "nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

Review of a state-court judgment is sought, lest such methods should become more prevalent in the other states as well, so please see the below matter of an order dated September 18, 2024 in the Third District Court of Appeals ("3rd D.C.A.") in Miami-Dade County, FL:

I. The lower courts' orders are facially invalid.

C. The 3rd D.C.A. incorrectly denied jurisdiction to hear the case and the Florida Supreme Court incorrectly denied review, and conflict with the trial court.

The 3rd D.C.A. incorrectly denied jurisdiction to hear the case motion set forth by Petitioners, claiming it was pre-trial when, on the contrary, Petitioners filed a thorough appeal with exhibits to the 3rd D.C.A. as in the context below (*i.e.* in the "Statement" through to "Conclusion"), showing that the charges on Mr. King were dropped to county court on January 9, 2023, and trial took place October 4, 2023, and per court order in

the 16th Cir. dated October 31, 2023, he was granted immunity, attaining his full acquittal completed (with no rebuttal from the State for 30 days thereafter) by November 30, 2024. This was *exactly* two years after the unlawful arrest of Mr. King on November 30, 2021 by Officer Nicholis Whiteman found to be doing favours for a group of Landlords: a well-known, wealthy drug runner, his wife, and adult daughter (comprising the "Chico Enterprises"), who all three were found falsely, maliciously alleging heinous crimes in court against their tenant, Mr. King for 'Standing his Ground' against them three inside his own home, in presence of Mr. King's daughter, Sarah, as a witness, while the Landlords video-recorded their own illegal activities including their theft of personal property lawfully in Mr. King's possession inside his home.

The 3rd D.C.A.'s order stating "Lack of Jurisdiction" due to the case being "pre-trial" conflicts with the 16th Circuit trial court's actual proceedings exhibited to the 3rd D.C.A, in that there was indeed a trial for this case. The 3rd D.C.A.'s order also conflicts with Judge Garcia's new order dated July 8, 2024, in which he made an order with a 'sweeping' pardon of all liable parties for damages, using Mr. King's old case number he had just a few weeks prior struck down stating, "This court no longer retains jurisdiction", per his court order dated May 7, 2024, thus, reneging on this first claim as described in detail below.

Mr. King's case numbers "directly related" in accordance with U.S. Sup. R. P. 14(b)(iii) are detailed in the below "Statement" and "Reasons", including: (a)

2021-DR-423-P; (b) 2021-CF-310-AP; (c) 20-CF-59-AP; (d) 2023-MM-59-AP. The major issues are that:

(1) Mr. King did not receive a speedy trial in accordance with Florida due process nor with the U.S. Const. 6th Amendment, but rather more than eight months with each of case numbers (b) and (d) above, while the case number (c) issue is still unresolved.

With violation of the speedy trial rule, any charge should have been dismissed sooner than they were.

(2) Mr. King was unlawfully arrested November 30, 2021, and Internal Affairs investigated and dismissed Mr. King's arresting officer in around November 2022, only found out by Mr. King after *exactly two years* (November 2023) when he was fully acquitted, causing certain statutes of limitations for malicious prosecution terms to be run out. Instead of all charges being automatically dropped in November 2022 due to the unlawful arresting officer, the State decided to 'charge on' and added a new case number (c, above) 20-CF-59-AP belonging to a completely separate man Juan Gonzalez, to Mr. King's case on January 9, 2023, which should have already had full acquittal. Facially, this method would be useful by the State to indemnify Gonzalez, who was convicted of high crimes.

(3) Such actions made outside of due process by the lower courts, State Attorney's Office, collaborating with private attorneys, local wealthy drug runners and others in Monroe County, if continued, along with unlawful arrests, will inflict upon innocent Americans dire physical, mental, financial and diplomatic harm. If this apparent loophole in Florida spreads

nationwide, many more than just the Petitioners will be harmed if such methods are left unchecked.

Monroe County's current "Case Summary" from the Records Clerk as of December 9, 2024 for Mr. King, lists only some of the said related case numbers and a few items. One relevant item "Notice given Nov. 21, 2022 of the Evidentiary Hearing set for Jan. 9, 2023 in the 16th Judicial Cir." is reproduced at App. L, at 48a. This shows the trial that was set for January 9, 2023, before the charges were dropped from Criminal to County Court, so the trial was fulfilled at the County level, instead, more than eight months later due to intentional neglect by Petitioners' attorney playing along with the State to run out certain statutes of limitations regarding the unlawful arrest and malicious prosecution by the wealthy drug runner and his Enterprises. Such actions are facially being sanctioned by the 3rd D.C.A. by passing off the case for a "Lack of Jurisdiction" due to Petitioners' motion being received "pre-trial". On top of this, the 3rd D.C.A.'s response was very vague and not specifying statutes within their order when trial did in fact take place as was exhibited to them, contrary to that court's claim agreeing with the State Attorney General's Office whose motion with the detailed statutes which the Florida Supreme Court sought is reproduced at App. J, at 40a-42a in this petition.

The 3rd D.C.A. (in regards to U.S. Sup. R. P. 10(a)) "has so far departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings, or sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of this Court's supervisory power".

A timely Notice to Invoke Discretionary Review along with the 3rd D.C.A order was timely filed within 30 days in the FL Supreme Court, dated Oct. 17, 2024. Just hours afterwards, the court dismissed the notice without allowing the normally allotted 10 days to submit a brief, contrary to Fla. R. App. P. 9.120(d), nor should the court have issued an opinion that early. The opinion/final order is at Appendix B, at 3a below. In Fla. Const. art. IV, § 1(c), the constitution provides that the opinion must be rendered "not earlier than ten days from the filing and docketing of the request, unless in [the Court's] judgment the delay would cause public injury." There was no notation from the FL Supreme Court regarding "public injury", and rather wrote "No motion for rehearing or reinstatement will be entertained by the Court", signed solely by the Clerk, rendering Petitioners unable to submit a timely brief.

Thus, these three lower courts' (16th Cir., 3rd D.C.A. and FL Supreme) orders are facially invalid and conflicting. (For example, *Hillman v. Maretta*, 569 U.S. 483, 489 (2013) (stating that the Court granted certiorari "to resolve a conflict among the state and federal courts"))).

However, if this court somehow sees these three courts' orders as not conflicting, please consider the great public importance of the proceedings below and their unruly implications foreseen to only expand in government overreach, absent court intervention. (For example, *Massachusetts v. Env't Prot. Agency*, 549 U.S. 497, 505-06 (2007) (stating that, notwithstanding the absence of any conflicting decisions, "the unusual

importance of the underlying issue" persuaded the Court to grant certiorari).)

D. Mr. King's Freedom of Speech and 14th Amendment have been imposed upon unconstitutionally.

Not allowing Mr. King's unique scenario of this petition to be heard in the 16th Cir., 3rd D.C.A. nor FL Supreme courts, despite his full acquittal, as Petitioners have been "whistle blowers" on the said actions working outside of due process, is clearly imposing upon Petitioners' Constitutional, 1st Amendment Freedom of Speech. Petitioners seek this court's intervention that they may be allotted the privilege of being heard in court, and pursue lawful damages restitution from the State or other parties and alert this Court of said misconduct that they may further protect the American people.

Similar to the full statement and list of stated points/reasons through to the conclusion below was submitted to the 3rd D.C.A. by "Appellants", now changed to "Petitioners" along with the appendices' designations.

STATEMENT

I. Background

Petitioners Bradley E. King, Pro-Se, and family, are victims of an easily-proven cover-up within the judicial system, who filed twice, in the Sixteenth Judicial Circuit of Monroe County in 2024, essentially the same Motion to Compel, for damages: first filed on

May 1st where the presiding Judge struck down that Motion by a Court Order dated May 7, 2024 stating, "this Court no longer retains jurisdiction" of Case # 2021-CF-00310-AP; and the second time filed on June 17th where Petitioners this time used a different Case # 20-CF-59-AP and style given to the Petitioners by the State on January 9, 2023. The L.T. Judge chose to pardon Petitioners prior attorney of two years and eight months worth of damages spoken of in both motions, in his Order dated July 8, 2024 by changing, on his own, the Petitioners' Case # 20-CF-59-AP to his preferred Case # 2021-CF-00310-AP, and style to "Defendant", Oddly enough, the Judge just got done striking down his chosen Case number and Style by his own Order dated May 7, 2024. Further, the Judge unknowing used fraudulent documents as exhibits in his Order dated July 8, 2024 to justify his actions. Petitioners pray for this Court to compel the 3rd D.C.A. to overturn the Court Order dated July 8, 2024 and reset the evidentiary hearing that was set for July 30, 2024 "National Whistle Blower Day." Said hearing Petitioners pray will have a chance to be heard in its entirety.

II. Proceedings Below.

In Petitioners' Defence, we state:

1. The Petitioners filed on May 1, 2024 a Motion to Compel, Case # 2021CF310AP, and was set for Hearing on June 4, 2024.
2. The Petitioners' Motion filed on May 1, 2024 was cancelled on May 7th by the Honourable Luis Garcia of the L.T. Courts with the Judge stating "this

Court no longer retains jurisdiction" over Case # 44-2021-CF-310-AP a.k.a. Case # 44-2021-CF-000310-00-0APK (please see App. D).

3. On June 17, 2024, Petitioners Bradley, Robin and Sarah King filed essentially the same Motion to Compel using Case # 20-CF-59-AP (of which page 'one' was 'doctored up' not by Petitioners at App. M, at 40a), and using a similar Case known as *Hopson v. State of New Jersey* Case #1:03-CV-5817 as a similar case to reference.

4. The Petitioners presented themselves as Petitioners in both above-mentioned Motions to Compel.

5. Both Motions filed on May 1st and June 17th describe Plantation Key's well-known, wealthy "Drug Runner"; a "Dirty Cop"; a State Prosecutor; the Monroe County Courts, and Petitioners' prior Attorney, Mr. Dave Hutchison, Founder and C.E.O. of the firm known as Hutchison and Tubiana, who used Case # 2021CF310AP and Case # 20-CF-59-AP to their advantage to this very day (please see paragraphs #1 through #100 of App. N, 41a-52a).

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

I. The lower courts' opinions raise important, novel questions of law that the Court should resolve

A. The State issued the wrong case No. (20-CF-59-AP), indemnifying another man's felonies.

6. Both Motions to Compel filed described the Attorneys and divisions of the Judicial system who refused to disclose to the Petitioners the facts behind the November 30, 2021 unlawful arrest of Petitioner Bradley King, and the arresting Officer Sergeant Nicholis Whiteman, dismissal from the Police Force when found out to be a "Dirty Cop" thus all case history should have been dismissed at that time, rather, the State Attorney and the L.T. Courts chose to, 'charge on' with the below case numbers to this Day:

Case #1: 2021-DR-423-P (dismissed on March 7, 2022 by Judge Garcia's Court Order that day).

Case #2: 2021-CF-00310-AP (Dropped by the State on January 9, 2023 due to the dismissal of the "Dirty Cop", but reopened by Honorable Luis Garcia in July 2024). a.k.a. # 2021-CF-310-AP, a.k.a. # 21-CF-310-AP , a.k.a. # 44-2021-CF-310-AP , a.k.a. # 44-2021-CF-000310-00-0APK (shortened variations noted above).

Case #3: 20-CF-59-AP (State Attorney's (CF) Amended Information error dated and doc stamped by the Clerk of Courts twice, once on January 9, 2023 and again on January 29, 2024), a.k.a. # 2020-CF-00059-AP (shortened variation noted above).

Case #4: 2023-MM-59-AP (Immunity Motion granted by Judge Hamilton for Petitioner's full acquittal).

7. The Petitioners filed on June 17, 2024, essentially, the same Motion to Compel as Petitioners filed on May 1st, instead under the CF error Case Number 20-CF-59-AP given to the Petitioner by the

State on January 9, 2023 (please see App. G, at 29a-33a, and App. N, at 51a-77a).

8. Petitioners' June 17, 2024 Motion to Compel with the CF error Case Number was scheduled by the Judge's Judicial Assistant to be heard by Zoom on July 30, 2024, at 10:30 a.m. (please see App. C, at 6a-15a).

9. The above-mentioned CF error Case Number 20-CF-59-AP given to the Petitioner, Bradley King, by Monroe County State Attorney's office in the second page of the Notice of Transfer and Information doc, filing Number 164337523, E-filed on 1/9/2023, is, in fact, part of the Damages spoken of in both Motions to Compel.

10. The crime of that CF error Case Number # 20-CF-59-AP given to the Petitioner, in itself, and with other factors, caused the Petitioners to have lost their level of security developed within the government and international relations, and are in-part, considered damages that the Petitioners' prior Attorney, Mr. Dave Hutchison, Esquire, was paid to care for, but in the end, refused. Unfortunately, that prior Attorney on February 21, 2024 chose to tell the Petitioners to "Go to somebody else" (please see paragraphs 5 – 23, 28 – 35, 62 – 67, and 76 – 100 of the motion, App. N).

11. The facts behind the CF error Case Number 20-CF-59-AP, and how it was used by the State Prosecutors and the L.T. Courts, are easily proven by additional documentation that the Courts have yet to see, but would have been made privy to if said Motion to Compel's Evidentiary Hearing scheduled for

July 30, 2024 was not denied (please see paragraphs 19 – 26, 36 – 49, and paragraph 53 of App. N).

12. The State, the Courts and even Petitioners' Attorney left the Petitioners in the dark concerning the "Dirty Cop's unlawful arrest and dismissal on or about November, 2022, Case # 2021CF310AP a.k.a. Case # 442021CF000310000APK. At that time, all parties should have informed the Petitioners of the unlawful arrest, and dismissal of the "Dirty Cop", rather they all chose not to, and continued charging on to this day (please see App. N, at 51a-77a, paragraphs 1-4, 10-14, 25, and 50-53).

13. Both State and Petitioners' Attorneys, dragging their feet in open court, were seen to be so obvious that the Honorable Sharon Hamilton stated more than once, "Keep Mr. King's case moving forward", which seemed to have no effect (please see paragraphs 54 – 79 of App. N).

B. Long after the dirty cop was dismissed from the Force, all charges on Mr. King were dropped per FL Statute 776.031, then Mr. King was informed of the officer's dismissal and that it was beyond statutes of limitations for Mr. King to pursue certain damages inflicted by the State, Petitioner's attorney and the Chicos.

14. The heroes and reasons for Damages found in the CF error Case Number both Motions to Compel filed by the Petitioners speak of in depth and bravery found in The Monroe County Sheriff's Department, who diligently found the facts of the Petitioners' Case disturbing, and why the Petitioner, Bradley King, was

unlawfully arrested and jailed on November 30, 2021. It was they who decided to give the matter over to Internal Affairs (please see App. N, at 51a-77a paragraphs 12, 19, and 36 – 49).

15. Sergeant Nicholis Whiteman of the Monroe County Sheriff's Department was found to be a "Dirty Cop". His involvement with the wealthy Drug Runner, and the unlawful arrest of the Petitioner Bradley King on November 30, 2021, along with other heinous acts caused Sergeant Nicholis Whiteman to be given an ultimatum to resign, or, as the Internal Affairs' Agent, Michelle Maxwell, Esquire, put it "I would have fired him" (please see App. N, paragraphs 12, 19 – 21, and 36 – 46).

16. This above-mentioned fact, along with the fact that all parties involved kept the Petitioners 'in the dark' of this unlawful arrest, and dismissal of the "Dirty Cop", and what had become of Case # 44-2021-CF-310-AP a.k.a. 442021CF000310000APK, continued on for twelve (12) full months, prosecuting the Petitioners with a case that was dismissed and clearly dropped in 2022, further incriminating the Petitioner Bradley King with another man's felony Case Number 20-CF-59-AP issued by the State Attorney on January 9, 2023 (please see paragraphs 12, 25 – 28 , 50 – 54, 80–84, 91–93 of App. N, at 51a-77a).

17. Petitioners, made aware of the above-mentioned facts on November 21, 2023 by the Plantation Key's Captain of the Monroe County Sheriff's Department, Derek Paul, have now every reason to ask for damages, and to show that the deliberate intentions of the State Prosecutors and

Petitioners' prior Attorney was to run out the Statute of Limitations surrounding the Police camcorders, audio and video footage before a suit concerning malicious prosecution and damage charges could be filed (please see paragraphs 43 – 45, and 54 – 100 of App. N, at 51a-77a).

18. The November 30, 2021 unlawful arrest of the Petitioner, Bradley King, and the facts brought forth in this Petition, as well as other factors described below, serves as reason why this is so important to be personally presented to the 3rd D.C.A.

C. Judge Garcia incorrectly denies Mr. King's damage claims per an order, using fraudulent documents, refusing hearing, all after Judge Garcia's order of 'lack of jurisdiction'.

19. Three more points to consider as to why the L.T. Order dated July 8, 2024 sent to the Petitioners in three different ways should be overturned. (Please see App. C, at 6a-15a.)

1. The Honorable Luis Garcia chose, without permission of the Petitioners, to switch out Case Number and Style of Petitioners' June 17th Motion to Compel (App. N) to a Case Number and Style that he himself struck down by Court Order just weeks prior (App. C, at 6a-15a, App. D, at 16a-17a, an App. M, at 50a). This 'doctoring up' of the Judge's new Case Number and Style that the Judge used in his Order dated July 8, 2024 did cripple Petitioners' Motion to Compel right for damages.

2. The Honorable Luis Garcia unknowingly produced fraudulent documents in the Court Order dated July 8, 2024 and should be seen for what they are and not to be 'candy-coated' (Please see App. C).

3. The L.T. Judge changed both Case Number and Style of his Court Order dated July 8, 2024, despite Petitioners' efforts to promote June 17th's Motion Case Number and Style in a different manner for the purposes of damages that rightfully belonging to the Petitioners, but denied by the L.T. Judge who 'doctored up' said June 17th Motion within his Court Order dated July 8, 2024, which was sent once again on July 29, 2024 via email to Petitioners.

20. The question as to why the Honorable Luis Garcia had in an unorthodox manner chosen to add fraudulent Documents as his exhibits concerning his July 8, 2024 Order when Denying Petitioners' Motion to Compel is in question, and can only be construed that the L.T. Judge wanted this matter to come before the 3rd D.C.A.

21. This much should be enough to overturn the Honorable Luis Garcia's Order Denying the Evidentiary Hearing concerning the Motion to Compel filed on June 17, 2024, but there is more.

22. The above-mentioned documents which are dated January 9th, 2024 and signed by the Assistant State Attorney, Mr. Trey Evans, and those entered in as exhibits by the L.T. Judge's Order dated July 8, 2024 are fraudulent. The Petitioners are respectfully requesting the opportunity to personally present this case to the 3rd D.C.A. The Petitioners are supremely

confident that we can give clear convincing proof of said fraud.

23. The Court Order dated July 8, 2024, if not challenged, will provide a way to succeed for the State and prior Attorneys, who played a role in dragging their feet purposefully and neglectfully for two full years, while working outside of what is known as a "timely manner". This, combined with their hope to have gotten away with the running out of certain Statutes of Limitations concerning Police Cam, audio, and records of this clearly malicious prosecution, has yet to be recognized.

There seems to be a paradox: Petitioners' Motion to Compel filed on May 1, 2024, Case Number 2021CF310AP was struck down with prejudice by the L.T. Judge on May 7, 2024 due to the Courts not retaining jurisdiction of said case. Oddly enough, on June 17, 2024, when Petitioners filed essentially the same Motion to Compel, and using the CF error Case Number mentioned in that June 2024 Motion, a conflict of interest was found within the L.T. Judicial system. Namely, the Judge who chose to take that Jurisdictional Number and Style that he just finished striking down, and used it to his own advantage as his new Case Number and Style used in his Court Order dated July 8, 2024, despite his prior Order in May 2024, stating that his Court no longer retains Jurisdiction over said Case Number. The Judge proceeds on by rendering a closed ruling with an opinion on July 8th, cancelling the Evidentiary Hearing that was set for July 30, 2024 ("National Whistle Blower's Day"), but not before pardoning just about everybody involved concerning damages that

Petitioners have a right to. The Honorable Luis Garcia continues on by unknowingly adding fraudulent documents of which the Petitioners can provide in person clear and convincing proof are fraudulent. I would like to quote Law, but this is an Honorable L.T. Judge of whose position I respect, so Petitioners pray that those of the Third District Court of Appeal see the destruction caused by the L.T. Court Order dated July 8, 2024, and consider overturning it due to a lack of Jurisdiction, but if that Court Order Case # 442021CF000310000APK is seen to somehow have retained jurisdiction when clearly Judge Garcia states in his May 7th Court Order that his court does not retain Jurisdiction of said Case Number, then please consider overturning the Pardoning of those involved in what is close to three years of damages found in the CF error and other areas of Petitioners' June 17th Motion to Compel, and allow Petitioners to reschedule the evidentiary hearing denied by the L.T. Court Order. God bless all of those considering the Petitioners' respectful request.

The Petitioner Bradley King Pro-se and family request to personally present this case before the 3rd D.C.A. or the court deemed appropriate.

ENDING REASONS

- I. There Is a Significant Possibility of Inadequate Expungement due to State-inflicted damage.
- II. There is a likelihood of irreparable harm absent Court intervention.

- III. Absent the overturn of the Third DCA's order denying hearing Mr. King regarding Judge Garcia's July 8th Order, Mr. King and his family
- IV. may be required to bear the burdens of damages never to be recompensed.
- V. State Attorney Offices continuing in said conduct, will inflict grave injuries/damages on thousands of American families.
- VI. The balancing of equities strongly favors Court intervention.
- VII. This case presents an appropriate vehicle to resolve these lofty issues.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Bradley King
Robin King
Sarah King
137 South Courtenay Pkwy,
Unit 626
Merritt Island, FL 32952
MyJehovah777@mail.com

Pro Se