

24-7207
NO.

ORIGINAL

IN The
Supreme Court of The United States

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

FEB 28 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN RE: Willie C. Simpson - Petitioner

ON Petition For writ of HABEAS CORPUS

28 U.S.C. 2254 petition for writ of HABEAS CORPUS

Willie C. Simpson
NAME

WISCONSIN Secure Program Facility P.O. Box 1000
ADDRESS

Boscobel, WI. 53805
City State Zip Code

608-375-5656
Phone

28 U.S.C. 2254 petition for writ of HABEAS CORPUS PAGE - 2
Supreme Court of The United States

A. [Questions]

1. IS THE STATE CUSTODY UNDER THE SUSPENSION OF PRIVILEGE TO HABEAS CORPUS RELEASE UNTIL INDIGENT PETITIONER PAY A 1,500 DOLLAR FILING BAR FEE TO CHALLENGE THE CONVICTION CASE 1996CF965778 IN VIOLATION OF U.S. CONST. ARTICLE I SEC. 9 CL. 2 SUSPENSION CLAUSE?
2. IS THE STATE CUSTODY UNDER THE SUSPENSION OF PRIVILEGE TO HABEAS CORPUS RELEASE UNTIL INDIGENT PETITIONER PAY A 1,500 DOLLAR FILING BAR FEE TO CHALLENGE THE CONVICTION CASE 99CF4849, IN VIOLATION OF U.S. CONST. ARTICLE I SEC. 9 CL. 2 SUSPENSION CLAUSE?
3. IS THE STATE CUSTODY UNDER THE SUSPENSION OF PRIVILEGE TO HABEAS CORPUS RELEASE UNTIL INDIGENT PETITIONER PAY A 1,500 DOLLAR FILING BAR FEE TO CHALLENGE THE CONVICTION CASE 11CF123, IN VIOLATION OF U.S. CONST. ARTICLE I SEC. 9 CL. 2 SUPREMACY CLAUSE?
4. IS THE STATE CUSTODY UNDER THE SUSPENSION OF PRIVILEGE TO HABEAS CORPUS RELEASE UNTIL INDIGENT PETITIONER PAY A 1,500 DOLLAR FILING BAR FEE TO CHALLENGE THE CONVICTION CASE 11CF220, IN VIOLATION OF U.S. CONST. ARTICLE I SEC. 9 CL. 2 SUPREMACY CLAUSE?
5. IS THE STATE CUSTODY UNDER THE SUSPENSION OF PRIVILEGE TO HABEAS CORPUS RELEASE UNTIL INDIGENT PETITIONER PAY A 1,500 DOLLAR FILING BAR FEE TO CHALLENGE THE CONVICTION CASE 12CF066, IN VIOLATION OF U.S. CONST. ARTICLE I SEC. 9 CL. 2 SUPREMACY CLAUSE?

28 USC 2254 petition For writ OF HABEAS corpus page - 3
Supreme Court OF The United States

B. [statement OF THE CLAIMS]

1. The state custody under the suspension OF privilege TO HABEAS corpus release until indigent petitioner pay A 1,500 Dollar Filing BAR Fee TO CHALLENGE THE CONVICTION CASE 1996 CF 965778, VIOLATES THE U.S. CONST. ARTICLE 1 SEC. 9 CL. 2 SUSPENSION CLAUSE.
2. The state custody under the suspension OF privilege TO HABEAS corpus release until indigent petitioner pay A 1,500 Dollar Filing BAR Fee TO CHALLENGE THE CONVICTION CASE 99CF4849, VIOLATES THE U.S. CONST. ARTICLE 1 SEC 9 CL. 2 SUSPENSION CLAUSE.
3. The state custody under the suspension OF privilege TO HABEAS corpus release until indigent petitioner pay A 1,500 Dollar Filing BAR Fee TO CHALLENGE THE CONVICTION CASE 11CF123, VIOLATES THE U.S. CONST. ARTICLE 1 SEC 9 CL. 2 SUSPENSION CLAUSE
4. The state custody under the suspension OF privilege TO HABEAS corpus release until indigent petitioner pay A 1,500 Dollar Filing BAR Fee TO CHALLENGE THE CONVICTION CASE 11CF220, VIOLATES THE U.S. CONST. ARTICLE 1 SEC 9 CL. 2 SUPREMACY CLAUSE.
5. The state custody under the suspension OF privilege TO HABEAS corpus release until indigent petitioner pay A 1,500 Dollar Filing BAR Fee TO CHALLENGE THE CONVICTION CASE 12CF0666, VIOLATES THE U.S. CONST. ARTICLE 1 SEC 9 CL. 2 SUPREMACY CLAUSE.

28 USC 2254 petition for writ of HABEAS corpus page - 4
Supreme Court of The United States

C. [List of parties]

1. Petitioner Willie C. Simpson is a citizen of The United States, prisoner of The State of Wisconsin Department of Corrections Located at Wisconsin Secure Program Facility, P.O. Box 1000, Boscobel, WI. 53805.

2. Respondents Paula Stoldt and Peter J. Jaeger are citizens of The United States, Acting Wardens' Located at Wisconsin Secure Program Facility P.O. Box 1000 Boscobel, WI. 53805

D. [Related cases]

The claims raised in this petition for writ of HABEAS corpus are in relation to the decision of The U.S. Supreme Court interpretation of Article I sec. 9 cl. 2 suspension clause constitutional rule that the privilege of writ of HABEAS corpus may not be suspended based upon a prisoner inability to pay fees or cost of filing announced in:

Smith v. Bennett 365 U.S. 708, 709 (1961):

We hold that to interpose any financial consideration between an indigent prisoner of the state and his exercise of state right to sue for his liberty is to deny that prisoner equal protection:

Smith v. Bennett 365 U.S. at 712:

While HABEAS corpus may of course be found to be a civil action for procedural purposes, it does not follow that its availability in testing the states right to detain an indigent prisoner may be subject to the payment of a filing fee. ... HABEAS corpus considered by the founders as the highest

28 USC 2254 petition For writ of HABEAS corpus page - 3
Supreme Court of The United States

[Related cases continued]

SAFEGUARD OF LIBERTY, it WAS WRITTEN INTO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES THAT ITS PRIVILEGE SHALL NOT BE SUSPENDED, UNLESS WHEN IN CASES OF REBELLION OR INVASION THE PUBLIC SAFETY MAY REQUIRE IT, ARTICLE I SEC. 9 :

Smith v. Bennett 365 U.S. AT 713 :

WE REPEAT WHAT HAS BEEN SO TRULY SAID OF THE FEDERAL WRIT; THERE IS NO HIGHER DUTY THAN TO MAINTAIN IT UNIMPAIRED AND UNSUSPENDED SAVE ONLY IN THE CASES SPECIFIED IN OUR CONSTITUTION, WHEN AN EQUIVALENT RIGHT IS GUARANTEED BY A STATE FINANCIAL BARRIERS MUST NOT BE PERMITTED TO CONDITION ITS EXERCISE :

THE U.S. 7TH. CIR. COURT OF APPEALS JUDGES, ROVER, WOOD AND HAMILTON SUSPENDED HABEAS CORPUS PRIVILEGE FOR INDIGENT PETITIONER BASED SOLELY UPON COST AND FEES OF 1,500 DOLLARS, LOOK AT APPENDIX A BARRING INDIGENT PETITIONER PRIVILEGE TO WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS UNTIL INDIGENT PETITIONER PAYS IN FULL A 1,500 DOLLAR RING BAR FEE IN ERROR OF U.S. CONSTITUTION ARTICLE I SEC. 9 CL. 2 SUPREMACY CLAUSE INTERPRETED BY THE U.S.

SUPREME COURT IN Smith v. Bennett 365 U.S. AT 712-713.

THIS CASE HABEAS CORPUS ALSO INVOLVES AND RELATED TO TITLE 28 USC 2244(D)(2) INTERPRETATION BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT IN Wall v. Kholi 562 U.S. 548, 552 (2011), DETERMINING THAT A STATE PRISONERS PETITION FOR HABEAS CORPUS TOLLS THE LIMITATION PERIOD TO COLLATERALLY ATTACK A JUDGMENT, OR A STATE COLLATERAL REVIEW, THIS APPLICATION CLAIMS ALSO RELATES TO THE U.S. CONST. ARTICLE I SEC. 9 CL. 2 SUPREMACY CLAUSE INTERPRETED BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT IN KANSAS V. GARCIA 589 U.S. 191, 202 (2020) AND ARMSTRONG V. EXCEPTIONAL CHILD CENTER INC 575 U.S. 320, 324 (2015) RULE OF DECISION, COURTS SHALL REGARD THE CONSTITUTION AND ALL LAWS MADE IN PURSUANCE THEREOF AS THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND. BECAUSE THE U.S. SEVENTH CIR. JUDGES SUSPENSION OF HABEAS CORPUS REFUSE TO REGARD ARTICLE I SEC. 9 CL. 2 SUSPENSION CLAUSE AS THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND.

28 USC. 2254 petition for writ of HABEAS corpus page- 6
Supreme Court of The United States

E. [TABLE OF CONTENTS]

1. OPINIONS Below	11
2. JURISDICTION	11-15
3. CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	16
4. STATEMENT OF THE CASE / FACTS	17-26
5. REASON FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	28-32
6. STATEMENT OF THE CLAIMS	2-3
7. CONCLUSION	32-33

[INDEX TO APPENDIX]

APPENDIX - A - U.S. 7th Cir. COURT OF APPEALS
September 18, 2023 ORDER CASE
23-2438

APPENDIX - B - JUC. CASE 1996CF965778

APPENDIX - C - JUC. CASE 99CF4849

APPENDIX - D - JUC. CASE 11CF123

APPENDIX - E - JUC CASE 11CF220

APPENDIX - F - JUC CASE 12CF066

APPENDIX - G - petition for review notice case
SIMPSON v. BOUGHTON 24AP625-LW

APPENDIX - H - Doe. Sentence completion

APPENDIX - I - Willie C. Simpson Inmate Trust
Account Statement

28 USC. 2254 petition For writ OF HABEAS Corpus page ~7
Supreme Court OF The United States

F. [TABLE OF Authorities Cited]

[cases]

[page]

Armstrong v. Exceptional Child Center Inc.

575 U.S. 320 (2015)

5

BANISTER v. DAVIS

590 U.S. 504 (2020)

12-29

Bell v. State of Md.

378 U.S. 226 (1964)

23

Brown v. Davenport

596 U.S. 118 (2022)

12-13

Brown v. Plata

563 U.S. 493 (2011)

23

U.S. v. Chambers

291 U.S. 217 (1934)

23

Dorsey v. U.S.

567 U.S. 260 (2012)

24

Feiker v. Turpin

518 U.S. 651 (1996)

12

State v. Cole

262 Wis. 2D 167, 66 NW. 2D 700 (WI, 2003)

17

Graham v. Florida

560 U.S. 48 (2010)

N/A

KANSAS v. GARCIA

589 U.S. 320 (2020)

5

28 USC. 2254 petition For writ OF HABEAS CORPUS PAGE-8
Supreme Court OF The United States

[TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CONTINUED]

[CASES]

[PAGE NUMBER]

McFarland v. Scott

512 U.S. 849 (1994)

N/A

Montgomery v. Louisiana

577 U.S. 190 (2016)

N/A

Lockhart v. United States

546 U.S. 142 (2005)

22

O'Sullivan v. Boerckel

526 U.S. 838 (1999)

27

Preiser v. Rodriguez

411 U.S. 487 (1973)

13-14

U.S. v. Reisinger

128 U.S. 398 (1888)

23

State v. Ringer

326 Wis. 2d 351, 785 N.W. 2d 448 (WI. 2010)

18

Shinn v. Ramirez

596 U.S. 366 (2022)

29

Smith v. Bennett

365 U.S. 708 (1961)

16, 31

28 USC. 2254 petition For writ OF HABEAS Corpus page. 9
Supreme Court OF The United States

[CASES] [TABLE OF Authorities CONTINUED] [page no.]

State v. Taylor

289 Wis. 2D. 34, 710 NW. 2D. 466 (wi. 2006)

19

State v. Thompson

342 Wis. 2D. 647, 818 NW. 2D. 904 (wi. 2021)

18

U.S. v. Tynen

78 U.S. 88 (1870).

22

Wahl v. Kholi

562 U.S. 545 (2011)

30

[Federal statutes AND rules]

Title 28 USC. 2244(BX3)(E)

29

Title 28 USC. 2254(A)

28

Title 28 USC. 2243

12

Title 28 USC. 2254(D)(1)-(2)

12-13

Title 28 USC. 2254

12-13

Title 28 USC. 2244(D)(2)

15

30

28 USC. 2254 petition For writ of HABEAS Corpus page - 10
Supreme Court of The United States

[TABLE OF Authorities CONTINUED]

[Federal statutes and rules]

[Page]

Title 28 USC. 2242

Title 1 USC. 109

14

21-22

[State statutes and rules]

WIS. Statute 948.02(1)

WIS. Statute 948.02(2)

WIS. Statute 948.02(4)(Am)

WIS. Statute 939.50(3)(A)(4)

2001 WIS. Act 109

2007 WIS. Act 80

17, 19

17, 19

19

19

17-18

17-18

28 USC 2254 petition For writ OF HABEAS Corpus page-11
Supreme Court OF The United States

G. [OPINIONS Below]

[For CASES From Federal Courts]

The OPINION OF The United States 7th Cir. Court OF Appeals Appears
At APPENDIX A TO This petition AND IS Unpublished 2023-2638

[For CASES From state Courts]

The OPINION OF The Highest state Court TO review The merits Appears
At APPENDIX UNAVAILABLE TO This petition AND IS Unpublished 2024Ap625-W
SIMPSON V. BOUGHTON, APPENDIX G

The OPINION OF The WISCONSIN Court OF Appeals review OF The merits
Appears At APPENDIX UNAVAILABLE TO This petition AND IS Unpublished 2024-
Ap625-W SIMPSON V. BOUGHTON.

H. [JURISDICTION]

[For CASES From Federal Courts]

The DATE ON Which The United States 7th Cir. Court OF Appeals Decided
my CASE WAS September 18, 2023 A copy OF That Decision Appears At
APPENDIX A

28 USC. 2254 petition For writ of HABEAS corpus page - 12
Supreme Court OF The United States

[JURISDICTION CONTINUED]

[For Cases From state court]

The Date on which The highest state court Decided my case was
Sept. 11, 2024 AND A Copy OF That Decision Appears At Appendix: UNAVAILABLE

1. [The U.S. Congress Delegates To The U.S. Supreme Court
Appellate Jurisdiction To entertain An Application For
writ of HABEAS corpus pursuant to 28 USC. 2254(A), Title
28 USC. 2251(A)(1) AND Title 28 USC. 2243]

U.S. Congress Adopted The Antiterrorism AND effective Death penalty
Act OF 1996 (AEDPA), Title 28 USC. 2254(A)(D)(1)-(2) gives The U.S. Supreme
Court Authority To issue A writ of HABEAS corpus ON BEHALF OF A person in
state custody pursuant To The judgment OF A state Court. The U.S. Supreme
Court has interpreted (AEDPA) AND determined That The U.S. Supreme Court
has Appellate Jurisdiction To entertain An Application For writ of HABEAS
corpus, in The case Felker v. Turner 518 U.S. 651, 660-662 (1996). The U.S.
Supreme Court has interpreted (AEDPA), 28 USC. 2254(A)(D)(1)-(2) ANNOUNCED
A rule OF Decision-requiring The Court To grant or deny HABEAS corpus
relief in The case:

BROWN V. DAVENPORT 596 U.S. 118, 127 (2022):

When Congress Supplies A Constitutionally valid rule OF Decision
Federal Courts must Follow it, in (AEDPA), Congress ANNOUNCED Such
A rule, it instructed That A Federal Court shall not grant relief
with respect To A claim That has Been Adjudicated ON The merits
in state Court unless The state Courts Decision was (1) contrary To
or AN unreasonable Application OF clearly established Federal

28 USC. 2254 petition For writ of Habeas Corpus page -13
Supreme Court of The United States

[JURISDICTION CONTINUED]

LAW AS DETERMINED BY THE DECISION OF THIS COURT, OR (2)
BASED ON AN UNREASONABLE DETERMINATION OF FACTS
PRESENTED IN THE STATE COURT PROCEEDING; 28 USC. 2254(D):

TITLE 28 USC 2243 EXPRESSLY REQUIRE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT JUSTICE OR JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES TO HEAR AND DETERMINE HABEAS CORPUS MATTERS AND DISPOSE OF THE MATTER AS LAW AND JUSTICE REQUIRES ACCORDING TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT INTERPRETATION IN THE CASE BROWN V. DAVENPORT 596 U.S. AT 132, TITLE 28 USC. 2254(A) GRANTS THE U.S. SUPREME COURT JUSTICE JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY TO GRANT HABEAS CORPUS PROCEEDINGS WHERE THE STATE CUSTODY IS IN VIOLATION OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION OR FEDERAL LAW, ACCORDING TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT INTERPRETATION IN SHILIN V. RAMIREZ 596 U.S. 366, 375 (2022), THE U.S. SUPREME COURT HAS DETERMINED THAT CONGRESS HAS DETERMINED THAT HABEAS CORPUS IS THE APPROPRIATE REMEDY FOR STATE PRISONERS ATTACKING THE VALIDITY OF THE FACT OR LENGTH OF THEIR CONFINEMENT IN THE CASE PREISER V. RODRIGUEZ 411 U.S. 475, 500 (1973), THUS, WHETHER A PETITIONER'S CHALLENGE TO HIS CUSTODY IS THAT THE STATUTE UNDER WHICH HE STANDS CONVICTED IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL, THAT HE HAS BEEN IMPRISONED PRIOR TO TRIAL OR ACCORD TO A DEFECTIVE INDICTMENT AGAINST HIM, THAT HE IS UNLAWFULLY CONFINED IN THE WRONG INSTITUTION, THAT HE WAS DENIED HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS AT TRIAL, THAT HIS GUILTY PLEA WAS INVALID, OR THAT HIS PARDON WAS UNLAWFULLY REVOKED CAUSING HIM TO BE INCARCERATED IN PRISON, IN EACH CASE HABEAS CORPUS IS ACCEPTED AS THE SPECIFIC INSTRUMENT TO OBTAIN RELEASE FROM SUCH CONFINEMENT, ACCORDING TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT INTERPRETATION IN PREISER V. RODRIGUEZ 411 U.S. AT 486, HABEAS CORPUS RELIEF IS NOT LIMITED TO IMMEDIATE RELEASE FROM ILLEGAL CUSTODY BUT THE WRIT IS AVAILABLE AS WELL TO ATTACK FUTURE CONFINEMENT AND TO OBTAIN FUTURE RELEASE, ACCORDING TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT IN PREISER V. RODRIGUEZ 411 U.S. 487, HABEAS CORPUS IS ALSO AVAILABLE TO CHALLENGE PRISON CONDITIONS WHEN A PRISONER IS PUT UNDER ADDITIONAL

28 USC. 2254 petition for writ of HABEAS corpus page - 14
Supreme Court of The United States

[Jurisdiction continued]

AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL restraints during his unlawful custody. HABEAS corpus will be available to remove the restraints making the custody illegal according to the U.S. Supreme Court in Preiser v. Rodriguez 411 U.S. At 499,

2. [Pursuant to 28 USC. 2242 Extraordinary circumstances for not making application to the U.S. District Court of the District in which the applicant is held]

The reason petitioner did not file this petition for writ of HABEAS corpus in the U.S. District Court Eastern District of Wisconsin, or Western District of Wisconsin where petitioner is held, is because the U.S. 7th. Cir. Court of Appeals judges, ILANA DIMOND RIVER, DIANE P. WOOD, AND DAVID F. HAMILTON suspended writ of HABEAS corpus privilege for petitioner until petitioner pays a total \$1,500 dollar filing bar fee in full. Look at Appendix A. The U.S. 7th. Cir. prohibits the clerk of U.S. District Court and U.S. Circuit Courts of Appeals 7th. Cir. from filing petitioner petitions for writs of HABEAS corpus and collateral attacks based solely upon a total 1,500 dollar filing fee bar. Look at Appendix A. The 7th. Cir. U.S. Court of Appeals sanction filing fee bar direct the clerk of court to not file petitioner HABEAS corpus or any post-conviction challenges to petitioner confinement convictions and sentences in the U.S. District Court and in the 7th. Cir. which prevent petitioner from seeking review of the state collateral review court judgment in case 2024AP625-W by writ of certiorari or appeal in the U.S. Supreme Court because U.S. Congress bar the U.S. Supreme Court jurisdiction of writ of certiorari review of the 7th. Cir. second or successive application decision suspending HABEAS corpus.

28 USC 2254 petition For writ OF HABEAS corpus PAGE-15
Supreme Court OF The United States

[Jurisdiction continued]

The 7th Cir. U.S. Court of Appeals, pursuant to 28 USC 2244(B)(3)(B) which in relevant part reads:

28 USC 2244(B)(3)(E):

The grant or denial of an authorization by a court of appeals to file a second or successive application shall not be applicable and shall not be the subject of a petition for rehearing or for a writ of certiorari;

However, the U.S. Supreme Court jurisdiction granted by Congress under title 28 USC 2254(a) to issue a writ of HABEAS corpus is not barred by 28 USC 2244(B)(3)(E) according to the U.S. Supreme Court interpretation in FELKER v. TURPIN 518 U.S. at 661-662. These exceptional circumstances are reason why petitioner did not seek review by appellate process, writ of certiorari in the U.S. Supreme Court or by writ of HABEAS corpus in the U.S. District Court Eastern or Western District of Wisconsin or 7th Cir. U.S. Court of Appeals where appellant confinement is located, necessary in aid of the U.S. Supreme Court to exercise its appellate jurisdiction, sec 2284(a) constituting exceptional circumstances identified in CHANEY v. U.S. DIST. COURT FOR DIST OF COLUMBIA 542 U.S. 367, 380-381 (2004). A HABEAS corpus petition filed to the U.S. Supreme Court is not second or successive according to the U.S. Supreme Court in BANISTER v. DAVIS 590 U.S. 504, 512 (2020);

28 USC. 2254 petition for writ of HABEAS corpus page - 16
supreme court of the United States

[JURISDICTION CONTINUED]

3. [28 USC. 2254(A) JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY TO THE U.S.
SUPREME COURT TO ISSUE HABEAS CORPUS RELIEF IS NOT
TIME BARRED BY 28 USC. 2244(D)(1)]

IN RELEVANT PART 28 USC. 2244(D)(1) READS:

A 1 YEAR PERIOD OF LIMITATION SHALL APPLY TO AN APPLICATION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS BY A PERSON IN CUSTODY PURSUANT TO THE JUDGMENT OF A STATE COURT, THE LIMITATION PERIOD SHALL RUN FROM THE LATEST OF:

IN RELEVANT PART 28 USC. 2244(D)(2) READS:

THE TIME DURING WHICH A PROPERLY FILED APPLICATION FOR STATE POST-CONVICTION OR OTHER COLLATERAL REVIEW WITH RESPECT TO THE PERTINENT JUDGMENT OR CLAIM IS PENDING SHALL NOT BE COUNTED TOWARD ANY PERIOD OF LIMITATION UNDER THIS SUBSECTION.

TITLE 28 USC. 2244(D), 1 YEAR PERIOD OF LIMITATION IS SUBJECT TO EQUITABLE TOLLING UNDER 28 USC. 2244(D)(2) ACCORDING TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT INTERPRETATION IN WALL V. KHOLI, 562 U.S. 545, 547 (2011), PETITIONER STATE HABEAS CORPUS COLLATERAL ATTACK UPON THE STATE COURT JUDGMENT IN CASES 1996CF965228, 99CF4849, 11CF123, 11CF220 AND 12CF066 TOLLED THE 1 YEAR PERIOD AS INTERPRETED WALL V. KHOLI 562 U.S. AT 547-548, THE WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT DENIED REVIEW IN SIMPSON V. BOUGHTON, NO. 2024AP625-W ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2024, THEREFORE PETITIONER 28 USC. 2254 PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS IS TIMELY FILED AS OF THE DATE WITHIN THE TOLLING TIME

I. [Constitutional and statutory provisions involved]

petitioner petition for writ of Habeas Corpus involves Article I sec. 9 cl. 2 Supreme clause as interpreted by the U.S. Supreme Court that the privilege of writ of Habeas Corpus may not be suspended based upon a prisoner liability to pay fees or cost of filing announced in :

Smith v. Bennett 365 U.S. 708, 709 (1961) :

we hold that to interpose any financial consideration between an indigent prisoner or the state and his exercise of state right to sue for his liberty is to deny that prisoner equal protection :

Smith v. Bennett 365 U.S. at 712 :

while Habeas Corpus may of course be found to be a civil action for procedural purposes, it does not follow that its availability in testing the states right to detain an indigent prisoner may be subject to the payment of a filing fee... Habeas Corpus considered by the founders as the highest safeguard of liberty, it was written into the constitution of the United States that its privileges shall not be suspended unless in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it Article I sec. 9 :

Smith v. Bennett 365 U.S. at 713 :

we repeat what has been so truly said of the Federal writ, there is no higher duty than to maintain it when - paired and unsuspended save only in the cases specified in our constitution, when equivalent right is guaranteed by a state, financial hurdles must not be permitted to condition its exercise :

28 USC 2254 petition For writ OF HABEAS Corpus page 18
Supreme Court OF The United States

J. [Statement OF The case / Facts]

1. I FACE imprisonment AND punishment which I cannot challenge in The Federal Court By 28 USC 2254 writ OF HABEAS Corpus AS UNCONSTITUTIONAL TO OBTAIN release BECAUSE The U.S. 7th Cir. Court OF Appeals Judges, ROVER, WOOD, AND HAMILTON suspended privilege TO The HABEAS Corpus TO challenge The constitutionality OF my confinement until I pay 1,500 Dollar Filing Fee. LOOK AT APPENDIX A

2. The suspension OF HABEAS Corpus privilege Allows The state TO confine me INDEFINATELY IN error OF Article I SEC 9 CL 2 suspension Clause.

3. ON OR ABOUT 11/15/1996 I WAS arrested IN Milwaukee County WI. For criminal charges OF second degree sexual assault OF A child prescribed By Wis. Statute 948.02 (2) CLASS B1 Felony AND convicted AND sentenced TO A total 15 year sentence stayed 5 year probation. LOOK AT APPENDIX B

4. ON OR ABOUT 9/21/1999 I WAS arrested IN Milwaukee County WI. For criminal charges OF First degree sexual assault OF A child prescribed By Wis. Stat. 948.02(1) CLASS B Felony By Milwaukee County Police Department IN The case 99CF4849 AND convicted AND sentenced TO A total 50 year sentence which I maintained innocents AND still DO. LOOK AT APPENDIX C

5. WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE enacted new sentencing Law called Truth IN sentencing. 2001 WIS. ACT 109 Creating Bifurcated sentencing AND extended supervision which took effect JAN. 2003 AFTER I WAS charged AND convicted IN The case 99CF4849 AND 1996CF965778 according TO The WIS. Supreme Court interpretation OF ACT 109 IN State v. Cole 262 WIS. 2D. 167, 181, 663 NW. 2D. 700 (WI, 2003)

6. WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE enacted new sex crime Law AND mandatory minimum Law. 2005 WIS. ACT 437 AND 2007 WIS. ACT 80 which took effect AFTER I WAS charged AND convicted IN The cases 99CF4849 AND

28 USC. 2254 petition for writ of HABEAS corpus page - 19
Supreme Court of The United States

[statement of the case / facts continued]

1996 CF 96S778 according to the Wis. Supreme Court interpretation of Act 437 and Act 80 in the cases State v. Thompson 342 Wis. 2D. 647, 688-689, 818 NW. 2D. 904 (WI. 2012), and State v. Ringer 326 Wis. 2D. 351, 785 NW. 2D. 448 (WI. 2010)

7. Act 437 repeated criminal statute 948.02(1) sex offense classification and recreated the statute and mandatory minimum sentencing for violation of the offense. However Act 80 repeated sec. 948.02(1) sex offense classification and recreated the statute as sec. 948.02(1)(am) making the offense of first degree sexual assault of a child a class A felony, mandatory life imprisonment, and added an additional element to the offense. After I was charged and convicted for violating repeated statute 948.02(1) according to the court interpreted of Act 437 and Act 80 and sec. 948.02(1)(am) in the cases:

State v. Ringer 326 Wis. 2D. 351, 355 N. 2, 785 NW. 2D. 448 (WI. 2010):

Wisconsin statute 948.02(1) and 948.025(1) (2005-2006) were repealed and recreated by 2007 Wis. Act 80, sec. 12 and sec. 13 codified as amended at Wis. Stat. sec. 948.02(1) and 948.025(1) (2007-2008). 2007 Wis. Act 80 took effect March 27, 2008:

State v. Thompson 342 Wis. 2D. 674, 687 N. 5, 818 NW. 2D. 904 (WI. 2012):

The Legislature addressed the confusion created by Acts 430 and 437 by passing 2007 Wisconsin Act 80, that Act read in part, section, 12, 948.02(1) of the statutes as effected by 2005 Wisconsin Acts 430 and 437 is repealed and recreated:

[statement of The case / Facts continued]

8. Act 109 repealed criminal statute 948.02(2) sex offense classification BC Felony for all crimes and recreated the statute 948.02(2) proscription for second degree sexual assault as a class C Felony, increasing the maximum sentence to 40 years under Wis. Stat 939.50(3)(c) after I was charged and convicted for violating repealed criminal statute 948.02(2), according to the Wis. Supreme Court interpretation of Act 109 and new enacted statute 948.02(2) in the case:

State v. Taylor 289 Wis. 2D 34, 394 N.W. 2D 466, (Wis. 2006);

On July 26, 2002, the Wisconsin Legislature enacted 2001 Wis. Act 109, which amended Wis. Stat. 948.02(2) from a class BC Felony to a class C Felony. The Act also amended the classification of felonies under Wis. Statute 939.50. Under the new statutory scheme, the penalty for class C Felony is a fine not to exceed 100,000 or imprisonment not to exceed 40 years or both, Wis. Statute Sec. 939.50(3)(c), 2003-2004. The BC Felony classification was repealed. The Act did not take effect until February 1, 2003.

9. In relevant part, pre-repeal first degree sexual assault of a child statute 948.02(1) reads:

Sexual Assault of a Child, First Degree Sexual Assault, whoever has sexual contact or sexual intercourse with a person who has not attained the age of 13 is guilty of a class B Felony

10. In relevant part the repealer Act 80 First Degree Sexual Assault of a Child statute 948.02(1)(am) reads:

Sexual Assault of a Child, First Degree Sexual Assault, whoever has sexual contact or sexual intercourse with a person who has not attained the age of 13 years and causes great bodily harm to the person is guilty of a class A Felony.

[Statement of The Case/Facts continued]

11. IN RELEVANT PART, pre-repeal second degree sexual assault of A Child statute 948.02 (2) read:

SEXUAL ASSAULT OF A CHILD, SECOND DEGREE SEXUAL ASSAULT OF A CHILD statute 948.02 (2) read:

Whoever has sexual contact or sexual intercourse with a person who has not attained the age of 16 years is guilty of a class BC Felony

12. IN RELEVANT PART Act 109 repealer statute second degree sexual assault.

SECOND DEGREE SEXUAL ASSAULT, whoever has sexual contact or sexual intercourse with a person who has not attained the age of 16 years is guilty of a class C Felony;

13. The repealer Act 80 re-enacted criminal statute 948.02 (1)(AM) expressly AND specially remit former statute 948.02 (1) sex offense class-1 Felony AND sentence making the offense a class A Felony.

14. The repealer Act 109 enacted statute 948.02(2) expressly AND specially remit former statute 948.02 (2) expressly class BC Felony AND the maximum sentence making the offense a class C Felony.

15. The repealer Act 80 re-enacted statute 948.02 (1)(AM) new sex offense classification provisions attach new legal consequences to the offense AND additional element, redefining the offense, increasing the penalty to mandatory life imprisonment, as a class A Felony per section statute 939.50 (3)(A)

16. The repealer Act 109 enacted statute 948.02(2) attach new legal consequences to the offense, increasing the punishment from a maximum 20 year sentence to maximum 40 year sentence under sentencing statute 939.50(3)(C) AND remit the offense as a BC Felony

[Statement of The Case / Facts Continued]

17. WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE ENACTED REPEAL STATUTE 990.04 AND THE U.S. CONGRESS ENACTED REPEAL STATUTE TITLE 1 USC. 109 TO GOVERN AS A RULE WHEN A STATUTE IS CONSIDERED REPEATED. THESE REPEATING STATUTES IN RELEVANT PART READS:

WIS. STATUTE 990.04:

ACTIONS PENDING NOT DEFEATED BY REPEAL OF STATUTE. THE REPEAL OF A STATUTE HEREAFTER SHALL NOT REMIT, DEFEAT OR IMPAIR ANY CIVIL OR CRIMINAL LIABILITY FOR OFFENSES COMMITTED, PENALTIES OR FORFEITURES INCURRED OR RIGHTS OF ACTION ACCURRED UNDER SUCH STATUTE BEFORE THE REPEAL THEREOF... UNLESS SPECIALLY AND EXPRESSLY REMITTED, ABROGATED OR DONE AWAY WITH BY THE REPEATING STATUTE, AND CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS AND ACTIONS AT LAW OR IN EQUITY FOUNDED UPON SUCH REPEATED STATUTE, WHETHER INSTITUTED BEFORE OR AFTER THE REPEAL THEREOF, SHALL NOT BE DEFEATED OR IMPAIRED BY SUCH REPEAL... UNLESS THE OFFENSE, PENALTIES, FORFEITURES OR RIGHTS OF ACTION ON WHICH SUCH PROSECUTION OR ACTION SHALL BE FOUNDED SHALL BE SPECIALLY AND EXPRESSLY REMITTED, ABROGATED OR DONE AWAY WITH BY SUCH REPEATING STATUTE:

TITLE 1 USC. 109:

REPEAL OF STATUTES AS AFFECTING EXISTING LIABILITIES.
THE REPEAL OF ANY STATUTE SHALL NOT HAVE THE EFFECT TO RELEASE OR EXTINGUISH ANY PENALTY, FORFEITURE OR LIABILITY INCURRED UNDER SUCH STATUTE, UNLESS THE REPEATING ACT SHALL SO EXPRESSLY PROVIDE... FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUSTAINING ANY PROPER ACTION OR PROSECUTION FOR THE ENFORCEMENT OF SUCH PENALTY, FORFEITURE OR LIABILITY:

[Statement OF The case / Facts continued]

18. Title 1 USC. 109 substantive statutory repeal rule extinguish A repealed statute force AND effect unless The repealing criminal Act expressly provide That The repealed criminal statute shall remain in effect, IF NOT The repealing statute governs, according TO The U.S. Supreme Court interpretation OF Title 1 USC. 109 repeal statute. IN :

LOCKHART v. UNITED STATES 546 U.S. 142, 149 (2005) :

When The plain import OF A later statute directly conflicts with an earlier statute, The later enactment governs regardless OF its compliance with The earlier enacted requirement OF AN express reference or other magical password ... 1 USC. 109 :

U.S. v. TYNEN 78 US 88, 92 (1870) :

where two Acts are not in express terms repugnant, yet IF The later Act covers The whole subject OF The first AND embraces new provisions, plainly showing That it was intended AS A substitute for The first Act, it will operate AS A repeal OF That Act :

19. Title 1 USC. 109 substantive statutory repeal rule extinguishes repealed criminal statutes 948.02(1) AND SEC. 948.02(2) force AND effect because repealing Act 80 AND Act 109 did NOT expressly provide That The criminal statutes AND BC felony classification offenses shall remain in force TO sustain any prosecution or penalty incurred under The criminal statutes.

20. WISCONSIN Legislature repeal OF criminal statutes 948.02(1) AND SEC. 948.02(2) AND all BC felony classification crimes, effectively extinguished The convictions OF myself AND thousands OF other prisoners covered By The repeals because Title 1 USC. 109 substantive & statutory rule AND common law repeal rule, release U.S. from The repealed criminal statutes penalties, forfeitures AND liabilities incurred under The repealed criminal statutes because The repealing Act

28 USC 2254 petition for writ of HABEAS corpus PAGE - 284
Supreme Court of The United States

[statement of The case / facts continued]

did not expressly provide that the repeated statutes shall have force and effect according to the U.S. Supreme Court interpretation of Title 1, U.S.C. 109 and common law repeal rule in :

Bell v. State of M.D. 378 U.S. 226, 231 (1964)

it is well settled that a party cannot be convicted after the law under which he may be prosecuted has been committed repeated, although the offense may have been committed before the repeat

U.S. v. Chambers 291 U.S. 217, 223 (1934) :

The repeal of the law imposing the penalty is itself a remission, the court thus stated the principle applicable to criminal proceedings, there can be no legal conviction, unless the new creating law creating the offense, be at the time, in existence :

U.S. v. Tynen 78 U.S. 88, 95 (1870) :

There can be no legal conviction, nor any valid judgment pronounced upon conviction unless the law creating the offense, be at the time, in existence, by the repeal, the legislature will is expressed that no further proceedings be had under the act repealed, the repeal of the law imposing the penalty is of itself a remission :

U.S. v. Reisinger 128 U.S. 398, 401 (1888) :

it is conceded that under the general principle of the common law, the repeal of a penal statute operates as a remission of all penalties for violation of it committed before its repeal, and a release from prosecution thereafter after said repeal unless there be either a clause in the repealing statute or a provision of some other statute expressly authorize such prosecution ?

[Statement of The Case/Facts continued]

The 1989 Substantive Statutory repeat rule and common law repeat rule as interpreted by the U.S. Supreme Court release petitioner from repeated criminal statutes 948.02(1) and 948.02(2) penalties, forfeitures and liabilities. However, the state refuse to release petitioner from the repeated criminal statutes penalties, forfeitures and criminal liabilities. 21. The U.S. District Secretary and prison wardens system wide realize that the 1989 substantive statutory repeat rule and common law repeat rule interpreted by U.S. Supreme Court preclude release petitioner from the repeated criminal statutes 948.02(1) and 948.02(2) penalties, forfeitures, liabilities, forfeitures and liabilities. However, to usurp and circumvent the substantive right of the 1989 and common law repeat rule, the warden and District Attorney to charge petitioner with assault and battery as a prisoner while in prison which petitioner was convicted and sentenced to a total 23 additional years in prison in the combined criminal cases, 11CP123, 11CP220 and 12CP06, look at Appendix D-F

22. Petitioner was initially taken into custody of the Doc. on 2/8/2000 and from 2/8/2000 to present 2025 petitioner was remained in prison for a total 25 years completing the total 23 year sentence imposed in the cases 11CP123, 11CP220, and 12CP06. However, the Doc. still refuse to release petitioner from the custody of the Doc. Look at Appendix H

23. The state Doc. prison officials use the state unlawful custody systematically to secretly kill me by use of physical force and toxic chemical poisoning under the authority of Doc. disciplinary and security policies enforcement upon me to cover-up the state false imprisonment of me and if the state prison officials succeed in killing me they plan on using Doc. officials and law enforcement to circumvent any investigation and prosecute a medical cause of death.

28 USC 2254 petition For writ OF HABEAS Corpus page - 26
Supreme Court OF The United States

[Statement OF The CASE/Facts continued]

24. IN August 2023 petitioner Filed AN Application pursuant to 28 USC 2244 (b) For permission to File A second or successive petition For writ OF HABEAS Corpus IN The U.S. District Court Western District OF Wisconsin The place OF petitioner confinement, IN The U.S. 7th. Cir Court OF Appeals Case SIMPSON v. Broughton 23-2638 ON The ground THAT The DOC. confines petitioner UNDER DOC. custody UNDER repeated criminal statutes IN violation OF The U.S. Constitution

25. However, The U.S. 7th. Cir. Court OF Appeals Judge ILANA Diamond Rorer, Diane P. Wood AND David F. Hamilton realized THAT Title 1 USC. 109 substantive statutory repeal rule AND common law repeal rule release petitioner AND all covered From repeated criminal statutes 948.02 (1) AND SEC. 948.02 (2) penalties, Forfeitures AND criminal liabilities convictions AND sentences incurred UNDER The repeals AND AS A result OF This realization The 7th. Cir. Judges suspended Article I sec. 9 cl. 2 privilege OF HABEAS Corpus For petitioner By sanctioning petitioner A total 1,500 dollar filing fee bar until The filing fee bar is paid IN Full, IN Leuge with The state OF Wisconsin judicial, executive AND legislative officials whom are hell bent UPON circumventing Title 1 USC. 109 substantive statutory repeal rule AND common law repeal rule rights AND protections AS interpreted By The U.S. Supreme Court, LOOK AT Appendix A

26. IN April, 2024 I Filed A petition For supervisory writ AND A writ OF HABEAS Corpus TO The Wis. Court OF Appeals challenging The state repeal OF former criminal statutes 948.02 (1) AND SEC. 948.02 (2) which I WAS convicted OF violating seeking release ON The grounds THAT The state conviction confinement OF me violate The U.S. Const 14th. Amend. IN The case SIMPSON v. Broughton NO 2024AP625-W.

28 USC. 2254 petition For writ OF HABEAS corpus page- 247
Supreme Court OF The United States

[Statement OF The case / Facts CONTINUED]

27. IN April 24, 2024 The WISCONSIN Court OF Appeals Judges, White, DONALD AND COLON DENIED my petitions For supervisory writ AND writ OF HABEAS corpus IN The case 2024AP625-W, SIMPSON V. BOUGHTON. WITHOUT CONSIDERING TITLE 1 USC. 109 SUBSTANTIVE STATUTORY REPEAL RULE AND COMMON LAW REPEAL RULE RELEASED PETITIONERS FROM REPEATED CRIMINAL STATUTES 948.02 (1) AND SEC. 948.02 (2) PENALTIES, FORFEITURES AND CRIMINAL LIABILITIES AND EXTINGUISHED THE CONVICTIONS AND SENTENCES INCURRED UNDER THE REPEAL, HELD BENT UPON CIRCUMVENTING, TITLE 1 USC 109 SUBSTANTIVE STATUTORY REPEAL RULE AND COMMON LAW REPEAL RULE RIGHTS AND PROTECTIONS

28. I FILED A petition For review OF The WIS. Court OF Appeals DENIAL OF my petition For writ OF HABEAS corpus TO The WISCONSIN Supreme Court AND ON September 11, 2024 The WIS. Supreme Court DENIED review CASE 2024AP625-W LOOK AT APPENDIX E

29. I FACE IMPRISONMENT AND PUNISHMENT UNDER STATE CUSTODY WHICH I CANNOT CHALLENGE IN FEDERAL Court BY 28 USC. 2254 writ OF HABEAS corpus AS UNCONSTITUTIONAL TO OBTAIN RELEASE BECAUSE THE U.S. 7TH. CIR JUDGES, ROVER, WOOD AND HAMILTON SUSPENDED PRIVILEGE TO THE HABEAS corpus FOR ME TO CHALLENGE THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF MY CONFINEMENT UNTIL I PAY 1,500 DOLLAR FILING FEE BAR, LOOK AT APPENDIX A

30. THE SUSPENSION OF HABEAS corpus privilege ALLOWS THE STATE TO CONFIN ME UNCONSTITUTIONALLY INDEFINITELY IN VIOLATION OF MY CONSTITUTIONALLY RIGHT, ARTICLE 1 SEC. 9 CL. 2

31. TITLE 28 USC. 2244 (D)(2) TOLLED THE 1 YEAR TIME LIMIT TO ATTACK THE 7TH. CIR Court OF Appeals JUDGMENT, SIMPSON V. BOUGHTON NO 23-2638 (7TH. CIR. SEPT. 18, 2023, BARRING PETITIONER petition For writ OF HABEAS corpus UNTIL PETITIONER PAY A 1,500 DOLLAR FILING BAR FEE, ACCORDING TO THE U.S. Supreme Court INTERPRETATION OF SEC. 2244 (D)(2) IN WALL V. KHOLI 562 U.S. 545, 552 (2011).

32. THE U.S. SEVENTH CIR JUDGES SUSPENSION OF HABEAS corpus UNTIL I PAY THE 1,500 DOLLAR FILING BAR FEE, REFUSES TO REGARD ARTICLE 1 SEC. 9 CL. 2 SUSPENSION CLAUSE AS THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND WHICH ARTICLE 6 CL. 2 SUPREMACY CLAUSE REQUIRES.

28 U.S.C. 2254 petition for writ of HABEAS Corpus page- 28
Supreme Court of The United States

K. [EXHAUSTION OF STATE COURT REMEDIES]

I have exhausted all available state court remedies given the state courts one full opportunity to resolve my constitutional issues as required and recognized by the U.S. Supreme Court in O'Sullivan v. Boerckel 526 U.S. 838, 845 (1992), in April 2024 petitioner filed a petition for supervisory writ and a writ of HABEAS Corpus under state law, Wis. Stat. 809.51(1)(2) and sec. 782.20 and 782.22 pursuant to the courts jurisdictional authority seeking release on the grounds that confinement for violation of repeated criminal statutes 948.02(1) and sec. 948.02(2) is unconstitutional in the case SIMPSON v. Boughton NO. 2024AP625-W, which case was dismissed and HABEAS Corpus was denied look at Appendix G and August I petitioned the Wis. Supreme Court for review of the court of appeals decision, and on Sept. 11, 2024 the Supreme Court denied review in the case SIMPSON v. Boughton NO. 2024AP625-W, look at Appendix G, this collateral attack on the U.S. 7th Cir. court of appeals judgment SIMPSON v. Boughton NO 23-2638 (7th Cir. Sept. 18, 2023) imposition of the 1,500 dollar bar on petitioner HABEAS Corpus is therefore timely under 28 U.S.C. 2244(b)(2) as interpreted by the U.S. Supreme Court in Wall v. Kholi 567 U.S. 545, 547 (2011),

28 USC. 2254 petition For writ OF HABEAS corpus page- 29
Supreme Court OF The United States

4. [REASON For granting The writ]

1. [AEDPA, THE 28 USC. 2254(A), (D)(1)-(2) rule OF DECISION requires The reviewing Justice TO grant HABEAS corpus ON ground THAT petitioner IS IN custody IN violation OF The CONSTITUTION or LAWS OF The UNITED STATES]

ACCORDING TO The U.S. Supreme Court interpretation OF Title 28 USC. 2254(A), (D), (1)-(2), Congress created A rule OF DECISION, which require The reviewing Justice TO issue The writ ON The grounds THAT petitioner IS IN custody IN violation OF The CONSTITUTION OR LAWS OR TREATIES OF The UNITED STATES or where The state court decision IS contrary TO or involved AN UNREASONABLE application OF clearly established Federal Law AS determined By decisions OF The U.S. Supreme Court ACCORDING TO The U.S. Supreme Court IN The cases :

BROWN v. DAVENPORT 596 U.S. 118, 127 (2022) :

When Congress supplies A constitutionally valid rule OF DECISION, Federal courts must Follow it. IN AEDPA, Congress ANNOUNCED such A rule, it instructed THAT A Federal court SHALL NOT grant relief WITH respect TO A claim UNLESS The state courts decision WAS (1) CONTRARY TO or AN UNREASONABLE application OF clearly established Federal Law AS determined By The decision OF This court, or (2) BASED ON AN UNREASONABLE determination OF Facts presented IN The state court proceeding, 28 USC. 2254(D) :

28 U.S.C. 2254 petition For writ OF HABEAS corpus page - 30
Supreme Court OF The United States

[REASON For granting The writ Continued]

SHINN V. RAMIREZ 596 U.S. 366, 375 (2022):

A state prisoner may request that a federal court order his release by petitioning for a writ of habeas corpus sec. 2254. The writ may issue only on the ground that the prisoner is in custody in violation of the constitution or laws or treaties of the United States, sec. 2254(A), to respect our system of dual sovereignty. The availability of habeas relief is narrowly circumscribed.

2. [28 U.S.C. 2244(B)(3) second or successive petition requirement does not apply to habeas corpus consideration filed in the U.S. Supreme Court for the first time]

THE 28 U.S.C. 2244(B)(3) second or successive petition requirement does not apply to petitioner habeas corpus petition filed in the U.S. Supreme Court according to the U.S. Supreme Court interpretation of 28 U.S.C. 2244(B) in the cases:

FELKER V. TURNER 518 U.S. 651, 662 (1996):

SEC. 2244(B) ADDRESSING SECOND OR SUCCESSIVE HABEAS CORPUS PETITIONS, SECTION 2244(B)(3)'S GATEKEEPING SYSTEM FOR SECOND PETITIONS DOES NOT APPLY TO OUR CONSIDERATION OF HABEAS PETITIONS, BECAUSE IT APPLIES TO APPLICATION FILED IN THE DISTRICT COURT, SEC. 2244(B)(3)(A);

BANISTER V. DAVIS 590 U.S. 504, 512 (2020):

THE COURT OF APPEALS AGREE (AS DO BOTH PARTIES) THAT AN AMENDED PETITION FILED AFTER THE INITIAL ONE BUT BEFORE JUDGMENT IS NOT SECOND OR SUCCESSIVE, SO TOO, APPEALS FROM THE HABEAS COURT JUDGMENT, OR STILL LATER PETITIONS TO THIS COURT ARE NOT SECOND OR SUCCESSIVE, RATHER THEY ARE FURTHER ITERATIONS OF THE FIRST

28 USC. 2254 petition for writ of HABEAS corpus page 34
Supreme Court of The United States

[REASON For granting The writ continued]

3. [Petitioner state HABEAS corpus petition for collateral review in state court toll the 1 year limitation for attacking any judgment under title 28 USC. 2244(D)(2)]

title 28 USC. 2244(D)(2) in relevant part reads:

The time during which a properly filed application for state post-conviction or other collateral review with respect to the pertinent judgment or claim is pending shall not be counted toward any period of limitation under this subsection.

The U.S. Supreme Court interpreted title 28 USC. 2244(D)(1)-(2) to toll the 1 year time period for attacking any judgment in the case:

Wain v. Kholi 562 U.S. 545, 547 (2011)

under the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (AEDPA), a properly filed application for state post-conviction or other collateral review with respect to the pertinent judgment or claim tolls the 1 year limitation period for filing a federal HABEAS petition 28 USC. 2244(D)(2);

The U.S. Supreme Court has determined that HABEAS corpus is a form of collateral review, a state prisoner petition for HABEAS corpus is a toll of the limitation period in Wain v. Kholi 562 U.S. at 552.

4. [The Doc. custody of petitioner is in violation of the U.S. Constitution Article I Sec. 9 Cl. 2 Supremacy Clause which under 28 USC. 2254(A) relief is mandated]

28 USC. 2254 petition for writ of HABEAS corpus PAGE -32
Supreme Court of the United States

[reason for granting the writ continued]

Article I sec. 9 cl. 2 suspension clause reads:

The privilege of the writ of HABEAS corpus shall not be
suspended unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion
the public safety may require:

Article I sec. 9 cl. 2 suspension clause prohibits the suspension of HABEAS
corpus privilege by imposing cost for filing on an indigent prisoner as inter-
preted by the U.S. Supreme Court in:

Smith v. Bennett 365 U.S. at 709:

We hold that to interpose any financial consideration
between an indigent prisoner of the state and his exercise
of state right to sue for his liberty is to deny that prisoner
equal protection:

Smith v. Bennett 365 U.S. at 712:

While HABEAS corpus may of course be found to be a civil
action for procedural purposes, it does not follow that its avail-
ability in testing the states right to detain an indigent
prisoner may be subject to the payment of a filing fee. . . .
HABEAS corpus considered by the founders as the highest
safeguard of liberty, it was written into the constitution
of the United States that its privilege shall not be suspended
unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public
safety may require it, Article I sec. 9:

Smith v. Bennett 365 U.S. at 713:

We repeat what has been so truly said of the Federal writ,
There is no higher duty than to maintain it unimpaired
and unsuspended save only in the cases specified in our
constitution, when an equivalent right is guaranteed
by a state, financial hurdles must not be permitted to
condition its exercise:

28 USC. 2254, petition For writ OF HABEAS corpus page -33
Supreme court OF The United States

[Reason For granting The writ continued]

The U.S. 7th Cir court OF Appeals judges suspension OF HABEAS corpus privilege until petitioner pay 1,500 Dollar Filing Bar Fee is in error OF Article 1 sec. 9 cl. 2 suspension clause AS interpreted By The US Supreme court. Article 1 sec. 9 cl. 2 suspension clause privilege TO HABEAS corpus TO obtain release From custody. petitioner Face imprisonment AND punishment under The state repeated criminal statutes 948.02(1) AND 948.02(2) penalties, Forfeitures AND Liabilities which indigent petitioner cannot challenge in Federal court By writ OF HABEAS corpus 28 USC. 2254 AS unconstitutional TO obtain release Because The 7th Cir. judges, Rover, wood AND Hamilton suspend petitioner constitutional right TO privilege TO HABEAS corpus until I pay 1,500 Dollar Filing Bar Fee, which I Am unable TO pay Due TO my poverty, Lack OF means AND Assets, Therefore 28 USC. 2254(A) mandate petitioner HABEAS corpus Be granted. AS interpreted By The U.S. Supreme court in SHINN v. RAMIREZ 596 U.S. AT 375.

M. [Relief Requested]

ISSUE AN ORDER granting The petition For writ OF HABEAS corpus AND order petitioner release From custody OF The state OF Wisconsin Department OF corrections immediately

N. [Conclusion]

The U.S. 7th Cir suspension OF privilege OF HABEAS corpus until petitioner pay 1,500 Dollar Filing Bar Fee is in error OF U.S. Const. Article 1 sec. 9 cl. 2, AND AS A result The state OF Wis. Doc. custody OF petitioner is in violation OF Article 1 sec. 9 cl. 2, petitioner Face imprisonment AND punishment under The

28 USC. 2254 petition For writ of HABEAS Corpus PAGE 324
Supreme Court OF The United States

[CONCLUSION CONTINUED]

CONVICTIONS CASES 1996CF965778, 99CF4849, 11CF123, 11CF220 AND 12CF066 which petitioner cannot seek release from By HABEAS Corpus, Therefore 28 USC. 2254(A) rule OF Decision AS interpreted IN SHINN V. RAMIREZ 596 U.S. AT 375 requires HABEAS Corpus TO BE granted, Article 6 U-2 supremacy clause rule OF Decision requirement THAT courts shall regard THE CONSTITUTION AND ALL LAWS MADE IN PURSUANCE THEREOF AS THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND ANNOUNCED IN KANSAS V. GARCIA 589 U.S. AT 202 AND ARMSTRONG V. EXCEPTIONAL CHILD CENTER INC. 575 U.S. AT 324, THE U.S. 7TH CIR. SUSPENSION OF PRIVILEGE OF HABEAS Corpus TO CHALLENGE THE JUDGMENT OF CONVICTIONS, CASES 1996CF965778, 99CF4849, 11CF123, 11CF220, AND 12CF066 REFUSES TO REGARD Article 1 SEC. 9 CL. 2 SUSPENSION CLAUSE AS THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND, AND THE U.S. SUPREME COURT HAS RECOGNIZED THAT, WHO WOULDN'T HOLD A RIGHTLY DIMINISHED VIEW OF THE COURTS IF THE COURT ALLOWED INDIVIDUALS TO LINGER LONGER IN PRISON THAN THE LAW REQUIRES, ONLY BECAUSE THE COURT IS UNWILLING TO CORRECT THE COURTS OWN OBVIOUS MISTAKES, IN HICKS V. U.S. 137 S.Ct. 2000, 2001 (2017).

28 USC, 2254 petition for writ of HABEAS CORPUS PAGE 35
Supreme Court of the United States

[Declaration under 28 USC 1746]

I WILLIE C. SIMPSON DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY OF 28
USC 1746 THAT THE FOREGOING ALLEGATIONS MADE IN THIS COMPLAINT
ARE TRUE AND CORRECT AND THAT THIS DOCUMENT, HABEAS CORPUS
PETITION IS PREPARED UNDER 28 USC, SUP. CT. RULE 20.2.4, (A), 34, 33.2,
(B) AND 29.3, IT IS 35 PAGES TOTAL

SIGNED THIS 5 DAY OF MAY 2023
WILLIE C. SIMPSON 331220 PRO SE
WISCONSIN SECURE PROGRAM FACILITY
PO BOX 1000
BOSCHBEL, WI. 53805