


24-7223

ORIGINAL



IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Torrence Belcher- PETITIONER, Pro Se

VS.

Ron Neal et al -- RESPONDENT

Represented by: David E. Corey

Indiana Government Center South, 5th floor

302. West Washington St

Indianapolis, In 46204-2770

ON PETITION FOR *WRIT OF CERTIORARI* TO

The court of the Northern District of Indiana.

&

U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Torrence L. Belcher

1 Park Row

Michigan City, IN 46360

Questions

1. What does in the interest of justice mean??
2. How can an informant become unreliable?
3. Is a guess or hunch enough evidence to find an American citizen guilty of a crime with no other evidence to support the allegation?
4. What is a sure way to lose the trust and faith of the public from a judge's standpoint?
5. How is an innocent person supposed to feel about a guilty verdict?
6. Why would a person ask a question if the answer is already known?
7. Is it true that woman as a whole have a different perspective on certain occasion or events then men as a whole does?
8. Is a person's perspective a reason to consider them bias or an unreliable jury member?
"For example a family member or team member who feels obligated to agree or who can only relate to one party and not the other??"
9. Does discrimination require personal or national attention?
10. Is discrimination a personal issue or a human issue as a whole??
11. How can we combat prejudices leadership in this country??
12. What is an example of a corrupt judge??
13. How can a judge become corrupt?
14. Is our system a corrupt judicial?
15. How can get I justice from the wrongs that was done to me if the judges of the supreme court don't seek justice in its court when the lower courts are meritless or good for nothing but, billing me for money I don't have??

LIST OF PARTIES

Ron Neal

Koree Read

DHO name unknown?

Represented by: David E. Corey

Indiana Government Center South, 5th Floor

302 West Washington Street

Indianapolis, In 46204-2770

RELATED CASE

Belcher v. Milligan et al (3:23-cv-00650-PPS-MGG) The U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Indiana. Entry of Judgment 12-1-2023

Belcher v. Ron Neal et al (3:24-cv-00083-TLS-APR) The U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Indiana. Entry of Judgment 7/12/2024. Judgment on motion to reconsider 8/12/24.

Belcher v. Ron Neal et al, (No 24-1935) U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. Entry of Judgment Nov 20, 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....	
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....	
CONCLUSION.....	

INDEX TO APPENDICES

- APPENDIX A – Decision of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Indiana. Belcher
v. Milligan et al
- APPENDIX B – Decision of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Indiana. Belcher
v. Ron Neal et al (3:24-cv-00083-TLS-APR)
- APPENDIX C – Decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. Belcher v. Ron
Neal et al (24-2442)

No. 24-2442

pg.1

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix C to the petition and is

☐ reported at Lexus nexus; 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 B to the petition and is

☐ reported at Lexus nexus; or,

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☐ is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was Nov 20, 2024.

☒ No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

[] A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C § 1254(1).

Pg.2

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

"Attached to this page are what I believe is asked for"

Document #13 of 3:24-cv-00083-TLS-APR, Filed 05/22/24

Document #15 of 3:24-cv-00083-TLS-APR, Filed 05/12/24

Document #23 of 3:24-cv-00083-TLS-APR, Filed 10/09/24

Appendix A: Belcher v. Milligan et al, No 3:23-cv-00650-PPS-MGG, U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Indiana

Judge Phillip P. Simon made the ruling on document #19 referring to” *Edward v. Balisok*, 520 U.S. 641 (1997)”, the United States Supreme Court made it clear that the principles of “*Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477,481 (1994)”, also applies to prison disciplinary proceeding, that is to say, if a judgment for monetary damages would necessarily imply the invalidity of the finding of guilt in his prison disciplinary proceeding, he may not proceed with a lawsuit unless he can demonstrated that the conviction of sentence has previously been invalidated.” Edwards, 520 U.S. at 643, Here Belcher’s guilt finding have not been invalidated and judgment in his favor would necessarily imply those findings of guilt were invalid. Therefore this case must be dismissed without prejudice. On Dec 1, 2023

Appendix B: Belcher v. Ron Neal et al, No. 3:24- cv- 00083- TLS- APR, U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Indiana

Magistrate Judge Theresa L. Springman, made the ruling that I, the petition hadn’t asserted a valid claim for habeas relief and denied my petition on document #15.

Appendix C: Belcher v. Ron Neal et al, No 24-2442, U.S. Court appeals for the Seventh Circuit. This cause, docketed on Aug 30, 2024, is dismissed for failure to timely pay the required docket fee, pursuant to circuit rule3(b) on Nov 20,2024.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

pg.3

The fact of the matter is, I, the petitioner, pro se, Torrence Belcher, never showed her, Koree Read, the bookmark or index card that I was using as a bookmark. I DIDN'T MAKE THE CARD AWARE TO HER. I DIDN'T SHOW HER THE CARD OR INDICATE FOR HER TO LOOK HERE OR THERE, OR AT THE CARD! Her own eyes nosily search out the card for themselves! And the **assumption** that I was moving the book in my hand in an attempt to get her to pay attention to the book is nothing more than an **assumption**. The whole conduct report is at best speculation! It is Unreliable and is a witness against its self! If she couldn't make out the large font words that my hand was covering up on this small index card then how is she so sure when she isn't sure at all. The bookmark didn't say what she imagine or made up for whatever reason.

I showed the DHO the bookmark and what was written on it and it was disregarded as irrelevant? I don't understand how this allegation even made it this far off this speculative arguments with no solid evidence to stand on. But none the less here we are disputing what is not sure and what is presumed or assumed **with absolute doubt!** The only concert statements are" I, the petitioner, Torrence Belcher, pro se, stopped her and asked about being seen for mental health reason". The other concert statement is "she asked me, Torrence Belcher, about the bookmark I was holding!" And the last concert statement is "I, Torrence Belcher, TOLD HER WHAT IT WAS then SHE, Koree Read, TOLD ME WHAT IT WAS???"

I repeat if she knew what the bookmark or index card was, then why did she asked me any question at all??? Maybe she, Koree Read, needs to be seen by a mental Health doctor instead of being the mental health doctor herself??

I told her it is ((**JUST A BOOKMARK! NOT A SEXUAL APPROACH**)) I even attempted to hide the book when she asked what it was because it wasn't attended for her! If this was a sexual advance, why didn't I put the bookmark where her eyes could see clearly???? **Instead I clarified my intentions if they were misunderstood.**

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

pg.4

My faith in the system has been lost and needs to be restored. It is safe to consider a judge a god or standing in the place of god. The highest of regard. My eternal destination is at your discretion. But I can't put my hopes in the afterlife! That would be a form of giving up and I would like to not give up on living this life. All I have is this life and you judges are but mortal men as well, hindered and restrained by emotions and desires, exhaustion and fears. Who really knows if your intentions are pure but the actual deities, the higher powers themselves? All I can ask of you mortal men is to treat me as you would want yourself to be treated. Fair and just. IF your moral compass guilds you to rule against me beyond a **reasonable doubt** that I believe should be harassing the good in your conciseness then so be it. I thank you and encourage you to continue in the legitimacy's of your serves as you rightly wear the title of honor. May the MOST HIGH be with you?

According to Wolfe v. McDonnell they didn't comply with the due process clause. There is no statement of fact finding. The whole conduct report is an assumption. And I wasn't allowed to submit evidence. A good reason to consider the DHO bias.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully Submitted,

Torrence L. Belcher Date: April 24, 2025

Torrence L. Belcher, Plaintiff, *pro se*
1 Park Row
Michigan City, IN 46360