

ORIGINAL

24-7525

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

Supreme Court, U.S.  
FILED  
JUN 12 2025  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

CAPITAL CASE TRIAL

Lacey Mark Svak PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

vs.

STATE OF IDAHO RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

IDAHO SUPREME COURT  
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Lacey Mark Svak  
(Your Name)

UNIT 9150  
PO BOX 14  
(Address)

BOZOSE, IDAHO 8370  
(City, State, Zip Code)

0  
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. CAN THE STATE CONTINUE TO CONFIN A U.S. CITIZEN WHO HAS NOT BEEN ARRIGNED OR HAD PRELIMINARY HEARING OR ANY PROTECTIONS OF LAW, AND, DO SO BEYOND STATUTORY ALLOWANCES?
2. CAN THE STATE CONTINUE TO CONFIN A U.S. CITIZEN WHO WAS GIVEN COUNSEL FUND TO BE INCOMPETENT BEFORE TRIAL?
3. CAN THE COURTS CONTINUE TO DENY SERVICE OF CASE DOCUMENTS TO THE CRIMINAL DEFENDANT? ~~AND~~
4. CAN BIAS JUDGES RULG ON CASES THEY ARE A PARTY TO?
5. CAN ABUSES BE IMPOSED IN A

LIST OF PARTIES

All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

All parties do not appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

RELATED CASES

STATE V. SQUAK 10183A TADA COMPANY,  
FOA#0) (NOW CL-FE-  
10183A) - CAPITAL  
CASE

THERE ARE PAST CASES UNDER OTHER  
APPEALS - I DO NOT HAVE MOST

THIS FOA#0 SUPREME COURT  
APPEAL IS 52693-2024

USDC 120B 1125-CU-00043-BCN

USDC 120B 1125-CU-00044-ANN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW..... 1

JURISDICTION..... 2

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED..... 3

STATEMENT OF THE CASE..... 4-30

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT..... 31-34

CONCLUSION..... 35

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A 2016 PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS ON SEVERAL BLADES (116-CU-0019-BLW)

APPENDIX B SEVERAL U. HARLOS SW CURRENTLY FILED DOCKET

APPENDIX C 41141 DOCKET

APPENDIX D 116-CU-0019-BLW DOCKET

APPENDIX E ~~CHARTERED REQUEST FOR SPOLING~~ ONDEAL GRANTING

APPENDIX F 10183A DOCKET

APPENDIX

G 12 MAY 20 ORDER FOR LACEY  
TO GO PROSE

V GRANTING COA

B JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT ON AS AMER

J 19-35713 RULING

K 24-3384 DOCKET 42

L WAINMANS LAST RULING

M ~~JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT~~  
~~CRIMINAL COMPLAINT ON~~  
NELSON

N CRIMINAL COMPLAINT ON  
NELSON

O JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT ON  
HURWITZ

P CRIMINAL COMPLAINT ON  
HURWITZ

Q SEVERAL JUDGE RULINGS

---

R CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS DATA  
LOG

S HABEAS CORPUS ON STATE CON-  
STITUTION LOGS

---

# APPENDIX

T WANT OF SUPERVISION CONTROL LOGS

V V 2 CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS ON TEN JUDGES

W CRIMINAL COMPLAINT ON BRADFORD

X NOTICE OF APPEAL ON ATTACHED RULING ON BRADFORD

Y CRIMINAL COMPLAINT ON NYG

Z JUDGMENT OF CONVICTION

AA APPEAL ON CRIMINAL COMPLAINT ON BEVAN

BB LETTER TO U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL ON A.D.A.

CC 24-3384 DOCKET 042

DD 24-3384 DOCKET 052

# APPENDIX

- EE LAZARUS REASONS WHY THE ISSUES ADDRESSED ON 1:16-CV-00189-BLW WERE EXHAUSTED
- FF 4 FEDERAL QUESTIONS LOG
- GG SOME OF THE ZAHARA CASES
- HH SOME OF THE MARTIN-OLGUAN CASES
- JJ 3:24-CV-01038-AND RULING OF 30 MAY 25 (AND 14 OTHER CASES)
- JJ. ZIMAN 2025 JDDC PAGE OF NO METHOD TO TAKE MEDICINES
- 
- KK ZIMAN 2025 JDDC PAGE ON NO A.D.A.
- 
- LL ICR 35 (a) (c) TO CORRECT AN ILLEGAL SENTENCE

APPENDIX

MM ORDER COLLECTING CREDIT

NN + NOTICE OF APPEAL

OO ORDER CONDITIONALLY

~~DISMISSING~~ APPEAL

PP NOTICE TO TAKE JUDICIAL

NOTICE - NEW HOUSE BILLS

QQ PETITION FOR WAIVER OF

FEE (COMMON COURT AND

STATE SUPREME COURT)

RR ORDER DENYING WAIVER

OF FEES

SS NOTICE APPEALING JUDGE

SCOTT'S ...

TT ORDER ~~DISMISSING~~ APPEAL

UU EARLY PETITION FOR

REHEARING

VV ORDER DENYING REHEARING



## APPENDIX

WW CRIMINAL COMPLAINT ON  
BEVAN

XX APPEAL ON CRIMINAL  
COMPLAINT ON BEVAN

YY PACKET FILED IN JOAHU  
SUPREME COURT THAT LACON  
HAS NEVER BEEN LAWFULLY SENTENCED

ZZ "SHAW" DEFINED

AAA RIBOU BAKER RULING

BBB CRIMINAL CASES DOCUMENT

CCC LIFE IS 30 YEARS

DDD APPEAL ON WINNIE CRIMINAL COMPLAINT  
(ADN RULING)

EEE CRIMINAL COMPLAINT ON MYG

FFF CRIMINAL COMPLAINT ON SCOT

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

ARTHUR ANDERSEN, LP v. U.S. \_\_\_\_\_ 34  
 CASES  
 1125-CU-00043-DCN \_\_\_\_\_ 4  
 1125-CU-00045-ARB \_\_\_\_\_ 4

~~1125-CU-00043-DCN~~ 1125-CU-00045-ARB \_\_\_\_\_ 21

3125-CU-01460-AMO \_\_\_\_\_ 22  
 3125-CU-01197-AMO \_\_\_\_\_ 22  
 3124-CU-06261-AMO \_\_\_\_\_ 26

Mandava v. Arizona 384 U.S. 436 - 31  
~~19-1502-33~~ Swaku. Hardism 08-99006-33  
~~19-804~~ C Swaku, Christensen 19-35713-33  
 Magwood v. Patterson 561 U.S. 320 - 32  
 Withrow v. Larkin (Appendix AAA) - 32  
 STATUTES AND RULES Illinois 35 U.S. 2 - 34

AMENDMENTS 5, 6, 9, 10, 14 U.S. CONSTITUTION  
 42 USC CHAPTER 126

~~18-4004 IDAHO CODE~~  
 28 USC 2261-2266  
 19-23 U IDAHO CODE  
 19-1719 IDAHO CODE  
 19-1502 IDAHO CODE  
 19-804 IDAHO CODE  
 18-4004 IDAHO CODE

OTHER

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 ~~VIII~~ to the petition and is

- reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
 is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

- reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
 is unpublished.

For cases from state courts:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix VI to the petition and is

- reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
 is unpublished.

UNKNOWN

The opinion of the ~~FEDERAL SUPREME COURT ON REHEARING~~ court appears at Appendix VU to the petition and is

- reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
 is unpublished.

UNKNOWN

**JURISDICTION**

For cases from federal courts:

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

No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

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

An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including \_\_\_\_\_ (date) on \_\_\_\_\_ (date) in Application No.   A  .

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

For cases from state courts:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was 11 APR 2025.  
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix II.

A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: 12 MAR 2025, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix VV.

An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including    (date) on    (date) in Application No.   A  .

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

AMENDMENTS 5, 6, 9, 10, 14 U.S.  
CONSTITUTION.

(SEE "REASONS FOR GRANTING THE  
PETITION")

42 USC CHAPTER 126 - US CODE

184004 IDAHO CODE

28 USC 2261-2266

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT FOR  
"STATEMENT OF THE CASE" - THE  
FOLLOWING TWENTY PLUS PAGES  
TRIES TO DETAIL OVER FORTY YEARS,  
FROM 1981 TO 2015, THERE WERE COUNT-  
APPOINTED PEOPLE. - THE TRIAL  
COUNSEL WAS FOUND "INCOMPETENT" BEFORE  
TRIAL AND KEPT ON - THE PERSON  
AND TALK PEOPLE CONTINUING TO ARGUE  
ANYONE WHO PURSUES REDRESS -

LACEY HAS NEVER BEEN ARRANGED  
OR NEVER HAD PRELIMINARY HEARING  
ON THE CRIMES HE'S IMPRISONED  
ON. LACEY HAS A TRIAL JUDGE WHO  
ADMITS BIAS BEFORE TRIAL (READ  
COMPLAINT USDC/DOJ 1:25-CV-00045-  
ARB) AND HE TRAINED WINMILL  
USING LACEY'S CASE. WINMILL HAS  
HAD THE FEDERAL HABEAS CORPUS SINCE  
1996 (READ COMPLAINT 1:25-CV-00043-  
DCN). (VIOLATES 28 USC 2261-2266)

"REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION"  
HAS SPECIFICALLY WHAT I SEEK ON EACH  
ITEM.

(A)

Access to Courts - Indigent Paper  
GSA 6

STATEMENT OF THE CASE  
 IN APRIL 1981, ON A CASE WHERE  
 A GAS STATION CASHIER WAS  
 FOUND STABBED AND SHOT, LACEY  
 AND CO-DEFENDANT WERE  
 ARRESTED - LACEY WAS ARRESTED AT  
 THE CONCLUSION OF A CHURCH  
 SERVICE, AND, WHILE LACEY DID  
 NOT RESIST, THE POLICE, WHO  
 REEKED OF ALCOHOL, INFLECTED  
 VIOLENCE ON LACEY AND TOOK  
 OPEN A PBLONICAL CYST AREA THAT  
 HAD FINALLY HEALED LESS THAN ONE  
 WEEK EARLIER.

~~THE ARREST HAPPENED ABOUT 1930~~  
 HOURS, 08 APRIL, AND AFTER LACEY WAS  
 PARADED THROUGH HUNDREDS OF FELLOW  
 CHURCH MEMBERS, WHILE THE POLICE  
 THREATENED TO KILL THOSE PARISHIONERS,  
 LACEY WAS THEN TRANSPORTED ABOUT  
 THREE MILES TO THE PUBLIC SAFETY  
 BUILDING AND PARADED THROUGH  
 A WAITING CROWD OF TELEVISION  
 PHOTOGRAPHERS, AND QUESTIONED FOR  
 OVER AN HOUR, EVEN THOUGH LACEY  
 REPEATEDLY INSISTED HE WANTED TO  
 TALK TO AN ATTORNEY AND HIS  
 MINISTER.

(B)

ABOUT 2100, LACEN WAS BOOKED INTO THE JAIL.

OVER THE NEXT SEVERAL DAYS, BETWEEN LACEN WITHDRAWING FROM TWICE THE MAXIMUM DOSE OF EMPERIN 3'S, AND, SUFFERING FROM THE DAMAGED PULMONARIAL AREA, THE EVENTS WERE A BLUR.

THE CONDITIONS IMPOSED WERE HARSH (UNSTANDARD), AND, THE PULMONARIAL AREA BECAME INFECTED - THE MEDICAL PEOPLE AT THE COUNTY JAIL ALSO WORKED AT THE STATE PRISON AND "CONTRACTED" AT THE COUNTY JAIL - THEY COULD UNDERSTAND COMPETITORS, BECAUSE THEY "STOLE" THE MEDICAL SUPPLIES FROM THE PRISON, AND, LISTED ALL UNDER PRISONER 99,999 (EVEN THOUGH IN 1981 THE PRISONER COUNT WAS IN THE 18,000'S) - THEIR "STORY" WAS THAT IF LACEN WAS CONVICTED, THEY WOULD PROVIDE CARE AT THE PRISON, BUT, IF LACEN WAS ACQUITTED, THEN LACEN COULD BUY CARE IN THE "FREE WORLD".

SEVERAL WEEKS BEFORE TRIAL, LACEN WENT TO COURT AND THE COURT AGREED THE COUNSEL



INCOMPETENT (THE IDAHO SUPREME COURT HAD JUST FOUND THEM INCOMPETENT IN THREE OTHER CASES), SO, THE TRIAL JUDGE, NEWHOUSE, AGREED IN LACEY'S CASE, BEFORE TRIAL". (SEE APPENDIX A, ATTACHMENTS "B" AND "C" - PAGES 239 AND 240)

BUT, KEENE AND WIERE WERE LACEY'S COUNSEL AT TRIAL" AND, THE COURT REFUSED TO DEAL WITH IT.

THE TRIAL IS SELECTED, AND COMPLETED 18 SEPT. 1981. (SEE APPENDIX A, ATTACHMENT FF, PAGE 271). - [LACEY WAS STILL SUFFERING FROM PULMONARIAL ARTERIA INFECTIONS.] THE CHARGES ON LACEY ARE ATTACHMENT GG OF APPENDIX A, PAGE 272)

ON SEPT 21, THE STATE ADDED A SECOND MURDER ON LACEY (SEE APPENDIX A, ATTACHMENT AA, PAGE 264)

AND, THEN THE TRIAL STARTS. LACEY IS DENIED ARRANGEMENT OR PRELIMINARY HEARING ON THE FELONY MURDER.

ON THE VERDICTS, WE SEE ON APPENDIX A, ATTACHMENT AA, PAGE 264

Access to Courts - Indigent Paper

ROBBERY

MURDER, PREMEDITATED

MURDER, FELONY (NEVER ARRIVED AND NO PRELIMINARY HEARING)

FIREARM POSSESSION

THE COURT TOLD THE JURY THEY COULD CONVICT OF TWO MURDER ON ONE REASON (APPENDIX A, ATTACHMENT BB, PAGE 279) WHICH USED LARGE IDAHO CODE 19-2311 (ATTACHMENT C) AND 19-2719 IDAHO CODE (ATTACHMENT DD)

THE JURY DECIDES

ROBBERY - GUILTY (LATER MERGED INTO FELONY MURDER [12 IDAHO 97 (1986)])

PREMEDITATED MURDER (ATTACHMENT E) NOT GUILTY

FIREARM POSSESSION (ATTACHMENT WW) NOT GUILTY

ANOTHER AND THIRD FIREARM POSSESSIONS (ATTACHMENTS XX AND YY) GUILTY

(E)

Access to Courts - Indigent Paper

DURING TRIAL, THE POLICE SAY THEY RECORDED BAINBRIDGE AND "FORGOT" A RECORDER ON LACEY. - THEY SAY

LACEY REQUESTED COUNSEL AND THEY CONTINUED QUESTIONING, SAYING LACEY STATED "BAINBRIDGE DIDN'T DO IT". - THE JURY WAS TOLD TO "UNHEAR IT". -

AND, WHILE THE JURY WAS DELIBERATING THEY HAD A QUESTION INSTEAD OF TRIAL JUDGE ROBERT NEWHOUSE BRINGING IN THE PARTIES, NEWHOUSE ANSWERED THE QUESTION HIMSELF (ATTACHMENT B B OF APPENDIX A)

(THE HARSH CONDITIONS WERE STAPLED TO OCCUR IN LACEY'S BODY.)

NEWHOUSE SENTENCED LACEY TO DEATH

THE INCOMPETENT TRIAL COUNSEL REFUSED TO APPEAL.

LESS THAN EIGHTEEN HOURS BEFORE EXECUTION, LACEY'S MOTHER, MARILYN, FOUND DAVID NEUMAN, WHO OBTAINED A STAY.

(THE INDIAN DEPARTMENT OF  
COLLECTOR'S REFUSED CAPITAL  
CASE PRISONERS ACCESS TO LEGAL  
MATERIALS OR LAW BOOKS, -) THE  
NOTICE OF APPEAL LACEN WROTE  
AND SENT TO MARZON, WHEN  
MARZON TRIED TO FILE IT,  
WAS STOPPED BY THE COURTS. -

THE STATE AND U.S. DISTRICT  
COURT REFUSED LACEN LAW BOOKS,  
COURT RECORDS, ETC., AND  
DAVID NEUJIN DID THE CASE.  
(LACEN WAS HIS FIRST CLIENT  
IN PRIVATE PRACTICE.)

AT A FUTURE DATE, NEUJIN WAS  
ABLE TO GET A RULING THAT  
ROBBERY WAS AN ELEMENT OF  
FELONY MURDER, AND MERGED  
THE CHARGE. -

AFTER MANY ROUNDS, THE  
CASE WAS FINALLY UPHOLD  
IN IDAHO. - LEO WARBERG  
BRADFORD, JR, AND GAR HACKNEY  
TOOK ON THE CASE IN FEDERAL  
COURT. - WHEN HACKNEY TOLD  
LACEN THAT HACKNEY WAS  
ONLY GO TO SUCK FEDERAL

COURT DOLLARS, LACEY FILED  
A COMPLAINT AND HACKNEY  
GOT OFF THE CASE. - BRUCE  
LAMBTON GOT ON.

BRIFEARD WAS CONFRONTED BY  
LACEY AND HE ADMITTED HE  
WOULD DO ONE ISSUE AND  
TAKE IT TO EXHAUSTION, THEN  
ADDRESS ANOTHER (PRE-AEDPA  
STYLE) AND AS WAS WITH HUMANS  
TO PROFIT (THAT'S WAY HE  
WAS RUN OUT OF MASSACHUSETTS)  
BRIFEARD GOT OFF AND TODD  
MAYBROWN JOINED.

THE RULING CAME DOWN IN  
SERRA U. HARRISON 08-99006 (SEPT.  
2001) APPENDIX B

THE CASE CAME BACK DOWN AND  
BRUCE TELLS ME THAT LANNY  
LAMONT ANDERSON, HARRISON'S  
ATTORNEY, TOLD BRUCE THAT  
IF HE DID NOT WAIVE LACEY'S  
RIGHTS, THE STATE WOULD  
MAKE ALL CASES DIFFICULT.  
LACEY REPORTED ANDERSON'S  
ANDERSON PETITIONING JUDGE  
WENMILL TO RETALIATE ON  
LACEY FOR LACEY REPORTING

THE RECALCITRANT  
 W3N MALL JUST ISSUED  
 THE AMENDED JUDGMENT  
 (APPENDIX A, ATTACHMENT NN,  
 PAGE 289)

Access to Courts - Indigent Paper

THE CASE WENT BACK BEFORE  
 THE STATE, AND IDAHO CODE  
 14-2818 HAS THE IDAHO SUPREME  
 COURT TO DO THE ENTIRE CASE,  
 THEN APPOINT RONALD WALPER  
 TO DO IT, AND, TWO SHEETS  
 OF MANUSCRIPT APPEAR ON  
 ONE PAGE IN APPENDIX A,  
 ATTACHMENT UU, PAGE 299. (THE  
 PURPOSE OF THAT WAS TO SHOW  
 "LIFE IS 30 YEARS" IN IDAHO).  
 IT SHOWS THE BEGINNING  
 OF THE FIRST HEARING.

LACEY INSISTED HE WANTED  
 TO PROCEED PRO SE, BUT WALPER  
 INSISTED HE WANTED CHASTAIN  
 AND KRISTAL ON THE CASE.

WALPER DID LET LACEY MOVE  
 BACK TO THE PRISON (APPENDIX  
 A, ATTACHMENT ODD, PAGE 310).

AND, MIKE JAWHALL WAS ON  
 DEATH ROW AND "WARNED"

Access to Courts - Indigent Paper

Lacey, - CHASTAIN AND KRISTAL  
HAD BEEN APPOINTED TO  
REPRESENT JAHALLA, AND,  
THEY CALLED EVERY ONE OF  
JAHALLA'S FAMILY IN. - EACH  
WAS ASKED ON JAHALLA'S  
DEATH SENTENCE, AND, THEY  
STATED OPPOSITIONS. - THEN,  
THE STATE ASKED POINTED  
QUESTIONS ON MAIL AND  
PHONE CALLS. - WHEN THE  
FAMILY ANSWERED, THE PRO-  
SECUTOR WOULD BRING IN  
OPPOSING "EVIDENCE", -  
JAHALLA WAS RESENTENCED  
TO DEATH, AND, CHASTAIN  
AND KRISTAL TOLD JAHALLA  
THAT IF HE FOUGHT THE  
DEATH SENTENCE, THE  
PROSECUTOR WOULD PROSE-  
CUTE THE FAMILY. -  
JAHALLA HAD AIDS, AND,  
AFTER HE "WARNED" LACEY,  
JAHALLA QUIT TAKING HIS  
DRUGS AND DIED, TO SAVE  
HIS FAMILY. -  
LACEY'S MOM, MARION, WAS

WALLEN'S LEGAL ASSISTANT  
OF RECORD, AND, UNABLE  
TO BE FORCED TO TESTIFY.

Access to Courts - Indigent Paper

WALLEN'S MINISTER WAS  
PROTECTED BY THE CATHOLIC  
CHURCH. - HE CAME IN, GAVE  
A STATEMENT, AND LEFT. -

WALLEN'S SISTER WAS UNABLE  
TO TESTIFY BY DOCTOR'S  
ORDERS. -

(SOON AFTER THE SENTENCING,  
THE MINISTER'S WIFE  
DIED AND THE MINISTER  
SOON DIED FROM A BROKEN  
HEART.)

WALLEN HAD DEMANDED A  
FULL SENTENCING, AS  
ALLOWED BY LAW. - (SEE  
APPENDIX A, ATTACHMENT 00,  
PAGE 291), AND, SENT TO BOTH  
THE ADA COUNTY COURT AND  
STATE SUPREME COURT. -  
THE SSC CASE NUMBER  
IS 4441 - (SEE APPENDIX C)

WALLEN ASKED THE PROSECUTOR,



WHO STATED 7000  
PERSPECTIVE JURORS AND  
18 MONTHS. - WILPER REFUSED

Access to Courts - Indigent Paper

THE JURY SENTENCING

ON 28 AUGUST 2013, LACEY DID HIS  
ALLOCATION. - WILPER KEPT  
ARGUING WITH LACEY AND  
THAT DRAGGED IT OUT TO  
FOUR HOURS.

AS SOON AS THE ALLOCATION  
WAS DONE, WILPER ISSUED  
A SENTENCE WHICH HE  
HAD PREPARED AT SOME  
POINT BEFORE THE ALLO-  
CATION (MEANING HE DID  
NOT EVEN CONSIDER THE  
ALLOCATION). - AND, LACEY  
WAS IMMEDIATELY WHISKED  
OUT OF COURT. -

LACEY REMEMBERS WILPER  
SAYING "LIFE WITHOUT  
PAROLE", AND, SEVERAL  
MINUTES LATER WILPER  
AGAIN SAID "LIFE WITHOUT  
PAROLE" A SECOND TIME. -

AT A FUTURE DATE, LACEY WOULD SEE A "MINUSCRIPT" AND IT SHOWS THAT

WHEN LACEY WAS DONE WITH THE ALLOCUTION, THE JUDGE TOOK A RECESS AND WHEN THE COURT RECONVENED, HE STATES HE THOUGHT ABOUT IT AND WAS GIVING "LIES WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE" (ONE TIME)

LACEY HAS TRIED TO GET THE AUDIO TAPE OF THE HEARING - IT WOULD SHOW THE PAPER MANUSCRIPT IS FALSE, AND DIANE TUCKER HAS BEEN DOING THE TRANSCRIPTS ON LACEY SINCE 1981, SO, THAT MEANS NONE OF THE TRANSCRIPTS SINCE 1981 CAN BE TRUSTED.

LACEY FILED TO GO PRO SE ON APPEAL AND, FILED UNDER JOAH

15

LAW ON CAPITAL CASES BY  
DOING ANOTHER OF APPEAL, POST-  
CONVICTION, NEW TRIAL,  
SENTENCE CORRECTION (APPENDIX E).

(THE FULL PART IS IN THE COURTS  
PACER) WILPER HAD CHASTAIN AND  
KRISTAL PUT IN THE PAPERS AND  
THE COURT FORCED THE STATE  
APPELLATE PUBLIC DEFENDER -  
LACBY OBJECTED AND CITED  
FARRETTA V. CALIFORNIA 422 U.S,  
806 (1975) AND DEUTSCHER V. ANGELO  
ONE 16 F.3D 981 (1994), BUT, THE  
COURTS REFUSED TO ALLOW LACBY  
TO PROCEED. THE STATE APPELLATE  
PUBLIC DEFENDER PUT IN JAN  
THOMPSON - HE PUT IN THE BRIEF  
THAT THE SENTENCE WAS TOO  
SEVERE (WAS ADVANTAGE ALL OTHER ISSUES).  
JAN THOMPSON TOLD ME IN A  
PHONE MEETING THAT HE WAS GOING  
TO TALK TO OTHER ATTORNEYS IN  
ONLY THE ISSUES THAT HAD  
SUPREME

(4)

COURT WANTED ADDRESSED,  
AND, TURNED THE CASE OVER  
TO JOHN THOMPSONS, (BT WAS  
HIS CONTRIBUTION THAT THE  
COURT WANTED HIM TO TEACH  
THE OTHERS TO WAITING ISSUES)

WHEN THE IDIHO SUPREME  
COURT REFUSED REDRESS AFTER  
THE COURT OF APPEALS DENIED  
REDRESS, LACEY WENT TO THE  
US DISTRICT COURT ON A FEDERAL  
HABEAS CORPUS (SEE APPENDIX  
A), STUART V. BARBER -

AT FIRST LACEY WAS  
CONFUSED, BECAUSE THE IDIHO  
ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE,  
LANNY LAMONT ANDERSON,  
ARGUED THE CASE WAS  
BEYOND STATUTE, - BUT,  
WHEN LACEY WAS ABLE  
TO OBTAIN A DOCKET, LACEY  
UNDERSTOOD - (SEE APPENDIX D)  
DOCKET ENTRY 2 SHOWS  
THE COURT HAD THE ATTACH-  
MENTS / EXHIBITS - THEY COULD  
NOT SEE THAT THE U.S. SUPREME  
COURT WAS DETERMINING

ALLOWING COST.

WINMILL DENIED REORERS  
APPENDIX D, DOCKET ENTRY

103, ~~103~~

LACEY WENT TO THE NINTH  
CIRCUIT, AND, WAS GRANTED  
THE CERTIFICATE OF APPEAL-  
ABILITY. (APPENDIX H)

THE COURT PUT ON ROBYN FIFE,  
LACEY WOULD CALL AND THE  
SECRETARY WOULD TELL LACEY  
THEY WERE BUYING STORAGE  
UNITS TO DOWNLOAD THE  
PACER. - AT THE END OF THE  
TIME, FIFE ASKED FOR AN EX-  
TENSION - LACEY POINTED  
OUT THAT FIFE WAS ONLY ON  
LACEY'S CASE TO STEAL PACER  
DATA. - PETER SHAW APPOINTED  
LACEY "PRO SE".

THEN, JONAH HORWITZ  
WAS PUT ON AS AMICUS (APPENDIX  
I).

THE CASE PROCEEDED FORWARD,  
AND THE COURT GRANTED A  
VICTORY FOR LACEY (APPENDIX J)

(D)

WHEN THE CASE CAME BACK  
DOWN, WEND MILL WENT TO LAMMY  
LAMONT ANDERSON TO SHOW WHAT

ISSUES HAD BEEN ADDRESSED. - (INSTEAD  
OF LACOM SHOWING WHAT LACOM  
ADDRESSED)

SO, LACOM DID A DOCUMENT  
AND THE "FRONT PART" IS APPENDIX  
K, WHICH HAS TEN PAGES ON  
WHY WEND MILL'S 30 MARCH 2022  
RULING IS WRONG. - [THE  
ENTIRE DOCUMENT SHOULD  
BE IN THE PACER.] -- SEE  
APPENDIX K. (SEE APPENDIX G,  
DOCKET ENTRY 245)

THE MATTER WENT BACK UP

ABOUT THIS TIME, MARCH 2023,  
THE NINTH CIRCUIT STARTED  
TO REQUIRE INDIAH PRISONERS  
TO ELECTRONICALLY FILE.

IN EARLY 2024, THE ESCI  
PRISON HIRING ZAHIDA  
PERERA TO RUN THEIR  
"LAW LIBRARY, CALLED "RESOURCES

Center", -

Access to Courts - Indigent Paper

WHEN THE NINTH CIRCUIT SENDS A DOCUMENT, THEY ALSO SEND A COVER DOCUMENT. ZAHBIDA FORWARDS THE COVER DOCUMENT, BUT WITHHOLDS THE DOCUMENT. - SHE SENDS A NOTICE THAT IF WE WANT THE DOCUMENT, TO ASK THE COURT TO SEND THE DOCUMENT THEY ALREADY SENT. (EXAMPLES ON THIS CASE ARE APPENDIX CC (24-3384 #042) AND APPENDIX DD (24-3384 #052))

HORWITZ REMAINED AMICUS APPENDIX B)

SO, WHEN YOU LOOK AT 24-3384, LACEN DID NOT RECEIVE THE DOCUMENTS FROM THE COURT OR PROPOSING COUNSEL. - THIS VIOLATES THE "SERVICES" REQUIREMENTS AND (SINCE IT RARELY IS ADDRESSED) ARTHUR ANDERSON LLP V. UNITED STATES, 544 U.S. 696

THE NINTH CIRCUIT DENIED A CO.A., AND LACEN FILED

(P)

A JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT (APPENDIX M) AND CRIMINAL COMPLAINT (APPENDIX N) ON NELSON. - THE CRIMINAL COMPLAINT APPEARS AS 3:25-CV-01460-AMC. THEN, HURWITZ ENTERED A DENIAL, AND LACEY FILED JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT (APPENDIX O) AND CRIMINAL COMPLAINT (APPENDIX P). THE CRIMINAL COMPLAINT APPEARS AS 3:25-CV-01471-AMC.

DURING THE TIME, WHEN LACEY WAS AT BSCC PRISON, VERNON GREENLAND, JR, DEMANDED LACEY STOP DOING LEGAL WORK AND STAY IN PRISON TILL DEAD. - THIS IS BECAUSE LORRIE FULTON OVERDOSED LACEY'S MOM ON BLOOD THINNERS, CAUSING BLOOD VESSELS TO RUPTURE IN MARLON'S HEAD. LORRIE THEN HELD MARLON SIXTEEN HOURS, ENSURING BRAIN DAMAGE, BEFORE CALLING PARAMEDICS. - LORRIE PUT MARLON IN A CAR



FACILITY AND STOLE ALL MARIJUANA  
AND LARRY'S POSSESSIONS. →

Access to Courts - Indigent Paper

LORRIE'S SON, ZACK, WAS A  
PRISON GUARD, SO, LORRIE HAD

GREENLAND RETALIATE, TO TRY  
TO KEEP LARRY IMPRISONED  
FOR FEAR OF LARRY'S RELEASE, -

WHEN LARRY REFUSED TO STOP BEING  
LEGAL IN ~~2015~~ 2015-2022, GREEN-

LAND WOULD HAVE ~~BEEN~~ GUARDIANS TAKE  
ALL LARRY'S PROPERTY AND FILES OUT  
OF THE CELL AND TOAN OFFICE,

TRASH IT, DISPOSE OF PLOT, ETC. →

THERE ARE SIX INCIDENTS THAT  
LARRY FILED CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS

ON THE MATTERS, APPENDIX R

IS THE CASES AND THEIR

ANCESTRY. (THE FEDERAL JUDGE

IN IDAHO REFUSED TO ALLOW  
ACTION) -

IT IS BASED ON APPENDIX Q,

WHICH ALLOWS IT, AND,

EXPLAINS MAGEWOOD V PARRSON.

LARRY ALSO FILED OTHER

ACTIONS FOR REDRESS BECAUSE

THE COURTS AND GOVERNMENT OF

IDAHO ARE DEMANDING REDRESS, (THE

PRISONS HAVE LESS THAN 50 PERCENT

MINIMUM STAFFING, ARE OVERLOADED, AND, HAVE SENT A LOT OF PRISONERS TO BE HELD IN OTHER STATES, - IT HAS BECOME A DICTATORSHIP WITH AN OVERFLOW OF PRISONERS.

APPENDIX T IS APPEALS TO THE US COURTS (LACK OF SUPERVISORY CONTROL)

APPENDIX EE SHOWS THAT LAEGY DID EXHAUST THE ISSUES IN STATE COURT (LATER IN APPENDIX A). THE FULL APPENDIX EE IS IN PAPER. -

(APPENDIX FF IS FOUR FEDERAL QUESTIONS) IN MID 2023, THE NINTH CIRCUIT STARTED TO REQUIRE IDHIO PRISONERS TO ELECTRONICALLY FILE.

IN THE BEGINNING OF 2024, THE ESC PRISON Hired ON ZAHBOA PEREA TO RUN THEIR LAW LIBRARY (CALLED "RESOURCE CENTER".)

WHEN THE NINTH CIRCUIT SENDS DOCUMENTS, THEN SEND COVER DOCUMENTS. ZAHBOA FORWARDS THE COVER DOCUMENTS AND WITHHOLDS THE DOCUMENTS (SEE APPENDIX CCA AND DD)

SO, LACEY WAS UNABLE TO GET DOCUMENTS TO RESPOND ON THE CASE.

AND, WHEN LACEY PUT IN ON THE CASES, LIKE APPENDIX CC AND DD AND OTHERS, SINCE THE NINTH CIRCUIT ISSUED THE PAPERS, LACEY CAN GO WHERE THE EVENT STARTS, CONTINUES, ENDS. - LACEY WENT TO THE US DISTRICT COURT (NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, AND EACH "SIVAK V PEREA" WAS AN ACTION TO COMPEL UNDER 28 USC 1361

APPENDIX GG ARE ON ZAHIDA PEREA WITHHOLDING DOCUMENTS - EACH CASE IS ONE UNKNOWN DOCUMENT

MOST CASES WERE HEARD BY ADALBERT MARTINEZ-OLGUIN, WHO WANTED \$40500 OR \$60500 ON EACH. - WHEN LACEY PUT IN TO GO UNDER IMMIGRANT DANGER, DUE TO BEING ILLEGALLY HELD, SHE REFUSED. -

(CLEARLY HER RULINGS ARE ILLEGAL, AS ARTHUR ANDERSON U.S. V. UNITED STATES DOES NOT ALLOW THE WITHHOLDING OF EVIDENCE / DOCUMENTS) - THE CASES INVOLVING



MARTINEZ-OLGUIN IS IN  
 APPENDIX H H. - MANY SHEETS  
 ON JUDGMENT ON HERSELF.  
 (SEE APPENDIX H A)

AND ARACELI MARTINEZ-  
 OLGUIN IS STOPPING APPEALS  
 ON THE CASES SHE DENIED, AND  
 MOST WERE AGAINST HER. - AN  
 EXAMPLE FROM MAY 2025, IS APPENDIX I  
 (THE CASE SHE LOST AS 24-CU-  
 06261-AMO (PR) IS 3:24-CU-06261-  
 AMO AND IS ACTUALLY

"IN THE MATTER OF LACEY  
 SVAK FOR A WRIT OF SUPER-  
 VISORY CONTROL ON A  
 FEDERALLY PROTECTED RIGHT")

(MONTAÑEZ, SVAK, V. UNKNOWN PARTY  
 25-362)

AND DEALS WITH PRISON OFFICIALS  
 MALICIOUSLY DESTROYING IN-  
 COMING AND OUTGOING LEGAL MAIL.

LACEY IS LIMITED ON PAGES HERE,  
 BUT APPENDIX U AND V SHOW THE  
 NINTH CIRCUIT JUDGES ARE CLEARLY  
 SUPPORTING THE VIOLATION OF SERVICE  
 OF DOCUMENTS AND, MALICIOUS OBSTRUC-  
 TION OF RIGHTS.

(4)

Lacey also made  
 in Quincy because a contract  
 provided "contingency" has  
 been withholding Lacey's  
 medications since CPL Jan Plummer  
 took them 23 July 2024. - The  
 reason is Lacey was taking on  
 bill off each card, each day, as  
 per the promise made to Dr. [redacted].  
 The bill number matched the day  
 of the month. - Summer Gloridge  
 says we must take only one card  
 at a time. - Appendix JJ shows the  
 units.

March 07, the prison guards stole  
 Lacey's files, medicines, property,  
 and A.D.A. items. - In the past  
 Lacey had addressed to the  
 U.S.A.G. on Americans with  
 Disabilities Act, because the  
 prison did not follow federal  
 statute (Appendix BB). - On  
 29 May 2025, there is no  
 A.D.A. issues left. - See Appendix  
 KK

THIS CASE STARTS

HERE

THE JUDGMENT WAS APPENDIX Z  
LACON, USING APPENDIX Q PUT  
IN "ISSA 35(a)(c) TO CORRECT AN  
ILLEGAL SENTENCE". (APPENDIX U)

THE DISTRICT COURT GRANTED  
THE AMENDMENT (CORRECTING  
APPENDIX MM).

LACON APPEALED (APPENDIX  
NA)

THE SUPREME COURT GAVE AN  
"ORDER CONDITIONALLY DIS-  
MISSING APPEAL" (APPENDIX  
OO)

LACON ALSO FILED DOCH-  
MENTS FOR FILES RETURN,  
ETC, WHILE THIS WAS GOING  
ON.

LACON FILED FOR THE COURT  
TO TAKE INDICIAL NOTICE  
OF TRIAL JUDGE BEAT.  
(APPENDIX PP)

LACON ALSO FILED FOR  
WAIVER OF FEES IN THE  
DISTRICT COURT (ATTACHED  
TO ISSA SET) AND ONE TO  
THE IDAHO SUPREME COURT.

## APPENDIX QQ

THE DISTRICT COURT DENIED WAIVER (APPENDIX RR)

LACOM APPEALED (APPENDIX SS)

THE STATE SUPREME COURT ISSUED ITS ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL (APPENDIX TT)

LACOM FILED JAR RULE 42 PETITION FOR REHEARING (APPENDIX UU)

COURT DENIED REHEARING (APPENDIX VU)

LACOM FILED A CRIMINAL COMPLAINT ON BEVAN (APPENDIX WW)  
THE DISTRICT COURT REJECTED IT. ALSO, LACOM APPEALED (APPENDIX XX)

IN THE IOWA SUPREME COURT, LACOM ALSO FILED APPENDIX YY THAT HE'S NEVER BEEN LAWFULLY REPRESENTED.

APPENDIX ZZ DEFENSES "SHALL"



APPENDIX AAA IS RIPPON V. BAKER

APPENDIX BBB IS THE DOCUMENTS  
TO ALLOW CITIZENS TO FILE  
CRIMINAL CASES

APPENDIX CCC IS "LIFE IS  
30 YEARS" IN IDAHO

APPENDIX DDD IS THE APPEAL  
ON CRIMINAL COMPLAINT  
(NYE, RULIN)

APPENDIX EEE IS CRIMINAL  
COMPLAINT ON NYE

APPENDIX FFF IS THE CRIMINAL  
COMPLAINT ON SCOT



## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

U.S. CONSTITUTION, AMENDMENTS 5, 6, 9, 10, AND 14  
GIVE LACEY THE RIGHTS TO

A. QUESTIONING MUST CEASE WHEN DEFENDANT  
INSISTS ON ATTORNEY (STATEMENT OF CASE PAGE  
[MIRANDA V. ARIZONA 384 U.S. 436])

AND, WHEN POLICE/LAW-ENFORCEMENT  
MADE STATEMENT OF WHAT LACEY  
ALLEGEDLY STATED AFTER INVOKING  
"MIRANDA", TRIAL JURY IS ILLEGAL.

B. ~~ARRAIGNMENT~~ (FD. CODE 19-1502) DEFENDANT  
MUST BE PRESENT (ID. CRIM. R. 5(b)-

24 HOURS) [NEVER ARRAIGNED ON FELONY MURDER/FIREARMS]

C. PRELIMINARY HEARING (ID. CRIM. R. 5  
(a) - 14 DAYS) (19-804 FD. CODE)  
[NO PRELIM. ON FELONY MURDER/FIREARM]

D. PREMEDITATED MURDER IS THE MOST  
SEVERE AND "FELONY MURDER" IS A  
LESSER-INCLUDED OFFENSE. THE SECOND  
MURDER ON THE SAME PERSON IS

ILLEGAL AND THE JURY MUST FIND  
ON THE MOST SEVERE AND CAN REDUCE  
IT (19-2312 CONVICTION OF INCLUDED

OFFENSE), BUT, WHEN NOT GUILTY WAS  
FOUND ON PREMEDITATED MURDER, IT  
INCLUDED ANY LESSER COUNT.)

(ATTACHMENTS OF APPENDIX A)

E. DEPRIVED OF MEDICAL CARE AT JAIL AND PRISON - "TORTURED" AND ABUSED.

(A.D.A. DID NOT COME TO BE A LAW TIL 1990)

F. TRIAL JUDGE ADMITTED TO BIAS - TRIAL ILLEGAL (APPENDIX PP) (THE WITHROW V. LARKIN 1975 CASE IN APPENDIX AAA)

G. COUNSEL FOUND INCOMPETENT BEFORE TRIAL MEANS TRIAL AND ALL POST-TRIAL ILLEGAL

H. TRIAL JUDGE ADMITS TEACHING WINNIE APPELLATE JUDGE, USING LACEY'S CASE (BIAS) (WITHROW V. LARKIN IN APPENDIX AA) (1:23-CV-0043-DCN)

I. THE NEW AMENDED/CORRECTED JUDGMENT (APPENDIX MM) IS A NEW APPEAL AS DEFINED IN MAGWOOD V. PATTERSON 561 U.S. 320 AND SEVAK V. DOE (APPENDIX Q)

J. LACEY DEMANDED JURY RE-SENTENCING (4114 I.S.S.C. - APPENDIX C) AND IT WAS DENIED, VIOLATING 18-4004 I.D. CODE PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER

"IF A JURY ..."

SO LACEY HAS NOT BEEN LEGALLY RESENTENCED

K. U.S. CODE REQUIRED WINMILL TO DO THE CAPITAL CASE IN 450 DAYS. - HE HAS DRAGGED IT OUT SINCE 1996 TO PRESENT.

L. WINMILL HAD MOST OF THE FEDERAL HABEAS CORPUS ON 11-16-CV-00189-BLW (APPENDIX A AND D) TO TAMPER WITH RECORDS

M. WINMILL WAS FOUND BY THE NINTH CIRCUIT IN SIVAK V. HARDISON 08-99006 SIVAK V. CHRISTENSEN 19-35713 (2022 RULING)

TO HAVE BEEN INVOLVED IN MISCONDUCT.

N. THE APPENDIX 22 DEFINES "SHALL". IDAHO CODE 18-4004 "PUNISHMENT FOR MURDER" STATES

"...THE COURT SHALL IMPOSE A ~~LIFE SENTENCE WITH A MINIMUM PERIOD OF CONFINEMENT~~ OF NOT LESS THAN TEN YEARS" ...

SEE APPENDIX 2

O. APPENDIX CCC SHOWS LIFE IS 30 YEARS AND LACEM HAS BEEN IMPRISONED

P. THE TRIAL AND ENTIRE PROCESS IS ILLEGAL AS SET IN THESE PAGES

Q IN APPENDIX UU, LACEY POINTS OUT THAT HE CANNOT PAY, BUT, BRITAIN V. ILLINOIS 351 U.S. 2 REQUIRES LACEY BE PROVIDED TRANSCRIPTS AND THE COURT RECORD AND ALLOWED TO APPEAL

RR APPENDIX UU SHOWS THE PARALEGAL WITHHOLDING DOCUMENTS, APPENDIX HH IS THE FEDERAL JUDGE CONDONING IT.


THEY MUST DELIVER THE HELD DOCUMENTS, PAY FOR TIME HELD, STAND ACCOUNTABLE, AND, THE COURT GRANT LACEY RELIEF ON ALL CASES AFFECTED.

(ARTHUR ANDERSEN LLP V. UNITED STATES 544 US 696)

**CONCLUSION**

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of stylized initials, is written over a solid horizontal line.

Date: 12 JUNE 25