

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON DC 20543-0001

RICARDO ENRIQUEZ SANCHEZ — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

LORIE DAVIS, Director — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

USCA 5th Cir. Case 16-51771 from 8-3-2017
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

RICARDO ENRIQUEZ SANCHEZ
(Your Name)

CID TERRELL PRISON R3
(Address)

1300 FM 655 Rosham TX 77583-
(City, State, Zip Code)

(281) 595 3481
(Phone Number)

See

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED ✓

28 US § 2254 Waco TX Court Prevent file Constitutional claims
USDC WESTERN DISTRICT DISCRIMINATE REVIEW IN HABEAS CORPUS
EXPERT TESTIMONY IN THE GUILT - INNOCENCE Phase and
4th amend 5th amend 6th amend and 14th amend constitutional
of a Child indecency c.p. 21.11 Need Prove any
element include Evidence to intent under Rule of
Evidence 702 Scientific, technical, or other specialized
knowledge will help trier of fact to understand the
evidence or to determine a fact in issue, a witness who
is qualified as an expert by knowledge, skill, experience,
training or education may testify in the form an opinion
or otherwise. In The case 2008-1925-C1

THE Trier act under Expert Witness Tex R of Evid.
702 were followed in a strict manner, this type of expert
testimony along with many other topics would be eliminated
if that is Confuse to understand the evidence or determine
a fact in issue to determine what type of opinions
and expert can to offer and describes who qualifies
as an expert Of course the unremovable observation
that an expert may be qualified by experience in
this case how seriously lacking in empiricism
because don't saying is that this child is victim of any
act of intent or symptom that prove she has been touched
sexually EXPERT Lack or ignore The underlying the expert
testimony because no exist any act or There are no reliable
symptoms behavior that prove a child has been touched sexually
abused because no exist moral turpitude involve or any
aggravate act or because The child live in the own
TESTIMONY P Example 13 May 2017 Sonday all family
have a party celebration of Birthday of The victim and
mother, The date of one of the accusation against
Defendant but no one took about that important
point. as many times were asked to facts talking
about a true memory and which child was talking
about a false memory NO Remember and Lack information
Jessica Esqueda Newer can't identification. True to Defendant in
8- The event.

note add. (8)(a) CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

- 1) Grounds for state postconviction Relief Petitioner are Claims of Const Errors. That is assertions that the Conviction Sentence 2008-1925-C1 and 2008-1926-C2 and any misdemeanor cause and Custody include Detainer and Punishment for The accident Occurred on 4-1-2016 Result in Injury and Punishment for 6-9-2017 out of Place Results from an error involving a violation a provision of Constitutional Law since 1930's and 1940's
- 2) Const. Grounds for Relief have been the most frequent raised and litigated was Petitioner been issues in multiple ways but Discriminatory acts exist for a Mexican Population was uneducated in law with poor English affecting the Validity of The conviction
- 3) Claim that the Statute CCP § 21.11 defining the Offence and Ex parte Smith 135 Mo 223, 36 S.W 628 (1896) - Ex parte Rollins 80 Va 314 (1885) because The word Intent not Apply in The Allegation to Prove Prosecutor Act. To Intent the Requisite Error from Courts Need Review No exist any act of intent Before Act of Indecency Allegation False.
- 4) or Define the Offence prescribed the punishment over The Statute 2-20 or may be 2-10 misdemeanor in The 21.07 CCP. because The case not involve any act of moral Turpitude. To The Total Holding The unconstitutional detainer or Release. for unconstitutional Sentence involve False Arrest Against Mr Enriquez for Indecency w/ch on Aug 8, 2008 See Eg person V. Wimbish 124 Ga 76 (52 E 651 (1906) (Ordinance authorizing Sentence violate due Process)
- 5) Claims That the Convicted Mr Enriquez has been denied a Constitutional Right to App. to witness. to proper Defense to Cancel Affy. to New Trial, to Confront witnesses ect. Was The Courts Denied a Const. Right to proceedings The reach of habeas corpus has been expanded to include denials of fundamental Fairness; habeas corpus may be used if Enriquez positive was deprived of fair trial Eg State v. Sims 65 NJ 359 322 A.2d 809 (1974) Lomb V. Page 482 P 2d 615 (Okla Crim App (1971) People v. Wheeler 5 Cal App 3d 534, 85 Cal. Rptr 291 (1970)
- 6) Also Denied any Const. Right in The Sentencing proceeding Generally both Fed. and St. Const. Grounds are Cognizable in proceedings pursuant Remedy's See eg Georgia Hab. C. Act 1967. Ga Laws p. 835. Relief. See Appendix A infra. (8)(a)

(8)(b)

Note add.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- (1) Whether Under 28 USC § 2253(c)(1)(A), a CBA ISSUE Habeas Corpus § 2254 MR. Enriquez Can Appeal the District Court's Denial To Grant a habeas Corpus, for Substantial showing, District Court deny a Constitutional right to Claims debatable or Wrong Conviction and Civil Complain for any Procedural in Courts Criminal, Civil or Administrative Procedurals, for invalidates a federal treat or statute or holding a state statute to objection Should To succeed on a Brady Claim to Court Review Goals for innocent under fourteenth Amendment and other therein Denied witnesses and violation Civil Rights Denie my right to Appeal because I'm Mexican?
- (2) Mr Enriquez Applying for Relief is indigent and Claim which would entitle him to Relief, also The conviction denied Postconviction Relief Enriquez he seek appellate review of the denial of the Postconviction Petition via a Supervisory writ is further appellate Review immigration Detainer
- (3) Habeas Corpus Judgments - Deprivation of Due Process in State Conviction Fraudulent Court Appoint.
- (4) To Obtain new trial base newly discovery evidence favorable to defendant Under Brands Rule. Prove not be merely Cumulative is material to the issue's each Statemen from The Prosecutor include C.E.P § 21.11 3rd degree misdemeanor - Sentence Unconstitutional - State court need prove Intent exist, § 21.07 Need Review and Recantation, Summariz any Denials.
- (5) A Wrongful Incarceration Should There be More Than a Moral Obligation - Compensation - I'm Suffer for my medical condition from my accident and Pain and for not proper medical Attention
- (6) And Compensation for The accident. Cause injury on 4/1/2016
- (7) and Pay for Pain Suffer need Civil Remedy; from false Conviction

Court in Was violate my Rights and unconstitutional Arrest 8/2/2008

(8) I believe in a new Trial and Reopen Arguments based in Newly discovered "Arguments; evidence"; favorable To Defence

(9) if I'm Innocent and I can't undersend all the law I have finish The Sentence for wrong conviction and continuity with a civil Complain in any Contry Against The state of TX. ? Because I never did any Act of indecency with Child. I have Way for Emigration?

(8)(C)

Note add

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

Constitutional Law: Bill of Rights, Procedural Due Process
General Overview.

Defendant Have Rights to Review Procedural Due Process
Was the State violate, also if the Defendant failed maybe
To show That Tex penal Code Ann §§ 22.011 and 21.11
Violated his rights to due Process and due Course of Law
because the fact that a statute might be invalid in some
situations did not establish that there were no circum-
stances in which the statute could be held valid defendant
made no contention that the Due Course of Law Clause of
the Texas Constitution afforded greater protection than
that afforded by the due Process Clause of the United
State Constitution Jennings v. State SW 3d 2011 Tex app
LEXIS 9925 (Tex App. Eastland Dec 15 2011)

Constitutional Law: The Judiciary Case or Controversy: Constitu-
tional of legislation General Overview. "Conduct of Sp. Father."

Trial Court erred by sua sponte determining that
Tex. Fam Code Ann § 161.002(b) was unconstitutional as
violating due process and equal protection because there was
no evidence of any injury a father did not automatically
have full Constitutional parental Rights by virtue of his
mere biological relationship Rather the fathers Rights had
to be asserted early in the child's life in re CMD 287
SW 3d 510 516 2009 Tex App. Lexis 4765 (Tex App - Houston
14th Dist 2009 - State need prove injury.

Constitutional Law Bill of Rights: Fundamental Right
Procedural Due Process: General Overview.

When defendant was convicted of two counts
That The Trial Court denied him due process When the
Judge made comments demonstrating partiality at
punishment the trial Courts comments reflecting on
other similar case did not reflect bias partiality or
the failure consider the full punishment range instated
the trial court considered the evidence of defendant's
Prior Criminal History Probation and failure to seek any
Treatment - These factors influenced The sentence
Compare with cause 2008-1925-C1 to 2008-1926-C2

see, Martinez v. State - SW 3d 2013 Tex App Lexis 4683 (Apr 2013)

(8)(C)

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:

- 1 Director of TDCJ Lori Davis Director
- 2 Prosecutors Ms Beth Toban & Mr Parker
- 3 Court Appoint Attorney Walter Rivas
- 4 Interpreter Carro del To -
- 5 Waco police Department
- 6 Federal Court in Waco Denie Deseriminatory to Mexican Innocent man & Court Appoint Atty At Law and Denie Hearing for End.
- 7 Same "State Court" did cause 2008-1926-C2 Holding for 3 yers and Removed Original Court Appoint Atty. in case 2008-1925-C1 To (2008-1926-C2) A Hornys Charge my Family \$900 Dll for lie Detector He force me to Sained a Revocation provation Against me in The Cause 2008-1925-C1 state Court Officers.

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 -	8/3/17 Pg #19 - (1) page 20 from USCA 5th Cir on Aug. 03, 2017 Judmen issue Mandate.
APPENDIX B -	8/3/17 (21 to 49) Review Evidence Allowed motion to Hearing New Arguments
APPENDIX C	Letter 1-8-14 F.R.E.T.S. (50 to 51)
APPENDIX D	Common Law under 28 USC § 1651 (51(a) to 129)
APPENDIX E	NOTES (130 to 142) 13 pages.
APPENDIX F	Court Response 5th Cir 16-51071 (142 to 179) 37 pages.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
Miller 81 537 US 47 327	
Bowen V. State 374 SW 3d 427 App. 2012	Page (5)
Jackson V. Virginia 443 US 307 318-319 (1979)	Page (5)
Frase V. State 07-15-00 267 CR 2017	Page (5)
TX App Lexi 5368 (Tex App Amarillo (June 9 2017) pg (5)	
US V. Colorado Lessa 16-50328. pg (5)	
2017 US App Lexis 11303 (5th Cir Jun 9, 2017 (5) pg	
Gilho V. United State 405, US 150, 152, 154 (1977)	
Under State V. Davis 16-70005, 2016 US App Lexis (5 pg)	
21470 (5th Cir June 15 2017), US C 3529 (5 pg)	
28 USC 2253 (1) (1) Jare Lee V. Under State 16-327	
2017 US Lexis 4045 US June 23, 2017 (6 pg)	
LED Digest Hab. Corpus 112.5 28 US CS 2244 (d) 11 Page 7	
HAB. Corp. § 112.5 2244 (d) (1) (A) (page 8)	
ANDERSON V. Creyton 483 US 635 (1987) (page 10)	
Hunter V. Clandy 558 F2d 220 5th Cir. (page 10)	
STATUTES AND RULES	
28. USCS § 2244 (d) (1) (A) Page 3	
§ 1254. § 1257 Page 3	
28 Fed. Practice §§ 671.13 Page 4	
28 USCS, 2244 Hab. Cor. 153 L Ed 2d 981 Page 4	
28 USCS § 2255 Remedy in Fed. Custody 143 L Ed page 4	
LED Digest Hab. Corpus § 112.5 Page 4	
LED Appeal § 1321 Page 4	
CCP 21.11. CCP. 21.07	
CCP - 12.	
10 USC § 867	
28 USC § 1651 a	
28 US § 2241	
Act 5 USC §§ 701-706	

OTHER

4th Amend., 5th Amend., 6th Amend 14th Amend.
CIVIL RIGHTS OF THE CONST.

ART. 64.03

Page (2)

TX PenCode. 303.09

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

<i>Prystash v. Davis</i> , No 16-70014 (2017 US App)	
<i>Miley & v. Cockrell</i> 537 US 322 338 (2003)	
<i>Buck v David</i> 137 S Ct 759 773 (2017)	
<i>Gonzalez v Thaler</i> 565 US 134-140-141 (2012)	
<i>Nunes v. Ramirez Palma</i> 485 F 3d 432 (9th Cir 2007)	
<i>Martin v. Rios</i> 472 F 3d 1206, 1207 (9th Cir 2007)	
<i>Thibodeau v Portvondo</i> 486 F 3d 61, 141 (2d Cir 2007)	
<i>Dressler v. McCaughy</i> 238 F 3d 908 912 (7th Cir 2007)	
<i>Brady v. Maryland</i> 373 US 83-83 of 1194 1963	

STATUTES AND RULES

Rule 22(b) of the Fed. Rul. of App. Pro. Amend by the Act.

§ 2241

§ 2243

§ 1983

§ 2104 Determination

§ 21-11

§ 21.07

OTHER Case No (16-50071) (05-15-90036) (6-12-CV-00-284-RP)

(4:16-2688) (096-517-203)

TOUS REC. 1745089

Parole # 1745089

INTERNATIONAL LAW. Human. Riv. Rights for Innocent.

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 _____ 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 A to the petition and is

- ☒ reported at mandate 16-51071; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the USCA 5th Cir. court appears at Appendix F to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at 2087; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

✓ 5th Cir. C. N. O.
[] For cases from **federal courts**: (No 16-51071) 10 USC (1651) 28 USC (1651)
Rule 10.
Rule 14 2867 Rule 12.5
The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case
was 8-3-2017.

[] 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: 8-3-2017, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix F.

[] 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).

R. 12.5

R. 14.

R. 10

10 USC 28 USC 1651

✓ [] For cases from **state courts**:

6:12-CV-284 USDC Waco TX

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

[] A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: 8-3-2017, 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. § 1257(a).

Rule 12.5.

R. 14

R. 10

10 USC 28 USC 1651

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

THE SUPREMACY CLAUSE OF THE CONSTITUTION PROVIDES IN RELEVANT PART: THE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES SHALL BE THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND ANY THING IN THE CONSTITUTION OR LAWS OF ANY STATE TO THE CONTRARY NOTWITHSTANDING US CONST. ART VI, C12

THE 4th AMEND DURING ARREST.

THE 6 AMEND DURING JURY TRIAL

THE 14 AMEND DUE PROCESS AND EQUAL PROTECTION LAW

§ 1915A Screening

§ 1916 Semen Suits.

§ 2241 POWER to Grant writ (S)

§ 2244 Finality of Definitive

Supreme Rule 14 Confront

Supreme Rule 10. Consider Case.

1. Dean v. United States No 15-9260, 2017 US Lexis 2190 (US April 3, 2017) Regard Sentence
2. Moore v. Texas No 15-797, 2017 US Lexis 2185 (US March 28, 2017)
Court Consider Prisoner factor in Trial Court
Case, 2008, 1925-C1 7-14-2009 and 7-13-2011
3. Guilty for perjury oneself Guilty but not for
indeency to self oneself after Coercion
Case. 2008-1926-C2

1/2

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Ricardo Enrique Sanchez Legal Alien in USA - Native of Mexico DF
PRISONER IN TOL #1745089 WAS CONVICTED BY A JURY OF TWO COUNTS
OF INDECENCY WITH A CHILD CCP § 21.11 WAS SENTENCED TO CONSECUTIVE
TERM OF 13 YEARS IN PRISON SENTENCE UNCONSTITUTIONAL BECAUSE

1. STATUTE OF INDECENCY W/CH. IS 2 TO 20
2. RECOMMENDATION FROM THE PROSECUTOR SUGGEST TO THE HON JUDGE IN BAD FAITH
CONSECUTIVE WHEN PROSECUTOR MADE FALSE EVIDENCES FROM MISDEMINOR CASE
AND REVOCATION PROVISION UNCONSTITUTIONAL AFFECT THE SENTENCE BECAUSE
FALSE STATEMENTS PROSECUTOR GIVE TO THE TRIAL COURT BY JURY.
3. TO DETERMINE WHETHER A PRIOR OFFENSE IS A CRIME OF VIOLENCE FOR SENTENCING
ENHANCEMENTS PURPOSES UNDER THE CATEGORICAL APPROACH, THE COURT LINES UP THE
ELEMENTS OF THE PRIOR OFFENSE WITH THE ELEMENTS OF THE GENERIC ENUMERATED
OFFENSE TO SEE IF THEY MATCH IF THE ELEMENT OF PRIOR OFFENSE COVER CONDUCT
BEYOND WHAT THE GENERIC OFFENSE COVERS IT IS NOT A QUALIFYING OFFENSE THE CATEG-
ORICAL APPROACH NOT IS A OFFENSE IN LINE UP DOES NOT CONSIDER THE CONDUCT OF THE
DEFENDANT IN COMMITTING THE OFFENSE.
4. ACCORDING FROM THE HISTORY IN THE RECORDS ENRIQUEZ DON'T SPEAK ENGLISH IN COURT
HE LEARNING WITH DIFFICULTY AND FRUSTRATION INTEN TO COMMUNICATION TO THE COURT
THE INFAMOUS ACUTATION WAS IS FALSE AND NOT TRUE ACCORDING FROM THE TRUE
EVIDENCES THE ACUSATION IS ERROR AND FOR APPROXIMATE 10 YEARS PETITIONER SEEK FOR
NEW TRIAL AND DISCOVERY EVIDENCES AND COMPULSORY EACH ACUSATION IN ORDER
TO PROVE PROSECUTOR FROM THE ALLEGATION IN CONVICTION WITH MY EX WIFE AND
CHILDRENS AGAINST ME FOR SOMETHING NO IS REALITY EXIST.
5. IF STATUTE IS DIVISIBLE MINING IT SETS OUT ONE OR MORE ELEMENTS OF THE OFFENSE IN
THE ALTERNATIVE THE COURT APPLIES THE MODIFIED CATEGORICAL APPROACH TO
NARROW AN OFFENSE THAT OTHERWISE WOULD NOT BE A CATEGORICAL MATCH
WITH AN ENUMERATED OFFENSE COURT NEED LOOKS AT SHEPARD DOCUMENTS
FROM THE MISDEMINOR AND TO FOREINDICTAMEN DATE OR INT. TERMS OF A
PLEA AGREEMENT OR TRANSCRIPT OF THE PLEA HEARING IN WHICH THE
FACTUAL BASIS FOR THE PLEA WAS CONFIRMED BY THE DEFENDANT IF THESE
DOCUMENTS SHOW THE ALTERNATIVE MENTAL STATES ARE MEANS AND
NOT ELEMENTS THEN THE STATUTE IS NO DIVISIBLE
6. ESTABLISH ERROR AND DEFECT THAT HAS NOT BEEN INTENTIONALLY RELINQUISHED OR
ABANDONED FOR MEDICAL JUSTIFICATION FOR TRANSFERS FOR NOT ACCESS TO
COURT INTO THE TIME REQUIRED ON ANY LEGAL REASON AFFECTS THE FAIRNESS
INTEGRITY OR PUBLIC REPUTATION OF JUDICIAL PROCEEDING ENRIQUEZ IS A
MEXICAN FIRST LANGUAGE SPANISH RECORDS IN COURT AND TOL IF PROVE THE
CONTRARY COURT AND TOL VIOLATE RIGHT TO INTERPRETER FOR YEARS BECAUSE
ENRIQUEZ AS PROVE DIFFICULT TO ESTABLISH DEFENCE ONSELF HE LEARNING
AFTER MANY YEARS IN PRISON WITH OUT HELP OR ANY SUPPORT.
7. ENRIQUEZ SEEK TO COA TO CHALLENGE THE VALIDITY OF CONVICTION AND RELEASE
BUT THE COURTS DENIED THAT RIGHT AND AFFECT ANY RELIEF BECAUSE ENRIQUEZ
HAVE DIFFICULTY IN THIS STEP OF COA TO UNDERSTAND WHAT IS THE
CONSEQUENTLY TO SHOWING IF HE SAY UNCONSTITUTIONAL CONVICTION IS
EVIDENT AND PERJUDICE ANY AVAILABLE PROMPT RELIEF BECAUSE ENRIQUEZ
IS A MEXICAN SOFER MANY DISCRIMINATIONS FOR HE IS MEXICAN AND
POOR WITH NOT EFORD TO PAY ANY ATTY AT LAW TO DEFEND THE CAUSE
AGAINST HIM FROM 2008 IN PRISON. COURTS OF UNITED STATE NED ARMEN
FORCED UNDER 10 USC § 867 OR ISSUE ACT 5 USC §§ 701-706 BUT I NEED HELP.

2/2

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

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

Enriquez was accused for laches, ^I False and Liked Accusation for indecency with child, from, ex wife and step Dancer on 2008. The wife was mad with Mr Enriquez because Mr Enriquez reported to THE IRS FOR FRAUD. and wife Denise have the check for income 2007.

The step Dancer lie and against ^{II} Mr Enriquez for indecency with out prove any act of intent act of indecency before the Supostubi exist true, because in protection of the Rosangely her Mam Cause 2008-1925-C1 and 2008-1926-C2 and Misdemeanor Revok Nov. 8/8/2008

prosecutor to lie but not ^{III} prove exist act of indecency from prosecutor lie and from false evidence against Mr Enriquez. The Trial by Jury and Cause influence to the Jury in bad faith 9/16/2009

Court Appoint Attorney and ^{IV} Interpreter Lie to Mr Enriquez to sign paper in Court against him and not explain the Nature of the Cause 7/20/2009 ^V (Misdemeanor case).

Mr Enriquez provide from the County Jail in multiple time in pro se I.F.P. and Court Denise the access to Court and Attorney to deliver any available Relief and Release. Cause 2008-1925-C1 and 2008-1926-C2 and ^{VI} (Misdemeanor case) - App's Habeas Corp

Mr Enriquez is innocent victim of false accusation seek Multiple Relief I.F.P. pro se from the State to Fed. Court and Appeals Courts. for Cause 2008-1925-C1 and 2008-1926-C2 and Misdemeanor Cause because if the Trial Court During the Jury Trial Present all favorable evidences from the Defendant and Affidavit and witness in innocent here and Court not Remove out the Jury Trial when exist evidence from defendant or statement. and prosecutors not from false Documents, the Result of the Verdict from the Jury Trial positive favorable to Defendants. and Different Verdict

^{VII} Add. prosecutor holding Mr Enriquez for 3 years to offer 3 years of plea Bargain. Lie to complete the Agreement, Enriquez seek to Appeal the involuntary plea Bargain under duress because Enriquez is innocent for indecency to child but guilty for perjury involuntary guilty so in fact Enriquez is guilty for perjury guilty himself but not for indecency with child but he have to do that in protection himself for any risk and he seek for years to Appeal both cases. and New Trial - because Waco TX Made Double Jeopardy and enhance Misdemeanor Case from. Violence put charge of ind. w/ch. in The Motion to Revocation Probation to convict Mr Enriquez for false acts. Enriquez was victim for unconstitutional proceedings. in Waco TX also

After 5 yrs in Prison and seek for Abalable Relief in
 The Haber Corpus \$2254 Curt Jamie Abalable Relief.
 or Release

IX
 And Enigues seek to Relief in The Appals Court
 and Supreme Court he Sofor A accident for unsafe
 Order from The Supervisor in Prison Result in injury cracks
 finger Hand and multiple condition, of pain claim 7500,000
 and propot medical condition War violate 8th Amend const.
 Result in Sofor pain claim for Tort. Act.

X
 Enrique failre in many times to Spelling Correct and Spabish
 The proper understand in The brie because he is Spanish
 person seek of justice if he made miss documents or pre-
 dural The fact is to seek prove The innocent and Wrong
 Conviction from The Waco TX Melennan C. Court.

XI
 He seek to prove in The Emmission Court he is innocent
 and Wrong conviction and The cause not engage moral
 forpithels and injury to deportation in fact The delator
 is unconstitutional into of Tort Against Any Abalable
 Relief and limit of Relief provation, School, and
 Release. of prison. for over sentence unconstitutional
 of 26 Yr for false charges.

I declare under penalty of
 Perjury That This Statment is true and
 correct to dispose in the Record of the
 Supreme Court in quarenty to Review in
 Consideration of Court under Rule 10.

Sincerely,

My Oct-25-

Records Enigues Enigues

9-11-2017

1/2

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

IN ARTICLE 67 a(6) OF THE UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE 10 USC § 867 a(6), CONGRESS HAS PROVIDED THAT THE ACCUSED SERVICE MEMBER MAY PETITION THE SUPREME COURT FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI WITHOUT PREPAYMENT OF FEES AND COSTS OR SECURITY. THEREFOR AND WITHOUT FILING THE AFFIDAVIT REQUIRED BY SECTION 1915a OF TITLE 28 TO EFFECTUATE THAT CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTIVE RULE 40-3 OF THE COURT RULE PROVIDES

UNDER 10 USC § 870 (c) Art 70 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice the Judge Advocate General will Appoint an appellate Defense Counsel to Represent the accused before the Appellate Courts as well as the Supreme Court. The accused also has the Right to be Represented before these Courts by civilian counsel if provide by him. § 870 (d) Such counsel can be expected to prepare and file a petition for certiorari in accordance with the relevant Rules of the Supreme Court.

AND IN VIEW OF WHAT THE SUPREME COURT HAS DESCRIBED AS THE STRICTLY CIRCUMSCRIBED JURISDICTION OF THE ARMED FORCES COURT TO REVIEW COURT MARTIAL FINDINGS AND SENTENCES UNDER 10 USC § 867 THE COURT HAS GRANTED CERTIORARI TO DETERMINE WHETHER AND INJUNCTION GRANTED BY THE ARMED FORCES COURT UNDER THE ALL WRITS ACT 28 USC § 1651(a) CLINTON V. GOLDSMITH 526 US 529 (1999)

ANY Violation of Deprivation Constitutional and Civil Rights Exist in increment from The act Discriminatory. The Appendix B Reflect Respond Same date court made The judgment issued as the mandate 8-3-2017 AND The Question and all documents Reflect Proue Enriquez is innocent and TDCJ and Court Holding The Available Relief because Court made a Detainer before Trial prejudicial because is a Racial Discrimination in USDC. WESTERN DIST. C. Waco TX. And McLennan County Off. Staff. ect. Only because in Mexican Court Give more time for a Case may be is a misdeed. and NO True

Plf [Signature] cys.

2/2-

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

The Reason is To Review My case and
The State provide My Release according
of the Law for each Claim. Was Unconstitutional
for wrongful conviction in violation 4, 6, 8 and 14^{Amend.}
I Respect The Government and
Authorities of this Country and I seek for
Justice Because I'm Innocent

If The Supreme Court Denie and
Not Qualificate petitioner to Custody
please I pray for New Rules to
Continuance Defend my case to Release
of prison and stay with my family
my mother is old and my father both
I want to be work and help my mom

please I'm Innocent help me
in Order to protection the Human Rights
Civil Rights and Constitution Rights.
in This Country. Every man in This Country is
Guilt with The evidences false was The prosecutor from
in my Jury Trial only to make The conviction. I prove
This in The Records.

Sincerely .

RH [Signature] -
Ricardo Enriquez Samuels.

4/11/2017

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Rf. [Signature]
Ricardo Enriquez Sanchez

Date: 11-14-2017