

No. _____

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Anthony D. Jones — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

WARDEN-SHERMAN Campbell — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

NONE

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI Extraordinary Writ of Habeas Corpus

Anthony D. Jones
(Your Name)

2727 E. BEECHER St.
(Address)

ADRIAN, Michigan 49221
(City, State, Zip Code)

NONE
(Phone Number)

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:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	4
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	6
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	9
CONCLUSION.....	16

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A -	LENAAWEE County Circuit Court Judge DENING PETITIONER STATE HABEAS CORPUS PETITION.
APPENDIX B -	LENAAWEE County Circuit Court Judge DENING PETITIONER REQUEST FOR REHEARING OR RECONSIDERATION
APPENDIX C -	ALL FELONY WARRANTS INVOLVED.
APPENDIX D	Motion DENIED PRESERVING THE ISSUE.
APPENDIX E	Psychologist Reports & Social Security Administration Adjudication
APPENDIX F	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
Welsh -vs- Wis, 466 U.S. 740; 104 S.Ct. 2091 -	7 & 14
JONES -vs- City Of Taylor, 2015 U.S. Dist. Lexis 99385 -	7
Woodwin -vs- City Of Painsville, 781 F.3d 314 -	7 & 11
Clerk -vs- Luker, 2007 U.S. Dist. Lexis 63895 -	11
Kentucky -vs- King, 563 U.S. 452 -	11
Kirk -vs- Louisiana, 536 U.S. 635 -	11
People -vs- Brenay, 2015 Mich. App. Lexis 2350 -	11
Bunkley -vs- City Of Detroit, 2017 U.S. Dist. Lexis 147122 -	12
Hudson -vs- Michigan, 547 U.S. 586 -	12

STATUTES AND RULES	
United States Constitutional 4 TH & 14 TH Amendment Rights -	7
M.C.L.S. Constitutional Article 1, Section 11 -	7

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 _____ 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☐ is unpublished.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 _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☒ is unpublished.

The opinion of the LENAWEE County Circuit court appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at _____; 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 _____.

☐ 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 1-23-18.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix A.

☒ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: 1-29-18, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix B.

☐ 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).

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1.) DOES 'EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES' EXIST FOR THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT TO PROMPTLY HERE PETITIONER CASE ON THE MERITS WITHOUT REQUIRING THE PETITIONER TO EXHAUST ~~THE~~ STATE AND FEDERAL REMEDIES WARRANTING THE EXERCISE OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT?

PETITIONER - Says YES

RESPONDENT - NO ANSWER

2.) MUST THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ACKNOWLEDGE THE PETITIONER BEING ILLEGALLY RESTRAIN OF HIS LIBERTY AND DISCHARGE THE PETITIONER FROM THE RESPONDENT ILLEGAL RESTRAINT?

PETITIONER - Says YES

RESPONDENT - NO ANSWER

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

United States Constitutional Amendment Rights
4TH & 14TH Amendment Rights

U.S. Constitutional Article I, Section II

Welsh -vs- Wis, 104 S.Ct. 2091; 466 U.S. 740
JONES -vs- City Of Taylor, 2015 U.S. Dist. Lexis
99385

Goodwin -vs- City Of Painsville

MUST THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ACKNOWLEDGE THE PETITIONER BEING ILLEGALLY RESTRAIN OF HIS LIBERTY AND DISCHARGE THE PETITIONER FROM THE RESPONDENT ILLEGAL RESTRAINT.

SEE : STATEMENT OF THE CASE ON NEXT PAGE.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

First, the PETITIONER NOW ASSERTS that he has a witness:

Ms. Rolonda Bonner, 8840 MEYER'S St., Detroit, Michigan 48228; Phone No. 313-740-1923.

PETITIONER NOW ASSERTS also, that ON JUNE 3, 2015 at 12:50 AM in the middle of the night, the Detroit police illegally "force entry" his house at: 10942 Haverhill Street, Detroit, Michigan "by-way-of-a pump shot gun," by pointing the pump shot gun at the PETITIONER front door of his house and then used "DURESS" AND "COERCION" toward PETITIONER witness- Ms. Rolonda Bonner forcing her to open PETITIONER front door, after she open the door the Detroit police pointed the pump shot gun at her face requesting for the PETITIONER, the PETITIONER then appeared in his living room, then the Detroit police pointed their pump shot gun at the PETITIONER ORDERING PETITIONER to turn around putting PETITIONER UNDER "duress," then the Detroit police came inside the PETITIONER house and illegally handcuff / SEIZE the PETITIONER "without" CONSENT to ENTER the PETITIONER house, "without" A COMPLAINT, "without" EXIGENT CIRCUMSTANCES, "without" PROBABLE CAUSE, AND "without" A WARRANT.

6.

'Attached' as evidence are all the 'felony warrants' involved in the Petitioner illegal seizure, and all the felony warrants 'ARE NOT' signed nor dated by the magistrate judge proving that the Detroit police did not obtain permission nor authority to go out to the Petitioner home and illegally seize the petitioner.

The Detroit police actions violated the 4TH & 14TH United States Constitutional Amendment Rights and also violated Michigan Constitutional Law.

M.C.L.S. Constitutional Article I, Section 11:
States:

Sec 11. The persons, houses, papers and possessions of every person shall be secure from unreasonable searches and seizures. No warrant to search any place or to seize any person or things shall issue without describing them, nor without probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation. SEE: *Welsh vs Wis*, 466 U.S. 740; 104 S.Ct. 2091; 1984 U.S. Lexis 82; *JONES vs City Of Taylor*, 2015 U.S. Dist. Lexis 99385; *Woodwin vs City Of Painsville*, 2015 U.S. Lexis 4417.

The PETITIONER immediately after his illegal SEIZURE, COMPLAINED to the INITIAL ARRAIGNMENT COURT, the district court, and the state circuit COURT CONCERNING the Detroit police illegally SEIZING PETITIONER without exigent circumstances, without probable cause, and without a warrant, and that this violated PETITIONER 4TH & 14TH United States Constitutional Amendment Rights, but the courts REFUSE to RELEASE the PETITIONER, the TRIAL COURT Judge - VONDA R. EVANS ALSO DENIED the PETITIONER Motion For Acquittal Notwithstanding the Verdict in which the PETITIONER ARGUED for his RELEASE in AND ORALLY - (SEE ATTACH EXHIBIT - D).

THEREAFTER, the PETITIONER RECEIVED A illegal CONCURRENT terms of 8 years to 22 years ON TWO - (2) CASES - (SEE ATTACHED EXHIBIT - E).

Now the PETITIONER moves this United States Supreme Court UNDER - 28 U.S.C. SECTION 2254 to GRANT PETITIONER Writ Of HABEAS CORPUS AND 'discharge' the PETITIONER from illegal DETENTION that is illegally RESTRAINING PETITIONER of his LIBERTY.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

According to : Puertas -vs- Overton, 2003 U.S. Lexis 12354 states :

'AN UNEXHAUSTED CLAIM SHOULD BE DISMISSED "EXCEPT" IN UNUSUAL OR EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES.'

The petitioner now presents his 'EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES' to why his claim is UNEXHAUSTED, AND PRESENTS his 'EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES' that WARRANT THE EXERCISE OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT DISCRETIONARY POWERS, AND ALSO PRESENTS his 'EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES' REASONS FOR NOT MAKING AN APPLICATION TO THE DISTRICT COURT, AND WHY A ADEQUATE RELIEF CANNOT BE OBTAINED IN ANY OTHER FORM ~~AND~~ OR FROM ANY OTHER COURT.

PETITIONER EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES : The PETITIONER is a "Social Security Recipient," AND ATTACHED AS EVIDENCE ARE TWO-(2) psychologist reports AND A SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION DECISION ADJUDICATED BY THE FEDERAL COURT SYSTEM SHOWING THAT THE PETITIONER IS SUFFERING FROM :

- 1.) bipolar disorder, 2.) anxiety disorder, 3.) impaired formal and operational judgment, 4.) schizoid effect disorder, 5.) anti-social personality disorder, 6.) personality disorder, 7.) schizophrenia, 8.) psychosexually confused and disturbed, 9.) retarded personality in coping adequately

Psychologist's and psychiatrist's has explained in the attached evidence that the petitioner mind is deteriorating, and that the petitioner psychological condition is so bad that his severe mental illnesses effects, diminishs, and impaires the petitioner reading, writing, understanding, and his memory is impaired, and his judgments are impaired.

The petitioner now asserts, because of his "SEVERE MENTAL ILLNESSES" actually causes appellant to be unable to pursue his legal rights and prevent the petitioner from exhausting his state and federal remedies to the district courts, this causes the lower court to give a inadequate relief. Now petitioner request that the United States Supreme Court here the matter on the merits because the petitioner severe mental illnesses has impaired his reading, writing, learning, memory, and understanding causing petitioner to be unable to exhaust his state and federal court remedies. Also, see attached "argument" for further reasons to grant petitioner petition.

MUST THE UNITED STATES
SUPREME COURT
ACKNOWLEDGE THE
PETITIONER BEING
ILLEGALLY RESTRAIN OF
HIS LIBERTY AND
DISCHARGE THE
PETITIONER FROM THE
RESPONDENT ILLEGAL
RESTRAINT

ARGUMENT

According to: Goodwin -vs- City Of Painsville,
781 F. 3d 314; 2015 U.S. Lexis 4417 states:

It is well established that all police in every state are 'REQUIRE' to obtain probable cause and a warrant [both] 'BEFORE' arresting anyone inside their house, and a arrest made without probable cause and a warrant is a 'false arrest.'
Clerk -vs- Luker, 2007 U.S. Dist. Lexis 63895;
Kentucky -vs- King, 563 U.S. 452; 131 S.Ct. 1849; 2011 U.S. 3541; Kirk -vs- Louisiana, 536 U.S. 635; 122 S.Ct. 2458; 2002 U.S. Lexis 4682.

Also, a house arrest made without probable cause -and- exigent circumstances is a 'false arrest.' SEE: People -vs- Brenau, 2015 Mich. App. Lexis 2350; O'Brien -vs- City Of Grand Rapids, 23 F.3d 990 (1994); Trakhtenberg -vs- Oakland County, 2015 U.S. Dist. Lexis 144729.

Under Michigan Law, AN ARREST without PROBABLE CAUSE is illegal AND UNJUSTIFIED. SEE: BUNKLEY -VS- City Of Detroit, 2017 U.S. Dist. Lexis 147172.

According to: HUDSON -VS- Michigan, 547 U.S. 586, 126 S.Ct. 2159, 165 L. Ed. 2d 56, 2006 U.S. Lexis 4677 states:

UNTIL A VALID WARRANT HAS ISSUED, CITIZENS ARE ENTITLED TO SHIELD THEIR PERSONS, HOUSES, PAPERS AND EFFECTS FROM THE GOVERNMENT SCRUTINY

THE PETITIONER NOW ASSERTS THAT HE WAS ILLEGALLY SEIZE INSIDE HIS HOME WITHOUT EXIGENT CIRCUMSTANCES, WITHOUT PROBABLE CAUSE, AND WITHOUT A WARRANT, AND WITHOUT A COMPLAINT SUPPORTED BY OATH OR AFFIRMATION.

According to: PEOPLE -VS- DE LA MATER, 213 Mich. 167, 1921 Mich. Lexis 540:

WHEREVER A STATUTE REQUIRES PROBABLE CAUSE, SUPPORTED BY OATH OR AFFIRMATION, A VALID COMPLAINT MUST BE ISSUED AND SWORN TO THE COMPLAINANT UNDER OATH.

According to : Steiger -vs- Hahn, 2018 FED App. 0001N (6TH Circuit) states:

The Fourth Amendment conditions warrant's on probable cause and prohibits unreasonable seizures. Worthington -vs- United States, 166 F.2d 557; 1948 U.S. App. Lexis 2361

According to : Manuel -vs- City Of Joliet, 137 S.Ct. 911; 2017 U.S. Lexis 2021 states:

The Fourth Amendment establishes the minimum constitutional standards and procedures not just for arrest but also for ensuing detention, and without probable cause and a warrant "before" a police house arrest violates the Fourth Amendment, and, Petitioner - Appellant shall be immediately release back to society.

Also, any legal process after a illegal house seizure "makes no difference", it would be too late for any kind of legal action by either the prosecution or the court, and that Petitioner - Appellant challenging his prosecution or conviction and any ensuing prison incarceration

ONCE A TRIAL HAS OCCURRED DOES SO UNDER THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE OF THE FOURTEENTH UNITED STATES CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

According to: Welsh -vs- Wis, 466 U.S. 740;
104 S. Ct. 2091; 80 L. Ed. 2d 732;
1984 U.S. Lexis 82 states:

The court "VACATED" AND REMANDED, holding that the "WARRANTLESS ARREST" of Appellate in his home violated U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT IV BECAUSE THE STATE, ALTHOUGH DEMONSTRATING PROBABLE CAUSE TO ARREST, HAD NOT ESTABLISHED THE EXISTENCE OF EXIGENT CIRCUMSTANCES.

WARRANTLESS FELONY ARREST IN THE HOME ARE PROHIBITED BY U. S. CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT IV, ABSENT PROBABLE CAUSE AND EXIGENT CIRCUMSTANCES.

The Detroit ~~police~~ had NO BUSINESS AT THE PETITIONER HOUSE IN THE MIDDLE OF THE NIGHT WITHOUT A SIGN WARRANT.
SEE: MCR. 6.102 (C)(4).

RELIEF SOUGHT

IN this PETITIONER - ANTHONY D. JONES #193539 CONSOLIDATED two-(2) CASES, the Detroit police did not have a COMPLAINT; did not have EXIGENT CIRCUMSTANCES; did not have PROBABLE CAUSE; AND did not have a WARRANT "BEFORE" illegally SEIZING OR SEIZURE of PETITIONER - ANTHONY D. JONES #193539 INSIDE his house; AND AFTER A ILLEGAL SEIZURE the PROSECUTION NOR the COURT "CANNOT" LATER try to submit ANY LEGAL ACTION OR PROCESS NOR try to submit AN COMPLAINT OR WARRANT, it would be constitutionally to late. MANUEL VS- City Of Joliet.

Now PETITIONER REQUEST this United States SUPREME COURT to "DISCHARGE" the PETITIONER from the RESPONDENT illegal DETENTION AND illegal RESTRAINT at the RESPONDENT PRISON institution.

DATE: 2-15-2018

Anthony D. Jones

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony D. Jones

Date: 3-15-18