

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

GERALD JONES — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

People of the state of Illinois — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

GERALD JONES
(Your Name)

PONTIAC CORRECTIONAL CENTER
P.O. BOX 99

(Address)

PONTIAC ILLINOIS 61764
(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. WHETHER through **EX Parte** Communication, the Judge **Secretly** GAVE A **FORBIDDEN BY LAW** modified ALLEN CHARGE OR INSTRUCTIONS TO the JURY, AND HAD the JURY TO CHANGE their FINAL VERDICT Firmly Held BELIEF, AFTER the JURY NOTE SAID that "it's VERDICT is NOT GOING TO CHANGE" — thus MADE the VERDICT Judgment VOID OR COERCIVE **AND** in CONFLICT with the UNITED STATES Supreme COURT Policy mandate.
2. WHETHER the Judges through **secretly EX Parte** Communication, GAVE the JURY, INSTRUCTIONS TO CONTINUE Deliberate, AFTER the JURY NOTE SAYING "their VERDICT is FINAL AND it's NOT GOING TO CHANGE". But **secretly** CHANGED their JURY VERDICT AFTER the JUDGE secret EX Part COMMUNICATION with the JURY. — thus NOT DONE IN NOR MADE **PART** OF DEFENDANTS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO A PUBLIC JURY TRIAL. — thus the LAW AND UNITED STATES 1, 9 AND 14 AMENDMENT CONSTITUTION AND UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT MANDATES DOES NOT ALLOW, **FORBIDDEN** AND **VOID** such VERDICTS **AND** 3. WHETHER such DEPRIVES a DEFENDANT A FAIR **AND** OPEN PUBLIC JURY TRIAL.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

4. Whether ~~the~~ state appellate court, on a motion to withdraw as Defendant's appeal counsel, **UPON GRANTING** such motion dismiss Defendant's entire appeal, **DENYING** Defendant the right to represent him self on appeal, to file a pro se brief **FOR** an appeal review on the issue on the merit raised, **WAS** CONTRARY TO *Ionchar v. Thomas* 517 U.S. 314, 116 S.Ct. 1293, 134 L.Ed.2d 440 (1996)
5. whether Trial counsel whom was NOT a Public Defender that said he was, but lied AND WAS a Private Attorney, whom prevented AND DENIED Defendant request AND demand to testify at his own trial. - thus entitle A) Defendant an evidence hearing and some kind of appeal review on the merits, and B) does constitute ineffective assistance of counsel depriving Defendant rights to testify and C) deprived Defendant due process rights to a defense, fair trial and D) the decision of trial counsel to refuse to let Defendant to testify at his own trial is void because it was not counsel's decision nor had the authority to make and E) whether the trial counsel's action constituted prejudice Defendant case as Defendant's testimony could have impeached the witnesses used against him.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

6. Whether the State Appellate Court is obligated to address the merits of Petitioner's claims raised on Appeal. In order to determine to dismiss the Appeal and deprives Due Process Dismissing Petitioner's ~~without~~ Appeal Review on the merits, Dismissing His Appeal Based on Granting Appellate Counsel's motion to withdraw as Petitioner Counsel, contrary to *Lonchar v. Thomas* 517 U.S. 314, 116 S.Ct. 1293 (1996)
7. Whether Petitioner should be allowed to represent himself and file a pro se brief for a determination on the merit, whom refuse to accept court counsel or when counsel files a motion to withdraw as counsel. ~~without~~ consulting with Petitioner, is mandated by the Equal Protection of the law or Due Process clause of the 1. AND 14. Amendment United States Constitution.
8. Whether the Circuit and Appellate Court after overlooking specific claims, that Petitioner took every step known to have reviewed on the merits, can dismiss sua sponte the Habeas Corpus Petition raising the same claims that never been addressed nor redress, now bar his claims as defaulted or waived.

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 AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGES
ARIZONA V. FULMINANTE, 499 S.U. 279, 111 S.Ct. 1246 (1991)	7
CARPENTON V. A.T. MASSEY COAL CO., 556 U.S. 868, 129 S.Ct. 2252	14
CITY OF CHICAGO V. ROMAN, 705 NE 2d 81, 184 Ill. 2d 504 (1998)	10
GLOBE NEWSPAPER CO. V. SUPERIOR COURT, 457 U.S. 596, 602-03, 610	9
HAMDAN V. RUMSFELD 126 S.Ct. 2749	16, 17
IN RE MURCHISON 349 U.S. 133, 136-39 (1955)	8, 13
JENKINS V. U.S., 380 U.S. 445, 446	7, 12
LONGHAT V. THOMAS 517 U.S. 314, 116 S.Ct. 1293 (1996)	9, 12
NAPUE V. ILLINOIS 360 U.S. 264, 79 S.Ct. 114 (1959)	12
PEOPLE V. ARNA 168 Ill. 2d 107, 113, 658 N.E. 2d 445 (1995)	10
PEOPLE V. FAIR 193 Ill. 2d 256, 738 N.E. 2d 500 (2000)	14
PEOPLE V. WRICE 2012 IL 111860, 962 N.E. 2d 934 (2012)	15
PRESS-ENTERPRISE CO. V. SUPERIOR COURT, 464 U.S. 501 508-09 (1984)	9, 12, 13
ROGERS V. U.S., 422 U.S. 35, 39 (1975)	8
SHIELDS V. U.S., 273 U.S. 583 (1927)	7
TIMEY V. OHIO 273 U.S. 510, 532, 47 S.Ct. 437, 444 (1927)	7, 14
U.S. V. BURGESS 55 F.3d 933 938 (4th Cir. 1995)	7
U.S. V. COWAN 819 F.2d 89, 93 (5th Cir. 1985)	8
U.S. V. DANDVARO 877 F.2d 583, 589 (7th Cir. 1989)	9
U.S. V. MANNING 79 F.3d 212, 222-23 (1st Cir. 1996)	7
U.S. V. PETER 754 F.2d 753, 760 (7th Cir. 1985)	9
U.S. V. ROBINSON 953 F.2d 433, 436-38 (8th Cir. 1992)	7
U.S. V. RUIZ 536 U.S. 622, 122 S.Ct. 2450 (2002)	12
U.S. V. SCISUM 32 F.3d 1478, 1484 (10th Cir. 1994)	8
WALLER V. GA., 467 U.S. 39, 46 (1984)	9, 12, 13

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	7
CONCLUSION.....	19

INDEX TO APPENDICES

- APPENDIX A is three page, First District Appellate Court's
OPINION, ORDER Dismissing Appeal.
- APPENDIX B is one page, First District Appellate Court's
FINAL DECISION Denied Rehearing
- APPENDIX C is one page Illinois Supreme Court's
DENYING Petitioner leave To Appeal
- APPENDIX D is one Page Jury Note EX Parte Communication
With the Judge indicating other unknown EX parte
communications.
- APPENDIX E
- APPENDIX F

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 C. 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 Appellate Court First District 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 1-18-18.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix C.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied 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. § 1257(a).

THE CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED:

the Constitutional AND Statutory Provisions are lengthy
their ~~CITATIONS~~ involves ~~NOT~~ in the Appendix to this
Petition ~~SOONER~~.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Defendant Gerald Jones, the Petitioner Filed A State Habeas Corpus IN Cook County Circuit Court

this Circuit Court Judge Kevin Sheehan, Arbitrary sue sponte Dismissed the Habeas Corpus Petition AND Defendant timely Appeal TO the First District Appellate Court

the Appellate Court Dismissed the Petitioner Appeal WITHOUT REVIEWING the Issues RAISED ON Appeal AND NOT ON the merits,

the Appellate Court Dismissed the Petitioner Appeal Based on Granted the Appellate Public Defender motion TO WITHDRAW AS Petitioner Counsel, whom argue as Counsel Belief the Appeal lack merit Appellate Issues For REVIEW.

the Petitioner Gerald Jones Responded Requesting the Appellate Court TO Allow Him TO File His Own Brief Pro se, AND argued THAT His Counsel never Talked NOR CONSULT with Him ABOUT the case AND Filed the motion TO WITHDRAW as Counsel as a surprise, arbitrary AND never Told Petitioner it's intentions, NOR never Told Petitioner she Marsha Watts was His appointed Counsel, IN order TO learn anything ABOUT the case From Petitioner.

the Appellate Court Denied Petitioner Gerald Jones Request To Represent Himself, File His own Brief on Appeal To Argue His Issues on the merits. Pro se

the Appellate Court Clerk Refuse To File Petitioner motion For Reconsideration REASONS Allege BECAUSE Petition Appellate Counsel HAVE TO File it,

thus therefore Petitioner Filed on Appeal To the Illinois Supreme Court timely on 11-7-17

the Appellate Court later Denied the motion For Reconsideration that on 11-6-17,

the Illinois Supreme Court Denied the Petitioner's Petition For leave To Appeal on January 18, 2018 AS A Final Highest State Court Decision For Review.

thus therefore the Petitioner Files this timely writ Petition of certiorari To the United States Supreme Court Following the last Date 1-18-18 that the Illinois Supreme Court Denied leave To Appeal

the issue that REASONS BRING this case To the United States Supreme Court: Having the Authority To REDRESS this issues.

ONCE the APPELLATE COURT APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
FOR the PETITIONER FILED A MOTION TO **WITHDRAW AS**
COUNSEL, the COUNSEL IMMEDIATELY FILED ALSO
A BRIEF OPPOSING the PETITIONERS APPEAL TO HAVE
the ENTIRE APPEAL REVIEW DISMISSED, ACTING AGAINST
the CLIENT-PETITIONER AND ACTING INDIRECTLY AS the
OPPOSING PARTIES PEOPLE OF the STATE OF ILLINOIS
RESPONDENTS.

thereFORE the COURT-APPELLATE COURT GRANTED the
MOTION TO **WITHDRAW AS** COUNSEL AFFIRMING the
LOWER COURT CIRCUIT OF COOK COUNTY JUDGMENT.

REASONS FOR GRANTING this PETITION

A) CONFLICTS WITH DECISIONS OF OTHER COURTS:

the CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY AND APPELLATE COURT First District, Decision TO Dismiss Petitioner Habeas Corpus Petition For lack of merits issues or Procedure Default, **CONFLICTING** with the UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT Decisions Held in JENKINS V. U.S. 380 U.S. 445 446 (1965) SHIELDS V. U.S. 273 U.S. 583 (1927) AND APPEAL COURTS Decision, OF U.S. V. BURGESS 55 F.3d 933 938 (4 Cir. 1995) U.S. ROBINSON 953 F.2d 433, 436-38 (8 Cir. 1992) U.S. V. MANNING 79 F.3d 212, 222-23 (1 Cir. 1996) — THUS HOLDING WHEN A JURY VERDICT HAVE BEEN COERCED AND MERITS REVIEW,

the TWO APPELLATE COURT AND CIRCUIT COURTS Decision CONFLICTS with thus said cases, **By the issues RAISED**, INDICATING Petitioner's claims HIS **VERDICT** WAS COERCED HAVE DECIDED WAS NOT or lack merit REVIEW, Decision is CONTRARY TO ESTABLISH LAW. Id JENKINS V. U.S. 380 U.S. 445, 446 (1965) SHIELDS V. U.S. 273 U.S. 583 (1927) U.S. V. BURGESS 55 F.3d 933, 938 (4 Cir. 1995) U.S. V. MANNING 79 F.3d 212 222-23 (1 Cir. 1996) ARIZONA V. FULMINANTE 499 U.S. 279, 113 S.Ct. 1246, 113 L.Ed.2d 302 (1991)

The CIRCUIT COURT CONDUCTED A SECRETLY EX PARTE COMMUNICATION INSTRUCTING the JURY TO CONTINUE TO DELIBERATE, **AFTER** the JURY FIRMLY HELD it's FINAL

VERDICT HAVE BEEN DECIDED AND IT'S NOT GOING TO CHANGE¹¹
thus influence^{ly} made the JURY change their Firmly
HELD BELIEF FINAL VERDICT, — thus NOT DONE IN, NOR NEVER
MADE PART OF DEFENDANT-PETITIONER'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS
TO THE PUBLIC JURY TRIAL — thus CONFLICTED with the
FORBIDDEN BY LAW CLAUSE AND FORBIDDEN BY the UNITED
STATES SUPREME COURT MANDATE in IN RE MURCHISON
349 U.S. 133, 136-39 (1955) ROGERS V U.S. 422 U.S. 35, 39
(1975) U.S. V. COWAN 819 F.2d 89, 93 (5 Cir 1985) U.S. V. SCISUM
32 F.3d 1479, 1484 (10 Cir 1994) thus FEDERAL LAW.

the JUDGES lacked the Authority TO SECRETLY EX PARTE
Communicate with the JURY in RESPONSE TO learning
the JURY FINAL VERDICT, — AND HAD A lawful
Administrative ministerial Duties TO PRESENT READ
AND IN OPEN COURT OF A PUBLIC JURY TRIAL OF the
JURY'S FINAL Firm HELD VERDICT, AND ALLOW PETITIONER
as AN DEFENDANT TO PARTICIPATE IN MAKING OBJECTIONS
or move FOR AN MISTRIAL or REQUEST FOR the ALTERNATIVE
Juries TO DECIDE or BE RELEASED.

thus that the JUDGES secret EX PARTE Communication
that secretly influence the JURY TO secretly change
their Firmly HELD BELIEF FINAL VERDICT, that said it
will NOT change, But DID change it TO A 12 VOTE
GUILTY VERDICT, — thus CONFLICTED with, the UNITED
STATES CONSTITUTION OF the RIGHTS TO A PUBLIC TRIAL AND
FAIR TRIAL CLAUSE AND CONFLICTING with the UNITED
STATES SUPREME COURT MANDATE FORBIDDEN thus ACTS

OF SECRETNESS EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS THATS
EFFECTS the most important parts of a fair TRIAL
AND EFFECT FAIR DECISIONS AND PROCEEDING OF A TRIAL
NOT MADE IN A DEFENDANT-PETITIONER'S PUBLIC TRIAL,
IN WALLER V. GA., 467 U.S. 39, 46 (1984), PRESS-ENTERPRISE
CO. V. SUPERIOR COURT 464 U.S. 501, 508-09 (1984), U.S. V.
PETERS 754 F.2d 753, 760 (7th Cir. 1985) AND U.S. V.
DANOVARO 877 F.2d 583, 589 (7th Cir. 1989) GLOBE
NEWSPAPER CO. V. SUPERIOR COURT 457 U.S. 596, 602-03
610-11 (1982)

THE APPELLATE COURT DISMISSING THE APPEAL BASED
ON GRANTING A MOTION TO WITHDRAW AS COUNSEL FOR
THE PETITIONER, AND DENYING PETITIONER AN OPPORTUNITY
TO FILE HIS OWN BRIEF PRO SE, FOR APPEAL REVIEW, AND
NOT ADDRESSING NOR REVIEWING THE ISSUES RAISED
ON APPEAL OR IN THE HABEAS CORPUS PETITION WAS
CONTRARY TO AND CONFLICTS WITH THE UNITED
STATES SUPREME COURT MANDATE OF LONCHAR V.
THOMAS 517 U.S. 314, 116 S.Ct. 1293, 134 L.Ed.2d 440
(1996).

THE APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL FILED A MOTION TO WITH-
DRAW AS COUNSEL ARGUED ABOUT HOW IN THE PASS
PETITIONER OTHER POST-CONVICTIONS PETITION WAS
DISMISS RAISING SOME OF THE SAME ISSUE AND A
735 2LCS 5/2-1401 SIMILAR PETITION, IN ORDER TO HAVE
THE PRESENT HABEAS CORPUS PETITION DISMISSED WITH
HER MOTION TO WITHDRAW AS COUNSEL ON APPEAL.

the Appellate Court erroneously with the Public DEFENDERS, ignored the new issues AND most importantly ignored the issue raised on Petitioner Alleged Claims ABOUT Decisions made AT TRIAL ARE VOID JUDGMENTS, BY the TRIAL JUDGE MADE Decisions For BIDDEN BY LAW AND LACKED All Authority To make or enter that Violated Petitioners 1, 6, 9 AND 14 AMENDMENT United States Constitutional Rights, AND United State Supreme Court Law.

Petitioner was Guided By clearly ESTABLISHED LAW that HELD, IN CITY OF CHICAGO V. ROMAN 705 N.E.2d 81, 184, ILL.2d 504, 235 ILL. DEC. 468 (1998) PEOPLE V. ARNA 168 ILL.2d 107, 113, 212 ILL. DEC. 963, 658 N.E.2d 445 (1995) that "when a sentence is void, the Petitioner may File A Petition FOR TO Correct AND Have Vacated the sentence AT ANY TIME AND IS NOT BARRED BY RULES OF LIMITATION".

Because the Circuit Court Cook County AND Appellate COURT First District Decisions ARE IN CONFLICT with the Supreme Court of the United States AND VIOLATES the United States Supreme Courts mandates, it is OF Great importance TO this Honorable Supreme COURT OF the United States TO Finalize what is the Proper Due Process in carrying out it's mandate when the Court Circuits AND Appellate Courts misinterpret or Act Arbitrary AS TO what the Law is or incorrectly Act ON mistaken UNauthorize Authority.

the Cook County Circuit Court and Appellate ~~sua~~
sponte Dismissed the Habeas Corpus Petition and
Arbitrary Dismissed the Appeal on a motion to
Withdraw as Counsel,

the All Appointed Court Counsels in Cook County
Circuit and Appellate Appointed Court Counsels on
Appeal keep waiving or dropping most of the
issues raised by Petitioner causing both Courts
to ignore them and address one issue or fail
to construe each issue on the merits — thus
while the Appellate Court refuse to allow Petitioner
to represent himself on the any Appeals requested,

In view of the large amount of ~~in~~igation over self
representation, ex parte communication, public
open trial entitlements, and the rights to be meaningful
heard, guidance on these issues and question is
also of great importance to the Judiciary Courts
and public interest, to ~~claim the~~ due process duties, and
in addition the question and answer is of great
importance to Defendants, because it affects all
Defendants ability to receive fair appeal reviews
on the merits, and represent them selfs on appeal
and redress issue thats being overlooked, that may
result in years of incarceration or harsh confinement
unconstitutionally

The issue's importance is enhanced by the fact the
lower circuit court and appellate courts in this case

HAVE seriously FAIL TO COMPLY THE ESTABLISHED LAW OF
THE AND MANDATED BY THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT
THAT HELD PETITIONER CLAIMS RAISED IN THE HABEAS CORPUS
DOES HAVE MERITS, ENTITLED TO A NEW TRIAL AND ENTITLED
PETITIONER TO A EVIDENTIARY HEARING. IN NAJUE V.
ILLINOIS 360 U.S. 264, 79 S.Ct. 114 (1959) U.S. V. RUIZ 536
U.S. 622, 122 S.Ct. 2450 (2002) JENKINS V. U.S. 380 U.S. 445,
85 S.Ct. 1059, 13 L.Ed.2d 957 (1965) WALLER V. GA. 467 U.S. 39
46 (1984) PRESS-ENTERPRISE CO. V. SUPERIOR COURT 464 U.S.
501, 508-09 (1984) LONGCHAMP V. THOMAS 517 U.S. 314, 116
S.Ct. 1293, 134 L.Ed.2d 440 (1996)

THE LOWER COURT'S REASONING ACTUALLY APPEAR ARBITRARY
AND SUPPORTED BY THEIR OWN ASSUMPTIONS OF THEIR
AUTHORITY TO DISMISS THE APPEAL, WITHOUT ADDRESSING
NOR REDRESS NOR REVIEWING THE ISSUES RAISED. THAT TO
DISMISS THE APPEAL BASED ON A MOTION TO WITHDRAW
AS COUNSEL — THUS DEPRIVED PETITIONER OPPORTUNITY
TO BE MEANINGFULLY HEARD, ON THE MERITS.

BECAUSE PETITIONER REFUSE TO ACCEPT AN APPELLATE
APPOINTED COURT COUNSEL, IT SHOULD BE HELD ERRONEOUSLY
DECIDED TO FORCE PETITIONER TO ACCEPT THE COURT
COUNSEL THEN DISMISS HIS APPEAL BASED ON COUNSEL
FILED MOTION TO WITHDRAW AS COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER AND
REFUSE TO ALLOW PETITIONER TO REPRESENT HIMSELF ON APPEAL
AND FILE HIS OWN BRIEF AS REQUESTED. — WITHOUT REVIEW
ON THE MERITS OF THE ISSUES RAISED ON APPEAL AND IN THE
HABEAS CORPUS PETITION.

B. THE importance of the Question Presented;

the TRIAL JUDGE Violated the Supreme Court's STANDARDS AND Administrative ministerial Duties OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT Rule 63-CANON 3 A. 4. BY EX PARTE COMMUNICATED with the JURY without the PETITIONER-DEFENDANTS KNOWLEDGE AND NEVER NOTIFIED PETITIONER NOR HIS ATTORNEY NOR NEVER MADE IT PART OF THE OPEN COURT PUBLIC TRIAL. NOR PART OF THE TRIAL.

SUPREME COURT'S STANDARDS AND ADMINISTRATIVE Duties OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT Rule 63-CANON 3, states that "A. (4) A JUDGE SHALL ACCORD TO EVERY PERSON (petitioner) who has a legal interest in a proceeding, or that person's lawyer, the right to be heard according to law. A JUDGE SHALL NOT initiate, permit, or consider EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS, or CONSIDER other COMMUNICATIONS MADE TO THE JUDGE OUTSIDE the presence of the parties concerning a PENDING or impending proceeding."

THUS the TRIAL JUDGE DID NOT meet ANY EXCEPTIONS JUSTIFICATION TO VIOLATE clearly his limitations OF Authority OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT Rule 63-CANON 3 A. 4) 8) Rule 63-CANON 3 B.(3)(a) AND C.(1) and (a) that thus these limitations OF the TRIAL JUDGES Authority as stated is ALSO MANDATED BY the UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT and the CONSTITUTION Due Process clause, see, in RE MURCHISON 349 U.S. 133, 136-39 (1955) WITH PRESS-

Enterprise Co. v. Superior Court 464 U.S. 501, 508-09 (1984)
Waller v. Ga., 467 U.S. 39, 46 (1984)

there WAS NO Question For the TRIAL JUDGE TO ANSWER
TO, From the JURY Note, AND SO HAD A Proper Lawful
ADMINISTRATIVE ministerial Duty TO REPORT the FINAL
Verdict IN OPEN COURT IN Defendant's PUBLIC TRIAL, By
Law, Having NO Authority NOR Discretion TO Refuse, Id.

THE JUDGE USED HIS JUDGES JUDICIAL POSITION STATUS TO
AND INFLUENCE the JURY TO CHANGE their FINAL FIRMLY
Belief Verdict, — then secretly conceal HIS EX PARTE
Communication that INFLUENCE the change, AGAINST
Petitioner-the Defendant, constitute Prejudice AND
BIAS AND HOLD the JUDGE Deviated From the Law By DID
NOT CONDUCT the TRIAL balance nice, clear and true and
FAIR, Between the state JUDICIAL COURT system and
the ACCUSED, DENYING Defendant Due Process OF LAW,
see Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co. 556 U.S. 868, 129 S.Ct.
2252, 173 L.Ed.2d 1208 (2009) *Timex v. Ohio* 273 U.S. 510,
532, 47 S.Ct. 437, 444 (1927), *People v. Fair* 193 Ill.2d 256
738 NE.2d 500, 250 Ill. DEC. 284 (Ill. 2000).

THE Petitioner-Defendant WAS Deprived the most clearly
ESTABLISHED CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO TESTIFY IN HIS OWN
TRIAL, that Deprived Him A CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO A
DEFENSE, that GO'S HAND IN HAND, that constitutes
Deprived Him CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE
OF COUNSEL.

THE COOK COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT NEVER REDRESSED PETITIONER'S
GROUNDS RAISED AND IGNORE THE ISSUES RAISED OF A)
INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL DENIED HIS FUNDAMENTAL
RIGHTS TO TESTIFY IN HIS OWN TRIAL AS PETITIONER DEMANDED
B) DEFENSE TRIAL COUNSEL WORKED UNDER A CONFLICT OF INTEREST
BY LIED HE WAS A PUBLIC DEFENDER ATTORNEY BUT WAS NOT AND
THEREFORE HAD A CONTEMPORANEOUS ASSOCIATION WITH THE
PROSECUTOR OR JUDGE OR BOTH, OR SECRETLY WITH THE VICTIMS
FAMILY OR FRIENDS, C) DEFENSE TRIAL COUNSEL LIED AND
FALSIFIED HIS CLOSING ARGUMENTS ARGUING THE PROSECUTOR'S
WITNESSES TESTIMONY AS BEING TRUE, HELPING THE PROSECUTOR
WITHOUT INVESTIGATING, NOR ASK PETITIONER WHAT'S TRUE OR
NOT TRUE, THAT WAS PREJUDICE AND INCONSISTANT WITH HIS
NOT GUILTY DEFENSE, D) DEFENSE COUNSEL REFUSE TO LISTEN
INVESTIGATE AND CONSULT WITH PETITIONER TO LEARN WHY PETITIONER
SIGNED A CONFESSION STATEMENT AND LEARN HOW IT WAS DONE
BY BLACKMAIL, COERCED AND ASSAULTED — AND INSTEAD HELP
THE PROSECUTOR'S BY ARGUE PETITIONER GAVE THE CONFESSION
STATEMENT, WHEN PETITIONER DID NOT, E) DEFENDANT WAS
DENIED A PUBLIC TRIAL AND F) THE PROSECUTORS USED
KNOWINGLY PERJURY TESTIMONY THAT WAS PREJUDICE AND
G) THE TRIAL JUDGE MADE HARM PREJUDICE ADVERSE
EX PARTE COMMUNICATION DECISIONS THAT WAS NEVER
MADE PART OF PETITIONER'S OPEN COURT PUBLIC TRIAL SECRETLY
AND SECRETLY ~~SP~~ CHANGED PETITIONER DEFENSE ATTORNEY
AND MADE THE JURY CHANGE THEIR FINAL VERDICT ALL
DONE ALTRA VIRE FORBIDDEN LAW AND AUTHORIZE MADE
THE TRIAL JUDGE DECISIONS VIOL. AND H) THE ISSUES
RAISED IN PEOPLE V. WRICE 2012 IL 111860, 962 N.E.2d
934 (IL. 2012) THE USE OF DEFENDANTS MENTAL AND PHYSICAL
COERCED CONFESSION AND CONFESSION WAS COERCED CLAIMS.

7) Thus the TRIAL COURT JUDGE Violated these Four Restrictions (Acted ALTRA VIRES.) WHEN HE. 1.) Executed the JURY Deliberating Proceedings OF DEFENDANTS TRIAL. NOT IN OPEN COURT. NOT IN the PUBLIC TRIAL NOT IN the PRESENCE OF the DEFENDANT AND 2.) in thus doing so DID NOT Appoint or OBTAIN a Counsel to Represent DEFENDANT while ABSENT. TO Participate AND 3.) in thus doing so CONDUCTED EX PARTE Communications, Deliberate Proceedings with the JURY AND 4.) CONCEAL such EX PARTE Communications From the DEFENDANT TO ASSURE such AND the results would NOT BE PART OF the ~~DEF~~ENDANTS TRIAL in a MANNER TO PREVENT DEFENDANT RIGHT TO PARTICIPATE or Act TO the JURY Notes. AND 5.) EXCLUDED DEFENDANT From HIS OWN TRIAL AND 6.) in VIOLATION OF the GOVERNING LAW AND Duties OF the JURY INSTRUCTION Fail TO ANNOUNCE in OPEN COURT the Juries FINAL Declaration OF a MIS TRIAL Alleging" AND will NOT CHANGE votes Notes. — THAT the JURY INSTRUCTION TRIAL COURT Alleged would TO BUT DID NOT. AND 7.) Thus Deviated From Thus Restrictions Lacked the Power AND Authority TO Proceed. see HAMDAN V. RUMSFELD 126 S.Ct. 2749, 165 L.Ed. 2d 723 (U.S. 2006).

8) Pursuant TO LAW AND the JURY INSTRUCTIONS LAW GIVEN TO THE JURY, the TRIAL COURT CANNOT Proceed in NO OTHER MANNER other than ANNOUNCE the JURY Notes OF EXHIBIT one ATTACHED, in OPEN COURT in the PRESENCE OF DEFENDANT AND ALLOW DEFENDANT TO PARTICIPATE OBJECT AND RESPOND, AND File motions Base ON a JURY Note Before Proceeding Further. Id.

9.) Neither the legislators nor any courts authority authorized the trial court to conduct the jury's deliberating proceedings of defendant's trial, unless the defendant's due process protections, statutory procedures are followed and in the presence of the defendant. see *HAMDAN V. RUMSFELD* 126 S. Ct. 2749, 165 L Ed. 2d 723 (U.S. 2006.) whether having independent power, he may not disregard limitations that legislator's has, in proper exercise of its own powers and authority place on his power to act. *Id.* that even the judicial branch is bound to comply with the rules and statutory of law that prevails in the jurisdiction. *Id.*

10.) Thus therefore respectfully defendant also request this court consider all grounds raised in this petition and stated reasons, separately and as a total, and the restrictions of law that was violated by the court, prosecutors and the defendant defense counsel.

11.) The trial court lacked jurisdiction to proceed and enter the second jury verdict that was obtain under false pretense and ex parte communication *ATRA VIRE*s in this said manner. All in violations of Gerardo Jones defendant's 1, 8, 5, 6 and 14 amendment rights and was prohibited by thus constitutional rights, and United States supreme court mandate authority.

REQUESTED:

Wherefore the Petitioner Pray this Supreme Court of the United States Grant this Petition For Review Because:

it is most important to the Public Citizens Whom Being Tried As Defendants in All 50 States and the Courts of State and Federal Jurisdictions, To Have and see the Issues Redressed To Prevent A Continue Lack of Guid of Constitutional Violations on Prejudice Grounds Harmful To the Uneducated and Innocent Citizens in the United States,

Thus To ~~Solve~~ the Questions Thousands, Even Millions of Citizen and Defendant Need To Know Redress Available, thus when:

A) Appointment of Court Counsels Refuse To Raise Claims Having Merits on Appeals To Do Less Work and B) Circuit Courts and Appeals Courts Ignore Specific Claims Raised Depriving Citizen a Meaningful Opportunity To Be Heard on the Merits, and C) and Claims Raised Does Have Merits Already Decided By the United States Supreme Court Being Overlooked and Ignored,

thus in light of A, B, and C. How can a Innocent Citizen Have His Claims Review and seek Relief and His Freedom, if His Petitions Being Arbitrary Dismiss Because the Judge AND Court Counsel Do NOT like the Nature of Petitioner's Claims or Feels there To Difficult To Redress. when they Have the Authority Duty

CERTIFICATE

I Petitioner GERALD JONES, CERTIFY I HAVE
COMPLIED TO ALL RULES OF THE COURT TO THE BEST OF MY
UNDERSTANDING AND KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted. AND REQUEST FOR HELP
AND AN OPPORTUNITY TO REDRESS THE CLAIMS ON THE MERITS BY THE
CIRCUIT OR APPELLATE COURTS THAT NEVER BEEN REDRESS BUT OVERLOOKED.

Respectfully submitted,

Gerald Jones

Date: 4-13-18

I CERTIFY ALL STATED HEREIN THIS CERTIORARI, IS TRUE AND CORRECT TO
THE BEST OF MY UNDERSTANDING AND MAKE THIS AFFIDAVIT UNDER OATH UNDER LAW.

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE
me on April 13, 2018

Amy B. Wykes
NOTARY PUBLIC

