

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

TERRY GLEN BOSTIC SR — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

VS.

JEANETTE ALLENE BOSTIC — RESPONDENT(S)
GT AL

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT
100 E. FIFTH ST. CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

TERRY GLEN BOSTIC SR.
(Your Name)

5225 CHERRY AVE. APT. 301
(Address)

COLUMBUS OHIO 43228
(City, State, Zip Code)

614-404-1457
(Phone Number)

THIS IS MY MOTHERS ADDRESS AND IS
WHERE I GET MY MAIL. I ALIVE ALONG
DOWN IN A TENT AND BE ABANDONED
(HOMELESS). I HAVE A PHONE AND A

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

Question One

Why should the defendant (Davis) be allowed to walk away from this case as if she is completely innocent? She has been the focus of this case since the civil suit was filed in a county court by the plaintiff (Bostic) in 2013. She has clearly received compensation from one and/or all of the following: the city of Columbus, Ohio, the Columbus Police Department, the F.B.I., and/or the Federal Government of the United States of America.

Question Two

Why should the F.B.I. and the Columbus Police Department be allowed to indirectly influence the court to abuse rule 54(b) in influencing the court to dismiss (Davis) from this case right before the discovery process was to begin? Why was Davis allowed to not even answer a simple interlocutory? Why should the F.B.I. be allowed to destroy innocent people's lives and cover up what they did because they did not have the courage and/or decency to admit they were wrong and walk away from the misery, sadness, and sorrow and disaster that they clearly caused as if because who they are they can break the laws that they swear to uphold, and use the Constitution of the United States of America as if it was toilet paper?

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:

TERRY GLEN BOSTIC SR. PLAINTIFF

V.

1. JERNIETTE ALLENE DAVIS
2. THE POLICE DEPARTMENT OF COLUMBUS, OHIO
3. THE COLUMBUS, OHIO POLICE CHIEF GIMBENLEY JACOBS
4. COLUMBUS, OHIO POLICE OFFICER ERNEST FLORE
5. UNKNOWN COLUMBUS POLICE OFFICERS.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	35, 36, 37, 38, 39 PAGES 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34
JURISDICTION	PAGE 14
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	PAGE 15
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	PAGES 16, 17
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	PAGE 18
CONCLUSION	PAGE 19

INDEX TO APPENDICES

PAGE 23	APPENDIX A	PAGE 28	OPINION & ORDER DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO EASTERN DIVISION
PAGE 33	APPENDIX B	ORDER / OPINION	UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT
PAGE 37	APPENDIX C	PETITION FOR WRIT HEARING	
	APPENDIX D		
	APPENDIX E		
	APPENDIX F		

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

Plaintiff did his best to find cases that were similar to his that would shed positive light on plaintiff's case.

Plaintiff called up the Federal District Court in Columbus, Ohio, and talked to the court's librarian, and found out that she was the only employee of the library, and was not there one-hundred percent of the time, and was very often in meetings or other duties she had to do, plus courts library was very small compared to the Supreme Court of Ohio.

Plaintiff was aware of the library on the top floor of the supreme court being that this case was at one time being considered by the Ohio Supreme Court but was dismissed.

Nevertheless plaintiff had much respect for the Ohio Supreme Court, and even though plaintiff had never been to the courts library he had heard that it covered the entire floor and was by far the best law library in Ohio, which it was, and he had heard that the library employees were very helpful.

Plaintiff decided to take the advice of the federal court librarian and go to the Ohio Supreme Court library. When plaintiff got to the library several employees were making a christmas tree out of books which plaintiff thought was very unique.

When plaintiff asked for help, plaintiff felt like he was seen as an intrusion. One of the librarians said she was not very familiar with federal laws even though the library and a very extensive area covered federal laws. She did take me to that area, did very briefly show me how to look up federal cases, but that was about all she did.

Plaintiff was very disappointed in the way he was treated after hearing how helpful these employees were supposed to be.

This however was not surprising in view of the fact that very recently an Ohio Supreme Court judge publicly announced that in his seventy years of life he had sex with over fifty women, one of which was the personal secretary of former Ohio governor, Robert Taft.

I am sure that the employees of the Ohio Supreme Court do look up to and respect the Ohio Supreme Court judges, however after this public announcement which would be the same as putting a full page ad in the Columbus Dispatch or the New York Times, plaintiff can see why he was treated the way he was. Leaders set the pace and path that we the people follow, and the path

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

that this Supreme Court judge of Ohio set for employees of the court was a very big part why the plaintiff was unable to find a case that he could use to help support his case.

~~RECEIVED~~
PAGE 21

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 B to the petition and is

☒ reported at APPEAL COURT FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT; 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 17 to the petition and is

☒ reported at COUNT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO; 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 _____ 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 _____ 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.

1702
~~1000~~ ~~1000~~
~~1000~~ 14

JURISDICTION

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was 09-06-2017.

☐ 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: 10-6-2017, 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. § 1254(1).

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

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

☐ 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).

~~Page~~
PAGE
~~15~~
15

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The plaintiff has indeed been deprived of his civil rights. The Plaintiff also has been denied the right in pursuit of happiness.

The Bill of Rights, Amendment IV.

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath on affirmation, particularly, the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

How can a person feel secure in their persons when their life is threatened, when the lives of their family is threatened, and when in fact threats were carried out with the murders of the plaintiff's grandson, and son.

How can a person feel secure in their home when law officers, and/or civilians being paid by these law officers to feel free to go into the plaintiff's home, and molest and torture his two pugs, poison his food and drink as if they have every right to do whatever they please to do to the plaintiff and his life.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

1. This case of the plaintiff began in the Franklin County Common Plea Court in Columbus, Ohio on 11-20-2013, was dismissed in May of 2014 before trial was sent to the Franklin County Court of appeals in August of 2014, and was denied in May of 2015, was sent to the Supreme Court of Ohio in June of 2015 and was denied in November of 2015, was sent to the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio Columbus Division with leave to amend February 29, 2016. Was sent to the United States Court of Appeal and was dismissed. Plaintiff filed a petition for hearing and was denied 10-6-2017.
2. The defendant Davis was dismissed from the case because of lack of jurisdiction because Ms. Davis is a private individual and did not receive any type of compensation from the Columbus Police Department, City of Columbus, the F.B.I. or the Federal Government. Plaintiff knows that Ms. Davis did receive compensation from at least one of the above, and that the court was indirectly influenced by the F.B.I. and was dismissed from this case right before the discovery process was to begin.
3. Defendant Davis does know the details of the deaths of plaintiff's son, and grandson, Jason Bostic and Joel Frederick respectfully. Defendant Davis does know who was directly involved in the deaths and who was indirectly involved in their deaths (as in planning of money and payment).
4. It was because of this information she has that the F.B.I. indirectly influenced the court to dismiss Ms. Davis. Ms. Davis was obviously tired of taking all the heat (scapegoat) for all of the brave men and women of the F.B.I. and Columbus Police Department. America's and Columbus' finest, and if this is America's finest then America is in trouble. Observe what is going on in this nation. The leaders and those with authority and power set the pace and select the path that the people follow. This case is an excellent example of how authority and power can be such a negative influence on the people, and so misused, and so destructive in bringing misery to innocent people's lives.
The F.B.I. is obviously in almost all cases very good at what they do, but because of their power and authority that they have they can be wearing blinders and have tunnel vision, and not even know it. In this case that is the fact. The F.B.I. does not know what is going on in this case, and they are making things worse not better, and the F.B.I. needs to STAND DOWN before they make things even worse than they are in regards to this case.
5. Ms. Davis has obviously been told in a very direct way to be quiet and to not say a word. A person does not have to be directly threatened to get the message as plaintiff so well knows from

STATEMENTS OF THE CASE

5. (continued) the many, many, cowardly threats that he has received directly or indirectly from the very brave men and women of the F.B.I. and Columbus Police Department.

6. Ms.Davis needs to be reinstated on this case and the sooner the better.

7. Ms.Davis did receive compensation and the plaintiff does ask the court to investigate her bank accounts for deposits and withdrawals, and she needs to at least go through the discovery process.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

1. Plaintiff was considering dropping this case before his grandson was murdered in Southern California on July 4, 2016 and then his son was murdered on January 6, 2017. These two murderers put a whole new light on this case. Since now these nuts were willing to kill human beings because plaintiff would not drop the case, and because plaintiff would not walk the line and/or path that the nuts wanted him to walk.
2. Defendant Davis has a wealth of information about not only this entire case, but also about the two murders. The F.B.I. and Columbus Police Department knew that they put Davis in harm's way and USED her in ways they should not have. Davis in return was tired of being their scapegoat and insisted in being no longer associated with this case.
3. Granting this petition is absolutely necessary for not only bringing justice for plaintiff's son and grandson, but this case is in the interest of the people because what has happened to the lives of so many innocent people because of the abuse of power and authority in this country must never happen again.

CONCLUSION

1. Even though I the plaintiff am only a pro se and not attorney it is a honor, win or lose to send this writ to the Supreme Court of the United States.
2. For the people of this nation and for everything this nation stands for, for the scales of justice, for the statue of liberty that immigrants have looked at with hope in their heart, for the red, white, and blue that Betsy Ross sewed together, for the men and women who fought and/or died in the Revolutionary War, and the Civil War, and all other wars fought for by the American military, for freedom not only for ourselves, but also for others, for every star added to old glory since Betsy Ross sewed the first one with thirteen stars and now fifty, for fairness and justice, and last but certainly not least in the name of our Holy Father in Heaven (God) who this nation says they trust, and if some don't, THEY SHOULD!
3. This pro se standing before the highest and respected court in the nation does ask in all humility that this petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Teddy W. Bortch Sr.

Date: 12-16-2017