

FEB 26 2018

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. _____

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Richard Louis Hall — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

City of Detroit John Doe City of Detroit — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

United States Court of Appeals For the Sixth Circuit
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Richard Louis Hall
(Your Name)

8110 Wyoming Street
(Address)

Detroit, MI 48204
(City, State, Zip Code)

323-447-6342
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

Reasons Why My Case has been dismissed in Error!

- 1) Whether Plaintiff's claim against the city of Detroit, A Municipal Defendant, is barred by the Monell Doctrine?

Plaintiff Richard Hall Answers: "No"

- 2) Whether Claim against the John Doe Police officers is barred, as the complaint was filed more than three years after the alleged incident of police brutality?

Plaintiff Richard Hall Answers: "No"

- 3) Whether City of Detroit ~~has~~ has Immunity from being sued Answer: No

- 4) Are the City of Detroit Titled "Corporation"? Answer
Yes

- 5) Are City of Detroit / Attorneys / Officer participating in Immunity with Corporate Charter Answer: No

Questions

- 6) Ann I Alleging that I am a Man Answer: Yes
- 7) Did all acts (especially injuries) take place on the soil within actual boundaries of the state Answer: Yes
- 8) Should perpetrators (employees) as "officers" under the Constitution for breach of their fiduciary obligations to the people Answer: Yes
- 9) Will a claim of money issue (others) defeat City of Detroit ~~D.~~ Sovereign Immunity Answer: Yes
- 10) Does (Employees) have fiduciary obligations to the people based on their Oaths of Office, Answer: Yes
- 11) Are employees guilty of fraud for masquerading as if they were "officers" of the State and therefore only a pretense of Authority when they know or should know that they had no Authority from the beginning and precluding the de facto officer doctrine Immunity Answer: Yes
- 12) Can Attorney's Representing City of Detroit Produce Corporate Charter Answer: No
- 13) Are the Attorney's participating in fiduciary obligations under the Constitution Answer: No

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	19
JURISDICTION.....	20
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	21
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	22
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	23
CONCLUSION.....	24

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	Decision of State Court of Appeals
APPENDIX B	Decision of State Trial Court
APPENDIX C	
APPENDIX D	
APPENDIX E	
APPENDIX F	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
Conley vs Gibson (1957), 355 U.S. 41, 45, 46, 78 S.Ct. 99, 102, 2 LEd 2d 80	P 26
SEYMOUR vs. Union News Company, 7 Cir, 1954, 217 F.2d 168 rule 54c	P 26
U.S. v White County Bridge Commission (1960), 2 Fr Serv 2d 607, 275 F2d 529 S35	P 26
LYNN vs Valentine vs Levy, 23 Fr 46, 19 FDR, DSCDNY (1956)	P 45
Burt vs City of New York, 2 Cir (1946) 156 F2d 791	P 34
STEIN vs Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, DCCD (1950) 11 FRD 15	P 35
John Edward Crockord vs Publishers, Saturday Evening Post Magazine of Philadelphia, PA	P 36
(1956) 1 Fr Serv 29, 19 F.R.D., 511, DC ED Pa 19 (1958)	
Dioguardi vs Durning, 2 Cir, (1944) 139 F2d 774	
STATUTES AND RULES	

28 U.S.C. § 2101

Fed R Civ P 8f

Fed. R. Civ P. 10-14

Fed

Fed. R. Civ P. 29

Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(c)

Fed. R. Civ P. 30

Fed. R. Civ P. 29.4

Fed. R. Civ. P. 33.2 And 34

Fed R Civ P 12(b)(6)

Fed. R. Civ. P. 39

OTHER

Copies of Orders by District/Court of Appeals/Discovery Subpoena
Defendants Brief

Officers fail to report a traffic stop by a known felon.

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~~ 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 United States 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.

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix B 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 State Courts court appears at Appendix B 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 11/29/2017.

☒ 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: _____, 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 09-15-2015.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix B.

☒ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: 10-15-2015, 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).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

5 U.S. Code § 706 - Scope of review

(1) (2) (A) (B) (C) (D) (E) (F)

(1) Compel Agency action unlawfully withheld or unreasonably delayed, And

(2) held unlawful and set aside Agency action, findings, And conclusions found to be

(A) Arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law;

(B) Contrary to constitutional right, power, privilege, or immunity;

(C) in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations, or short of statutory right;

(D) with observance of procedure required by law

(E) unsupported by substantial evidence in a case subject to section 556 and 557 of this title or otherwise reviewed on the record of an agency hearing provided by statute; or

(F) unwarranted by the facts to the extent that the facts are subject to trial de novo by the reviewing court

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Breach of

claiming

Priming fiduciary obligation/de facto officers/~~immunity~~ Dept claiming immunity. Why?
Richard Hall vs City of Detroit et al John Doe - 1-3 city officers

Appears to have some merit. I will recover and state
claim, only and if first the identity of the
undercover/plainclothes officers/not identifiable
by badge (not worn at time of incident) nor patrol car
number (unmarked) I attempted to ^{serve} produce/discovery
to Detroit Law Dept correctly by a server ^{4 second time} but server
was informed they would not accept, after stamped
certified by U.S. District Court ^{for the} Eastern District
of Michigan. Law Dept received notice of discovery
but ignored and I filed for default. I have been denied
photo lineup by ~~the~~ Internal Affairs after my description
of 3 officers "matched more than half the Dept" stated by ~~at~~ Sgt Roche
Internal Affairs.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

District Court

The 10-13-2015 order City of Detroit vs Title is Municipal Corporation
and different title just Corporation

The general rule in appraising the sufficiency of a Complaint for failure to state a claim is that a Complaint should not be dismissed, unless it appears beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove not set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief, *Conley vs. Gibson* (1957), 355 U.S. 41, 45, 46, 78 S. Ct. 99, 102, 2 LEd 2d 80, *SEYMOUR vs. UNION NEWS COMPANY*, 7 Cir., 1954 217 F. 2d 168 and see rule 54c, demand for judgment, FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 28 U.S.C. Every final judgment shall grant the relief to which the party in whose favor it is rendered is entitled, even if the party has not demanded such relief in his pleadings. *U.S. V. WHITE COUNTY BRIDGE COMMISSION* (1960), 2 Fr Serv 2d 107, 275 F 2d 529, 535.

I CAN RECOVER !! (From statute of Limitations / Failure to State Claim
SYNNUS VALONING VS LOVY AND ASK COURTS TO ASSIST IN HAVING DETROIT LAW
23 FR 46, 19 FDR, DSCONY (1956) Dept giving me photo line up to identify officers (23) pg

I AM Requesting Rehearing And Dismissing Defendants ^{DISMISSAL}
~~28 U.S.C. 1983~~ 42 U.S.C. 1983 Act Police Brutality

Count 1 False Arrest I was held down without
my consent, my freedom was restricted

Count 2 Excessive force: I WAS RESTRAINED, KICKED, KNUCKLED
AND SAT ON.

Count 3 Assault & Battery I sustained a broken NASAL and 2
Broken ribs and lower back problems

CONCLUSION I AM Seeking Judgment
of

- 1) Personal Injuries
- 2) Emotional Distress
- 3) Punitive DAMAGES

TOTAL \$20,000,000.00

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Hall

4-10
Date: ~~4-26~~ - 2018