

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

SCOTT PETERS PRO SE - Petitioner

VS.

KHALIA SATKEWICZ ET. AL. - Respondant(s)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

SUBMITTED BY:

SCOTT PETERS PRO SE

MS2851 P.O. Box 1000

MENARD, ILLINOIS 62259

ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- ① Did Plaintiff state as Briefly as Possible, when, where, how AND By Whom He Felt His Constitutional Rights were violated? Stating a claim? (Fed R.C.V.P. 8(a)(2)).
- ② Did Plaintiff put forth a successful Excessive Force complaint, citing *McCann v. Neilson* 466 F.3d 619 (7th Cir 2006) as an Excessive Force, Rendering generally ASSAULTING police officer During course of arrest is generally not a Bar From maintaining 1983 action for Excessive Force Stemming from same confrontation 42 USC 1983 Civil Rights 1395(c)?
- ③ Did Plaintiff's providing information on How Excessive Force Transpired By Alleged Truthful Testimony that was unsubstantiated Plend Plaintiff out of court?
- ④ As well if Plaintiff's Excessive Force complaint was looked at as obstruction of a Police officer it also does not Bar a claim under Heck for Excessive Force Even if guilty. Did Plaintiff put forward an Excessive Force claim By obstruction? *Smith v. City of Hemet* 394 F.3d 698 (9th Cir 2005) *Busby vs. Strain* 513 F.3d 492, 498 (5th Cir).
- ⑤ Moreover, was Plaintiff's move claim Against the Municipal Agencies stated as Briefly as possible, in his statement of claim, when, where, how and By whom His Feeling that His Constitutional Rights By these Agencies were violated, THERE own Procedures, Policies, And Customs were violated, *Lanigan v. Village of East Hazel Crest* 110 F.3d 467, 480 (7th Cir 1997) Holding general allegation of Policy of Inadequate Police Training or supervision was sufficient. *Canton v. Harris* 109 S.Ct. 1197. (may need more on A. Present Training)
- ⑥ Because THE Plaintiff was a 100% Disabled Veteran of THE U.S. Army should this Situation Been Handled Differently under the ADA Laws of THE United States? Did officers create a more volatile situation in there Handling of the Incident?
- ⑦ Further, Did Plaintiff put forth and state a 4th Amendment claim of search and seizure leading to a 4th Amendment claim of false arrest which the District Court should have stayed and a claim that should have proceeded on these bases and the above basis? Because none of the witnesses the Police alleged stated THE Plaintiff was/or did Hurt His wife in any way EVER testified to this, no 911 Recording was EVER played, and no EMT, doctor, picture, or mark was EVER brought forth in relation to Plaintiff's wife, who Police attempted to shoot Mr. Peters over and assaulted His Home.
- ⑧ How can Mr. Peters/Plaintiff fail to prosecute this case because He failed to Pay THE Appellate Fee of \$505.00 on 12 April 2018 letter, this is discrimination under the 14th Amendment in order to satisfy the Equal Protection clause indigent prisoners must be provided with the same basic tools of adequate defense or Appellate review without cost if those same tools are available to other inmates for a cost. *U.S. vs White* 222 F.3d 363 (7th Cir 2000) The government has a special Responsibility to ensure the integrity of the Judicial Process.
- ⑨ Significantly, How in the 12 April 2018 Final Order can the Plaintiff/Petitioners Case Be Dismissed for failure to pay and then be ordered to have the monies \$505.00 removed from His Trust Fund Account. Because that says He paid and is to be allowed Appeal?

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

<u>CASES</u>	<u>PAGE NUMBER</u>
MOORE V. NEW YORK CITY 436 U.S. 658 (1978)	Appendix B-1 p 5, B-5
VIA COM INC V. HARBOR BRIDGE MERCHANT SERVICES 20 F.3d 771, 775 (7th Cir 1994)	Appendix B-4
VIDIMOSIN V. LAZER LAB LTD 99 F.3d 217, 222 (7th Cir 1996)	Appendix B-4
PEOPLE V. WILSON 632 N.E. 2d 114 (1st Dist 1994)	Appendix B-8-1
GRAHAM V. CONNOR 490 U.S. 397 (1989)	Appendix B-8-4
BLACK V. STEPHENS 662 F.2d 181 (3rd Cir 1981)	Appendix B-8-4
BROWN V. BRYAN COUNTY OK 219 F.3d 450 (5th Cir 2000)	Appendix B-8-4
LAWIGAN V. VILLAGE OF EAST HAZLECREST, ILL 110 F.3d 467, 480 (7th Cir 1997)	Appendix B-8-4
CANTON V. HARRIS 484 U.S. 378	Appendix B-8-4
U.S. V. SERRATA 425 F.3d 886 (10th Cir 2005)	Appendix B-8-6
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO CALIFORNIA PETITIONERS V. TERESA SIECHMAN	Appendix B-8-8
WALLACE V. KATO 549 U.S. 384 (2007)	Appendix B-9
MCCANN V. NEILSEN 466 F.3d 619 (7th Cir 2007)	Appendix B-9

STATUTES AND RULES

1.) U.S. Constitution	Preamble	Paragraph H	p 5+6
2.) U.S. Constitution	ARTICLE VI	PARAGRAPH II	p 5+6
3.) U.S. Constitution	ADAMENDMENT 1	Petition THE GOVERNMENT FOR Redress OF GRENANCES.	p 5+6
4.) U.S. Constitution	ADAMENDMENT 4	Right of the people to Be Secure IN THERE PERSONS, Houses.	p 5+6
5.) U.S. Constitution	ADAMENDMENT 14	NOR SHALL ANY STATE Deprive ANY Person of life, liberty or property WITHOUT Due PROCESS OF LAW; NOR Deny to ANY person WITHIN ITS Jurisdiction THE EQUAL Protection of LAWS.	p 5+6
6.) FRCP 8(a)(2) @	Allegations in pleadings are required to Be Short, Plain and Direct. Appendix B-4		
⑥ Rules	Require THAT THE Pleadings Do not Have to Detail Facts or Plead legal theories.		

OTHER

LIST OF PARTIES

[] All PARTIES APPEAR IN THE CAPTION OF THE CASE ON THE COVER PAGE

[X] 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.) JUDGE Phillip G. Reinhard

CASE # 16-CV-50326

Primary

MAGISTRATE Iain D Johnston

DWIGHT MANESS OFC

KHALIA SATKIEWICZ OFC

ERIC LUNA OFC

Keith Nygren OFC

McHenry County Sheriffs Dept

Clinton GABARA President

McHenry County

2.) JUDGE Stacy M. YANDIE

CASE # 17-CV-00529

Secondary

John Baldwin Director FDOC

Jacquelin Lastbrook warden

JOHN OR JANE DOE Mailroom Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW

1

JURISDICTION

2

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

3+4

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

5+6

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

7+8+9

CONCLUSION

10

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A SEVENTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS - CASE 16-CV-50326 N.D. W.D.
All 14 Documents of the Entire Record of Prose Plaintiff

APPENDIX B NORTHERN DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DIVISION - CASE 16-CV-50326 N.D. W.D.
All 21 Documents of the Entire Record of Prose Plaintiff

APPENDIX C SOUTHERN DISTRICT COURT - CASE 17-CV-00529
All 14 Documents of the Entire Record of Prose Plaintiff

APPENDIX D SEVENTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS - CASE 17-CV-00529
All 12 Documents of the Entire Record of Prose Plaintiff

APPENDIX E EXHIBIT

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:

A THE OPINION OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS APPEARS AT APPENDIX
_____ TO THE PETITION AND IS

☐ Reported AT _____

☐ HAS BEEN DESIGNATED FOR PUBLICATION BUT IS NOT YET REPORTED; OR:

☒ IS UNPUBLISHED

☒ THE OPINION OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT APPEARS AT APPENDIX B TO
THE PETITION AND IS

☐ Reported AT _____

☐ 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 _____

☐ 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 _____

☐ 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 APRIL 12th 2018

☐ 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: APRIL 2nd 2018 AND A COPY OF THE ORDER DENYING REHEARING APPEARS AT APPENDIX A(#12)

☐ AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI WAS GRANTED TO AND INCLUDING _____ (DATE) IN APPLICATION NO. A _____

THE JURISDICTION OF THIS COURT IS INVOKED UNDER 28 USC § 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 USC § 1257(1).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES

- | | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------|---|---|
| 1) U.S. Constitution | <u>ARTICLE VI</u> | Paragraph II | Supreme Law of the Land, |
| 2) U.S. Constitution | <u>Preamble</u> | Paragraph | Secure the Blessings of Liberty |
| 3) U.S. Constitution | <u>AMENDMENT 1</u> | Petition | THE Government For a Redress of Grievance |
| 4) U.S. Constitution | <u>AMENDMENT 4</u> | Right of THE People | To Be SECURE in there Persons, houses |
| 5) U.S. Constitution | <u>AMENDMENT 14</u> | NOR SHALL ANY STATE Deprive Any person of Life, Liberty, Property, without Due Process of Law; NOR deny to any Person within its Jurisdiction THE equal Protection of | |

CASE CITATION ISSUES

- 1.) MONELL V. NEW YORK CITY 436 U.S. 658 (1978) Failure to follow THEREOWN AND NATIONAL Policies, Procedures AND CUSTOMS, Failure in TRAINING, Failure of SUPERVISOR
- 2.) People vs. Wilson 632 N.E. 2d 114 (1st Dist 1994) Information did not qualify AS coming from THE Alleged Victim, A Third party whose BASIS of Knowledge AND was never verified by police.
- 3.) GRAHAM V. CONNOR 490 U.S. 397 (1989) officers acted out of malice AND there ACTIONS were UNREASONABLE
- 4.) BLACK V. STEPHENS 662 F. 2d 181 (3rd Cir 1981) Damages Awarded Against officer who Brandished A Gun At Point BLANK Range.
- 5.) BROWN V. BRYAN COUNTY OK. 219 F. 3d 450 (5th Cir 2000) Single Failure to TRAIN CAN result in Municipal Liability
- 6.) LANIGAN V. VILLAGE OF EAST HAZEL CREST, ILL 110 F. 3d 467, 480 (7th Cir 1997) Holding General allegation of POLICE OF INADEQUATE police TRAINING OR SUPERVISION was sufficient.
- 7.) CANTON V. HARRIS 481 U.S. 378 (1987) (It may happen THAT in the light of the duties assigned to officer AND EMPLOYERS THE need for more AND different TRAINING is so obvious THAT the policy makers OF the city/COUNTY CAN BE SAID to have BEEN Deliberately INDIFFERENT.
- 8.) U.S. VS. SERRATA 425 F. 3d 886 (10th Cir 2005) Failure to Adequately TRAIN OR INSTRUCT
- 9.) COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO CALIFORNIA PETITIONERS V. TERESA SUTTERHAN - Supreme Court NO 13-1412, 573 (18 May 2015) 42 USC 12132 ADA GOVERNS THE MANNER IN WHICH A QUALIFIED INDIVIDUAL WITH DISABILITY IS ARRESTED.
- 10.) WALLACE VS. KATO 549 U.S. 384 (2007) THE COURT HEARING your civil case CAN STAY FALSE ALLEGATION UNTILL later Before conviction set aside.
- 11.) SMITH V. CITY OF HEMET 394 F. 3d 689 (9th Cir 2005) Conviction FOR OBSTRUCTING A Police officer DOES NOT BAR EXCESSIVE FORCE claim UNDER Heck BECAUSE THE OFFICER COULD HAVE USED EXCESSIVE FORCE EVEN IF THE PLAINTIFF WAS guilty AS CHARGED.
- 12.) MCCANN V. NEITSEN 466 F. 3d 659 (7th Cir 2007) THE DEPUTIES use of DEADLY FORCE WAS NOT REASON THEREFORE ARRESTEE'S excessive force claim AGAINST OFFICER COULD BE BROUGHT.
- 13.) DAVIS V. MONROE CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION 119 S. Ct. 1661, 1666 (1999) THE COURT MAY IN Decide Disputed Fact ISSUES, RATHER THE COURT MUST ASSUME ALL MATERIAL FACTS IN THE complaint are TRUE.
- 14.) JONES V. G.F. CO. 87 F. 3d 209, 211 (7th Cir 1996) THE COURT MUST INDULGE ALL DIFFERENCES IN FAVOR OF THE PLAINTIFF.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

15.) FRCP 8(a)(2) Allegations in Pleadings are Required to be Short, Plain and Direct
VIA COM INC v. HARBRIDGE merchant services 20 F3d 771, 775 (7th Cir 1994)

Rules also do not require the Pleadings to detail facts or plead legal theories,
Conley v. Gibson, Victimosin v. LAZER LAB LTD 99 F.3d 217, 222 (7th Cir 1996).

16.) Snyder v. Nolan 380 F.3d 279, 291 (7th Cir 2002) A mail room which caused a
Prisoner to miss a deadline or otherwise to lose the opportunity to pursue
his claim in court, is as well sufficient to state a claim under CIVIL RIGHTS
ACT.

STATEMENT OF CASE

ON 10/07/2016 Petitioner Brought THE Following CASE 16-CV-50326 For

Violation of his constitutional rights of Preamble, Article III, Amendment I,

Amendment IV and Amendment 14, as well as 28 USC 1231 ADA pertaining to arrest of

Qualified individuals. Further, Petitioner False Arrest and Actual Innuence in

These matters Had Revealed to him violations of these rights of which there were

He was able to bring a civil rights complaint under 42 USC 1983 for violation of

Policies, customs and procedures as well as excessive force and could even get the

Statute of limitations stayed on a false arrest claim until he could prove his Act

Innuence in his criminal proceedings, as he had already seen false arrest and in

Violations stayed in the 1st District. Further, bringing these complaints would

Not violate Heck statutes, However, Having been familiar with Judge Reinhardt from a

case of abuse by some of the same Defendants, and his issuing of a local curfew in

the county the Defendants are from and having a bad experience which he/petitioner

Received as corruption, felt he could not get a fair hearing from the Judge Reinhardt

and asked him to remove himself, Petitioner Believes that was taken as a threat or

the honorable Judges reputation, and as it can be seen petitioner believes by and the

way he adjudicated the Petitioner's claim. As well as the way he outlined petitioner

cases, as petitioner has suffered unredeeming abuse at the hands of Agents of the

State, and Believes the political effect of the criminal case may be driving the

Adjudication and decisions made and not fairness or due process, bringing into view

Judge Reinhardt's court, Judge handles court and the Illinois Department of correction

in these instances, Judge Reinhardt's court operating for McHenry county, Judge yandi

Agents of the court operating for the Illinois Department of corrections, and all

Count operating for the truth and he cases from being litigated by suppress

Justice. As a disabled Veteran of the U.S. Army with a 100% disability Rating injured

Duty in the service of this country and sworn to defend this constitution. I can

Say this is not how the constitution and our judicial system is supposed to operate

without Justice because a person has not the means to pay while others do and are

able to obtain Justice simply because there members of a different class is not

constitutional under the 14 Amendment of the constitution. So all petitioners

Asks is that these complaints are looked at from an objective point of view, as Peti-

Believes that the Supreme court being outside the state of Illinois would most like

Have an impartial Decision, as well as the number of Judges on the panel would

Also Have an opinion of Reliability And hopes and Prays an Reliable Decision

STATEMENT OF CASE

AS BOTH JUDGE YANDLE AND JUDGE Reinhardt's Decision Differs on the Constitution AND THE REASON THE SAME CASE SHOULD Be Dismissed, AS Judge YANDLE opines That THE Reinhardt CASE 16-cv-50326 IS Invalid Because IT Violates Heck protocol, AND Judge Reinhardt Believes THE CASE SHOULD Be Dismissed Because THE Petitioner Plead Himself out of court By Providing Testimony that SHOWED Excessive force THROUGH UNSUBSTANTIATED testimony of THE officer commit THE Excessive force, which could Have Been Brought Forward IF THE CASE WAS TO Proceed, I Believe IT WAS NOT Allowed to proceed For this reason. I Put Forth Reasons which stated A claim of Excessive force, False Arrest, AND Lack of Policies, Procedures AND Use of customs AND training which caused IT. A viable complaint. AND Because of THE Lack of Due Process I WAS FORCED TO FILE Another Action Through no fault of my own For denial of Access to THE court, I Believe HAD I NOT Filed That complaint THE Reinhardt court would Have continued to Ignore my complaint. AS well when IT WAS SO important to the Honorable Judge Reinhardt For the trust Fund Account Information to Be up to date for the first Instance He Then Accepts A Trust Fund Account Data EVEN Further out of date THE second time. THEN Just Takes the money. I Believe this shows Bias, HOWEVER That IS For your Honors to Decide. Moreover, THE Supreme court Has NOT Decided A CASE of Excessive force such AS THIS, pertaining too military Tactics Used By FORMER soldiers Against civilians; OR THE 4th Amendment AND search AND seizure AND UNSUBSTANTIATED information. while Using information of This nature to Enter A civilian Residence AND Perpetrate Excessive force on those civilians, ALSO when THE ADA CODE protects Disabled Veterans From This RAUCOUS behavior Moreover, whether COMBAT VETERANS SHOULD Be Able to serve IN Law Enforcement Capacities, That most likely caused this Excessive force situation Based on UNRELIABLE information AS has Happened IN Like situations some 400 times A year AND to A state representative. AND lastly whether ITS Constitutionally correct to Discriminate Against someone Because of His or Her socioeconomic class. AS I Have no money HOWEVER OTHER inmates Do. I CAN'T Proceed to THE appellate court But they can Because they Have money. THIS IS AN ISSUE That ALSO Exist IN my CASE, complaint, claim. All THESE TOGETHER I Believe MAKE A compelling Statement of case to Be Decided.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

THE REASON FOR THE SUPREME COURT TO GRANT CERTIORARI IN THIS CASE IS IMPORTANT AND REQUIRES THIS COURT'S DISCRETIONARY JURISDICTION. FIRST, BECAUSE THAT JURISDICTION IS THE CONSTITUTION AND THE CONSTITUTION IS THE PEOPLE. BY JUST LOOKING AT PETITIONERS APPENDIX E EXHIBIT THERE HAS TO BE PRECEDENT PUT FORWARD BY THE SUPREME COURT WHAT CONSTITUTES INDICIA OF RELIABILITY WHEN 911 CALLS OR COMMUNICATIONS WITH POLICE FROM OTHER STATES CONSTITUTES PROBABLE CAUSE TO USE LETHAL FORCE OR BREAK DOWN A CITIZEN'S FRONT DOOR WHEN THE VALIDITY OF THE INFORMATION IS ALWAYS QUESTIONABLE BECAUSE THE INFORMANT IS STATES AWAY FROM THE SITE OR ALTERCATION. AS WELL WHETHER A JUDGE CAN MAKE A DETERMINATION OF THIS SITUATION WITHOUT KNOWING THE FACTS, ASSUMPTIONS SHOULD BE CONVERTED TO FACT BEFORE AN ASSUMPTION BY A JUDGE SCREENING A CASE FOR EXCESSIVE FORCE SHOULD BE ALLOWED. FURTHER, THIS CASE IS IMPORTANT TO NATIONAL IMPORTANCE BECAUSE THERE IS NO PRECEDENT INVOLVING EXCESSIVE FORCE AND POLICE USING MILITARY TACTICS ON NORM EVERYDAY CIVILIANS THIS WAS THE REASON SWAT TEAMS WERE COMMISSIONED. NOW WE HAVE MORE AND MORE HARDCORE COMBAT VETERANS CONDUCTING MILITARY TACTICS ON CIVILIAN RESIDENCES AND VEHICLES OR IN THE STREETS. ITS WELL KNOWN VETERANS ADMINISTRATION FEELS THAT COMBAT VETERANS ARE PRONE TO PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEMS AND THE PROOF IS THAT THERE COMMITTING SUICIDE AT AN UNPRECEDENTED RATE, IS THAT SAME PSYCHOLOGICAL ISSUE CAUSING THEM TO KILL CIVILIANS AT AN UNPRECEDENTED RATE? THE FACT IN THIS CASE IS ALL THE SIGNS ARE THERE AND THERE COMING FROM THIS POLICE OFFICER COMBAT VETERANS MOUTH IN A CASE OF EXCESSIVE FORCE, AND IF YOU LOOK CLOSE ENOUGH YOU CAN SEE THE COVER UP OF A MISTAKE BY THE OTHERS IN WHAT IS CALLED THE BLUE WALL. FURTHER, IF YOU LOOK AT THE FEMALE'S HUSBANDS TESTIMONY AT THE PETITIONERS CRIMINAL SENTENCING ITS EASY TO SEE THE TYPE OF AGGRESSION THAT IS HARBORED AS HE AS WELL IS A POLICEMAN WITH THE STATE POLICE. AND MOST LIKELY THE SOURCE OF THE FEMALE OFFICERS AGGRESSION. HOWEVER THE PLACE FOR THIS TYPE OF STATEMENTS IS IN FRONT OF A TRIER OF FACT. THE PROBLEMS I'M ATTEMPTING TO BRING FORWARD ARE THE EXCESSIVE FORCE THAT TOOK PLACE AND VIOLATED MY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS. I'M ALSO A VETERAN 100% DISABLED ON DUTY IN THE SERVICE OF THIS COUNTRY. AND I'M NOT SAY I'M PERFECT, BUT WHY IS IT THE POLITICAL ASPECT SAYS THE POLICE CAN KILL CIVILIANS WHOLESALY AND ARE NEVER WRONG, HOWEVER WHEN THEY ATTACK A CIVILIAN HOME BASED ON BAD INFORMATION WITHOUT LETTING ANYONE KNOW WHO THEY ARE OR SHOWING IN BRIGHT COLORS WHO THEY ARE AND YOU PROTECT YOURSELF FROM BEING SHOT, YOU'RE AUTOMATICALLY WORN AND NO ONE WANTS TO LOOK AT THE EVIDENCE AS THE PUBLIC DEFENDERS, STATE AND POLICE WHO WORK TOGETHER JUST JOIN TOGETHER FOR POLITICAL REASONS AND DESTROY YOUR FAMILY.

Reasons For Granting Petition

THE QUESTION IS WILL THIS SUPREME COURT HAVE THE WILLINGNESS TO OVERCOME THE POLITICAL NATURE OF THE INCIDENTS I'M SPEAKING OF AND LOOK AT THE SITUATION FOR WHAT IT IS. AND NOT DO WHAT THESE JUDGES I BELIEVE HAVE DONE SUPPRESS IT. I'M FOR VETERANS, I'M ONE, I'M FOR VETERANS BEING POLICE, HOWEVER, I DON'T BELIEVE COMBAT ARMS VETERANS LIKE INFANTRY SHOULD BE PATROL OFFICERS AND I BELIEVE ITS CAUSING EXCESSIVE FORCE SITUATIONS LIKE THE EXHIBIT IN APPENDIX E. I BELIEVE PATROL OFFICERS WHO ARE NOT MILITARY OR ARE BUT LIKE COOKS, ENGINEERS OR TRUCK DRIVERS WOULD BE MORE ATONE TO DESCUATION/ THAN SOMEONE LIKE THE OFFICER WHO WAS A COMBAT ARMS VETERAN A RANGER BY HIS OWN WORDS WOULD BE. THATS A TRAINED KILLER. AND AGAIN IF YOU LOOK AT THE TESTIMONY BY HIM AND THE GRAND JURY TESTIMONY I BELIEVE ITS EVIDENT. THEN WHEN JUDGE REINHARD AND YANDLE COLLUDED THEY SAID MY COMPLAINT WAS FILED IN BAD FAITH OR NOT IN GOOD FAITH SO BECAUSE I AM OF A POOR SOCIOECONOMIC CLASS I WAS NOT ALLOWED TO APPEAL AND MY MONEY WAS TAKEN ANYWAY, HOW CAN YOU FAIL TO PROSECUTE AND BE DISMISSED FOR NOT PAYING THE MONEY. BUT, PAY THE MONEY (APPENDIX #13), I DON'T UNDERSTAND? EITHER I PAID THE MONEY OR I DIDNT, EITHER I GET TOO APPEAL OR I DONT BECAUSE I DIDNT PAY. THIS IS IMPORTANT BECAUSE IT VIOLATES THE 14TH ADMENIMENT AND HAS TO BE ADDRESSED, I'M AN INMATE WITH NO MONEY SO I CANNOT APPEAL, HOWEVER AN INMATE WHO HAS MONEY AND RICH CAN PAY THE \$505.00 AND APPEAL THATS NOT EQUAL PROTECTION UNDER THE LAW. I'M ALSO SHOWING THAT MY CASE IS IN CONFLICT WITH THE APPELLATE COURT CASES AND THE LOWER COURT CASES WITH THE CASE CITES AND CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED. THE ONLY DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE LOWER DISTRICT AND APPELLATE CASES IS THAT THOSE CASES INVOLVED USUALLY THE PETITIONER NOT BEING AT HOME RESIDENCE OR AN ACTUAL CRIME BEING COMMITTED. I COMMITTED NO CRIME POLICE SAID I WAS KILLING MY WIFE, WHY THEY CAME TO HELP MY WIFE BY A CALL FROM 3 STATES FROM MY WIFE, NEVER SAID THIS OR TESTIFIED, HAD NO MARKS ON HER, DID NOT CALL 911, ASKED FOR NO HELP FROM ANYONE, EMERGENCY DOCTOR, POLICE OR HOSPITAL, SHE WAS NOT ABUSED AT ALL. NO PERSON THE POLICE SAID CAL EVER TESTIFIED OTHER THAN A RADIO RECORDING BY POLICE TO POLICE NO 911 CALL WAS EVER PLAYED NO PERSON EVER CAME FORWARD AND SAID THEY SAW OR HEARD ME DO ANYTHING NOR SAY ANYTHING TO MY WIFE. YET THERE WAS AN ATTEMPT MADE ON MY LIFE. AND THE PROBLEM IS I'M STILL ALIVE. THE ALLEGED PUBLIC DEFENDERS I HAD DIDNT AND WOULDN'T BRING MY WIFE OR THIS ALLEGED INFORMANT INTO COURT TO TESTIFY. AND I CANT MAKE THEM THE JUDGE TOLD ME THAT I DONT HAVE THE RIGHT TO TELL THEM TO DO ANYTHING. ONLY, IF I WANT A JURY TRIAL, TO TESTIFY, OR TRIAL BY JUDGE I HAVE THAT IN TRANSCRIPTS AND OTHER CORRUPTION BY THE JUDGE AND PUBLIC DEFENDERS. IT CAN BE SEEN

Reasons for granting Petition

If you look at THE CASE. But my criminal case is not what we are here for, we are here to decide THE QUESTIONS OF THIS COMPLAINT OF EXCESSIVE FORCE, MOVING CLAIM, SEARCH AND SEIZURE, ADA VIOLATION, EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAW, AND A STRAY FOR FALSE ARREST. AND WHETHER THESE COURTS FEARED IN THESE ADJUDICATION OF THIS COMPLAINT COMPARED TO OTHER LIKE CASES, WHICH I DO NOT BELIEVE THERE ARE ANY. AND ASK IF THIS COURT IS BRAVE ENOUGH TO OVERCOME THE POLITICS OF THE COMPLAINT AND DO WHAT IS RIGHT ACCORDING TO THE CONSTITUTION EVERY VETERAN INCLUDING MYSELF HAVE SWORE TO DEFEND. AND IF NOT THEN, EVERY VETERAN HAS LOST, NOT ONLY RESPECT FOR THIS COUNTRY BUT THE PAPER THEY SWORE TO DEFEND WITH HERE LIFE MEANS NOTHING.

Respectfully submitted,

CONCLUSION

THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI SHOULD BE GRANTED.

Respectfully Submitted,
Scott PERKINS

DATE: 5-23-2018