

No. 25-5472

**ORIGINAL**

Supreme Court, U.S.  
FILED

JUL 16 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

LARS ST. JOHN — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

vs.

CMHA et al. — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

THE 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

LARS ST. JOHN  
(Your Name)

P.O. BOX 14011  
(Address)

CLEVELAND, OHIO 44114  
(City, State, Zip Code)

(216) 266-7016  
(Phone Number)

#### QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

IT IS WELL ESTABLISHED THAT PETITIONER LARS ST. JOHN WAS IN HIS HOME WHEN RESPONDENT'S CORNELL GRIMES AND TISHAWN HARRIS BANGED ON HIS DOOR, THREATENED TO ENTER IF HE DID NOT OPEN. WHEN PETITIONER OPENED HIS DOOR BLOCKING GRIMES AND HARRIS FROM ENTERING. GRIMES PLACED BOTH HANDS ON HIS WEAPONS, SCREAMING BELLIGERENTLY - "STEP BACK" IF YOU DON'T THIS WILL BE THE WORST DAY OF YOUR LIFE. PETITIONER IN FEAR OF LOSS OF LIFE AND LIMB MOVED ASIDE. WHEN ONCE ENTERED, ORDERED ST. JOHN INTO A CORNER, FACE THE WALL AND NOT TO MOVE. THE DISTRICT COURT DENIED IMMUNITY BASED ON THE PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE. THE SIXTH CIRCUIT USED LAWFUL REASONS AND RATIONALE AND REVERSED DISTRICT COURT DECISION.

1. IS A POLICE OFFICER ENTITLED TO QUALIFIED IMMUNITY WHEN A CLEAR VIOLATION OF ONE'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS WERE VIOLATED WHEN AN OFFICER UNLAWFULLY ENTER ONE'S HOME?
2. SHOULD AN APPELLATE COURT RULE ON AN APPEAL THAT DOES NOT FALL WITHIN THE COURT'S PENDENT APPELLATE JURISDICTION?
3. DOES THE SIXTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS HAVE THE RIGHT OR AUTHORITY TO DEPRIVE PETITIONER LARS ST. JOHN OF HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS?

## 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:

CMHA, CORNELL GRIMES, TYSHAWN HARRIS

## RELATED CASES

- LARS ST. JOHN V. CMHA, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, JEFFEREY K. PATTERSON, PAMELA E. ASHBY, DARLENE SLEDGE, DIANA HOCKETT STUBBS, ROBERTA CLEVELAND, ALYSE DISMOND, ADRIENNE PAGE, LEANA PEEBLES, ANGELA RICE, CORNELL GRIMES, TYSHAWN HARRIS, ANDRES GONZALEZ CUYAHOGA METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT. CASE NO. 21-CV-2198 U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
  - LARS ST. JOHN V. CUYAHOGA METROPOLITAN <sup>HOUSING</sup> AUTHORITY, PLAINTIFF - APPELLEE DEFENDANTS, OFFICER CORNELL GRIMES, CUYAHOGA METROPOLITAN HOUSING AUTHORITY POLICE, DEPARTMENT et al. DEFENDANTS, APPELLANTS.
- CASE NO. 24-3136 UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW .....	5
JURISDICTION.....	6
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	7
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	8, 9, 10
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....	11
CONCLUSION.....	12

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A *DECISION OF DISTRICT COURT*

APPENDIX B *DECISION OF FEDERAL APPELLATE COURT*

APPENDIX C *SIXTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS MAILED "ORDER"*  
*ONE MONTH AFTER FILING TO PETITIONER, PREVENTING HIM FROM*  
*PETITIONING UNDER FOR AN EN BANC REVIEW..*

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

# TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

## CASES

LARS ST. JOHN  
V.  
CMHA et al

UNITED STATES  
DISTRICT COURT  
1:21-CV-2198

## PAGE NUMBER

1, 8, 9, 10, 2

LARS ST. JOHN  
V.

SIXTH CIRCUIT  
24- 3136

3

GRIMES, HARRIS,  
CMHA et al

ANDERSON V. LIBERTY LOBBY, INC 477, U.S.  
STATUTES AND RULES 242, (1986)

10

SECTION 1983

7

FOURTH AMENDMENT

7

## OTHER

SWINT V. CHAMBERS COUNTY  
514 U.S. 35, 51 (1995)

9

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 \_\_\_\_\_; 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 VL ex.com; 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.

## JURISDICTION

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was APRIL 18, 2025.

☒ 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 \_\_\_\_\_. *PETITIONER WAS UNABLE TO FILE, DUE TO APPELLATE COURT MAILING ORDER ONE MONTH AFTER BEING FILED. MAKING IT TIME BARRED*

☐ 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).

## CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

PETITIONER LARS ST. JOHN BROUGHT A CIVIL SUIT/ACTION FOR DAMAGES UNDER 42 U.S.C. § 1983 FOR AN ALLEGED VIOLATION OF HIS FOURTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS.

SECTION 1983 PROVIDES: "[e]VERY PERSON WHO, UNDER COLOR OF ANY STATUTE, ORDINANCE, REGULATION, CUSTOM, OR USAGE OF ANY STATE OR TERRITORY OR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, SUBJECTS, OR CAUSES TO BE SUBJECTED, ANY CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES OR OTHER PERSON WITHIN THE JURISDICTION THEREOF TO THE DEPRIVATION OF ANY RIGHTS, PRIVILEGES, OR IMMUNITIES SECURED BY THE CONSTITUTION AND LAWS, SHALL BE LIABLE TO THE PARTY INJURED IN AN ACTION AT LAW, SUIT IN EQUITY, OR OTHER PROPER PROCEEDING FOR REDRESS, EXCEPT THAT IN ANY ACTION BROUGHT AGAINST A JUDICIAL OFFICER FOR AN ACT OF OMISSION TAKEN IN SUCH OFFICER'S JUDICIAL CAPACITY..."

THE FOURTH AMENDMENT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION PROVIDES: "[t]HE 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 OR AFFIRMATION, AND PARTICULARLY DESCRIBING THE PLACE TO BE SEARCHED, AND THE PERSONS OR THINGS TO BE SEIZED." U.S. CONST. AMEND IV.



STATEMENT OF THE CASE

ON NOVEMBER 22, 2019 CMHA SITE MGR. PAGE, "ACCORDING TO HER, CALLED OFFICERS GRIMES AND HARRIS TO ASSIST HER WITH A BED BUG INSPECTION AT ST. JOHN'S APARTMENT. PAGE HAS STATED GRIMES AND HARRIS WERE CALLED FOR "SAFETY" CONCERNS, ALTHOUGH SHE WAS NEW AT THIS CMHA PROPERTY (LESS THAN A MONTH) AND NEVER MET ST. JOHN UNTIL NOV. 27, 2019 (THE DAY OF THE INCIDENT) COUPLED WITH ST. JOHN NOT HAVING ANY HISTORY OF VIOLENCE, ALTERCATIONS WITH PREVIOUS SITE MGRS/CMHA EMPLOYEES. PAGE FELT SHE NEEDED THE POLICE. ON NOV. 27, 2019 PAGE AND THE SAME CMHA OFFICERS (GRIMES, HARRIS) ARRIVED AT ST. JOHN APART. AFTER LEAVING A NOTICE OF RETURN ON A DOOR TAG FROM NOV. 22ND DUE TO ST. JOHN NOT BEING HOME. LARS ST. JOHN HAS STATED UNDER OATH THAT HE DID NOT GIVE HIS CONSENT FOR ENTRY. HE ALSO TESTIFIED THAT WHILE BLOCKING HIS DOORWAY ENTRY TO HIS APARTMENT, GRIMES PLACED BOTH HANDS ON HIS WEAPONS AND ORDERED ST. JOHN TO "STEP BACK" AND MOVE OUT OF THE WAY "OR THIS WILL BE THE WORSE DAY OF YOUR LIFE" THEREFORE GRIMES USING THREATS OF BODILY HARM, COERCION, EXCESSIVE FORCE AND INTIMIDATION TO ENTER ST. JOHN'S HOME WITHOUT A WARRANT. DURING THE ILLEGAL INSPECTION, GRIMES ORDERED ST. JOHN TO GET UP OFF HIS COUCH AND TO STAND IN A CORNER AND NOT TO MOVE. ST. JOHN FILED A LAWSUIT IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO, EASTERN DIVISION. THE DEFENDANTS FILED A MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; WHICH WAS GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART. LEAVING THE REMAINING CLAIMS OF UNLAWFUL/WARRANTLESS ENTRY AND UNREASONABLE SEIZURE OF HIS PERSON AGAINST GRIMES AND HARRIS.

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

THE DEFENDANTS, CMHA, GRIMES, HARRIS FILED AN APPEAL WITH THE SIXTH CIRCUIT. USING PENDENT APPELLATE JURISDICTION BY WHERE THE APPELLATE COURT INITIALLY CITED PARTIAL GRANT OF SUMMARY JUDGMENT IS GENERALLY NOT APPELLABLE AS A COLLATERAL ORDER CITING SWINT V. CHAMBERS COUNTY 514, U.S. 35, 51 (1995). SWINT V. CHAMBERS IS PROPER WHEN (1.) THE APPELLABLE AND NON-APPELLABLE ISSUES ARE INTRICABLY INTER-TWINED OR (2.) REVIEW OF THE NON-APPELLABLE IS NECESSARY TO EFFECTIVELY REVIEW THE APPELLABLE ONE. BEING THE DEFENDANTS HAD ONE ISSUE, WHICH WAS QUALIFIED IMMUNITY FOR GRIMES AND HARRIS. THIS BEGS THE QUESTION, DID THE SIXTH CIRCUIT ERR BY ALLOWING DEFENDANTS TO USE PENDENT APPELLATE JURISDICTION, ESPECIALLY WHEN IT WAS DENIED TO ST. JOHN'S CROSS-CLAIM APPEAL. ONE ISSUE CAN NOT BE INTERTWINED BY ITSELF; IT WOULD NEED ANOTHER ISSUE. THE SIXTH CIRCUIT VACATED THE DISTRICT COURT'S JUDGMENT, GRANTING GRIMES AND HARRIS MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT BASED ON FALSE STATEMENTS, RATIONALE AND REASONING. THE SIXTH CIRCUIT CITED FALSE ACKNOWLEDGMENTS OF THE PETITIONER I.E. TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF HIS LEASE, BED BUG PROCEDURES, INSTALLATION OF LOCKS WITHOUT APPROVAL. ALL WHICH IS FALSE. (CPG 1 PAR. 2 ORDER APRIL 18, 2025) ST. JOHN NEVER ACKNOWLEDGE ANY OF THOSE TERMS. THE SIXTH CIRCUIT WENT ONTO STATE FALSE CLAIMS IN ORDER TO JUSTIFY THEIR LAWLESS ORDER. THE COURT CITES ST. JOHN AGREED TO PERMIT "A DULY

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

AUTHORIZED CMHA AGENT, EMPLOYEE, OR REPRESENTATIVE TO ENTER HIS APARTMENT TO PERFORM MAINTENANCE AND CONDUCT INSPECTIONS. THE IRONY OF THIS IS THE USE OF QUOTATIONS. ST. JOHN HAS CLEARLY WRITTEN, ORALLY STATED VIA DEPOSITION, INCIDENT REPORT CMHA, OHIO CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION ETC. ETC., THAT HE NEVER GAVE HIS PERMISSION FOR ANYONE TO ENTER HIS APARTMENT AND THAT HE WAS HELD AT GUNPOINT BY GRIMES, THREATENED TO MOVE AWAY FROM ENTRY AND TO "STEP BACK," WHICH WAS CORROBORATED BY CMHA MAINTENANCE EMPLOYEE DAVID ALLEN. THE COURT WENT AS FAR TO STATE PROVISIONS IN HIS LEASE AGREEMENT STATING CMHA, AGENTS, EMPLOYEES OR REPRESENTATIVES EXTENDS TO GRIMES AND HARRIS WHO ARE EMPLOYEES OF THE CMHA POLICE DEPARTMENT. THIS LAWFUL RULING WILL SET A NEW PRECEDENT IN DETERMINING QUALIFIED IMMUNITY. THE LAW IS CLEAR, REGARDLESS OF A LEASE AGREEMENT. WHEN PETITIONER LARS ST-JOHN IS STANDING IN HIS DOORWAY BLOCKING ENTRY INTO HIS HOME, THE ONLY WAY TO ENTER IS VIA EXIGENT CIRCUMSTANCES OR CONSENT. NEITHER OF THE TWO AROSE FROM THE INCIDENT ON NOVEMBER 27, 2019. WHEN CONSIDERING A MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGEMENT, THE COURT MUST VIEW ALL EVIDENCE IN THE LIGHT MOST FAVORABLE TO THE NON-MOVANT PARTY, WHICH THE SIXTH CIRCUIT FAILED TO DO WITH REGARD TO PETITIONER LARS ST-JOHN. SEE ANDERSON V. LIBERTY LOBBY, INC. 441 U.S. 242 (1986)

#### REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

GRANTING THE PETITION WOULD GIVE CLARITY TO QUALIFIED IMMUNITY WHEN CLEAR VIOLATIONS OF ONE'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS WERE VIOLATED. IT WOULD ALSO REJECT ANY COURT FROM PRODUCING ORDER/RULINGS BASED OFF OF FALSE CLAIMS AND LAWFUL RATIONALE AND REASONING. IT WOULD PREVENT A PRECEDENT FOR POLICE OFFICERS TO BE CONSIDERED CITY EMPLOYEES, BY WHERE GIVING THEM THE RIGHTS AND AUTHORITY AS ANY CITY EMPLOYEE FROM THE MAYOR'S OFFICE ON DOWN. ALL IN WHICH WILL HAVE A HAZARDOUS AFFECT ACROSS STATE LINES. IT WOULD FORCE COURTS TO VIEW ALL EVIDENCE IN THE LIGHT MOST FAVORABLE TO THE NON-MOVANT PARTY.

## CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Lars M. John

Date: 7-15-25