

25-5478

No. _____

ORIGINAL

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

FILED

AUG 22 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

GREGORY D CROSBY AKA CESI³⁴
— PETITIONER 05825045
(Your Name)

A. Colli WARDEN vs. AND
Federal Bureau of PRISON — RESPONDENT(S)
ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

U.S. Dist Court (Colorado)

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

1:24-cv-01128-GPG-14
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

GREGORY D CROSBY

(Your Name)

P.O. Box 8500 ADX, MTX

(Address)

Florence, Colorado

(City, State, Zip Code)

7191784-9484

(Phone Number)

81226-852

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- 1) WHEN DO FIRST STEP ACT BECOME
RELEVANT TO A INMATE CLASSIFY
AS A HIGH RECIDIVISM?
- 2) DID THE DISTRICT COURT ERR IN
IN DENYING HEARD WITH
OUT A EVIDENTIARY HEARING

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:

RELATED CASES

CROSBY vs. A CIOFFI, WARDEN
Civil Actal NO- 22-CV-03115-
ETG!
QPG KLM
(D. Colo)

111 Related FSA/cases -

Sutterlee vs Williams
2023 US Dist LX 91737

Garcia vs Williams -
2023 US Dist LX 239837

Galvan vs Carter - 2022 US Dist LX
247732

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	1
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	2
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	3
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	4
CONCLUSION	5

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

USCA Appeal/Judgment
A-5 A-7
US Dist Ct (Donnell)
Judgment B-5

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

Quincy v. Cialli	3, 4
826 F.2d 1071 (10th Cir. 1987)	
Crescent v. T-2 v. 826 F.2d 1071 (10th Cir. 1987)	3, 4
Peter Salazar v. Davis	4
677 F.3d 1031 (10th Cir. 2012)	
Wach v. Wach	4 (control)
Citation omitted	
Hoot v. Smith	4 (control)
558 U.S. 87	
Levy v. Court Bank Corp.	4 (control)
474 U.S. 472, 477	

STATUTES AND RULES

Civil v. Civil	4 (control)
5108 F.3d 784 (10th Cir. 2009)	
18 USC 3632(A)	4
2018 First Step Public Law	4
118 385	
NOG v. State (BOP) Policy	4 (control)
5410.01 FIRST STEP ACP	

OTHER

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 A to the petition and is

[] reported at SEE ATTACHMENT; 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 B to the petition and is

[] reported at SEE ATTACHMENT; 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 NA; or,
[] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[] is unpublished.

The opinion of the MA court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

[] reported at NA; 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 7-01-2025 **SEE ATTACHMENTS**

☒ 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: NA, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

[] An extension of time to file the NA 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 NA.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix _____.

[] A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: NA, 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 NA (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. A.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

(3)

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

WILLIAM CROSBY, SCOTTIFIED @ U.S. Pen
itentional Mtx Florence, Colo
where he been housed since
11/21/2016. This matter has
been long drawn out AS TO
THE CONSTITUTIONAL ACT OF THE
PROVISION OF 2018 FIRST STEP
ACT. ON 7-10-24 THE DIST CT
ORDER A STAY IN CAUSE. SEE
ECF CLK 25 2-27-25 ALSO SEE
CROSBY VS TRUE 826 F.3d 699
10TH CIR. A RESPONSE WAS MADE
BY THE ECF CLK 22 8-16-24.
PERMADOC ONLY @ ECF CLK 23.
THE DIST CT ENTERED FINAL JUDG-
MENT 2-27-25 ECF. IT PRO-
WAS TAKEN TO U.S. SC 10TH CIR
WHICH AFFIRMED ON 7-31-25
SEE AFFIRMED THIS APPEAL
FOLLOWS NOW.

(2)

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

THE CONSTITUTIONAL / PROVISIONS CLEAR
WITH THE PUBLIC LAW OF 2018 FIRST
STEP ACT AND THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL
ACT(S) OF THIS BILL. REF OF
AGAINST "TIGHT RECIDIVISM INMATE
WHOM CANNOT GET TIME CREDIT
ADDED". ITS PROVISION OF
VAGUE UNAMBIGUOUS AS WELL
UNCONSTITUTIONAL IN ACCORD
WITH THE LAW.

(4)

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

THIS COURT SHOULD REVERSED OR
VACATED THE U.S. G. OF APPEAL
DECISION. UNDER 28 USC 2241
SEE MCCHEE VS MARYLAND.
Delmo-Saltzer VS DAVID. 677
F.2d 1031 (10th Cir 2012). THE
FIRST STEP ACT, THE BUD WAS
BOUNDED TO DEVELOP A RISK
AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT SYSTEM
FOR PRISONERS. BY JULY 2019.
18 USC 3632(A). TITUS TOOK
EFFECTIVE JAN 20 AND HAS BEEN
TABLED SINCE. PETITIONER ALSO
HAS PREVIOUS CASES
CROSBY I VS TROE 826 F.2d 1171
1st Cir 1987. CROSBY II VS
TROE 824 F.2d 1171 (1st Cir
2020). IN THIS INSTANT MATTER
MR CROSBY IS ARGUING THAT
THE FIRST STEP ACT DOESN'T
GIVE HIM THE TIME CREDIT
THAT HE SHOULD RECEIVE THE
PER BOP. POLICY 5410.01
2018 FIRST STEP ACT IMPLEM-
ENTATION OF TIME CREDIT
PROCEDURES. IT ALSO VAGUE
AND AMBIGUOUS AND IS BIAS
TOWARD THE DECISION
INMATE S.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE ~~40%~~ PETITION

1 THE LAW DOES NOT CALCULATE A
2 HCOH REP. D. J. SM IMMEDIATE AS IT
3 CHD IN THE PETITIONER CASE,
4 ACCURATELY OF CORRECT ARTICLE
5 III OF THE U.S. CONST. RESTRICTS THE
6 DECISION-MAKING POWER OF THE
7 FEDERAL JUDICIARY TO CASES INVOLVING
8 AN ACTUAL CASE OR CONTROVERSY. SOO ALVAREZ VS SMITH
9 558 US 87, 92, 175 LER 26 447
10 2005 TO SATISFY THE CASE OF
11 CONTROVERSY REQUIREMENT PETITIONER
12 OFFER INTURY OF HIS TIME NOT
13 HO. W. ADDED. HIS CREDITS W/TH
14 HOLD AND ELONG MORE TIME
15 THAT HE SHOULD HAVEN'T TO DO
16 AN ACTUAL INTURY + CREABLE TO
17 HO ADDRESSED BY RESPONDENT.
18 SOO LOWRIE VS CONN / BULL
19 CORR 494 US 472, 477, 108 LER
20 2D 400 (1990). HERE ACTUAL
21 CONTROVERSY MUST BE EXTANT
22 AT ALL STAGES, NOT MERELY AT
23 THE TIME THE COMPLAINT IS
24 FILED. SOO CARRA VS HASKELL
25 568 F3D 784 (10TH CIR 2009).
26 INTERNAL 900,000 MARK OMITTED
27 (500 P. 6) W/CLERSON VS CITY OF

Gold Card

of Albuquerque, 100 F 3d 863
10TH Cir 1996), Here a total
violation report and MR-
CROSBY took this time
Court Review Appeal of
decision in its entirety.

Conclusion

Based upon the foregoing
and the Appeal of cleared
District of decision the
Attorney said that
the Court reverse of
MAYNARD the decision.

Submitted.

Submitted By.

SI - EPOC 11 2011/11/11

GREGORY D CROSBY

REG NO 05825045

P.O BOX 8500 ALBUQUERQUE

NM 87106

FLORENCE, COLO

81226-8500

CONV PRU F

8-6-7025

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

Robert R. Roth
AUG 6, 2025