IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

In Re: Amy Bishop Anderson

Circuit Court of Madison County, AL Case No. CC-2011-001131.62
District Court Docket No. 5:25-cv-00210-MHH-SGC
11th Circuit Court of Appeals No. 25-11928-G
US Supreme Court docketing no. 25-5664

Petition for Rehearing of US Supreme Court Denial of Petition for Extraordinary Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to U.S. S.Ct. Rule 44

Amy Bishop Anderson, pro se, incarcerated, indigent
AIS # 285694, Dorm B-13B
Tutwiler Prison for Women
8966 US Highway 231
Wetumpka, AL 36092

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NOTE: Library no longer has printer. Needed to rely on someone else to print, hence discrepancies. My apologies for handwritten pg # corrections in Table of Contents & Authorities.

APPENDIX

(note: all lettered exhibits are from the corrected Petition for Writ of Habeas submitted to the US Supreme Court on 8/19/25)

Exhibit A: District Court Memorandum Opinion (doc 32-1) w/o adjudication of steroid psychosis per se (except in a footnotes)---asserted claims procedurally defaulted 2/5/21

Exhibit B: District Court Final Order (doc 33-1)---dismissed with prejudice 2/5/21
Exh A& B are adj of *1st* habeas/case # 5:18-cv-00971-MHH-SGCG

Exhibit C: District Court Memorandum Opinion (doc 8-1)--asserted need the Circ Ct. permission for second or successive petition 5/15/25

Exhibit D:District Court Final Order (doc 9-1)--dismissed without prejudice 5/15/25
Exh C&D: are adj of *2nd* habeas/case # 5:25-cv-00210-MHH-SGC

Exhibit E: 11th Circuit Court Court Action (doc 2-2) appeal case # 25-11928--leave to file a successive petition is dismissed in part and denied in part 6/30/25

U.S.S.Ct. Clerk Letter 8/7/25 asking for corrected petition of writ of habeas corpus

U.S.S.Ct. Clerk Letter 9/17/25 docketing corrected petition- docketing # 25-5664

U.S.S.Ct. Clerk Letter 10/14/25 petition denied

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Rules&U.S. Constitutional Amendments

Petition for Rehearing of US Supreme Court Denial of 2241 Extraordinary Writ of Habeas Corpus

I. Summary of Case and Procedural History

A.) I have had lifelong allergies and mental health problems. During the stress of the University of Alabama at Huntsville (UAH) tenure process and my increased lab work that entailed, my allergies flared (I was allergic to latex and formaldehyde-both instrumental in my work) necessitating huge increase of my already chronic use of prescription steroids. During this time I had blackouts and hallucinations. After one such blackout, I was informed of my crime of February 2010 and charged with capital murder/attempted murder-convicted as multiple counts of one act/one case number. In September 2012, I was sentenced in Madison County Circuit Court to Life Without Parole/consecutive Life With Parole sentences.

B) After an unsuccessful direct appeal to the Alabama Supreme Court, I filed a *first* Rule 32 with the trial court, and presented my claims (one of which was no defense raised at all) on up to the Al.S.Ct. I filed a pro se 2254 habeas corpus (*first* habeas) to the District Court (doc 1). The District Ct Memorandum/Final order on 2/5/21, denied (Exh A doc 32-1 & Exh B doc 33-1 note: all lettered exhibits are from the corrected Petition for Writ of Habeas submitted to the US Supreme Court on 8/19/25). On Memorandum Opinion (Exh A doc 32-1 pp2,3) the Court affirmed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendations that my habeas claims were procedurally defaulted, citing MJRR (doc 26 pp 1-18) and then the Court "For Purposes of this opinion" discussed my claims (with *no* discussion of a steroid psychosis claim per se, except as reference that there is no data for steroid psychosis for prescription steroids). The Memorandum Opinion (Exh A doc 32-1, p13) states "The Court adopts the [MJRR] report and accepts the magistrate judge's recommendation:" that my habeas claims were procedurally defaulted. I submitted up through the federal courts to the US S.Ct. (all denied). My rehearing was denied as successive 11/1/21 (here, in I.B. District Court docketing numbers in

reference to case # 5:18-cv-00971-MHH-SGC-*first* R32 and *first* habeas).

C.) After my *first* collateral review (state & federal) was complete, on August 31, 2022 on Channel 8, 5PM News, in the Medical Breakthrough segment, anchorwoman Ellis Eskew, announced a finding in the *British Medical Journal Open* (BMJ), cited as van der Meulen M, et al. *BMJ Open*, Aug 30, 2022, download from http://bmjopen.com. The findings are that prescription steroid use has been shown to lead to structural brain changes in brain volume, gray matter volume, white matter integrity and volume, and significant increase in the volume of the caudate / decrease in amygdala (parts of the brain responsible for fight or flight response/rage) one or all of which can lead to neuropsychiatric effects, many of which this study found were significantly elevated in systemic prescription steroid users.

D.) Within the 6 month time limit for new evidence claim I filed a R32.1e new evidence stating that in light of the new BMJ study (& my medical records of steroid use, psychiatric history and aberrant behavior during/post crime) my existing MRIs, in possession of the state, should be analyzed by steroid psychosis expert to see if steroid-induced brain changes are present, and if so, that (with other evidence of my steroid use and effects) would prove that I suffered from steroid psychosis, thus abrogating intent element of capital and attempted murder, thus calling into question the guilty verdict. Note, the murder definition used for my capital charge (Michie's Alabama Crim. Code13A-5-40 (a) (10)) and attempted murder charge, is section 13A-6-2(a)(1) which has specific intent as essential element. Also, even with a plea, as per section 13A-5-42 (as stated before 2013, my trial was before 2013) all essential elements of capital crime need to be proven in a trial.(here in I.D. doc # are for present case # 5:25-cv-00210-MHH-SGC-*second* habeas in regards to the R32.1e new evidence). My R32.1(e) was on 3/13/23 denied and dismissed, as it was adjudicated as successive (claims raised in *first* R32). Wrote a 59(e) (in response to the R32.1(e)) which was *apparently* denied by 59.1, without notice nor entering of decision in the State Judicial Information System (SJIS) system, in violation of state rules 59(g), 58(c), and in

violation of the 2008 amendment for 59.1 --requiring entrance of *any* denial (even by operation of law) in SJIS. So when called clerk (she accessed the SJIS database) she stated no action had been taken. When I was sent a Case Action Summary, still no record of any denial. Appealed to the ACCA which was denied on 10/2/24, rehearing to ACCA denied 10/18/24, and Al S.Ct. denied Cert on 1/10/25. Submitted a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (*second* habeas) to the District Court (doc 1). After the District Court Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendations(doc 5) recommended dismissal as court held that steroid claim raised in *first* habeas, I filed objections to the MJRR (doc 6). The District Court Memorandum Opinion (Exh C doc 8-1), on 5/15/25 held that steroid psychosis claim raised on *first* habeas (eventhough the steroid psychosis claim had not been adjudicated on first habeas) and as such, as per section 2244(b)(3)E needed permission from the 11th Circuit to allow District Court to adjudicate my successive petition. In the District Court Final Order (Exh D doc 9-1) 5/15/25, dismissed without prejudice. Submitted request for 11th Circuit Court permission/ Notice of Appeal and Application for CoA as one document. On 6/30/25 11th Circuit Court denied in part, and dismissed in part, permission to final a *second* or successive habeas as held that steroid psychosis claim raised in *first* habeas (Exh E doc 2-2 appeal #25-11928). On 7/28/25 submitted 2241 Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus to US S.Ct., followed by Court-directed corrected Habeas, submitted on 8/19/25, docket number 25-5664, which was denied 10/14/25 (US S.Ct. 10/14/25 denial included). And now approach Court with Petition for Rehearing, asking the Honorable US Supreme Court to re-examine my Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, in light of below, and recall its denial and remand to the District Court for evidentiary hearing on evidence for my claim of steroid psychosis, which would abrogate the intent element of my claim, an essential element of my crime.

II. Grounds for U.S.S.Ct. denovo review of my Petition for Rehearing, as denial of my 2241 habeas claim is in conflict with the precedents established by the caselaw below.

A.) U.S.S.Ct. has the power to grant a Writ of Habeas Corpus even when *2nd* or *3rd* Habeas.

1.) 28 USCS section 2241 "does not deny federal courts power to fashion appropriate relief other than immediate release. " [OPINION] *Peyton v Rowe* 391 US 54, 88 S.Ct. 1549, 20 LEd 2d 426 (1968). So this Honorable S.Ct. can rehear my 2241 Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and recall its denial and remand to the U.S. District Court for an evidentiary hearing on my steroid psychosis claim.

2.)28USCS section 2241 was applicable to circumstances in which petitioner inmate asserted actual innocence, not of crime of conviction, but of fact that added seventeen to twenty year to his federal sentence. *Goldman v Winn*, 565 F. Supp 2d 200 US Dist (D Mass 2008). So, likewise, in my 2241 habeas to Dist. Ct. and US S.Ct., I asserted that the evidence of steroid psychosis, with the evidentiary hearing needed to determine if my MRIs have the steroid-induced brain changes, would abrogate intent, an essential element of my charge, thus abrogating my capital charge/sentence.

3.) In another case, federal prisoner's *third* 28 USCS section 2241 habeas petition was barred as abuse of writ because (1) prisoner had twice before raised exact claims or their close cousins and prisoner could not have plausibly claimed that his arguments had gone unanswered and unaddressed, (2) to extent that his current petition raised new claims, prisoner had not justified his prior omission by showing cause or prejudice; and (3) to extent that petition raised claims already adjudicated, prisoner failed to show that reconsideration was mandated by appeal to the ends of justice. *Alden v Warden*, US Penitentiary Allenwood, 444 Fed. Appx. 514 (3rd Circ. 2011).

Unlike the petitioner, *Alden*, I fulfill the *Alden v Warden* grounds required to have my 2241 habeas petition adjudicated rather than banned as successive. As per *Alden v Warden* (1) my R 32.1e new evidence (*second* R32) was incorrectly adjudicated as successive, and my *second* District Court habeas (doc 1), with new evidence of steroid psychosis, was also incorrectly adjudicated as successive (Exh C doc 8-1), and thus, incorrectly triggered the need for permission from the 11th Circuit to submit, which was denied (Exh E doc 2-2). Neither my R32.1e, nor my Dist Ct Habeas (doc 1) were successive, as my *first* Dist Ct. Habeas was procedurally barred and thus not adjudicated (Exh A doc

32-1 & Exh B doc 33-1; citing Magistrate's Report and Recommendation doc 26, pp 1-18: note doc # from *first* collateral process cases # 5:18-cv-00971-MHH-SGCG). Hence, I did not need permission, and certainly my *second* Dist. Ct. Habeas (doc 1) and my 2241 S.Ct. Habeas are ripe for review. So, as per *Alden v Warden* (1) I can assert my claim has gone unanswered and unaddressed. As per *Alden v Warden* (2) I *did* assert in my *second* Dist Ct. Habeas (doc 1) and 2241 S.Ct. Habeas that my new evidence of steroid-induced brain did not exist during my *first* collateral review.

I fulfill *Alden v Warden* (3) as I asserted, in my *second* Dist Ct Habeas (doc 1) and 2241 S.Ct. Habeas, the new evidence of steroid induced brain structural changes in the areas involved in rage/fight/flight, that if demonstrated in my MRIs (already in possession of the state) along with medical evidence of chronic lifelong steroid use, and mental health history (in possession of the state) would abrogate specific intent, an essential element of capital murder and attempted murder, thus mitigating my sentencing. This *Sawyer v Whitley (Sawyer*, supra [505US] at 348, 120 L.Ed. 2d, 269, 112 S.Ct. 2514) innocence claim (innocence of death qualifying charge) as well as the *Alden v Warden* (innocence of fact elevating sentence- in my case to capital) survived AEDPA, thus the ends of justice would have been served by adjudicating my habeas at the District Court and/or S.Ct. level and granting me an evidentiary hearing where my MRIs can be assayed for steroid-induced brain changes.

Although my *2nd* habeas claim had not previously adjudicated, even if *it had been* previously adjudicated on the merit, *In re Hill* 715 F 3d 284 (11th Circ. 2013) [OPINION] II Discussion C."...because the purpose of AEDPA is to greatly restrict the power of federal courts to entertain second or successive petitions, the Supreme Court has made clear that this is a 'narrow exception' for claims' that call into question the accuracy of a guilty verdict.' *Tyler* 533 US at 661-62. [*Tyler v Cain*, 533 US at 661-63, 121 S.Ct. 150 LEd 2d (2001)]" Certainly, in my case, the 5th & 14th am Constitutional Violations at trial (the absence of any defense) and in the postconviction process (denial of adjudication merits of my claims: *1st* postconviction round adj as procedurally defaulted, *2nd* round adj as successive), and in light of the strong and conclusive new evidence that if proven, in light of the

evidence as a whole would 'call into question the accuracy of the guilty verdict,' my petition fulfills (post AEDPA) 2244 (b)(2)B(ii) rendering my *2nd* habeas at Dist Ct. level and S.Ct. level not barred, and ripe for federal review that would serve the ends of justice.

4.) In *Cone v Bell* 556 US 449; 129 S.Ct. 1769; 173 L.Ed. 2d 701 (2009) [LEXIS Headnotes] "When the state court refuses to readjudicate a claim on the ground that it has been previously determined...it provides strong evidence that the claim has already been given full consideration by the state courts and thus is ripe for federal adjudication. 28 USCS section 2254 (b)(1)(A)." and also in *Cone v Bell* "Where state courts did not reach the merits of a petitioner's claim, federal habeas review is not subject to the deferential standard that applies to any claim that was adjudicated on the merits in state court proceedings, 28 USCS section 2254 (d). Instead the claim is reviewed denovo." Thus my habeas at US Dist.Ct. and/or US S.Ct. should have been reviewed denovo.

B.) Jurisdiction of US S.Ct. to entertain a rehearing on Habeas. S.Ct. Rule 44.2 gives the Honorable Supreme Court jurisdiction to adjudicate a rehearing on the Extraordinary Writ of Habeas Corpus. Note, the denial of a Petition for Writ of Certiorari, is the denial of the *opportunity* to brief on the merits, while Habeas is *already* an assertion of the merits of a claim, so certainly, a denial of Habeas can be addressed on rehearing. Also, in S.Ct. Rule 16.1 it states: "After considering the documents distributed... the Court will enter an appropriate order. The order may be summary disposition on the merits." Such is my Habeas denial by the US S.Ct. as no procedural default is mentioned (US S.Ct. 10/14/25 denial included with rehearing). And in *Flynn v US* 75 S.Ct. 285, 99 L.Ed. 1298 (1955) [OPINION] "The right to such consideration [rehearing] is not to be deemed an empty formality as though such petitions will as a matter of course be denied."

C.) United State Supreme Court can review its own decisions to preserve the writ and in the interests of fairness.

1.) In *Peyton v Rowe et. al.*, 391 US 54, 20 L.Ed. 2d 426, 88 S.Ct. 1549 (1968) the US

Supreme Court overturned its own *McNally v Hill* decision. In *McNally* the S.Ct. held that a petitioner could not submit a habeas petition on a subsequent consecutive sentence (they had to wait until they finished serving their present sentence). The S.Ct. stated that it overturned *McNally* to preserve the purposes of the writ, and thus: "a district court was authorized to look behind the bare record of a trial proceeding and conduct a factual hearing to determine the merits of alleged deprivations of constitutional rights." Thus, the US S.Ct. can review its past decisions and correct them in the interests of justice.

2.) In *Cahill v NewYork, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co.*, 351 US 183, 100 L.Ed. 1075, 76 S.Ct. 758 (1956) the "losing party" the railroad appealed adjudication to the 2nd Circuit Court of Appeals and the 2nd Circuit reversed in favor of the railroad (i.e. yes trial court erred in submitting evidence of prior accidents at same site of injury). This 2nd Circuit judgment in favor of railroad was reversed by the US S.Ct. and the railroad's rehearing was denied. Railroad submitted a motion to recall and amend judgment. Even though technically a *successive* rehearing the US S.Ct. granted the railroad's motion and recalled its past denial. In *Cahill* [SUMMARY] The US Supreme Court stated "Rule 58 (4) [predecessor of Rule 44] ...which bars consecutive and out of time petitions for rehearing was held not to prohibit motions to correct this kind of error." In *Cahill* [OPINION][2] the S.Ct. recalled its original order in light of a previous case [*Boudoin v Lykes* Bros. S.S.Co. 348 US 336, 99 LEd 354,75 S.Ct. 382, 350 US 811, 100 LEd 727, 76 S.Ct. 38] where a rehearing was granted to correct a similar order. Thus, in *Cahill* :"We [S.Ct.] deem our original original order [*Cahill* rehearing denial] erroneous and recall it in the interest of fairness." Remanded to 2nd Circuit Court for further proceedings. Likewise, in my case, in the interest of fairness the Honorable Court should grant this rehearing, recall its original denial and remand to the US Dist. Ct. for the requested and necessary evidentiary hearing on my claim.

3.) In *Gondeck v Pan American World Airways Inc., et al* 382 US 25, 15 L.Ed. 2d 21, 86 S.Ct. 153 (1965) [OPINION][382 US 26] the Gondeck family of a victim killed in a car accident petitioned

for damages. The state awarded damages but the US Dist. Ct. set aside damages. 5th Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed set aside, US S.Ct. (in 1962) denied the Gondecks' Writ of Cert and their rehearing.

[OPINION] [382 US 27] Later (~3yrs), when the 4th Circuit Court of Appeals awarded damages to family of another victim of *same* accident and cited *caselaw* where victims of similar accidents with similar circumstances were awarded damages, Gondeck then submitted a *second* rehearing in light of this and in light of other circuits decisions (one of which was a *previous* court decision *O'Leary v Brown-Pacific-Maxon Inc.* 340 US 504, 95 LEd 483, 71 S.Ct. 470 (1951)) conflicting with 5th Circuit denial in the Gondeck case. [OPINION] [382 US 28] The US S.Ct. granted the rehearing and vacated the Pet for Writ of Cert denial, granted the Pet. for Writ. of Cert. and reversed the 5th Circuit Court of Appeals set aside damages.

[OPINION] [382 US 27] In *Gondeck v Pan American World Airways Inc., et al.* S.Ct. concluded that "' the interests in finality of litigation must yield when the interests of justice would make unfair the strict application of our rules.' *US v Ohio Power Co.* 353 US 98, 99, 1L.Ed 2d 683, 685, 77 S.Ct. 652 (1957)." Also in *US v Ohio Power Co.* "Eventhough order denying petition for Certiorari,...had, upon denial for rehearing, became final...,and petitions that were out of time were not received, Supreme Court might vacate order [denial] sua sponte so that the case might be disposed of consistently with other cases...presenting question."

Thus the U.S. S.Ct. can entertain a second rehearing and recall its denial when another circuit decides to grant in a similar case, and the S.Ct. can recall its denial to bring it into like with its [S.Ct.] other decisions in similar cases. (note: ADOC LEXIS does not have other circuits, so only find other circuits when discussed in other cases. ADOC LEXIS is only updated every six months, so can not find *subsequent* US S.Ct. cases that overturn or call into question habeas denial in my case, only *previous* cases which, according to my reading should be sufficient. However, subsequently, a dynamite postconviction case in another circuit, that deals with, *specifically* prescription steroids, is granted, I will *never* know and *never* be able to find out). Likewise, in my case, in light of the caselaw I have

already cited, and in light of the case law on intoxication mitigation of charge/sentence that I will discuss below, and in the interests of justice, this Honorable Court should grant rehearing, reverse its denial of the 2241 habeas and remand to the US Dist Ct. for evidentiary hearing.

III. The non-adjudication of my case by the District Court, 11th Circuit Court of Appeals, and the US S.Ct. denial, is in conflict with decisions of other circuits and US S.Ct. decisions in intoxication cases that are nearly identical to mine.

A.) *Cone v Bell* 556 US 449; 129 S.Ct. 1769; 173 L.Ed. 2d 701 (2009) [OPINION]{173 L.Ed. 2d 709}. The capital murder defendant, Cone, raised defense of intoxication of methamphetamine (illicit drug), to such a degree as to lead to "chronic amphetamine psychosis". *Earlier* in [OPINION]{173 L.Ed. 2d LEdHR1}During trial, a bit of evidence and history of his drug use was presented, but, unbeknownst to Cone, the prosecution declined to produce the exculpatory evidence of witness statements and police reports of his aberrant behavior that corroborated his amphetamine psychosis defense. Cone was convicted of capital murder and sentenced to the death penalty.

[Syllabus] {173 L.Ed.2d 705}{556 US 449}{129 S.Ct. 1770}"The Tennessee Supreme Court affirmed on direct appeal, and the state courts denied postconviction relief. [Cone,~10yrs later, discovered the prosecution's withholding of additional evidence bolstering his claim] ...in a *second* petition for state postconviction relief, Cone raised the claim that the State violated *Brady v Maryland* by suppressing witness statements and police reports that would have corroborated his insanity defense and bolstered his case in mitigation of the death penalty."

[OPINION] The Tennessee state court {556 US 452} denied his request for evidentiary hearing on the ground that his claim had been "previously determined" *Id.* at 753 (majority opinion), either on direct appeal or in *earlier* postconviction proceedings. Dist Court affirmed state court denial as successive and denied Cone's requested evidentiary hearing on his Brady claim [1998], and the 6th Circ. Ct. App. affirmed. Cone's rehearing en banc was denied [2007]. "Doubt concerning the

correctness of that holding [that Brady new evidence claim should be barred because had been previously determined] coupled with conflicting decisions from other Courts of Appeals, prompted our [US S.Ct.] grant of certiorari. 554 US 916, 128 S.Ct. 2974, 171 L Ed 2d 907 (2008)."

[OPINION]III {173L.Ed.2d715}The Supreme Court stated that its initial goal [in its evaluation of Cone's petition] was to answer question whether a habeas claim is procedurally defaulted when it is twice presented to state courts.[OPINION] IV {173 L.Ed. 2d LEdHR8}This Court concluded: "When a state court declines to review the merits of a petitioner's claim on the ground that it has done so already, it creates no bar to habeas review." Also, this Court concluded that: {556 US 467}"When a state court refuses to adjudicate a claim on the ground that it has been previously determined,...it provides strong evidence that the claim has already given full consideration by the state courts and thus is ripe for federal adjudication. [i.e. claims exhausted] See 28 USC section 2254(b)(1)(A)" and therefore not defaulted.{173 LEd 2d 718}

The Court then proceeded to discuss adjudication of the merits of Cone's Brady claim [OPINION] V {556 US 472}This Court concluded:"Because the Tennessee courts did not reach the merits of Cone's Brady claim [adjudicated as having been previously determined-successive] federal {2009 US LEXIS 43}habeas review is not subject to the deferential standard that applies under AEDPA to 'any claim that was adjudicated on the merits in State court proceedings.'28 USC section 2254(d). Instead, the claim is reviewed *de novo.*" [OPINION]V{2009 US LEXIS 50} The Supreme Court held "...the lower court failed erred in failing to assess the cumulative effect of the suppressed evidence with respect to Cone's capital sentence. Accordingly, the judgment of the Court of Appeals is vacated, and the case is remanded to the District Court with instructions to give full consideration of the merit's of Cone's Brady claim." As was done in *Cone*, this Honorable Court should do in my case.

B.) *Sallahdin v Gibson* 275, F.3d 1211, 1220, 1239 (10th Circ. 2003) In Sallahdin (as in my case)he asserted that he committed his crime under the influence steroids, however, his were anabolic (athletic

enhancement) *not* prescription steroids. No evidence of steroid psychosis and no testimony of his steroid psychosis expert was presented at trial. He was convicted of capital murder and sentenced to death. Sallahdin averred that his trial counsel did not bring up steroid expert's testimony as to the influence of steroids on his behavior at guilt phase nor sentencing phase. Sallahdin asserted that if this influence had been presented at trial, it would have mitigated his charge/sentence. His state postconviction averring these claims (among others) was held as procedurally barred and the US District Court affirmed.

The 10th Circuit Court of Appeals reviewed denovo, as the court did not need to show AEDPA deference to the state court when it declined to perform a merits determination. The 10th Circ held, among other holdings, that defendant was prejudiced by lack of steroid testimony, and that determination of the counsel's reasons for foregoing the use of the steroid expert's testimony required remand to US District Court. As in Sallahdin likewise in my case, remand to US District Court for an evidentiary hearing is required to have a steroid expert undertake analysis of my MRIs in light of the BMJ findings, and the other evidence (in possession of the state) of my chronic steroid use and aberrant behavior.

Note that in *Cone* he averred methamphetamine psychosis, and in *Sallahdin* he alleged anabolic steroid intoxication. In *Sallahdin* they discuss his intoxication as voluntary rather than involuntary and defined involuntary intoxication as having a psychotic reaction to medication that is required for a pathological condition. My prescription steroids (for severe allergies: eczema,asthma, anaphylaxis-my skin and brain were on fire) and the ensuing steroid psychosis (from much-needed prescription steroids) falls under involuntary intoxication.

IV. CONCLUSION My steroid psychosis claim has never been adjudicated and no evidentiary hearing has ever been held, despite years of my petitioning the courts as an *incarcerated, indigent, pro se* petitioner. For *second* state postconviction process and my *second* habeas to the US District Court I've

asked for an evidentiary hearing to assay my MRIs for the existence of BMJ structural changes in brain areas dealing with fight/flight/rage, and yet my *second* habeas with my BMJ steroid psychosis claim was adjudicated as successive.

My *first* habeas with (among other claims) the claim of *no defense* raised at trial (in violation of 5th and 14th am) despite medical records of chronic steroid use, mental health records, and aberrant/delusion behavior on police car and station video (in possession of the state-my attny showed me videos) was adjudicated unfairly and incorrectly as procedurally defaulted. Thus, my claim of steroid psychosis has *never* been adjudicated and no evidentiary hearing has *ever* been held. Since my *second* habeas was adjudicated as successive, permission to file at the District Court was denied by the 11th Circuit Court, and this denial can not be the subject of a rehearing nor Writ of Certiorari, I submitted a 2241 Petition for an Extraordinary Writ of Habeas Corpus to this Honorable Court, the Court of Last Resort, which was denied.

An evidentiary hearing is needed to determine if BMJ-elucidated prescription steroid-induced brain structural changes are present in my MRIs and if so, when taken with evidence of my chronic steroid use (medical records in state possession) and delusional behavior (police videos, mental health records in state possession) would bolster the cumulative evidence of my steroid psychosis, before and during my crime, thus mitigating intent (a specific element of my crime) calling into question my guilty verdict, opening the door to a lesser included charge, with a mitigation of sentencing (with the consecutive sentences run concurrent). The Life Without Parole sentence for a crime I do not remember, the non-presentation of *any* evidence of steroid psychosis at trial, the non adjudicatin of my claims during both my postconviction journeys the denial of my 2241 Habeas by this Honorable Court of Last Resort, the "catch-22" AEDPA hoops that are just about impossible for this pro se, incarcerated petitioner to jump through, are cumulatively a violation of the 5th and 14th amendments. The recent and *extreme* degradation of the prison, is a violation of the 8th am.

For years, in light of the BMJ study, I have been diligently pursuing this simple goal

(evidentiary hearing) that would take a steroid psychosis expert 10 minutes with my MRIs to complete. In light of the above, I humbly request that the Honorable US Supreme Court grant my Petition for Rehearing, recall this Honorable Court's denial of my 2241 Habeas, and remand to the US District Court for an evidentiary hearing on my claim. Thank you.

V. Certifications of compliance, timeliness,service and good faith.

Certificate of Compliance: The form of the Petition for Rehearing complies with U.S.Ct. Rule 33.1(c), 12 pt type, >¾ inch margins on all sides, double spaced, could not find font described so used this font. As per U.S.Ct. Rule 33.2: regular paper, stapled at upper left hand corner. As per S.Ct. Rule 33.2(b) rehearing is < 15pp. As per FRAP Rule 24(a)(3) I was granted *in forma pauperis* status at the District Court level, and proceeded with *in forma pauperis* status to the 11th Circuit Court--I included, for the US S.Ct., a complete Motion for Leave to Proceed *in forma pauperis*, after which my 2241 Petition for Habeas Corpus to the U.S.S.Ct. was docketed (U.S.Ct. Docketing on 9/17/25). As per U. S.Ct. Rule 12(2) last line "An inmate, confined in an institution, if proceeding in forma pauperis and not represented by counsel, need file only an original petition and motion." U.S. S.Ct. Rule 39.2 second to last line: "...unless the party is an inmate confined to an institution and is not represented by counsel, in which case the original, alone, suffices." so will include one copy of the Petition for Rehearing and enclosed S.Ct. Court orders to each party.

Note: Timeliness of 2241 habeas to S.Ct.: I received the June 30, 2025 11th Circuit Court denial. There is a 30 day from Court Action deadline to submit the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus to the US Supreme Court, making *my deadline July 30,2025.* I notarized and submitted my Petition (and in forma paup.) into the legal mail system on 7/28/25 as per U.S. S.Ct. Rule 29.2 (mailbox rule for incarcerated petitioner, date filed when when notarized and submitted into legal mail) which was stamped by US S.Ct. as received on 8/6/25 (see 8/7/25 US S.Ct. Clerk letter). 8/7/25 S.Ct. Clerk letter informed me of need to correct petition to comply S.Ct. Rule 14 and I did so. This, the *corrected* petition , with in

forma pauperis motion, and exhibits was re-notarized and re-sent in a timely fashion as per Rule S.Ct. 29.2 *well* before the 60 day deadline for returning corrected briefs as per U.S. S.Ct. Rule 14.5. This corrected petition was filed on 8/20/25 and docketed on 9/17/25 (see US S.Ct. Clerk 9/17/25 letter).

Timeliness of Petition for Rehearing: On October 14, 2025 the 2241 Habeas to this Honorable Court was denied (see US S.Ct Clerk letter 10/14/25). I received this notice in legal mail on the night of 10/20/25. According to Rule 44.2 Rehearing I have 25 days from court action in regards to a Certiorari or Extraordinary Writ of Habeas (my petition) to file a S.Ct. Rule 44 Petition for Rehearing, making my deadline 11/8/25 which falls on Saturday, making my deadline Monday 11/10/25. I will notarize and submit Rehearing (as per S.Ct. Rule 29.2) *well* before this deadline-see notary.

Note on exhibits: Because the library printer *still* has not been replaced yet, and was the only printer available to inmates, I *still* have to rely on an ADOC Lieutenant to print from her printer from library jumpdrive. The Lt. will *only* printout my Rehearing (I copy for S.Ct. and AG), so my *1st* habeas, *2nd* habeas, and other documents described in this Petition for Rehearing will have District Court document # for access by the Honorable Court. The *critical* Court decisions were xeroxed and included as Exhibits and mailed with corrected 2241 habeas (and uncorrected) to U.S.S.Ct. filed on 8/20/25 and are referred to as such, in this Petition for Rehearing.

Certificate of Service: As per S.Ct. Rule 12.2 last line, and S.Ct. Rule 39.2 second to last line, where an incarcerated, pro se, petitioner need only file one copy of petition, each of the parties will be served one copy of Petition for Rehearing, notarized and submitted into the legal mail system on or before deadline, as per S.Ct. Rule 29.2. The parties are as follows:

Honorable Clerk Scott S. Harris, Supreme Court of the United States, 1 First St., N.E., Washington D.C., 20543-0001;

Attorneys General, Office of the Attorney General, 501 Washington Ave., Montgomery, AL 36130

Certificate of Good Faith pursuant to S.Ct. Rule 44(2) This petition for rehearing is restricted to grounds of "intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial

grounds not previously presented." and this petition is presented "in good faith and not for delay"

I declare under penalty of perjury that the above is true and correct.
Respectfully submitted on this date 11/4/25

Amy Bishop Anderson

Amy Bishop Anderson
Dorm B, AIS# 285694 , Tutwiler Prison for Women,
8966 US Highway 231, Wetumpka, AL 36092

06-28-2029
Date Commission Expires

Jacqueline Ruiz
Notary