

No. \_\_\_\_\_

25-5684

ORIGINAL

37 pages

FILED

SEP 03 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Appeal from Court of  
Appeals Case  
No. 25-1549

JEREMIAH S. FARMER PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Jeremiah S. Farmer

(Your Name) #16931-027, ADX,

P.O. Box 8500

(Address)

FLORENCE, CO 81226

(City, State, Zip Code)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Phone Number)

RECEIVED

SEP 18 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

(1)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

Whether sentencing Judge Philip P. Simon violated the Sixth Amendment "the right to have effective assistance of counsel for defense, during the sentencing phase. Judge Simon denied counsel for Defendant at sentencing see Appendix B & C. Showing the sentencing judge denied Defendant a attorney at sentencing phase in Case No. 2215-cr-72-27 sentencing transcript page 7 & 8.

## 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

(3)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW ..... 1

JURISDICTION.....

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....8

STATEMENT OF THE CASE ..... 9

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT ..... 10

CONCLUSION..... 11

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A *United States Court of Appeals 7th circuit*

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

*Pettis v. U.S.* 129 F. 4th 1057--

10

STATUTES AND RULES

OTHER

Sixth Amendment United States  
of America Constitution -- 8, 9, 10

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 \_\_\_\_\_; 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☒ is unpublished.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 \_\_\_\_\_ 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 \_\_\_\_\_ 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.

4.

6

# JURISDICTION

☒ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was August 14, 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 \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ 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). 8-28 U.S.C. § 1291

☐ 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

~~Sixth Amendment United States  
Constitution~~

Sixth Amendment United States Constitution

14th Amendment Due process



STATEMENT OF THE CASE  
& RULE 20.4(A) STATEMENT

- ① Sentencing Judge used Judicial bias and blatantly violated the Sixth Amendment by denying petitioner Defendant Farmer Counsel at sentencing and post trial motions R. 33 and 28 U.S.C. § 2255.
- ② Petitioner is documented as suffering serious mental illnesses. see attached Appendix B showing Federal Bureau of Prisons documented Defendant as to suffering from serious mental illnesses with a total of 16 mental disorders.
- ③ See attached Appendix 1-2 exhibits showing that the sentencing Judge denied defendant a court appointed attorney. show Judicial bias.

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

① Defendant Farmer's sixth Amendment to U.S. Constitution and fourteenth Amendment was violated by sentencing Judge denying Defendant counsel at sentencing see attached appendix C exhibits 1-2 Sentencing transcript Judge denying counsel at sentencing.

---

② 129 F. 4th 1057 Pettis v. U.S., Pettis had a due process right to {2025 U.S. App. LEXIS 5} be sentenced by an unbiased judge and a sixth Amendment right to effective assistance of counsel. Defendant Farmer also has a due process right to be sentenced by an unbiased judge and a sixth Amendment right to effective assistance of counsel.

The Sixth Amendment provides "In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right -- to have the assistance of counsel for his defense 129 F. 4th 392 United States v. Frazier

---

③ "Farmer petitioner claims that the district court violated his sixth Amendment ~~right to~~ right to counsel by denying his request for counsel at sentencing U.S. Court of Appeals (2021) 122 F. 4th 268 November 23, 2024.

The sixth Amendment to U.S.C. was ~~violated~~ violated by sentencing Judge denying Farmer counsel with due process 14th Amendment violated also.

**CONCLUSION**

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Jermiah A Farmer

Date: 8/20/2025

(11)