

No. 167628

25-5840

ORIGINAL

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

FILED

AUG 18 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

ROBIN HAMMOCK

Petitioner

-V-

MICHIGAN

Respondent(s)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE MICHIGAN SUPREME COURT

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

BY: Robin Hammock #394595
Lakeland Correctional Facility
141 First Street
Coldwater Michigan 49036

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

Mr. Hammock alleges that on October 14, 2015 he filed a Second Post Conviction Motion for Relief from Judgment raising a Brady Violation, that the State suppressed exculpatory witness [Jason Carter]. After Michigan Court of Appeals issued a PEREMPTORY REMAND Ordering Circuit Court to Determine RELIEF under MCR 6.502(D). Circuit Court Judge (After Remand) Determined the Merits and ENTERED an Order "GRANTING Mr. Hammock's (Second) Motion For Relief from Judgment. The State DID NOT move for Reconsideration of the March 21, 2017 ORDER making it a FINAL ORDER Under the RES JUDICATA also Law of the case Doctrine. The Procedures after this ORDER are VOID and TOTALLY Unconstitutional. (Due Process) (EQUAL Protection). However Mr. Hammock will present the following questions because more evidence was discovered at (2023) Post Conviction Evidentiary Hearing that further establishes that his 2007 convictions are Unconstitutional. Under US Const Amend XIV.

I. Did Michigan Courts commit Plain Error that Violated Mr. Hammock's SUBSTANTIVE RIGHTS by REFUSING to ENFORCE CIRCUIT COURT'S FINAL ORDER GRANTING Mr. Hammock's (Second) Motion For Relief From Judgment???

II. Did Michigan's 3rd Circuit Court misapply the Suppression and Materiality Standards set forth in Brady v. Maryland where former LEAD Detective in Mr. Hammock's case CONFESSED at 2023 Postconviction hearing to SUPPRESSING Material Evidence???

III. Was Mr. Hammock Denied DUE PROCESS and a fair trial Under United States Constitution Amendment Fourteenth where the

PEOPLE failed to correct the known use of FALSE TESTIMONY in
violation of the standards set forth in NAAR v. Illinois?

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

MOONEY V. HOLOHAN 294 U.S. 103; 55 S. Ct. 340 (1934) (perjured testimony)

PEOPLE V. JOHNSON 502 Mich 541 (2018) Motion For Relief From Judgment Granted "[New Trial.]"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	20
CONCLUSION.....	36

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Michigan Supreme Court's Feb 28, 2025 ORDER

APPENDIX B: Michigan Supreme Court's May 22, 2025 ORDER

APPENDIX C: 3rd Circuit Court's October 23, 2023 ORDER (Motion)

APPENDIX D: Mr. Hammock's 2007 WAIVER Trial (Court's findings)

APPENDIX E: 3rd Circuit Court's Register of Actions

APPENDIX F: Michigan Court of Appeals July 15, 2016 REMAND.

APPENDIX G: 3rd Circuit Court's March 21, 2017 ORDER

APPENDIX H: Appointed Counsel's New Trial Motion

APPENDIX I: March 10, 2023 William Blake (Evidentiary Hearings)

APPENDIX J: March 10, 2023 Det. DeSireco (Evidentiary Hearings)

APPENDIX: K. March 23, 2023 Jason Carter (Evidentiary Hearing)

APPENDIX: L. Attorney's Brief (Supplemental brief)

APPENDIX: M. Hammock's Brief (Supplemental Brief)

APPENDIX: N. Attorney's Mich Appeals App & Complaint Supreme
Intendent Control.

APPENDIX: O. 18 U.S.C.S. 1509 Obstruction of A Court Order

APPENDIX: P. Inkster Police Report

APPENDIX: Q. MCR 6.502(A) Nature of Motion

APPENDIX: R. MCR 7.202 (b)(iv) Definition

APPENDIX: S. Gregory Fletcher's IPD Statement

APPENDIX: T. Mich Supreme Court's July 31, 2020 Remand

APPENDIX: U. Mr. Hammock's Mich Supreme Court's (2025 App)

APPENDIX: V. 3 of 4 Trans Det. DelGreco's trial testimony

APPENDIX: W. PEOPLE V. Johnson 502 Mich 541 (2018)

APPENDIX: X. Michigan Court of Appeals Sept. 18, 2024 (Opinion)

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83; 83 S.Ct 1194	(24) (32)
Mackey v. United States, 401 U.S. 667, 691 (1971)	(22)
Mich Court of Appeal July 15, 2016 Remand	(7)
Napue v. Illinois, 360 U.S. 265	(33)
People v. Johnson, 502 Mich 541	(22)
United States v. Bagley, 473 U.S. 667, 682 (1985)	(28)
United States v. Bostic, 371 F.3d 865 (6 th Cir. 2004)	(20)
United States v. Gardner, 463 F.3d 445 (6 th Cir 2006)	(20)

STATUTES AND RULES

18 U.S.C.S. 1509 Obstruction of Court Order	(9)
MCR 6.502(A) NATURE of Motion	(22)
MCR 6.502(G)(1)	(17) (10)
MCR 6.502(G)(2)	(11)
MCR 6.508(D)	(10) (11)
MCR 7.202 (6)(b)(iv) Definition	(22)
MCL 750.248, Making, Altering Public Record	(21)

OTHER

United States Const Amend <u>XIV</u>	(22) (24)
--------------------------------------	-----------

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 _____ 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 C 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 MICHIGAN SUPREME COURT court appears at Appendix A.B. 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 _____.

☐ 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).

☒ For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was Feb 28, 2025.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix (A).

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: MAY 22, 2025, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix (B).

☐ 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

The following Statutory and Constitutional provisions are involved in this case.

U.S. CONST., AMEND. XIV

Section 1. "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; 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 THE LAW."

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Mr. Hammock was convicted of the Murder of Claudy Lundy and attempt Murder of Lamone Pippins. According to Lamone Pippins (ex conv who was on Parole at the time of trial). He (Pippins) and Lundy where "Chillin and Drinking inside of a Home in Inkster Michigan (29549 Oakwood) when Mr. Hammock and Mr. Healel shows up there. Pippins testifies that everyone was [DRINKING] and as everyone was leaving Mr. Hammock began to shoot Mr. Lundy. Mr. Pippins testified seeing the Shootings yet walks into the same Room, then Mr. Hammock Shoots him. NO MOTIVE WAS GIVEN by Mr. Pippins as to why Mr. Hammock would want to kill him and Lundy. Pippins testified that Mr. Hammock was his friend for five years and that they where all just "DRINKING and Chilling" inside the Home. (NO DRINKS were recovered NO DNA). NO Physical evidence supported Pippins' testimony.

Mr. Hammock's defense counsel asserted that Pippins and Lundy where NOT Chilling and Drinking at that Home, that they had [BROKEN INTO] the Home and Pippins came up with multiple stories to escape going back to Prison for the Home invasion and Felony Murder due to Lundy's Death in the commission of their Robbery.

Trial counsel did the best with the evidence provided by the State. However Mr. Hammock was found guilty of Second degree Murder Attempted Murder Felony Firearm. The trier of Facts WAS NOT totally sold on the testimony of Mr. Pippins as the trier of Facts let it be known

in her Ruling. When reaching its verdict trial Judge stated that: "I DON'T KNOW WHY THE SHOOTING HAPPENED BECAUSE THE PEOPLE DON'T ESTABLISH THE [CIRCUMSTANCES] BECAUSE MR. PIPPINS -- AND HE IS THE [MAINSTAY] IN THIS THAT YOU HAVE TO [SINK] OR SWIM WITH MR. PIPPINS." (What degree of murder is I DON'T KNOW???)

The trial Judge questioned Mr. Pippins' (sole witness) Credibility with the testimony he provided. Trial of facts continues in its Ruling that: "BUT HIS CREDIBILITY, BASED ON THE FACT HE'S IN THIS HOUSE. AT ONE POINT HE SAYS, OH WE WENT OVER THERE TO SEE SOME GIRLS. ANOTHER POINT HE SAYS SOMETHING DIFFERENT [I DON'T KNOW]."]

"AND I TRIED TO FIGURE IT OUT BECAUSE I ASKED HIM SOME QUESTIONS MYSELF. AND HE'D SAY ONE THING ONE MINUTE AND SOMETHING ELSE THE NEXT MINUTE AND HOW CAN YOU RELY ON ALL OF THOSE THINGS THAT HE SAID." (Waiver trial 4 of 4) (APPENDIX (H)).

With all the DOUBT expressed on RECORD trial Judge still finds Mr. Hammock Guilty of Second degree Murder Assault with intent to Murder and Felony fire arm. Sentences Mr. Hammock to 35 to 70 YEARS for the Murder 20 to 60 YEARS for the AWTM and 2 YEARS for the Felony Firearm.

Years Later, while serving out those sentences at OAKS Correctional Facility, Mr. Hammock was approached by a young man who had information regarding the facts to his case. Jason Carter (New witness) explained to Mr. Hammock that:

Mr. HAMMOCK IS NOT GUILTY of the case he's in Prison for. He (Carter) goes on that: He (Carter) was in Inkster Jail weed the night/morning of the shooting. States that Mr. Lundy came and bought some and After Lundy left Carter notice he had Mr. Pippins with him. Carter witnessed the two walk across the street and kick in the side door to the Corner Home [BREAKING INTO] the home. Carter states that he witnessed the two Pippins and Lundy taken items from that home placing them inside of a Abandon home across the street. When a Light Blue Lincoln Pulls up to the house Lundy and Pippins had Broken into and a White male got out and walked into the home Pippins and Lundy Broke into. Carter stated that: He heard Yelling to the effects of "What the fuck are Yall doing in my house followed by gunshots. Carter further states that he stayed in the window as the man exit the home with a suit case in hand get back into the Blue Lincoln and Drive away. He states that: Minutes later Inkster PD Shows up and Abandons.

Carter then states that: "That same morning hours later making his way around the corner to his Sills home he was stopped by Former Inkster Detective DeSicco who interviewed him asking what did he (Carter) know about the shooting that took place? Carter states that he told Det. DeSicco the above facts yet he WAS NEVER called to testify.

With this Newly discovered evidence Mr. Hammock worked with the Facilities Legal writer and issued an Affidavit

for both Mr. Carter and Mr. Hammock also proffered two Motions, one Evidentiary Hearing Motion and a Motion for Relief from Judgment raising a BRADY Violation Requesting for the Court to [SET ASIDE] Mr. Hammock's 2007 conviction. The Motions was filed in Michigan's 3rd Circuit Court on October 2015. SEE APPENDIX (E) 3rd Circuit Court's Register of Actions (THE RECORD).

On January 4, 2016, Circuit Court Judge DENIED Relief Determining that: Jason Carter's proposed testimony is NOT [EXCULPATORY]. (((NO CREDIBILITY ISSUE))). Mr. Hammock files a timely Reconsideration Motion pointing out the obvious error that the newly discovered witness states that a [white male] did the shootings who's house Pippins and Lundy had broken into. Circuit Court Denied Reconsideration.

Mr. Hammock then files an Application for Leave to Appeal in the Michigan Court of Appeals. The Court's Chief Judge along with two other Judges issued a PEREMPTORY REMAND first VACATING the Circuit Court's January 4, 2016 Denial and Remanding the Matter. The Court determined that: "Mr. Hammock presented a claim of newly discovered evidence and MCR 6.502(G)(1) DOES NOT procedurally bar Mr. Hammock's claim." The court continues to state that: "Trial Court further erred when it concluded that there was no [EXCULPATORY] connection between the proffered evidence and material evidence at trial. The proffered evidence alleges that someone other than Mr. Hammock shot the victims." SEE APPENDIX (F) MICH COURT OF APPEAL JULY 15, 2016 Remand.

On March 21, 2017 (After Remand) Circuit Court DETERMINED that:

"UPON A THOROUGH REVIEW OF THE PLEADING AND THE RECORD, THIS COURT OPINES THAT THE AFFIDAVIT OF [JASON CARTER] ESTABLISHES A "GATEWAY SHOWING OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE" WHICH IS ESSENTIALLY INTERCHANGEABLE WITH THE "SIGNIFICANT POSSIBILITY STANDARD OF MCR 6.508(D)(3)(b)(i)." UNDER MICHIGAN LAW, WHERE "IT IS MORE LIKELY THAN NOT THAT NO REASONABLE [TRIER OF FACT] HEARING THE [PROPOSED] TESTIMONY OF [JASON CARTER], WOULD HAVE FOUND [MR. HAMMOCK] GUILTY BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT." THERE EXISTS A SIGNIFICANT POSSIBILITY THAT MR. HAMMOCK IS INDEED INNOCENT OF THE AFOREMENTIONED CONVICTION AND SENTENCE."

Circuit Court further determined that:

"VIEWED IN ISOLATION, IT IS ENTIRELY POSSIBLE TO DISMISS THE UNDER LYING CIRCUMSTANCES (WHETHER THE COMPLAINANT AND DECEDENT WERE COMMITTING AN ACTIVE LARCENY WHEN THEY BEFELL GUNFIRE), NEVER THELESS, AS THE PROSECUTION'S CASE RELIED UPON

"THE COMPLAINANT'S TESTIMONY CORROBORATED BY
THIN STRANDS OF CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE,
AN [EXCULPATORY] CONNECTION BETWEEN THE
HEART OF THE COMPLAINANT'S TESTIMONY IS
UNDENIABLE. IT FURTHER APPEARS THAT THIS
PREDECESSOR COURT FOUND THE VERACITY
OF THE COMPLAINANT'S TESTIMONY QUITE
DOUBTFUL".

Circuit Court ultimately enters an ORDER [GRANTING]
Mr. Hammock's (SECOND) MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT.
SEE APPENDIX (G) MARCH 21, 2017 ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR
RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT.

SEE ALSO APPENDIX (E) Circuit Court's Register of Actions 3/21/2017
entry clearly reflects Motion "GRANTED Order signed and
filed". P.

The State of Michigan DID NOT file a Motion for
Reconsideration. The State DID NOT APPEAL these Determinations
and ORDER entered to Michigan Court of Appeals.
MAKING THE MARCH 21, 2017 ORDER A FINAL ORDER.
THE PROCEEDINGS AFTER THIS VALID UNITED STATES COURT
COURT ORDER IS TOTALLY UNCONSTITUTIONAL: CRIMINAL
UNDER 18 U.S.C. 1509 OBSTRUCTION OF A COURT ORDER.

ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2018, Circuit Court holds another
hearing 177 days later issuing another Determinations, this
time Determining that Jason Carter's Proposed testimony
would NOT make a different outcome on Retrial.
Entering another Order Denying Mr. Hammock's M.R.J. as

Mr. Hammock immediately filed a Motion for reconsideration pointing out the obvious ERROR that the Court had ALREADY DETERMINED the facts and entered AN ORDER GRANTING MRS. the Prosecution did not challenge that Judgment under a Motion For Reconsideration.

Circuit Court REFUSED to rule on this Motion AS Months went by (7). Frustrated and Confused Mr. Hammock went to the Facility's Legal writer for advice what to do? He Advise Mr. Hammock to file A Complaint for Superintending Control to the Michigan Court of Appeals. Mr. Hammock put together the Complaint and filed it in the Michigan Court of APPEALS. This must have UPSETED the Circuit Court because once the Process started Circuit Court quickly entered an Order Denying Mr. Hammock's Motion for Reconsideration stating that its March 21, 2017 Order was NOT GRANTING his Motion For Relief From Judgment, It was GRANTING him the right to file a Motion for Relief From Judgment. (The Circuit Court's Justification must fall because first the Motion is filed on October 15, 2015 and the Michigan Court of APPEALS Permitted it pursuant to MCR 6.502(G)(2) July 15, 2016 and Remanded the Matter to Determine Relief Under MCR 6.508(D).).

Mr. Hammock took the Procedural Violation issue to the Michigan Court of APPEALS. This time the Court STATED that: "Mr. Hammock was BARRIED due to MCR 6.502(G)(1). Mr. Hammock immediately filed a Motion for Reconsideration pointing out the obvious ERROR that On July 15, 2016 this same Court Already Determined that MCR 6.502(G)(1)

does NOT Bar the motion and that the court had already Permitted these very issue under MCR 6.502(G)(2) and now that became Law of the case. The MCOA DENIED LEAVE.

Mr. Hammock then goes to the Michigan Supreme Court with the issues (2018). The Mich Supreme Court IGNORED the Subject Matter Jurisdiction violation issue where Circuit Court has already determined the standards for Entitlement for Relief under MCR 6.508(C) March 21, 2017 and entered an Order Granting the Motion. On July 31, 2020 Michigan Supreme Court however VACATED the trial court's September 13, 2018 Denial and Remanded the case for the Circuit Court to determine [CREDIBILITY], (reflecting back to the Record CREDIBILITY WAS NEVER in question in NONE of the prior RULINGS by Circuit Court or Michigan Court of Appeals which is the first analysis a court determine before determining entitlement for Relief. Michigan Supreme Court willfully blindness is apparent were it ignored the Procedural Violations by stating that the Circuit Court's March 21, 2017 ORDER WAS GRANTING an Evidentiary Hearing. Which is CLEARLY WRONG where the March 21, 2017 ORDER very specifically states that:

"ORDER GRANTING MR. HAMMOCK'S SUCCESSIVE MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT AFTER REMAND."

Mr. Hammock then files a Motion for a New Trial in Circuit Court based solely on the March 21, 2017 ORDER

GRANTING MRS. (Jan 2021). On October 2022 Mr. Hammock WAS appointed an Attorney for the Ordered Evidentiary hearings by Mich Supreme Court. Cecilia Quirindongo Baunsoe MBS. Baunsoe sent a letter to Mr. Hammock asking if there anything that she need to know about the case. Mr. Hammock provided Attorney with COPIES of the ORDER GRANTING the MRS along with the Circuit Court's REGISTER of Action. Attorney Baunsoe set up a visit and agreed with Mr. Hammock that the Circuit Court's Determination and Order entered March 21, 2017 LEAVE NO REASON to hold an Evidentiary Hearing. Ms. Baunsoe states that: "A COURT SPEAKS THROUGH ITS WRITING ORDERS" and the Prosecution did not appeal the Court's March 21, 2017 ORDER MAKING it a Final ORDER. Ms. Baunsoe is a DECORATED Attorney who won AWARDS for her Postconviction APPEAL cases. Attorney Baunsoe prepared a supplemental Motion for A New Trial and Motion for Bond due to the Circuit Court's ORDER GRANTING. SEE APPENDIX (H) Appointed Attorney Motions.

The Circuit Court set a date to hear the Motions for January 27, 2023. At that hearing Circuit Court DENIES Ms. Baunsoe and Mr. Hammock's motions without given an OPINION (As Mich Const Requires) Attorney Ms. Baunsoe asked the Judge as to why and the Judge simply states that: "I DENY the Motions". No OPINION WAS GIVEN.

A date for the Evidentiary Hearing WAS SET for March 10, 2023. On that date Counsel (Ms. Baunsoe) WAS able to locate the Person who's Home the Shootings

took place inside of (in 2006) he was in fact a white male and he testified at the Evidentiary Hearing. His (March 10, 2023) testimony corroborated Jason Carter's Affidavit regarding Pippins and Lundy had in FACT [BROKEN INTO] his Home (2006) and stolen several items. Mr. Blake very specifically testified to NOT knowing Pippins or Lundy and that they DID NOT have his permission to be at his Home, also did not give anyone permission to remove any items from his house. Mr. Blake also confirms that he owned a Light Blue Lincoln and that he allowed another white male to stay with him at the time of the shooting. Which further corroborates Jason Carter's Affidavit. See Appendix (B) March 10, 2023 Postconviction Evidentiary Hearing testimony by William Blake.

March 10, 2023 the People called former Inkster Detective Anthony DelSoreo. Former Det. DelSoreo testified that he was the officer in charge in Mr. Hammock's case. He (Det. DelSoreo) admits that: "HE DO NOT REMEMBER EVERY WITNESS HE INTERVIEWED" regarding the Hammock case." He (Det. DelSoreo) admits to interviewing the home owner (William Blake) of the subject house. He (DelSoreo) admits that Mr. Blake informed him that he (Mr. Blake) DID NOT give Pippins and Lundy permission to be at his Home and DID NOT give them permission to take ANY items from his home EVER. Former Det. DelSoreo surprisingly admits that this phone interview could have taken place Dec 2006 (before Mr. Hammock's 2007 trial)

SEE APPENDIX (7) March 10, 2023 Postconviction Evidentiary Hearing
During Mr. Hammock's Post Conviction Hearing Former Det.
DeSireco also admits to interviewing Gregory Fletcher
who provided the Detective with Material Information
Regarding the Hammock case. This interview/statement
was also suppressed. Detective Admits that Mr. Fletcher
had informed him (DeSireco) that: "He Mr. Fletcher was
with Pippins and Lundy when the two came up
with the plan to [BREAK INTO] THE CORNER HOUSE".
Det. Admits that this was ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE he obtained
as to why Pippins and Lundy were doing at the
Subject home (Mr. Blake's Home).

SEE APPENDIX (5) March 10, 2023 Hearing P. —

Defense next calls Jason Carter (March 23, 2023)
to testify. Mr. Carter confirms his signed 2015 Affidavit
he testifies to the events stated within the State
attempted to trip him up with an UNAUTHORIZED
REPORT SUPPOSEDLY BY CIU which all the facts was
conflicting. NO ONE'S name was documented as to who
the interviewing officer was. HOWEVER Carter was
not moved he testified that the Home of the
shootings the home the STOLEN items were taken
and the home he was selling out of where all
CORNER Home. The State also attempted to trip
Mr. Carter up by asking where did he (Carter)
read the names Pippins and Lundy in Mr. Hammock's
Legal work. The State use the MLOA 2008 opinion
to point out that Pippins and Lundy's names were

never mentioned. However on Cross Carter states that the Facility's legal writer provided him with Hammock's Brief on Direct Appeal and a 6,500 motion and he could have seen the names within those documents Mr. Carter was simply unsure due to the time of the Affidavit and the present Hearing (2019 Affidavit) (2023 Hearing).

SEE APPENDIX (K) JASON CARTER'S MARCH 23, 2023 TESTIMONY.

The State next calls Patricia Little a Detective for the Wayne County's INTEGRITY UNIT. Mrs Little testifies that she investigated the House of the Shootings and also the Home where the STOLEN items were taken. Mrs. Little confirms that: "The homeowner of the House of the Shootings WAS A WHITE MALE who owned a Lincoln. Ms. Little also testified that she interviewed Lamone Pippins who DID NOT come clean about why he was ever at William Blake's home.

The Evidentiary hearing concludes, and Attorney Ms. Bainsoe and Mr. Hammock prepared SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFS in light of the NEWLY DISCOVERED EVIDENCE that came out during these proceedings. NOTE WORTHY is the Former Lead Investigating Officer's (DELO) admissions to interviewing three (3) witnesses, that WAS NOT known at or before Mr. Hammock's 2007 trial. [Mr. Blake] [Mr. Fletcher] and [Mr. Benton] who all save investigator DET MATERIAL EVIDENCE. Brief were filed 5/5/2023 SEE APPENDIX (L) ATTORNEY'S BRIEF

SEE APPENDIX (M) HAMMOCK'S BRIEF (labeled 3 MRC) FRAUD.

On June 16, 2023 ORAL ARGUMENTS were held. The Judge wanted to know "how does Mr. Hammock explain the Complainant (Mr. Pippins) naming him (Mr. Hammock) as the shooter why not name the home owner? Mr. Hammock through his attorney (Mrs. Baursoe) pointed out to the Court that: "Pippins WAS ON PAROLEE AND HAD [BROKEN INTO] SOMEONES HOME AND DURING THAT ROBBERY SOMEONE LOST THEIR LIFE. WHICH IN MICHIGAN PIPPINS WAS LOOKING AT GOING [BACK] TO PRISON ON [FELONY MURDER] CHARGES, WHICH CARRIES LIFE IF HE DID NOT SHIFT GUILT."

On October 23, 2023 Trial Judge issued an 18 PAGE OPINION (which mirrored the states opposing brief of facts) (Remember this same Judge couldn't give an opinion as to why it REFUSE to ENFORCE IT'S MARCH 21, 2017 ORDER). The Court DENIES Mr. Hammock's Second Motion For Relief From Judgment (Void Judgment) and states that it DENIES Mr. Hammock's 3rd Motion For Relief From Judgment. NO SUCH 3rd MOT was filed in this case. The Circuit Court in this opinion KNOWINGLY AND WILLFULLY MISREPRESENTED THE FACTS OF RECORD. CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE DETERMINED THAT PIPPINS AND LUNDY DID NOT [BREAK INTO] MR. BLAKE'S HOME AND STOLE HIS BELONGINGS. CIRCUIT COURT STATES THAT PIPPINS AND LUNDY WERE TRESPASSING AT MR. BLAKE'S HOME ((JUST CHILLING))). Circuit Court's willful blindness to the facts testified to is ALARMING! Where the OATH OF OFFICE DEMANDS that JUDGES to be HONEST and have SOME INTEGRITY. The WAYNE County Justice Administration has HISTORY of violating

MICHIGAN UNITED STATES CITIZENS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS as they (WAYNE COUNTY) LEAD THE STATE IN WRONGFUL CONVICTIONS.

IN THIS CASE Mr. HAMMOCK has OVER WHHEMING EVIDENCE that certainly establishes that his 2007 convictions are UNCONSTITUTIONAL. Mr. HAMMOCK'S APPEAL ATTORNEY RAISED the constitutional claims to the MICHIGAN COURT of APPEALS and they RUBBER STAMPED THEM. (2024) SEE APPENDIX (M) ATTORNEY Mrs. BAUNSOES Application also Complaint for Superintendings Control.

Mr. HAMMOCK took the constitutional claims to the MICHIGAN SUPREME COURT and they RUBBER STAMPED them also. Mr. HAMMOCK then immediately files a Motion for Reconsideration pointing out the constitutional ERROR (DUE PROCESS) (EQUAL PROTECTION) that the MICHIGAN SUPREME COURT'S [LAND MARK] CASE PEOPLE V JOHNSON 502 MICH 541 (2018) RULED THAT: "SHOULD A TRIAL COURT [GRANT] A MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT THE CASE [EE WOULD]] BE REMANDED FOR RETRIAL"... (SEE RELATED CASES) (ALSO SEE APPENDIX (C) MSC CASE PEOPLE V. JOHNSON 502 MICH 541 (2018). HOWEVER MSC RUBBER STAMPED THE Reconsideration Motion MAY 22, 2025. Mr. HAMMOCK NOW SEEKS JUSTICE IN THIS HONORABLE COURT.

SEE APPENDIX (A) MICH SUPREME COURT'S FEBRUARY 28 202

SEE APPENDIX (B) MICH SUPREME COURT'S MAY 22, 2025 Order.

INTRODUCTION

This CASE PRESENTS the COURT with a rare OPPORTUNITY to RESTORE JUSTICE WITHIN Michigan's JUDICIAL SYSTEM where the COURTS ARE REFUSING to PROVIDE their CITIZENS with the FUNDAMENTAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS that OUR COUNTRY AFFORDS ALL CITIZENS OF this GREAT STATE, EVEN ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS. (DUE PROCESS) (EQUAL PROTECTION).

MAKE NO MISTAKE, Mr. HAMMOCK'S CASE IS [NOT] the ONLY CASE in Michigan where the JUDICIAL SYSTEM ARE [REFUSING] to ENFORCE the COURT RULES - SETTLED CASE LAWS - and UNITED STATES CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS, as the ERRORS within this CASE SHOWS just how COMFORTABLE the Michigan COURTS ARE in VIOLATING these FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS. The VIOLATIONS ARE SO FLAUNTANT that they ARE [CRIMINAL], KNOWINGLY and WILLFULLY MISREPRESENTING the FACTS OF RECORD IS FRAUD along with other FEDERAL CRIMES. (OBSTRUCTION OF COURT ORDER 18 U.S.C. 1509).

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Michigan's 3rd Circuit Court's RECORD will REVEAL that ON March 21, 2017 Mr. HAMMOCK'S (SECOND) Motion for Relief from Judgment has been "GRANTED" the COURT ORDER SIGNED and FILED with that COURT'S CLERK on that above date. The RECORD will also REVEAL that the PROSECUTION FAILED to FILE the PROPER Motion to OVERTURN this VALID COURT ORDER making the DETERMINATION within and ORDER [FINAL] under ANY COURT of this GREAT COUNTRY.

THESE SORT OF MISCONDUCTS MUST NOT GO UNCHECKED

AS IT WILL FOR SURE ENCOURAGE JUDICIAL CORRUPTION. THE
CONSTITUTION - LAWS - COURT RULES ARE PUT IN PLACE SO THAT
THE CORRUPTING EFFECTS OF [POWER] DOES NOT EFFECT
OUR SYSTEMS HERE IN AMERICA. NO ONE IS ABOVE THE
LAWS, and PUBLIC OFFICIALS MUST LEAD BY EXAMPLE.
IF THE [JUDGES] - PROSECUTORS (the good guys) hold [NO]
NO RESERVATION TO THESE COURT RULES - LAWS - CASE LAWS and
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS, THEN GOD SAVE US ALL.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

THE MICHIGAN'S JUDICIARY REFUSAL TO
ENFORCE A UNITED STATES OF AMERICA'S
COURT ORDER WARRANTS THIS COURT'S
ATTENTION PLAIN ERROR

Michigan's Judiciary Commits Plain Error by REFUSING to
ENFORCE it's ORDER GRANTING Mr. Hammock's (Second) Motion
FOR RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT (After Remand). This Violates
Mr. Hammock's Substantive Rights where he Raised a
BRADY Claim. (DUE PROCESS) (EQUAL PROTECTION) (Fair trial).

"A Procedural Unreasonable Claim is reviewed for Plain
Error. United States V. Bostic, 371 F.3d 865 (6th Cir. 2004).
Plain Error occurs when the Lower Court Erred in an
[OBVIOUS] or CLEAR Fashion that affected the
defendant's Substantive Rights, and the Error affected
the FAIRNESS, INTEGRITY or PUBLIC REPUTATION of
the Judicial Proceedings." United States V. Vonner, 516 F.3d
382, 386 (6th Cir. 2008) United States V. Gardner, 463 F.3d
445 (6th Cir. 2006).

"Only in exceptional circumstances will Courts find such
Error -- ONLY where the Error is SO PLAIN that the
trial Judge WAS DERELICT in Countenancing."

The Michigan Court's REFUSAL to ADDRESS the Merits of
this Claim SPEAKS VOLUMES. The Lower Court's Error is
SO FLAGRANT that it can be classified as FEDERAL
and State Crimes: OBSTRUCTION OF A COURT'S ORDER IS

A FEDERAL CHARGE under 18 U.S.C. 1509. MAKING, ALTERING, FORGING, OR COUNTERFEITING PUBLIC RECORD, is a State Charge under MCL 750.248 (Just to name a few). SEE APPENDIX (G) 18 U.S.C.S. 1509 Obstruction of A Court Order SEE APPENDIX (H) MCL 750.248. MAKING, ALTERING, FORGING, or COUNTERFEITING Public Record.

On March 21, 2017 Michigan's 3rd Circuit Court DETERMINED that:

"UNDER MICHIGAN LAW, where "it is MORE LIKELY than NOT that NO REASONABLE [trier of fact], hearing the [PROPOSED] testimony of [JASON CUTLER], would have found [Mr. Hammock] guilty beyond a reasonable doubt," there exists a significant possibility that Mr. Hammock is INDEED INNOCENT of the aforementioned conviction and sentence."

Ultimately Circuit Court enters an [ORDER] GRANTING Mr. Hammock's (second) Motion For Relief From Judgment. The prosecution had the opportunity to challenge these determinations reached and order entered through the proper legal motion however choose NOT to file against this valid order making it a FINAL BINDING COURT ORDER.

SEE APPENDIX (G) Circuit Court's MARCH 21, 2017 ORDER GRANTING
SEE APPENDIX (E) Circuit Court's Register of Actions (THE RECORD).

The PROCEDURES of Post Conviction Motion for Relief From Judgments are Governed by MCR 6.500 Subchapter. The NATURE of the Motion is to [SET ASIDE] a Defendant's Convictions.

Mr. Hammock's Motion for Relief from Judgment was based [SOLELY] on a BRADY violation and only Request that the Court [SET ASIDE] his 2007 Convictions. The uncontested March 21, 2017 Order is a FINAL ORDER Pursuant to MCR 7.202(G)(b)(iv).

SEE APPENDIX(Q) MCR 6.502(A) NATURE OF Motion.

SEE APPENDIX(R) MCR 7.202(G)(b)(iv) Definition

INTEREST IN FINALITY:

"No one, not criminal defendants, not the JUDICIAL SYSTEM, not Society as a whole is benefited by a Judgment Providing a man shall tentatively go to Jail today, but tomorrow and EVERY day thereafter his continued incarceration shall be subject to fresh litigation on issues ALREADY RESOLVED." Mackey v. United States, 401 U.S. 667, 691 (1971).

These Unconstitutional acts by Michigan's Judiciary has caused serious MENTAL HEALTH issues with Mr. Hammock as of now he's on Medication for Anxiety and Depression, and see Counselor for Mental Health once a Month.

Michigan's Supreme Court has ALREADY RULED on this VERY issue in its [LAND MARK] case PEOPLE V JOHNSON 502 Mich 541 (2018) the Court Determined that:

"SHOULD A TRIAL COURT GRANT A MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT THE CASE [WOULD] BE REMANDED FOR A NEW TRIAL."

SEE APPENDIX(W) Michigan Supreme Court's Land Mark case PEOPLE V. Johnson 502 Mich 541 (2018).

Not sure why Mr. Hammock's case is being treated differently however the United States Constitution Commands Justice in this matter where our Citizens are Born with Due Process and Equal Protection Rights under the Fourteenth Amendment This case presents a RARE opportunity to set new Precedents in the Interest in Finality of Court's Orders. No where in America would you find another case of this magnitude of DUE PROCESS and EQUAL PROTECTION VIOLATIONS.

Michigan has allowed its Law Officials to violate its Citizen's United States Constitutional Amendment Rights without any REAL CHECKS, now the Courts has become so corrupt that if continued we may go back in time to JIM CROW culture where the officials treat other groups or class of people different.

Because the 3rd Circuit Court (Michigan) has determined entitlement for Relief and entered an ORDER GRANTING Mr. Hammock's (second) Motion For Relief From Judgment and the State did NOT file the proper Motion to Overturn that Judgment this Court MUST GRANT Certiorari, and RESTORE JUSTICE in Michigan's Judicial System letting it be known that EVERYONE MUST Follow the Laws and Public Officials must make sure that its Citizens are provided our United States Constitutional Amendment Rights.

II. THE MICHIGAN 3RD CIRCUIT COURT'S MISAPPLICATION OF SUPPRESSION AND MATERIAL STANDARD SET FORTH IN BRADY WARRANTS THIS COURT'S ATTENTION

The Michigan 3rd Circuit Court's October 23, 2023 opinion misapplied the Brady v. Maryland 373 U.S. 83; 83 S.Ct. 1194 (1963) test for suppression and material in very important ways. First as procedural matter the Court FLAGRANTLY misstated the RECORD. It stated that:

"This Court DENIES Mr. Hammock's ~~See~~ Second Motion For Relief From Judgment Originally Filed October 7, 2015, and DENIES his third Motion for Relief from Judgment, originally filed May 3, 2023."

SEE APPENDIX (C) Circuit Court's October 23, 2023 opinion (LAST PAGE).

AS discussed within the first issue, the original (Oct 7, 2015) Motion For Relief From Judgment has ALREADY been determined and Order entered Granting March 21, 2017. (Res Judicata) (Finality).

No SUCH [THIRD] Motion For Relief From Judgment WAS EVER filed in this case. After the 2023 Post Conviction Evidentiary Hearing Ended, Appellate Attorney Ms. Baunsoe and Mr. Hammock Filed [Supplemental Motions] regarding the Newly Discovered that suppressed. Circuit Court's knowingly and willfully misleading the facts of Record trying to defraud the Courts hoping to cover up its misconducts and illicit act in this case. Please don't be fooled.

SEE APPENDIX (L) APPELLATE ATTORNEY'S SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF DATED APRIL 25, 2023.

SEE APPENDIX (M) MR. HAMMOCK'S SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF DATED MAY 28, 2023 (CLEARLY TITLED SUPPLEMENTAL MRS. PURSUANT TO MCR 6.502(F)).

ON THE ISSUE OF SUPPRESSION OF EVIDENCE, TRIAL COURT ALSO FLAGRANTLY MISSTATED THE RECORD. IT STATED THAT:

"NO EVIDENCE WAS SUPPRESSED BY THE STATE WITHIN THE MEANS OF BRADY, AND SECOND THAT TO THE EXTENT THAT FAVORABLE EVIDENCE WAS INDEED SUPPRESSED SUCH EVIDENCE WAS NOT MATERIAL UNDER BRADY."

CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE IS CLEARLY BIAS AND IS STATING ANYTHING AT THIS POINT - WHERE THE RECORD SUPPORTS EVERY CLAIM MR. HAMMOCK AND APPELLATE ATTORNEY MS. BAUNSDIE ARGUES.

CIRCUIT COURT HAS KNOWINGLY AND WILLFULLY MISREPRESENTED THE FACTS OF RECORD [TRYING] TO DEFRAUD THE COURTS WERE ON MARCH 10, 2023 AT MR. HAMMOCK'S POST CONVICTION EVIDENTIARY HEARING FORMER LEAD INVESTIGATING DETECTIVE OF HAMMOCK'S CASE ADMITS THAT: (((HE SUPPRESSED MATERIAL EVIDENCE)))

ATTORNEY Q: "DID YOU WRITE A REPORT AFTER YOU HAD CONTACT WITH THE HOME OWNER OR, AS WE KNOW HIM AS WILLIAM BLAKE?"

DETECTIVE A: "NOT TO MY RECOLLECTION."

ATTORNEY Q: "OKAY. AND YOU HAD TESTIFIED EARLIER THAT TYPICALLY WHEN YOU WOULD TALK TO

Witnesses and people that were involved, you would draft up a report correct?"

Detective A. "Correct."

Attorney Q. "So the information -- it's fair to say the information regarding your conversation with Mr. Blake would NOT have been something that would have been available to the -- Mr. Hammock or his attorney/s; is that CORRECT?"

Detective A. "CORRECT."

Attorney Q. "And when you spoke to Mr. Blake, could it have been in the month of December 2006?" (((BEFORE HAMMOCK'S 2007 trial)))

Detective A. "Could have been."

SEE APPENDIX (J) March 10, 2023 Postconviction testimony by LEAD investigating Detective Anthony DelSiedo.

THE RECORD IS CLEAR THAT FORMER INVESTIGATING DETECTIVE DELSIEDO [SUPPRESSED] THE IDENTITY OF THE PERSON WHO'S HOME THE SHOOTINGS TOOK PLACE AT (WILLIAM BLAKE) AS THE TESTIMONY BE PROVIDED AT POST CONVICTION HEARING MARCH 10, 2023. CIRCUIT COURT'S BIAS IS APPARENT, BECAUSE IT HEARD THIS TESTIMONY AND APPELLATE ATTORNEY MRS. BAUNSOE AND MR. HAMMOCK POINTED THESE ADMISSIONS OUT IN THEIR SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFS.

THE SUPPRESSION OF HOME OWNER OCCUPANT OF THE SUBJECT HOUSE WILLIAM BLAKE CERTAINLY SATISFIES THE MATERIAL STANDARD OF BRADY WHERE THE [ONLY] EVIDENCE AGAINST MR. HAMMOCK WAS THE TESTIMONY OF (EX CON ON ACTIVE PAYE) LAMONE PIPPINS. PIPPINS TESTIFIED THAT LUNDY AND HISSELF

WERE at the Subject Home (William Blake's Home) Chilling and DRINKING. NEWLY discovered testimony proves that to be false! NO DRINKS WAS EVER RECOVERED either for DNA.

THE TRIER OF FACTS at Mr. Hammock's 2007 waiver trial had SERIOUS CONCERNS with Pippins trial testimony! it WAS NOT COMPLETELY SOLD the COURT STATES that:

"And what I SEE here is maybe that there was something that happened BETWEEN all of the parties that CAUSED the shooter to react. I DONT KNOW WHAT IT WAS. BECAUSE THE PEOPLE DONT ESTABLISH THE [CIRCUMSTANCES] because Mr. PIPPINS AND HE IS THE [MAINSTAY] in this that you have to [SINK] or Swim with [MR. PIPPINS]".

SEE APPENDIX (D) April 2, 2007 waiver trial (P. 35 Line 6-12).

THE 2007 Trial Court Judge WAS VERY CLEAR that the State's case against Mr. Hammock WAS ONLY sailing ON the testimony of Mr. PIPPINS. Evidence that would have impeached that testimony! Such as the testimony OF Mr. Blake (March 10, 2023) would have dealt a serious Blow to the State's Case.

On March 10, 2023 at Mr. Hammock's Postconviction hearing Mr. Blake testified that:

((Pippins and Lund's Home invaded his Home))

Attorney Q. Could you tell me what -- the Conversation you had with him, what WAS SAID about -- what did Detective

DELGADO tell you sir"?

Mr. Blake: A. Well, I remember his first question WAS Did I Allow anyone into--into the House. You know, Did I Allow Anybody to Be inside the house. And I said NO!"

SEE APPENDIX (I) March 10, 2023 P.17 Lines 9-15 William Blake's testimony at Postconviction Hearing.

Newly discovered testimony evidence reveals that Pippins and Lundy were robbers. Police Reports also corroborates a Robbery where within former Lead Det. DELGADO'S IPD Reports he notes that the Subject Home was "RANSACKED" Items missing (TVs) etc.

SEE APPENDIX (P) Inkster Police Reports.

"To Establish Materiality, a defendant must show that there is a reasonable Probability that, had the evidence been disclosed to the defense, the result of the Proceedings would have been different. A 'reasonable Probability' is a Probability sufficient to undermine confidence in the outcome." United States v. Basley, 473 US 667, 682 (1985). Here the Circuit Court has already reached this Determination with less evidence in its March 21, 2017 ORDER Circuit Court Determined that:

"Under Michigan Law, where it is more likely than not that NO reasonable [trier of facts], hearing the [proposed] testimony of [Jason Carter], would have found [Mr. Hammock] guilty beyond a reasonable doubt." There exists a

Significant Possibility that Defendant is
INDEED INNOCENT OF THE AFOREMENTIONED
CONVICTIONS and Sentence".

The Circuit Court reached these Determinations with NO
Corroborating Evidence just the Record of trial.
(March 21, 2017). Now After Mr. Hammock's Post conviction
2023 HEARING with a mountain of CORROBORATING
testimony EVIDENCE the Court Claims that Mr. Carter
and Mr. Blake's testimony is Patently Incredible. To
the extent Carter is Credible, his testimony in conjunction
with Blake's could not make a different result Probable
on retrial". ((WHAT??))

SEE APPENDIX (C) Circuit Court's October 23, 2023 OPINION P. 10.

On March 23, 2023 Jason Carter testified at Mr. Hammock's
Post conviction Hearing consistent to his 2015
Affadavit that: "He was selling weed in Inkster Michigan

When Mr. Lundy shows up to buy
some, afterwards Carter witnessed
Pippins and Lundy BREAK into the
corner house. Taken items
to an Abandon home across the
street. As the two men was
inside of the subject house
a Light Blue Lincoln Pulls up and
he noticed a white male get out
and catch Pippins and Lundy
in the Act he heard yelling to
the effects of What the fuck are
you doing in my house followed
by multiple Gun Shots. He

He then witnessed the white male exit the home with a suit case get back into the blue Lincoln and drive off. Carter continues that the same morning hours later while heading to his girls home he was stopped by former Det. Delsreco who asked him about the shootings that night. Carter explained to the Detective what he witnessed however was NEVER called to testify.

SEE Appendix (K) March 23, 2023 Post Conviction testimony by Jason Carter and 2015 Affidavit Attached.

More corroborating evidence surfaced during Mr. Hammock's March 10, 2023 Post Conviction Hearing. Former Lead Det. Delsreco confessed to taken a statement from [Gregory Fletcher] who informed Det. Delsreco that:

"He (Fletcher) was with Pippins and Lundy when they came up with the plan to BREAK INTO the COOPER House to RECOVER Stolen Property. As they (Pippins & Lundy) went to carry out the Robbery Mr. Fletcher went home. Later that night he heard Gun Shots. The next day his father told him (Fletcher) that the Police came by and told him that two people were shot inside the home NEXT DOOR."

SEE Appendix (S) Gregory Fletcher's Inkster Police 2007 Statement
SEE ALSO Appendix (J) Det. Delsreco's March 10, 2023 testimony P. —

From the record it is clear that Pippins and Lundy were in the Commission of A Home invasion (Robbery) when they befell gun fire and a Death resulted which is felony Murder under MCL 750.316. Pippins (excon on parole) was facing serious time back in Prison if he did not shift Guilt and come up with another reason why he was inside of Mr. Blake's home. However there's now a Mountain of Corroborating Evidence that Establishes that the two were Burglarizing Mr. Blake's Home a fact that Michigan Supreme Court notes that would totally change the outcome of Mr. Hammock's case on retrial. Justice Megan K. Cavanagh in the Michigan Supreme Court's July 31, 2020 Opinion states that:

"Justice Markman notes that Mr. Hammock is African American and the man Carter saw entering and leaving 29549 Oakwood was Caucasian. That is accurate, but by way of clarification, that is not the critical aspect of [Carter's] story. If Carter is correct that Pippins and Lundy were burgling 29549 Oakwood then Pippin was lying about a fundamental aspect of his story. That would clearly call the rest of his version of events into question and his credibility was already tenuous at best with the finder of facts."

SEE APPENDIX (1) MICHIGAN SUPREME COURT'S JULY 31, 2020 OPINION P.6. FOOT NOTE ③. (HIGHLIGHTED).

Then 3 years later after the Evidentiary Hearing, Mr. Hammock presents Michigan Supreme Court with the newly discovered

CORROBORATING EVIDENCE that PIPPER and LUNDY were in fact [BURGLING] 29549 OAKWOOD (Mr. Blake's Home) that two Caucasian males occupied that address and that there exists a Light Blue Lincoln. Michigan Supreme Court REFUSED to address the MERITS of the claims RUBBER STAMPING the Application for LEAVE to APPEAL. (February 28, 2025. Mr. Hammock immediately filed for Reconsideration and the Courts DENIED the Motion May 22, 2025.

BECAUSE the Michigan Circuit Court has truncated the SCOPE of Brady v. Maryland 373 US 83, 83 S.Ct. 1194 (1963) and the Michigan Appellate courts REFUSE to administer Justice this Court MUST GRANT Certiorari.

PETITIONER WAS DENIED DUE PROCESS AND A FAIR TRIAL UNDER THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT FOURTEENTH WHERE THE PEOPLE FAILED TO CORRECT THE KNOWN USE OF FALSE TESTIMONY IN VIOLATION OF THE STANDARDS SET FORTH IN NAPUE V. ILLINOIS

In NAPUE V. ILLINOIS 360 U.S. 265 this Court held that:

"A conviction obtained through use of FALSE EVIDENCE, KNOWN to be such by REPRESENTATIVES OF the State, MUST FALL UNDER the DUE PROCESS CLAUSE OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT; the SAME result obtains when the State, although not soliciting false evidence, ALLOWS it to go uncorrected when it appears."

On March 10, 2023 at Mr. Hammock's Post Conviction Evidentiary Hearings, Former Lead Detective Anthony DelGreco CONFESSED to turning over ALL EVIDENCE and statements to the State. Even the STATEMENT taken from [GEGORY FLETCHER] by Lead Det. DelGreco. (March 2007 Before Mr. Hammock's trial). Mr. Fletcher's Statement was that:

"He (Fletcher) WAS WITH PIPPEN AND LUNDY When they had come up with the Plan to BREAK INTO THE CORNER HOUSE TO RECOVER STOLEN PROPERTY." Etc...

These 2023 CONFESSIONS by former Lead Det. DelGreco certainly ESTABLISHES that Mr. Hammock's 2007 convictions were in FACT Obtained through use of FALSE EVIDENCE [KNOWN] to be such by

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATE.

SEE APPENDIX (J) March 10, 2023 Confessions by Former Lead Det. DelGreco P.

SEE APPENDIX (S) March 20, 2007 Inkster PD Statement GILSON FLETCHER.

The March 10, 2023 Confession testimony by former Lead Det. DelGreco also establishes that he (Det. DelGreco) had testified FALSELY AT Mr. Hammock's 2007 WAIVER trial when the Court ASKED him (Det. DelGreco) the following:

THE COURT Q. "Did you EVER get any information -- did any complainant EVER come up and tell you that their house -- that house, which was their house, had been Robbed that night?"

Det. DelGreco A. "NO."

Trial Attorney Q. But you found -- but the fact still exists that that furniture came from that house, correct, and you LEARNED that"???

Det. DelGreco A. "No, I hadn't. The Complainants NEVER came forward..."

SEE APPENDIX (V) 3 of 4 trans p. 28-29. (Testimony by Former Det. DelGreco 2007 WAIVER trial).

This FALSE testimony by former Lead Det. DelGreco and sole witness Mr. Pippins Lead to Mr. Hammock's 2007 WRONGFUL Convictions where the trier of facts Questioned Pippins' CREDIBILITY. Trier of facts at Mr. Hammock's 2007 trial Stated that:

The Court... "But his Credibility, based on that, based on the fact he's in this house. At one point he SAYS, Oh, WE WENT OVER THERE TO SEE SOME GIRLS another Point he SAYS something different. [I I DON'T KNOW]]

AND I tried to figure it out because I asked him some questions myself and he'd say one thing one minute and something else the next minute, and how CAN YOU RELY ON ALL OF THOSE THINGS THAT HE SAID.

SO, I HAVE NO IDEA WHAT HAPPENED."

SEE APPENDIX (D) APRIL 2, 2007 Wavir trial Findings P.

Clearly, the 2007 Finder of Facts had serious concerns (Doubt) regarding the State's case against Mr. Hammock. Had the State disclosed [Jason Carter's] - [William Blake's] and [Gregory Fletcher's] Inkster Police interviews, Mr. Hammock would have certainly been found NOT GUILTY of these fabricated charges by HOME INVADER EX CON just released from Prison Lamone Pippins and former investigating Det. Delgredo who has a history of falsifying warrants in prior cases.

SEE APPENDIX ()

Pippins and Lundy had Home invaded William Blake's home and stolen several items the RECORD is clear on these facts, However on October 23, 2023 Circuit Court Determines that they were Trespassing (Just chilling) at the Location despite hearing testimony from investigating Det.

DeSireco and others. It is PAINFULLY CLEAR that the Circuit Court has knowingly and willfully misrepresented the Facts of Record in an attempt to Defraud the Courts. Mr. Hammock's Appellate attorney Ms Baunsode and Mr. Hammock have Raised these same issues in the Mich Court of Appeals and Mich Supreme Court but they REFUSE to address the Merits (Rubber Stamping).
SEE APPENDIX (M) Appellate Attorney Ms. Baunsode's Mich Court of Appeals Application and Complaint for Super Intending Control
SEE APPENDIX (U) Mr. Hammock's Michigan Supreme Court's Application.

CONCLUSION

For these reasons, a Writ of Certiorari should issue to review the Judgment and Opinion of Michigan's 3rd Circuit Court.

Respectfully Submitted,
Robin Emmanuel Hammock

Date: Aug 18 2025