

25-6013

No. USAP11 No. 25-708H


IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ORIGINAL

KIMBERLY LEE KESSLER (JB1354) — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

VS.

STATE OF FLORIDA — RESPONDENT(S)



ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS 11TH CIR.
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI


"TITLE 28, § 753(b)(3) 4TH PARA.: TRANSCRIPT... RECORD SHALL BE DEEMED PRIMA FACIE...; PRIMA FACIE, SUFFICIENT... UNLESS DISPROVED OR REBUTTED. REBUT. TO OVERTHROW BY ARGUMENT, EVIDENCE, OR PROOF. I REBUT THEIR FABRICATED RECORDS, TRANSCRIPTS, ESP. FAB'D VIDEO RECORDS. PLEASE COMPARE THEIR RECORDS WITH MINE IN MY "APPENDICES".

KIMBERLY LEE KESSLER - JB1354
(Your Name)

11126 N.W. GAINESVILLE RD.
(Address)

OCALA, FL 34482
(City, State, Zip Code)

LOWELL C. MAIN
(Phone Number)



QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

QUESTION 1 KANGAROO COURT KEEPS ME OUT OF MY TRIAL AND IN THE BASEMENT OF THE COURTHOUSE FOR THE ENTIRE TRIAL. ^F KANGAROO COURT, CHARACTERIZED BY... IRREGULAR PROCEDURES.... ¹ BLACK'S LAW DICT. 9TH ED. (GROUND 1 IN HABEAS CORPUS)

QUESTION 2 KANGAROO COURT WITH CONFLICT OF INTEREST COUNSEL INTENTIONALLY MISREPRESENT ME AS CRAZY TO HIDE THEIR INNUMERABLE DUE PROCESS VIOLATIONS. (GROUND 2 (A) IN HABEAS CORPUS)

QUESTION 3 KANGAROO COURT KEEPT JURY OUT OF TRIAL COURTROOM FOR ENTIRE TRIAL — JURY NEVER SAW OR HEARD ME EVER. (GROUND 3 & GROUND 7 (2) IN HABEAS CORPUS)

QUESTION 4 KANGAROO COURT PERMITS CONFLICT OF INTEREST COUNSEL TO FRAUDULENTLY FILE, WITHOUT MY KNOWLEDGE OR CONSENT, DESTRUCTIVE (FALSE) MOTIONS. (GROUND 8 & GROUND 31 IN HABEAS CORPUS)

QUESTION 5 KANGAROO COURT WITH COUNSEL INSTRUCTS JURY: COUNSEL IS NOT DEFENDING ME (DEFENDANT). (GROUND 10 (2) (B) IN HABEAS CORPUS)

QUESTION 6 KANGAROO COURT (COUNSEL, PROSECUTOR, JUDGE) TWICE (2^{CE}) FABRICATE WHAT TO TELL JURY ABOUT THEIR PREDICTION OF MY ABSENCE FROM TRIAL, WITHOUT MY KNOWLEDGE OR CONSENT, BEFORE TRIAL EVER BEGAN. (GROUND 10 (1) & GROUND 4 (C) IN HABEAS CORPUS)

QUESTION 7 KANGAROO COURT CONSPIRES WITH PROSECUTOR TO HIDE MISCONDUCT IN 4TH, 5TH, 14TH AMEND. VIOLATIONS AND SWITCH COUNT NO.'S, FABRICATED DATES, WITH FAB'D ADDED CHARGE: ① CAN'T HAVE 1ST DEG. MURDER CHARGE ON ME FOR "MISSING PERSON" WHO, WHEN THEY ARRESTED ME FOR THIS CHARGE SHE'S MISSING 2-3 DAYS NO D.N.A. NO BODY & SHE'S STILL MISSING; ② THEIR WHOLE SHAM CASE AGAINST ME FALLS APART IF THEY KEEP THE TRUE COUNT CHARGE ORDER: CNT 1: 1ST DEG. MURDER 2018-CF-815; CNT 2: GRAND THEFT AUTO 2018-CF-373; AFTER I SUBMIT POSTCONVICTION — THEY DID FRAUD MOTION TO HIDE THIS. (GROUND 32 (1) IN HABEAS CORPUS)

QUESTION 8 KANGAROO COURT GIVES ^F "STIPULATION" TO JURY THAT THEY MUST ACCEPT ALL (FALSE) WITNESS & (FABRICATED) EVIDENCE AS TRUE. (GROUND 11 (B) IN HABEAS CORPUS)

QUESTION 9 KANGAROO COURT JURY INSTRUCTIONS PERMITS ALL WITNESS TO BE FALSE AND ALL EVIDENCE TO BE FABRICATED. (GROUND 12 IN HABEAS CORPUS)

QUESTION 10 KANGAROO COURT ALLOWS DECEITFUL COUNSEL TO CHANGE MY PLEA WITHOUT MY KNOWLEDGE OR CONSENT TO NOLO CONTENDERE. (GROUND 29 (B) IN HABEAS C.)

LIST OF PARTIES

~~X~~ 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:

↑ END THIS SECTION "LIST OF PARTIES" ↑

PER "RULE 14.1(i)(vi) ANY MATERIAL... TO UNDERSTAND THE PETITION." ← FOR ALL IN THIS PETITION

- KESSLER V. FLORIDA, USAP 11 No. 25-10811, WRIT OF CERT. TO SUPREME COURT OF THE U.S., PER CLERK'S LETTER REF. RULE 14.5: CORRECTIONS MADE TO THIS PETITION: RESUBMIT NOW.
- KESSLER V. FLORIDA, No. 25-5266, E.W. OF HABEAS CORPUS TO SUPREME COURT OF THE U.S., DIRECTLY ON REVIEW NOW.

↑ CONT'D FROM ABOVE — CONT'D — RELATED CASES — CONT'D FROM ABOVE ↑

- KESSLER V. FLORIDA, No. 25-10811 J, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS 11TH CIR., PER ^{RULES OF THE SUPREME COURT} "RULE 10(a) DEPARTED" DISPROVE FALSE 4.23.25 DATE: SEE "P.2-4 JURISDICTION 14.1(c)" AND "RULE 14.1(i)(iv)... IF IT'S DATE OF ENTRY IS DIFFERENT FROM THE DATE..." (SEE APPENDIX A)
- KESSLER V. FLORIDA, No. 3:25-CV-00014-MMH-PDB, U.S. DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DIST. FLORIDA. PER "RULE 10(a) DEPARTED"; SEE THIS: DENIAL DATE OF 2.24.25: SEE DOCKET HISTORY IN APPENDIX A (F)(1); & "ORDER 2.24.25" APPENDIX D.
- KESSLER V. FLORIDA, No. 4:24-CV-531-MCR-HTC, U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTH. DIST. FL. BOUNDARY LINES CHANGED 2023 — SEE DEC. 31, 2022 LETTER (APPENDIX C); HABEAS CORPUS TRANSFERRED TO MIDDLE DIST AND TO WRONG (JAX) DIVISION: (APPENDIX B).
- KESSLER V. FLORIDA, No. SC 2024-1743, FL SUPREME COURT, "LETTER FROM CLERK" (APPENDIX E) "IRREGULAR PROCEDURES" HE DENIED BOTH MY "APPEAL POSTCONV." AND "FL SUP. CT. DISCRET. REV. POST. 3.850 (L)" ON DEC. 20, 2024. You've got to see this: (APPENDIX E)
- KESSLER V. FLORIDA, No. 5D 2024-3258, APPEAL COURT OF FLORIDA FIFTH DISTRICT. DENIED 12.7.2024 VIA "DEADLINE 10 DAY NOTICE" THAT I RECEIVED TOO LATE TO MEET. VIOLATION DUE PROCESS VIA LATE MAIL. (APPENDIX F)
- KESSLER V. FLORIDA, 1D22-0535, 2018-CF-815, 2018-CF-373, TRIAL COURT IN NASSAU CO. FLORIDA; POSTCONV. JUDGMENT OCT. 5, 2024 IS TRUE DATE. KANGAROO COURT FAB'D A FALSE DATE BUT I HAVE PROOF. SEE DOCKET-HISTORY (APPENDIX G). DOCKET HISTORY IS HOW I WAS NOTIFIED OF POSTCONVICTION DENIED 10.5.2024.
- KESSLER V. FLORIDA, No. 5D23-69, DIRECT APPEAL IN FIFTH DISTRICT CT. APPEAL FLORIDA, JUDGMENT ENTERED OCT. 31, 2023. SEE "ORDER" IN (APPENDIX H).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2-5
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	6-7
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	8-10
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	11-33
CONCLUSION.....	34

INDEX TO APPENDICES

"RULE 14.1 (i)(vi) ANY OTHER MATERIAL... TO UNDERSTAND THE PETITION." "RULE 10 (a) DEPARTED" / KANGAROO TRIAL COURT / § 31.3 PER SE PREJUDICIAL ERRORS THRU-OUT MY CASE - THEY FABRICATED RECORDS; I REBUT/DISPROVE THEM IN APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A: JURISDICTION 14.1 (e) AND RULE 14.1 (i)(iv) JUDGMENT... DATE... IS DIFFERENT FROM THE DATE...
- THEIR DISMISSAL NOTICES (3) STATED DIFFERENTLY - "FINDINGS OF FACT RULE 14.1 (i)(i)"

APPENDIX B: "TITLE 28. § 1406(a)... TRANSFER SUCH CASE TO ANY DIVISION OR DISTRICT..." - THE RIGHT DIVISION, FERNANDINA DIVISION, WOULD'VE BEEN APPRECIATED: VIOLATION 14TH AMEND. DUE PROCESS & EQUALITY.

APPENDIX C: "ORDER: 1-3-2025" HABEAS TRANSFER - BOUNDARY LINES CHANGED: U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTH-ERN DISTRICT FLORIDA (LOST THE GOOD DISTRICT)

APPENDIX D: "ORDER 2-24-2025", WITH FOCUS ON PGS. 4 & 3: RETALIATION & FALSE CLAIMS IN U.S. DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT FLORIDA (JAX DIV) ← WRONG DIVISION DENIED MY HABEAS.

APPENDIX E: FLORIDA SUPREME COURT: POSTCONVICTION DISCRETIONARY REVIEW
(YOU'VE GOT TO SEE THIS LETTER HE SENT - CLERK TOMASINO)

APPENDIX F: FLORIDA APPELLATE COURT; RE: (ESP), 10 DAY DEADLINE APPEAL POSTCONVICTION.

APPENDIX G: FLORIDA TRIAL COURT POSTCONVICTION

APPENDIX H: FLORIDA APPELLATE: DIRECT APPEAL DENIED 10-31-2023; DEPRIVATION OF COUNSEL

APPENDIX MAIL SCHEMES: "TITLE 18. § 1341 (D) USE OF MAIL IN EXECUTION OF SCHEMES." KEPT ME FROM TIMELY ACCESS TO THE COURTS: VIOLATION 14TH AMEND. DUE PROCESS & EQUALITY.

APPENDIX POST → HABEAS: POSTMARKED FOR ALL POST → HABEAS

APPENDIX EXHIBITS: PER "RULE 14.1 (i)(vi) ANY MATERIAL BELIEVES ESSENTIAL TO UNDERSTAND THE PETITION."

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
• <u>STRICKLAND V. WASHINGTON</u> . A REASONABLE PROBABILITY IS PROBABILITY SUFFICIENT TO UNDERMINE CONFIDENCE IN THE OUTCOME. <u>466 U.S. 668 (1984)</u>	→ APPLIES TO <u>ALL Q'S = G'S</u>
• "BRADY ERROR" <u>BRADY V. MARYLAND (1963)</u> SUPPRESSED... EVIDENCE... <u>373 U.S. 83 (1963)</u>	→ APPLIES TO <u>ALL Q'S = G'S</u>
• <u>SHAW V. FLORIDA</u> . <u>AARON RAMON SHAW V. STATE OF FLORIDA</u> . OPINION SEPT. 11, 2020; OPINION <u>302 So. 3d 504</u> JUDGE NORTH CUTT.	→ P. 15 - G:1; P. 17 - G:3; P. 17-18 - G:4(c)
• <u>SHEPPARD V. MAXWELL (1966)</u> MASSIVE, PIERVATIVE, AND PREJUDICIAL PRETRIAL PUBLICITY AND CIRCUS-STYLE ATMOSPHERE AT TRIAL. <u>384 U.S. 333 (1966)</u>	→ APPLIES TO <u>ALL Q'S = G'S</u>
• <u>RAMSAMMY V. FLORIDA</u> . AUG. 11, 2010 DECIDED. EVIDENCE INSUFFICIENT TO ESTABLISH THAT VICTIM'S SUDDEN DISAPPEARANCE & APPARENT DEATH WAS DUE TO SPECIFIC CRIMINAL AGENCY OF THE DEFENDANT, DEFENDANT'S DESCRIPTION OF GRAB-BING THE VICTIM BY THE NECK..., WHILE POTENTIALLY AN ADMISSION OF A CRIME LIKE DOMESTIC BATTERY, DID NOT EVINCE GUILT FOR 2 ND DEG. MURDER. CONVICTION REVERSED... FOR JUDGMENT OF ACQUITTAL. <u>43 So. 3d 100; 2010 FLA. APP. LEXIS 11750; 35 FLA. L. WEEKLY D 1825; No. 4D08-2020 AUGUST 15, 2010, DECIDED</u>	→ APPLIES TO <u>ALL Q'S = G'S</u>
• <u>U.S. V. WILLIAMS (2d Cir. 2004)</u> . A PER SE CONFLICT OF INTEREST REQUIRES AUTOMATIC REVERSAL WITHOUT A SHOWING OF PREJUDICE <u>312 F.3d 96, 103 (2d Cir. 2004)</u>	→ APPLIES TO <u>ALL Q'S = G'S</u>

STATUTES AND RULES

STANDARD 4.3 FAILURE TO AVOID CONFLICTS OF INTEREST. A LAWYER WITHOUT INFORMED CONSENT OF CLIENT, KNOWING LAWYER'S INTERESTS ARE ADVERSE TO THE CLIENT'S WITH INTENT TO BENEFIT LAWYER OR ANOTHER REGARDLESS OF INJURY OR POTENTIAL INJURY TO THE CLIENT, AND CAUSES SERIOUS POTENTIALLY SERIOUS INJURY TO THE CLIENT.

STANDARD 4.6 LACK OF CANDOR. LAWYER ENGAGED IN FRAUD, DECEIT, MISREPRESENTATION DIRECTED TOWARD A CLIENT. LAWYER KNOWINGLY OR INTENTIONALLY DECEIVED CLIENT WITH INTENT TO BENEFIT LAWYER OR ANOTHER REGARDLESS OF INJURY OR POTENTIAL INJURY TO THE CLIENT.

STANDARD 4.4 LACK OF DILIGENCE. LAWYER KNOWINGLY FAILS TO PERFORM SERVICES FOR A CLIENT AND CAUSES SERIOUS OR POTENTIALLY SERIOUS INJURY TO A CLIENT; OR A LAWYER ENGAGES IN A PATTERN OF NEGLECT WITH RESPECT TO CLIENT MATTERS AND CAUSES SERIOUS OR POTENTIALLY SERIOUS INJURY TO A CLIENT.

RULE 4-3.2 LAWYER SHALL MAKE REASONABLE EFFORTS TO EXPEDITE LITIGATION CONSISTENT WITH THE INTERESTS OF THE CLIENT.

RULE 4-3.3 CANDOR TOWARD TRIBUNAL. LAWYER OFFERS EVIDENCE LAWYER KNOWS TO BE FALSE.

OTHER

KANGAROO COURT ② CHARACTERIZED BY UNAUTHORIZED OR IRREGULAR PROCEDURES SO AS TO RENDER A FAIR PROCEEDING IMPOSSIBLE. ③ A SHAM LEGAL PROCEEDING. BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 9TH ED.

REBUT. TO OVERTHROW BY ARGUMENT, EVIDENCE, OR PROOF.

"Rule 14.1 (i)(vi) ANY OTHER MATERIAL THE PETITIONER BELIEVES ESSENTIAL TO UNDERSTAND THE PETITION."
FOR ALL IN THIS PETITION: DUE TO §31.3 PER SE PREJUDICIAL ERRORS, KANGAROO COURT SHAM, & APPLICATION OF RULE 10(a) (DEPARTED),
I REBUT/DISPROVE ALL THEIR FABRICATED RECORDS/VIDEO RECORDS. PLEASE COMPARE MY RECORDS TO THEIRS: ATTACH APPENDICES.
I HAVE PROOF.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

TITLE 28, §763 (b)(3). TRANSCRIPT...RECORD...DEEMED PRIMA FACIE. PRIMA FACIE: SUFFICIENT... UNLESS DISPROVED OR REBUTTED.
I REBUT/DISPROVE ALL THEIR FAB'D RECORDS/VIDEO RECORDS. PLEASE COMPARE MY RECORDS TO THEIRS: ATTACH APPENDICES.
I HAVE PROOF.

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

"RULE 14.1 (d)...THE OFFICIAL & UNOFFICIAL... OPINIONS... IN THE CASE..." THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF KANGAROO TRIAL COURT, IN THEIR "RULE 10 (a) DEPARTED", FAB'D MANY FALSE RECORDS, ESP., IN OPINIONS BELOW & JURISDICTION, BECAUSE!
"RULE 10 (a) U.S. COURT OF APPEALS HAS SO FAR DEPARTED..., OR SANCTIONED SUCH A DEPARTURE..."

OPINIONS BELOW

☒ For cases from federal courts:

The ^{ORDER} opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix A to the petition and is FALSE (ORDER DATED 4-23-25 IS FALSE): SEE P.2-4 (Pgs 2-4) DISPROVES DATE

☐ reported at _____; or,

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☒ is unpublished: NO INFO @ LOWELL C-1. LAW LIBRARY: INMATE CLERK SAID, "NO WAY TO KNOW."

The ^{ORDER} opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix D to the petition and is FALSE & DISPROVED W/ RECORDS IN APPENDIX D:

☐ reported at _____; or,

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☒ is unpublished: NO INFO @ LOWELL C-1. LAW LIBRARY: INMATE CLERK SAID, "NO WAY TO KNOW."

☐ For cases from state courts: ALL BELOW IS DIRECTLY RELATED CASES: (RULE 14.1 (i)(vi))

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix E to the petition and is LETTER FL SUP. CT. CLERK TOMASINO

☐ reported at _____; or,

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☒ is unpublished: NO INFO @ LAW LIB., AND I DO NOT BELIEVE THEY WOULD PUBLISH THE LETTER THEY SENT ME: CLERK DENIED MY POST. IN BOTH FL SUPREME CT AND FL APPELLATE CT IN K-SHAM. (KANGAROO COURT SHAM)

The ^{NOTICE} opinion of the FLORIDA APPELLATE COURT 5TH DISTRICT court appears at Appendix F to the petition and is

☐ reported at _____; or,

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☒ is unpublished: NO INFO @ THIS C-1. LAW LIBRARY; VIOLATION DUE PROCESS VIA LATE MAIL WITH "10-DAY DEADLINE" RECEIVED TOO LATE TO RESPOND; AND THE FL SUP. CT. CLERK 1. DENIED THIS APPEAL POST. ON 12-20-24 VIA K-SHAM ANYWAYS. (APPENDIX)

JURISDICTION 14.1 (e) AND U.S. CT. OF APPEALS 11TH CIR. RULE 10(a) "DEPARTED"

RULE 14.1 (e)(i) A CONCISE STATEMENT OF THE BASIS FOR JURISDICTION IN THIS COURT, SHOWING:

THE DATE THE JUDGMENT OR ORDER SOUGHT TO BE REVIEWED WAS ENTERED:

— I REBUT/DISPROVE THEIR FRAUD/FALSE 4-23-25 DATE.

RULE 10(a) A U.S. COURT OF APPEALS... HAS SO FAR DEPARTED FROM THE ACCEPTED AND USUAL COURSE OF JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS, OR SANCTIONED SUCH A DEPARTURE BY A LOWER COURT, AS TO CALL FOR AN EXERCISE OF THIS COURT'S SUPERVISORY POWER;

APPENDIX A FOR ALL BELOW — APPENDIX A FOR ALL BELOW UNLESS STATED OTHERWISE APPENDIX A ALL BELOW

A) THE CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT "AUG. 4, 2025 LETTER" REGARDING "SUB-PARAGRAPHS 2 & 3 (LETTER)":
"RULE 14.1 (e), REVIEW OF... APRIL 23, 2025... JURISDICTION..." I HOPE ALL BELOW BRINGS CLARITY AND CONCISELY ANSWERS WHAT THE CLERK BROUGHT UP IN SUB-PARA. 2 & 3 OF AUG. 4TH, '25 LETTER:

B.) U.S. CT. OF APPEALS 11TH CIR. SAID IN THEIR 3.13.25 DATED DOCKET NOTICE THAT MY APPEAL HABEAS CORPUS SENT 3.17.2025 (APPENDIX POST-HABEAS) WOULD BE DISMISSED... WITHIN 14 DAYS OF THE DATE OF THIS NOTICE... BE DISMISSED WITHOUT FURTHER NOTICE... — THE "RECEIVED 3.13.25 NOTICE" ON 3.24.25.

1.) ON SECOND PAGE OF 3.13.25 NOTICE SAID DISMISSAL WOULD HAPPEN IF I DID NOT:

2.) REFILE ENTIRE DOCUMENT

3.) INCLUDE ANY REQUIRED (UNCONSTITUTIONAL) ITEMS IDENTIFIED ABOVE ALONG WITH THE REFILED DOCUMENT.

4.) I DID NOT REFILE ANYTHING — ONLY SUBMIT 3.17.25 — THEIR 3.13.25 NOTICE DATE IS WRONG —
[SEE PARA "E" BELOW] THEY ARE TALKING ABOUT MY ONLY SUBMITTED APPEAL TO THEM SENT 3.17.25 IN THEIR 3.13.25 NOTICE: HOW ELSE CAN THEY SAY DOCKET & REFILE BUT THAT PUT THE WRONG DATE.

5.) THEREFORE, PER THEIR 3.13.25 NOTICE MY APPEAL HABEAS CORPUS WAS DISMISSED ON 3.27.25: WHICH IS 3.13.25 DATE PLUS 14 DAYS ^{DEADLINE} EQUALS 3.27.25 AND DATE JUDGMENT ENTERED SHOULD BE THE SAME DATE 3.27.25. DISMISSED/DENIAL DATE ^{EQUALS} JUDGMENT DATE.

C.) THEIR "4.1.25" DATED NOTICE SAYS "NO DEADLINES EXTENDED" AND SUPPORTS 3.27.25 DATE APPEAL DISMISSED; AND JUDGMENT DATE ENTERED SHOULD BE SAME AS DISMISSED DATE: 3.27.25.

D.) IN "RULE 10(a) DEPARTED" FASHION, U.S. CT. OF APPEALS 11TH CIR. SENT "4.2.25 DATED DISMISSAL NOTICE" THAT SAYS CONTRADICTIONS & CONFUSION:

1.) "APPEAL WILL BE DISMISSED WITHOUT FURTHER NOTICE UPON THE EXPIRATION OF 14 DAYS FROM THE DATE OF THIS NOTICE" — (BUT IT WAS ALREADY DISMISSED ON 3.27.25 ^{AND} WITH NO DEADLINES EXTENDED!?!)

- 2.) THEY SAID TO "FILE" SUCH & SUCH (UNCONSTITUTIONAL), AND
- 3.) I DID NOT FILE ANYTHING — BECAUSE MY APPEAL HABEAS CORPUS WAS ALREADY DISMISSED ON 3.27.25.
- 4.) SO NOW I HAVE ANOTHER DISMISSAL DATE 4.16.25: WHICH IS 4.2.25 NOTICE DATE PLUS 14 DAYS EQUALS 4.16.25: MY APPEAL HABEAS CORPUS DISMISSED TWICE 3.27.25 & 4.16.25 (CRAZY).
- 5.) I TIMELY & PROPERLY SUBMITTED EXTRAORDINARY WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS TO (YOU) SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES ON 4.18.25 (APPENDIX POST-HABEAS).
- 6.) THEIR NOTICES ADVISED 3.27.25 AND 4.16.25 AS APPEAL DISMISSAL DATES; THEREFORE 3.27.25 OR 4.16.25 IS RIGHTFULLY THE "JUDGMENT ENTERED DATE": JUDGMENT DATE EQUALS DISMISSAL DATE (SAME).

F.) "TITLE 18, § 1341 (D) USE OF MAIL IN EXECUTION OF SCHEMES": U.S. CT. OF APPEALS 11TH CIR "DEPARTED" —

PLEASE NOTE: THE 3.13.25 DATE ON THEIR NOTICE (DOCKET) IS WRONG — SERIOUSLY WRONG.

- 1.) THEY ADDRESSED MY 3.17.25 APPEAL HABEAS CORPUS (APPENDIX POST-HABEAS) IN THEIR 3.13.25 DOCKET NOTICE;
- 2.) HOW CAN THEY ADDRESS MY APPEAL H.C., I SENT 3.17.25 ON THEIR 3.13.25 DATED NOTICE?
- (a) BECAUSE THEIR 3.13.25 DATE IS WRONG.
- 3.) HOW CAN THEY SAY IN THEIR 3.13.25 DATED NOTICE TO RIFILE & INCLUDE... (UNCONSTITUTIONAL) WITH THE REFILED DOCUMENT, MY 3.17.25 APPEAL H.C. IS MY ONLY SUBMITTED APPEAL HABEAS CORPUS.
- (a) BECAUSE THEIR 3.13.25 DATE IS WRONG.
- 4.) THAT'S WHY THEIR NOTICE WITH ITS 3.13.25 FRAUD DATE WAS RECEIVED BY ME ON 3.24.25, SEE ENVELOPE WITH LOWELL C.I. 3.24.25 DATESTAMP — DATE RECEIVED ON: 3.24.25.
- (a) BECAUSE THEIR 3.13.25 DATE IS WRONG.
- 5.) THEY DID THIS "RULE 10 (a) DEPARTED" TO TRY TO "TRIP ME UP".
- (a) SEE THEIR METERED 3.17.25 FRAUD POSTAGE DATE: "TITLE 18, § 1341 (D) USE OF MAIL IN EXECUTION OF SCHEMES" (FABRICATING FOLLY JUST LIKE KANGAROO TRIAL COURT DID WITH FAB'D EVIDENCE.)
- (b) U.S. COURT OF APPEALS 11TH CIR (U.S. CT. OF A. 11TH CIR.) DID "RULE 10 (a)"... SO FAR DEPARTED — CRIMINAL OFFENSE — AND MORE → SEE APPENDIX MAIL SCHEMES.

- F.) THEN, U.S. CT. OF A. 11TH CIR. ENTERS FALSE FRAUD 4.23.25 JUDGMENT DATE: VIOLATION OF MY 14TH AMEND. RIGHTS DUE PROCESS & EQUALITY: THEIR STATED (PROMISED) DISMISSAL DATES 3.27.25 & 4.16.25 (PARA'S B, D ABOVE) AND THE ENTERED JUDGMENT DATE RIGHTFULLY SHOULD BE THE SAME 3.27.25 OR 4.16.25 DATE. "ORDER 4.23.25" OTHER FALSE CLAIMS REBUT/DISPROVED BELOW:
- 1.) "DOCKET HISTORY — FEDERAL" SHOWS I'M APPROVED IFP ON 1.23.25.
 - 2.) "IN FORMA PAUPERIS (IFP) MOTION 1.9.25" (APPENDIX C): THIS MOTION RECEIVED THE APPROVAL ON 1.23.25.
 - 3.) I REBUT/DISPROVE THEIR "C.I.P." DEMAND — THEY VIOLATED MY DUE PROCESS WITH IT:

(a) "C.I.P." DEMAND IS CONTRARY TO ESTABLISHED FEDERAL LAW / FEDERAL HABEAS CORPUS PRACTICE & PROCEDURE LAW;

(i) NO WHERE DOES IT SAY A C.I.P. MUST GO WITH HABEAS CORPUS OR IT WON'T ACCEPTED; AND

(ii) "C.I.P." DOES NOT APPLY TO ME — I'M NOT A CORPORATION.

4.) "C.O.A. SHALL ISSUE: TITLE 28, § 2253, APPEAL (C)(2) MOTION" 3-11-25 DATESTAMP:

(a) THEY VIOLATED MY DUE PROCESS WHEN THEY MOOTED MY "C.O.A. MOTION 3-11-25" WITH THEIR UNCONSTITUTIONAL C.I.P. DEMAND — C.I.P. DOES NOT APPLY TO ME.

(b) IN MY "MOTION C.O.A. SHALL ISSUE: TITLE 28, § 2253, APPEAL (C)(2) DATESTAMP 3-11-25", I PROVED I WAS DENIED A CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT — MADE A SUBSTANTIAL SHOWING OF IT:

(i) THE GROUNDS IN "C.O.A. MOTION" MIRROR QUESTIONS IN THIS "WRIT OF CERTIORARI"

(c.) THEY FALSELY USED UNCONSTITUTIONAL C.I.P. DEMAND TO MOOT MY "MOTION C.O.A. SHALL ISSUE"

(d) AND THEREBY DENIED MY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO APPEAL, AND DENIED 14TH AMEND. RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS & EQUALITY.

G.) SUMMARY: ALL FALSE CLAIMS IN "ORDER 4-23-25" ARE SOLIDLY DISPROVED / REBUTTED ABOVE:

1.) "JURISDICTION RULE 14.1 (e)" PROVED IN PARAGRAPHS B-F ABOVE;

2.) DUE TO THEIR SHAM⁽³⁾ USED/UTILIZED RULE 14.1(i)(vi) — NECESSARY TO DO/PROVE RULE 14.1(a)(ii) IN PARAGRAPH F ABOVE; DISPROVED ALL FALSE CLAIMS IN ORDERS 4-23-25;

3.) ALL THEIR SHAM FALSE CLAIMS & FABRICATED FALSE DATES: AND THEY DID IT ALL FOR KANGAROO TRIAL COURT "RULE 10(a)" ... SANCTIONED SUCH A DEPARTURE BY A LOWER COURT...

ADDED

H.) U.S. COURT OF APPEALS 11TH CIR. 4-17-2025 DATED DISMISSAL NOTICE (WITH 4-23-2025 RECEIVED DATESTAMP), AND 4-23-25 DATESTAMP RECEIVED ON ENVELOPE. THIS IS THE 3RD DISMISSAL NOTICE THEY GAVE W/ 14 DAY DEADLINE: 3 OF 3 "NOTICE W/ 14 DAY DEADLINE" THAT THEY DID NOT FOLLOW:

1.) SEE PARAGRAPH "B." ABOVE FOR THE FIRST, 1 OF 3: 3-13-25 DATED NOTICE

2.) SEE PARAGRAPH "D." ABOVE FOR THE 2ND, 2 OF 3: 4-2-25 DATED DISMISSAL NOTICE

3.) THIS PARAGRAPH "H" IS 3RD, 3 OF 3: 4-17-25 DATED DISMISSAL NOTICE

4.) NONE OF THE 3 14 DAY DEADLINE DATES DID THEY FOLLOW: (8 NO DEADLINES EXTENDED)

a.) 3-27-25; 4-16-25; 5-1-25 — INSTEAD THEY DISMISS IT ON 4-23-25!?!?

5.) I DID NOT REFILE OR SEND ANYTHING; SO TECHNICALLY, ACCORDING TO 3-13-25 NOTICE 2ND PAGE WHERE THEY SAID I "MUST REFILE" AND I DID NOT — WOULDN'T THAT MEAN 3-26-25 IS THE DISMISSAL DATE? — BUT NOT TO THROW MORE QUESTIONS INTO THIS ALREADY CONFUSING "RULE 10(a) DEPARTED" ISSUE: AFTER THE FIRST TWO NOTICES WITH DEADLINES OF 3-27-25 & 4-16-25, MY 4-18-25 SUBMITTED WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE U.S. IS PROPERLY & TIMELY FILED.

PER "RULE 14.1 (i) (vi)": THEY FAB'D RECORDS/GAVE FALSE RECORDS ESP. IN JURISDICTION. SEE P. 2 (PRIOR PAGE) AND APPENDIX A THAT DISPROVES THEIR FALSE 4-23-25 DATE AND SHOWS THEIR "NOTICES" THAT SUPPORT TRUE "JUDGMENT DATE ENTERED." RULE 14.1 (e) (i) - (SHOULD'VE BEEN ENTERED).

JURISDICTION

☒ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was FRAUDULENT FALSE DATE 4-23-25, THAT I REBUT/DISPROVE: SEE P. 2-4 (PRIOR PAGES) AND APPENDIX A.

☐ 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 _____.

ALL CLERK LETTERS ARE USED TO SHOW U.S. CT. OF APPEALS "RULE 10 (a) DEPARTED" & LETTERS ARE IN APPENDIX MAILSCHEMES FOR THAT
☒ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including CLERK LETTER APPENDIX MAILSCHEMES (date) on AUGUST 4, 2025 CLERK LETTER (date) in Application No. A. APPENDIX MAILSCHEMES WRIT OF CERT. USAPII No. 25-10811

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

DIRECTLY RELATED

☐ For cases from **state courts**: RULE 14.1 (i) (vi): SHOWS KANGAROO TRIAL COURT INFLUENCE?

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was 12-20-2024.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix E. FL. SUPREME CT.

☐ 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

14TH AMENDMENT, PRIVILEGES & IMMUNITIES CLAUSE: 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 LAWS.

6TH AMENDMENT. IN ALL CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS, THE ACCUSED SHALL ENJOY THE RIGHT TO A SPEEDY AND PUBLIC TRIAL, BY AN IMPARTIAL JURY OF THE STATE AND DISTRICT WHEREIN THE CRIME SHALL HAVE BEEN COMMITTED, WHICH DISTRICT SHALL HAVE BEEN PREVIOUSLY ASCERTAINED BY LAW, AND TO BE CONFRONTED WITH THE WITNESSES AGAINST HIM; TO HAVE COMPULSORY PROCESS FOR OBTAINING WITNESSES IN HIS FAVOR, AND TO HAVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL FOR HIS DEFENSE.

5TH AMENDMENT. NO PERSON SHALL BE HELD TO ANSWER FOR A CAPITAL, OR OTHERWISE INFAMOUS CRIME, UNLESS ON A PRESENTMENT OR INDICTMENT OF A GRAND JURY, ...; NOR SHALL ANY PERSON BE SUBJECT FOR THE SAME OFFENSE TO BE TWICE PUT IN JEOPARDY OF LIFE OR LIMB; NOR SHALL BE COMPELLED IN ANY CRIMINAL CASE TO BE A WITNESS AGAINST HIMSELF, NOR BE DEPRIVED OF LIFE, LIBERTY, OR PROPERTY WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF LAW;

4TH AMENDMENT. THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE TO BE SECURE IN THEIR PERSONS, HOUSES, PAPERS, AND EFFECTS, UNREASONABLE SEARCHES AND SEIZURES, SHALL NOT BE VIOLATED, AND NO WARRANTS SHALL ISSUE, BUT UPON PROBABLE CAUSE, SUPPORTED BY OATH OR AFFIRMATION, AND PARTICULARLY DESCRIBING THE PLACE TO BE SEARCHED, AND THE PERSONS OR THINGS TO BE SEIZED.

1ST AMENDMENT. CONGRESS SHALL MAKE NO LAW ... ABRIDGING THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH, ... OR THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE PEACEABLY TO ASSEMBLE, AND TO PETITION THE GOVERNMENT FOR A REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES.

8TH AMENDMENT. EXCESSIVE BAIL SHALL NOT BE REQUIRED, NOR EXCESSIVE FINES IMPOSED, NOR CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT INFLICTED.

"TITLE 28. § 753 (b)(3) THE TRANSCRIPT IN ANY CASE CERTIFIED BY THE REPORTER OR OTHER INDIVIDUAL DESIGNATED TO PRODUCE THE RECORD SHALL BE DEEMED 'PRIMA FACIE' A CORRECT STATEMENT OF THE TESTIMONY TAKEN & PROCEEDINGS HAD."

PRIMA FACIE (18C) SUFFICIENT... UNLESS DISPROVED OR REBUTTED. (14C) AT 1ST SIGHT AT 1ST APPEARANCE BUT SUBJECT TO FURTHER EVIDENCE OR INFORMATION.

FED. HABEAS CORPUS PRACTICE & PROCEDURE

§ 31.3 PER SE PREJUDICIAL ERRORS. "AT THE OTHER END OF THE SPECTRUM OF CONSTITUTIONAL ERRORS LIE 'STRUCTURAL DEFECTS IN THE CONSTITUTION OF THE TRIAL MECHANISM WHICH DEFY HARMLESS ERROR STANDARDS.' THE EXISTENCE OF SUCH DEFECTS — DEPRIVATION OF RIGHT TO COUNSEL, FOR EXAMPLE — REQUIRES AUTOMATIC REVERSAL OF THE CONVICTION BECAUSE THEY INFECT THE ENTIRE TRIAL PROCESS."

"SOME CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS... BY THEIR VERY NATURE CAST SO MUCH DOUBT ON THE FAIRNESS OF THE TRIAL PROCESS THAT, AS A MATTER OF LAW, THEY CAN NEVER BE CONSIDERED HARMLESS."

(CONT'D) CONSTITUTIONAL & STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

"WE HAVE RECOGNIZED A LIMITED CLASS OF FUNDAMENTAL CONSTITUTIONAL ERRORS THAT DEFY ANALYSIS BY HARMLESS ERROR STANDARDS. ... ERRORS OF THIS TYPE ARE SO INTRINSICALLY HARMFUL AS TO REQUIRE AUTOMATIC REVERSAL WITHOUT REGARD TO THEIR EFFECT ON THE OUTCOME."

"SOME CONSTITUTIONAL ERRORS REQUIRE REVERSAL WITHOUT REGARD TO THE EVIDENCE IN THE PARTICULAR CASE... [BECAUSE THEY] RENDER A TRIAL FUNDAMENTALLY UNFAIR."

"THERE ARE SOME CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS SO BASIC TO A FAIR TRIAL THAT THEIR INFRACTION CAN NEVER BE CONSIDERED TREATED AS HARMLESS ERROR."

FEDERAL HABEAS CORPUS PRACTICE & PROCEDURE

§ 31.4 STANDARDS, CRITERIA, & PROCEDURES FOR ASSESSING HARMLESSNESS (f.) THE EXERCISE OF JUDGMENT; DE NOVO REVIEW; HEARINGS.

THE DUTY TO PURSUE OTHER FACT DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURES IN CONNECTION WITH HARMLESS ERROR ANALYSIS MAY ARISE IN SITUATIONS IN WHICH THE IMPACT OF AN ERROR ON THE PROCEEDINGS—SAY FOR EXAMPLE, EXCESSIVE LAW ENFORCEMENT PRESENCE IN THE COURTROOM, AND OUTSIDE INFLUENCES ON JURORS—MAY NOT BE FULLY REVEALED IN THE EXISTING RECORD.

"28 U.S.C. § 1406 (a) ... OR IF IT BE IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE, TRANSFER SUCH CASE TO ANY DISTRICT OR DIVISION IN WHICH IT COULD HAVE BEEN BROUGHT."

TITLE 28 § 89, FLORIDA. FERNANDINA DIVISION IS IN NASSAU COUNTY—THE COUNTY MY TRIAL WAS IN AND IS THE CORRECT DIVISION FOR MY CASE: NOT JACKSONVILLE DIVISION WHICH IS IN DUNAL COUNTY WHERE CORRUPT JUDGE DANIELS JAMES TRANSFERRED BACK TO—WHERE HIS SPHERE OF INFLUENCE IS.

TITLE 28 § 23.4 (a) (ii) (7). ... REQUIRING EXHAUSTION WOULD CAUSE IRREPARABLE INJURY TO THE PETITIONER'S RIGHTS FOR SOME OTHER REASON, INCLUDING THAT UNDUE DELAY IN STATE COURTS RISKS MOOTING PETITIONER'S FEDERAL RIGHTS BEFORE HE REACHES FEDERAL COURTS.

TITLE 28 § 2253. APPEAL. (a). ... THE FINAL ORDER SHALL BE SUBJECT TO REVIEW, ON APPEAL, BY THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE CIRCUIT IN WHICH THE PROCEEDING IS HELD.

"TITLE 28 § 2253. APPEAL. (c) (2).

A CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY MAY ISSUE UNDER PARAGRAPH (1) ONLY IF THE APPLICANT HAS MADE A SUBSTANTIAL SHOWING OF THE DENIAL OF A CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT."

VOL. 2: CHAPTER 13; THE TRIAL. § 13.07. THE JURY VERDICT. 1. INTRODUCTION. FOR A VERDICT TO BECOME VALID, IT MUST BE ANNOUNCED IN THE COURTROOM IN THE PRESENCE OF THE DEFENDANT AND JURORS.

PREAMBLE OF THE CONSTITUTION: ... TO ESTABLISH JUSTICE ... PROMOTE THE GENERAL WELFARE, AND SECURE THE BLESSINGS OF LIBERTY TO OURSELVES AND OUR POSTERITY DO ORDAIN AND ESTABLISH THIS CONSTITUTION FOR THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

PREAMBLE TO THE BILL OF RIGHTS: ... EXTENDING THE GROUND OF PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN THE GOVERNMENT, WILL BEST INSURE THE BENEFICENT ENDS OF ITS INSTITUTION.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE, Rule 14.1(g)

A) PER Rule 14.1(i)(vi) ANY OTHER MATERIAL... TO UNDERSTAND THE PETITION, - THROUGH-OUT ENTIRE PETITION:

- 1) PLEASE USE RECORDS ATTACHED IN APPENDICES: A → H; POSTCON. → HABEAS; EXHIBITS; MAIL SCHEMES §1341(D); AND
- 2) COMPARE THE RECORDS THEY GAVE ME TO WHAT THEY GIVE YOU. THIS IS IMPORTANT BECAUSE AT TRIAL I HAD:
- 3) KANGAROO COURT, CHARACTERIZED BY UNAUTHORIZED OR IRREGULAR PROCEDURES SO AS TO RENDER A FAIR PROCEEDING IMPOSSIBLE. A SHAM LEGAL PROCEEDING. BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 9TH ED.; RULE 10(a) U.S. CT. OF APPEALS... DEPARTED.
- 4) THE TRIAL IS SHAM INFLUENCE ON ALL MY LOWER COURT PROCEEDINGS VIOLATED MY 14TH AMEND. RIGHTS OF DUE PROCESS & EQUALITY, ESP. IN:
 - (a) THEIR FABRICATING & EVER-CHANGING COURT & MED. MENTAL HEALTH RECORDS, TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS, DOCKET HISTORY'S, JUDGE'S "ORDERS"/NOTICES/ DISMISSAL DATES/ JURISDICTION DATES, AND VIDEO RECORDS; AND,
 - (b) OBSTRUCTION OF PROCESS VIA LATE MAIL (2-3 WEEKS LATE) (APPENDIX MAIL SCHEMES); OR MAIL NEVER RECEIVED, E.G., POSTCONV. DENIED ORDER NEVER RECEIVED - (APPENDIX G); AND
 - (c) TAMPERING WITH MY MAIL: ALL MY MAIL SENT ON WHITE PAPER / WHITE ENVELOPE;
 - (d) YELLOWING OF MAIL (WITH OMR) - (APPENDIX MAIL SCHEMES); AND
 - (e) OBSTRUCTION OF PROCESS: MISSING DOCUMENTS: OFFICIALS TOOK DOCS - BUT NOT BEFORE I COPIED THEM TO YOU:
 - (i) "FEDERAL DOCKET HISTORY" SHOWS "IFP APPROVED 1-23-2025" & "ORDER 2-24-2025" (APPENDIX A (f)(3)); AND
 - (ii) "ORDER 2-24-2025 EFILED 2-24-2025" (APPENDIX D) (THANK YOU FOR SENDING DOCUMENTS BACK TO ME)
- 5) I REBUT AND DISPROVE ALL THEIR FABRICATIONS &/OR FALSE CLAIMS WITH:
 - (a) "TITLE 28, § 553 (b)(3)... TRANSCRIPT... RECORD SHALL BE DEEMED PRIMA FACIE..."
 - (b) PRIMA FACIE SUFFICIENT... UNLESS DISPROVED OR REBUTTED.
 - (c) I HAVE PROOF.

END PARAGRAPH A

B) RULE 14.1(g) A CONCISE STATEMENT OF THE CASE SETTING OUT THE FACTS MATERIAL TO CONSIDERATION OF THE QUESTIONS PRESENTED,...

- 1) THE U.S. CT. OF APPEALS 11TH CIR, UNDER THE PREJUDICIAL INFLUENCE OF KANGAROO TRIAL COURT, WITH MUCH CONTINUED § 31.3 PER SE PREJUDICIAL ERROR, K-SHAM, & RULE 10(a) DEPARTED, DENIED MY APPEAL HABEAS CORPUS SENT 3-17-25 (APPENDIX POST-HABEAS) WITH FBI'D RECORDS & MANY FALSE CLAIMS E.G. ENTERED FALSE 4-23-25 ORDER DATE; SEE "P. 2-4 IN JURISDICTION" & "APPENDIX A" - WHERE 4-23-25 FALSE DATE IS DISPROVED.
- 2) U.S. COURT OF APPEALS 11TH CIR DID THIS BECAUSE: RULE 10(a) A U.S. COURT OF APPEALS HAS... SO FAR DEPARTED FROM THE ACCEPTED & USUAL COURSE OF JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS, OR SANCTIONED SUCH A DEPARTURE BY A LOWER COURT, AS TO CALL FOR AN EXERCISE OF THIS COURT'S SUPERVISORY POWER;
- 3) THE U.S. CT. OF APPEALS 11TH CIR. IN THEIR PARTICIPATION IN KANGAROO TRIAL COURT'S K-SHAM VIOLATED MY 14TH AMEND. RIGHTS OF DUE PROCESS & EQUALITY: DID NOT GET A FAIR PROCEEDING; NO CHANCE TO DISPROVE REBUT THEIR FALSE CHARGES; AND IN CUSTODY IN VIOLATION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.

END PARAGRAPH B

(STILL CONT'D) STATEMENT OF THE CASE (RULE 14.1(g)(ii))

D) RULE 14.1(g)(ii) IF REVIEW OF A JUDGMENT OF A U.S. COURT OF APPEALS IS SOUGHT, THE BASIS FOR FEDERAL JURISDICTION IN THE COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE. ^{"(FROM P. 12 "RULES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES")}

1.) THE BASIS FOR FEDERAL JURISDICTION IN THE COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE IS: RULE 10(a) A U.S. COURT OF APPEALS... HAS SO FAR DEPARTED FROM THE ACCEPTED AND USUAL COURSE OF JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS, OR SANCTIONED SUCH A DEPARTURE BY A LOWER COURT, AS TO CALL FOR AN EXERCISE OF THIS COURT'S SUPERVISORY POWER; — I/MY CASE NEVER GOT A FAIR HEARING/PROCEEDING IN THE LOWER COURTS — KANGAROO TRIAL COURT SHAM INFLUENCE/§31.3-PER SE PREJUDICIAL ERROR(S) ^{FROM FEDERAL HABEAS CORPUS PRACTICE & PROCEDURE 7TH EDITION} PERMEATED/INFECTED THE LOWER COURT PROCEEDINGS.

2.) e.g., U.S. COURT OF APPEALS 11TH CIR. — "SO FAR DEPARTED": SEE P. 2-4 JURISDICTION PROVED (THIS PETITION) & (APPENDIX A) & ALSO REFERENCING (APPENDIX MAIL SCHEMES (§1341(D))).

3.) HIGHLIGHTS FOR APPENDIX MAIL SCHEMES (TITLE 18, §1341(D)):

(A) VIOLATION DUE PROCESS & EQUALITY 14TH AMEND RIGHTS: TIMELY ACCESS TO THE COURT — MAIL IS MY ONLY WAY/ACCESS;

(B) e.g., WRIT OF CERT. 6-12-25 AND RECEIVED 7-8-25 — 26 DAYS LATER (APPENDIX MAIL SCHEMES (B)(1));

(C) AND THE U.S. CT. OF APPEALS 11TH CIR. ["]SIGNATURE RULE 10(a) DEPARTED... OR SANCTIONED SUCH A DEPARTURE ["]YELLOW (W/OMB) MAIL TREATMENT... ?! (BICHARD?)

(D) IS IT FAIR TO ANYONE, esp. OFFICE OF THE CLERK, U.S.P.S., ETC., TO HAVE TO DEAL W/ ANY OF THE ABOVE, LATE MAIL & THE CONFUSION IT CAUSES, & THE ["]SIGNATURE RULE 10(a) DEPARTED TREATED MAIL... ?! (APPENDIX MAIL SCHEMES (C)(D) (ESP. C (12))) FOR YELLOW; FOR LATR WRITS, DELICENT POSTAGE: PARA (A), (B), (E) OF SAME — APPENDIX MAIL SCHEMES (A)(B)(E).

END 14.1(g); 14.1(g)(i); 14.1(g)(ii); THIS SECTION:
STATEMENT OF THE CASE

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

THE REASONS FOR GRANTING THIS PETITION ARE THAT DUE TO THE FACT THAT I HAD KANGAROO TRIAL COURT / § 31.3 PER SE PREJUDICIAL ERRORS, I AM IN CUSTODY IN VIOLATION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES; I WAS UNFAIRLY CHARGED WITH CRIMES I DID NOT COMMIT. THIS KANGAROO TRIAL COURT EGRIGIOUSLY INFLUENCED ALL MY LOWER COURTS SO THAT I DID NOT RECEIVE A FAIR PROCEEDING — INCLUDING U.S. COURT OF APPEALS 11TH CIR. WHO ALSO DENIED ME A FAIR PROCEEDING VIA:

- 1.) FAB'D / FALSE DATES e.g. "3-13-25 NOTICE / DEADLINE": SEE P. 2-4 (THIS PETITION) PARAGRAPHS B & E; APPENDIX A (B);
 - 2.) EGRIGIOUS TITLE 18. § 1341 (D) USE OF MAIL IN EXECUTION OF SCHEMES: EASY TO FAB. FRAUD METERED (FALSE) 3-17-25 POSTAGE DATE: SEE P. 3 (THIS PETITION) PARA. E (5)(a); APPENDIX A (B); AND,
 - 3.) EGRIGIOUS TAMPERING WITH MAIL: (a) LATE MAIL & (b) MOST (95%) HAS THEIR "SIGNATURE RULE 10 (a) DEPARTED" YELLOW (W/ODOR) MAIL TREATMENT (BIOHAZARD)?; APPENDIX MAIL SCHEMES (§ 1341 (D));
 - 4.) FALSE CLAIMS e.g. "ORDERS 4-23-25": SEE P. 2-4 (THIS PETITION) PARAGRAPHS B-G ESP. F; APPENDIX A (F); AND,
 - 5.) ESP. FALSELY MOOTED MY "MOTION C.O.A. SHALL ISSUE: § 2253. APPEAL (c)(2)"
 - 6.) DENIED MY "MOTION VENUE CHANGE 2B. § 1406 (a)" (APPENDIX B)
- AND IN THEIR DOING ALL THIS THEY DENIED MY 14TH AMEND. RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS AND EQUALITY. (ALL ABOVE)

BECALUSE,

RULE 10 (a). A UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS... HAS SO FAR DEPARTED FROM THE ACCEPTED AND USUAL COURSE OF JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS, OR SANCTIONED SUCH A DEPARTURE BY A LOWER COURT, AS TO CALL FOR AN EXERCISE OF THIS COURT'S SUPERVISORY POWER;

RULE 14.1 (h). A DIRECT AND CONCISE ARGUMENT AMPLIFYING THE REASONS RELIED ON FOR ALLOWANCE OF THE WRIT.

A.) DIRECTIONS: (PLEASE READ THRU ENTIRELY BEFORE LEAVING THIS PAGE)

- 1.) IN THIS PETITION "QUESTIONS = GROUNDS", BUT NOT CONSECUTIVELY;
- 2.) GO TO NEXT PAGE TITLED "QUESTIONS = GROUNDS" ON PAGE NO. _____;
- 3.) IT WILL WALK YOU THROUGH QUESTION BY QUESTION THROUGH ALL TEN (10) QUESTIONS WITH PAGE NO.S TO GET YOU TO THE RIGHT GROUND: FOR THE REASONS THAT SUPPORT EACH Q/GROUND;
- 4.) IMPORTANT: PLEASE USE ATTACH "APPENDIX EXHIBITS" FOR ALL REFERENCES IN MY PETITION TO "ATTACH"; AND
- (a) IF YOU WISH COMPARE MY "APPENDIX EXHIBITS" TO WHAT THEY GIVE YOU;
- (b) MY ATTACH "APPENDIX EXHIBITS" SUPPORT ALL MY QUESTIONS IN THIS PETITION & ARE ESSENTIAL;
- (c) PER "RULE 14.1 (i) (vi)"... MATERIAL... ESSENTIAL TO UNDERSTAND THE PETITION.
- 5.) PLEASE GO TO PAGE NO. _____ AND BEGIN:

IMPORTANT: PLEASE USE ATTACH "APPENDIX EXHIBITS" FOR QUESTIONS IN THIS PETITION.

THANK YOU IN ADVANCE. GOD BLESS U.S.A.

QUESTIONS = GROUNDS (QUESTIONS EQUALS GROUNDS)

QUESTION 1: KANGAROO COURT KEEPS ME OUT OF MY TRIAL AND IN BASEMENT OF COURTHOUSE FOR ENTIRE TRIAL.

→ THIS IS EXPLAINED IN GROUND 1 ON PAGE 15. PLEASE GO TO AND READ...

QUESTION 2: KANGAROO COURT WITH CONFLICT OF INTEREST COUNSEL INTENTIONALLY MISREPRESENT ME AS CRAZY TO HIDE THEIR INNUMERABLE DUE PROCESS VIOLATIONS.

→ THIS IS EXPLAINED IN GROUND 2 (A) BEGINNING ON PAGE 15. PLEASE GO TO AND READ...

QUESTION 3: KANGAROO COURT KEPT JURY OUT OF TRIAL COURTROOM FOR ENTIRE TRIAL - JURY NEVER SAW/HEARD ME EVER.

→ THIS IS EXPLAINED IN GROUND 3 ON P. 17 AND GROUND 7 (2) ON P. 19. PLEASE GO TO AND READ...

QUESTION 4: KANGAROO COURT PERMITS CONFLICT OF INTEREST COUNSEL TO FRAUDULENTLY FILE, WITHOUT MY KNOWLEDGE OR CONSENT, DESTRUCTIVE MOTIONS.

→ THIS IS EXPLAINED IN GROUND 8 ON P. 20 AND GROUND 31 ON P. 27. PLEASE GO TO AND READ...

QUESTION 5: KANGAROO COURT WITH COUNSEL INSTRUCTS JURY COUNSEL'S NOT DEFENDING ME.

→ THIS IS EXPLAINED IN GROUND 10 (2) (B) ON P. 21. PLEASE GO TO AND READ... (APPENDIX EXHIBITS REFERENCED)

QUESTION 6: KANGAROO COURT ^{2ND} FABRICATE WHAT TO TELL JURY ABOUT THEIR PREDICTION OF MY ABSENCE FROM TRIAL - WITHOUT MY KNOWLEDGE OR CONSENT - BEFORE TRIAL EVER BEGAN.

→ THIS IS EXPLAINED IN GROUND 10 (1) ON P. 21 AND GROUND 4 (C) ON P. 17. PLEASE GO TO AND READ...

QUESTION 7: KANGAROO COURT CONSPIRES WITH PROSECUTOR TO HIDE MISCONDUCT IN 4TH, 5TH, 14TH AMEND. VIOLATIONS AND SWITCH COUNT NO. 5 (FAB'D DATES) W/ FAB'D ADDED CHARGE: CAN'T HAVE 1ST DEG. MURDER CHG. ON ME FOR "MISSING PERSON" WHO AT THE TIME OF MY ARREST FOR THIS CHARGE SHE'S MISSING 2-3 DAYS - NO D.N.A. NO BODY AND SHE'S STILL MISSING; ^① WHOLE SHAM CASE AGAINST ME FALLS APART IF THEY KEEP TRUE COUNT/CHG ORDER: CNT 1: 1ST DEGREE MURD. 2018-CF-815; CNT 2: GR. TH. AUTO 2018-CF-373. AFTER I SUBMIT POSTCONV. THEY DID FRAUD MOTION TO HIDE THIS.

→ THIS IS EXPLAINED IN GROUND 32 (1) ON P. 27. PLEASE GO TO AND READ...

QUESTION 8: KANGAROO COURT GIVES "STIPULATION" TO JURY THAT THEY MUST ACCEPT ALL (FALSE) WITNESS & (FABRICATED) EVIDENCE AS TRUE.

→ THIS IS EXPLAINED IN GROUND 11 (B) ON P. 22. PLEASE GO TO AND READ...

(CONT'D) QUESTIONS = GROUNDS

QUESTION 9: KANGAROO COURT JURY INSTRUCTIONS PERMITS ALL WITNESS TO BE FALSE AND ALL EVIDENCE FABRICATED.

→ THIS IS EXPLAINED IN GROUND 12 ON P. 23. PLEASE GO TO AND READ...

QUESTION 10: KANGAROO COURT PERMITS DECEITFUL COUNSEL TO, WITHOUT MY KNOWLEDGE OR CONSENT, CHANGE MY PLEA TO Nolo Contendere. THIS IS EXPLAINED IN GROUND 29(B) ON P. 24. PLEASE READ...

B.) WHEN YOU ARE FINISHED READING ALL THE CORRELATING GROUNDS THAT SUPPORT QUESTIONS 1-10 ABOVE, THEN,

C.) PLEASE GO TO PAGE NO. 30 FOR WIBAR-UP WITH: P.T. GUIDE... 13. REASONS FOR GRANTING...
PARAGRAPH D ON

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PATIENCE.

GOD BLESS.

CASE SUMMARY

PROCEDURAL POSTURE: DEFENDANT CONVICTED OF 1ST DEG. MURDER AND GRAND THEFT AUTO BY THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE 4TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, NASSAU CO., FLORIDA. EVIDENCE INSUFFICIENT CIRCUMSTANTIAL TO SUPPORT CHARGES. HOWEVER, DUE TO MISSING PERSON/VICTIM IN CASE MRS. JOLEEN CUMMINGS' FAMILY MEMBERS GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT, TRIAL AND ALL ASSOCIATED WITH THIS CASE WAS TAINTED WITH MUCH PREJUDICE(S), VIOLATIONS DUE PROCESS, SOME OF WHICH ARE:

- 1.) EGREGIOUS PROSECUTORIAL AND POLICE MISCONDUCT: BOTH IN QUANTITY AND SEVERITY (BRADY ERROR);
- 2.) PER SE PREJUDICIAL ERROR: DEPRIVATION OF COUNSEL; PER SE CONFLICT OF INTEREST: COUNSEL INSTRUCTS JURY THAT COUNSEL IS NOT DEFENDING THE DEFENDANT. (SEE: GROUND 10 (2) (B))
- 3.) PER SE CONFLICT OF INTEREST: APPOINTED COUNSEL JORDAN T. BEARD IS KIN COUSIN TO MISSING PERSON VICTIM MRS. JOLEEN CUMMINGS. "AS TO CONFLICT OF INTEREST, IF THERE IS ANY EFFECT ON ATTORNEY'S PERFORMANCE, PREJUDICE IS PRESUMED AND DEFENDANT'S ARGUMENT PREVAILS." PER SE CONFLICT OF INTEREST REQUIRES AUTOMATIC REVERSAL WITHOUT A SHOWING OF PREJUDICE.
- 4.) COUNSEL LACK OF CANDOR & CANDOR TOWARD TRIBUNAL IN KNOWINGLY INTENTIONALLY WITH DECEIT FRAUD PRESENTING FABRICATED FALSE NEGATIVE DEROGATORY RECORDS AGAINST DEFENDANT, SOME OF WHICH ARE: MISREPRESENTING AS AND FALSELY ACCUSING DEFENDANT OF INCOMPETENCE AND ALSO OF GUILT; WITHOUT DEFENDANT'S CONSENT OR KNOWLEDGE CHANGING PLEA FROM "NOT GUILTY" TO Nolo Contendere; AND (WITH PROSECUTION) SWITCHING CHARGES COUNT NO. 5 / DATES — FIRST ARRESTED FOR 1ST DEG. MURDER ON MISSING PERSON MISSING 2-3 DAYS AT ARREST & SHE'S STILL MISSING SO THEY FAB'D ANOTHER CHARGE & SWITCHED CHARGES, CHANGED DATES, SWITCHED COUNT NO. 5: BECAUSE IF THEY DON'T, THEN THEIR WHOLE SHAM CASE FALLS APART.
- 5.) JUDGE INSTRUCTS JURY MUST AGREE TO STIPULATION, (THAT'S ALREADY AGREED UPON BY COUNSEL, PROSECUTION, & JUDGE), THAT JURY MUST ACCEPT ALL EVIDENCE WITNESSES AS TRUE WITHOUT ANY FURTHER PROOF. NOTE: DUE TO COUNSEL'S LACK OF CANDOR, ETC., ONLY PROSECUTION HAD PURGED WITNESS/EVIDENCE.
- 6.) PROSECUTION IN "MONDAY MORNING QUARTERBACK" ANALOGY INSTRUCTS JURY & REQUIRES THEIR "YES" IN AGREEMENT THAT JURY IS NOT TO HOLD IT AGAINST FLORIDA AND PROSECUTION FOR CONVICTING ON A "WEAK CASE" — WHICH IN TRUTH IS NO CASE.
- 7.) "PRIMA FACIE" CORRECTED/AMENDED TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS ALTERED TO HIDE FACT THAT DEFENDANT'S DUE PROCESS RIGHTS WERE VIOLATED. TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS ARE "PRIMA FACIE" AND ARE CONSIDERED AS TRUE UNLESS/UNTIL REFUTED. I, DEFENDANT, REFUTE THEM; AS IS MY RIGHT. I NEVER AGREED NOR CONSENTED TO BE ABSENT FROM TRIAL; ANY ALLEGATIONS TO THE CONTRARY ARE FALSE. JURY ALSO ABSENT FROM COURTROOM FOR TRIAL — NEVER SAW NOR HEARD ME LIVE, IN PERSON, IN THE SAME ROOM AT THE SAME TIME SAY OR DO ANYTHING.
- 8.) DUE TO ALL OF THE ABOVE, AND ADDITIONAL ABUNDANCE OF CUMULATIVE ERRORS NOT YET MENTIONED, DEFENDANT WAS UNJUSTLY CONVICTED OF CHARGES. DEFENDANT MAINTAINS IS INNOCENT AND WAS FRAMED.
- 9.) BUT FOR COUNSEL'S UNPROFESSIONAL ERRORS, THE OUTCOME OF MY TRIAL WOULD BE DIFFERENT.

IMPORTANT: PLEASE NOTE: "EXHIBITS"

IN THEIR EFFORTS TO HIDE THEIR PREJUDICE AND DUE PROCESS VIOLATIONS IN MY CASE, "PRIMA FACIE" "CORRECTED/AMENDED" TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS MEDICAL RECORDS, ETC. IN YOUR SYSTEM OR OTHER GOV'T SYSTEM ARE MOST LIKELY STILL EXPERIENCING UNFORTUNATE & UNWANEUL (BRADY ERROR) "CORRECTING/AMENDING". FOR SUPPORT OF MY GROUNDS (1-36), MANY (BUT NOT ALL) TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS ARE ATTACHED "EXHIBITS". I RECEIVED TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS IN JANUARY 2024.

GROUND 1

MISS KESSLER WAS DENIED EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL AT TRIAL AND APPEAL.

SUPPORTING FACTS:

BOTH TRIAL & APPELLATE COUNSEL FAILED TO OBJECT TO MY BEING KEPT OUT OF TRIAL COURTROOM FOR MY TRIAL ADDRESSING JUDGE'S PART.

IN THIS, VIOLATING MY 1, 5, 6, 14 AMENDMENT RIGHTS, ESP., DUE PROCESS AND FREE SPEECH.

• I WAS NEVER DISRUPTIVE NOR DISRESPECTFUL.

• I NEVER CONSENTED NOR REQUESTED TO BE ABSENT FROM MY TRIAL; ANY ALLEGATIONS TO THE CONTRARY ARE FALSE.

"CORRECTED AMENDED" (A.K.A. FAISIFIED) TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS ARE PRIMA FACIE; I REBUTE THEM AS IS MY RIGHT. TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS WERE ALTERED

TO CONCEAL THAT MY DUE PROCESS RIGHTS WERE VIOLATED. VIDEO RECORDS → SEE ATTACHE (COVERSHEET) CORRECTED TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS

JURY WAS NEVER PHYSICALLY PRESENT IN TRIAL COURTROOM WHEN I WAS IN TRIAL COURTROOM, AND CAN ATTEST THEY NEVER HEARD ME SAY/DO

ANYTHING LIVE, IN-PERSON, IN THE SAME ROOM AT THE SAME TIME IN THEIR PHYSICAL PRESENCE. JURY & I ABSENT FROM TRIAL COURTROOM.

ROSEN V. FL. SUFFERED INJUSTICE IN KANGAROO COURT, ROGUE COURT; SHEPPARD V. MAXWELL. CIRCUS-LIKE PREJUDICIAL ATMOSPHERE AT TRIAL.

SHAW V. FL. STATE CONTENDS DEFENDANT'S ABSENCE FROM TRIAL WAS HARMLESS BECAUSE HE RECEIVED CONSTRUCTIVE NOTICE OF PROCEEDINGS

THROUGH HIS COUNSEL'S PRESENCE IN THE COURTROOM. WE FIND THIS ARGUMENT UNPERSUASIVE. CONSTRUCTIVE TRIAL PROCEEDINGS MAY BE

IMPUTED TO A DEFENDANT WHEN A DEFENDANT IS ABSENT FROM A PORTION OF HIS TRIAL, WHERE HE KNEW OR SHOULD HAVE KNOWN THE

PROCEEDINGS, WHEN HE IS REPRESENTED BY COUNSEL TO WHOM HE IS NOT OBJECTED, AND WHEN COUNSEL WAIVES OBJECTION TO THE

DEFENDANT'S ABSENCE? STATE V. MELENDEZ. BUT THIS PRINCIPLE IS LIMITED TO THOSE CASES IN WHICH THE DEFENDANT, UPON HIS REAPP-

PEARANCE AT HIS TRIAL, ACQUIESCES IN OR RATIFIES THE ACTIONS TAKEN BY HIS COUNSEL DURING HIS ABSENCE? Id. INDEED, A WAIVER OF

THIS KIND MAY BE FOUND ONLY WHEN, UPON THE DEFENDANT'S RETURN, HE FREELY AND WILLINGLY, KNOWINGLY AND WITH UNDERSTANDING,

WAIVES OBJECTION TO AND RATIFIES THE ACTIONS TAKEN BY HIS COUNSEL. Id. AT 140.

→ I WAS, AGAINST MY WISHES AND WITHOUT CAUSE, ABSENT FROM NOT JUST A PORTION OF MY TRIAL, BUT ALL OF MY TRIAL: JURY SELECTION,

ANNOUNCE VERDICT, SENTENCING, & FOR YEARS BEFORE TRIAL, EVERYTHING.

→ I DID NOT KNOW THE PROCEEDINGS; HAD NOT SPOKEN TO COUNSEL IN YEARS: SOPP & TOWNSEND OVER 3 YEARS; MILLER NEVERS & JORDAN T. BEARD

A FEW MINUTES TWICE IN (APPROX.) 2019 (DEC.): 5/2018 CASE BEGAN → 12/2021 TRIAL → SENTENCE 1/2022.

→ I WAS REPRESENTED BY COUNSEL TO WHOM I HIGHLY OBJECTED. COUNSEL DID NOT WAIVE OBJECTION TO MY ABSENCE, BUT INSTEAD PREPARED

THE JURY FOR IT -- & IN AT LEAST "2" INSTANCES REQUESTED TO JUDGE THAT I NOT BE BROUGHT INTO COURTROOM (DURING VOIR DIRE/JURY SELECTION).

→ I NEVER REAPPEARED = ABSENT ENTIRETY OF TRIAL: "BRADY ERROR" BRADY V. MARYLAND (1993) HID EVIDENCE; FAK'D VIDEO (MY CASE).

→ I NEVER ACQUIESCED IN OR RATIFIED ACTIONS TAKEN BY COUNSEL DURING MY ABSENCE -- OR AT ANY TIMES 2018-2022.

→ I NEVER FREELY & WILLINGLY, KNOWINGLY & WITH UNDERSTANDING WAIVES OBJECTION TO & RATIFIES ACTIONS TAKEN BY COUNSEL.

GROUND 2

I WAS DENIED EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL AT TRIAL WHEN COUNSEL ENGAGED IN FRAUD DECEIT MISREPRESENTATION DIRECTED TOWARD

ME; THEY KNOWINGLY AND INTENTIONALLY DECEIVED ME WITH INTENT TO BENEFIT LAWYER OR ANOTHER REGARDLESS OF INJURY TO ME; OFFERED EVID-

ENCE LAWYER KNOWS TO BE FALSE, NAMELY FLORIDA STATE HOSPITAL RECORDS (F.S.H.) & ALL DEROGATORY MED. REPORTS, ALL DOCUMENT RECORD, ALL MOTIONS

ESP. MOTION 2. THE ONLY ACTION I AGREE WITH IS "NOT GUILTY" PLEA -- I OBJECT TO & REBUTE REBUT ALL THAT COUNSEL DID BECAUSE I DON'T KNOW

(CONT'D) GROUND 2

WHAT THEY DID WITHOUT MY CONSENT/BEHIND MY BACK FROM 2018-2022. COUNSEL CONFLICT OF INTEREST STANDARD 4.3

SUPPORTING FACTS: (IN (A) & (B) BELOW)

- (A) COUNSEL SUBMITTED FABRICATED NEGATIVE DEROGATORY FALSE F.S.H. MEDICAL RECORDS (FAB'D MED EVIDENCE) TO TRIBUNAL WITHOUT MY KNOWLEDGE OR CONSENT IN ORDER TO "RUIN MY CREDIBILITY, SULLY MY REPUTATION, AND CREATE A COVER FOR THEIR DISHONEST SCHEMES;" SO THAT WHEN I COMPLAIN OF THEIR FRAUD, DECEIT, MISREPRESENTATION, CONFLICT OF INTEREST, & INJUSTICE, THEY CAN SIMPLY SAY, "SHE'S CRAZY! WE NEVER DID ANY OF THAT TO HER," AND AVOID ACCOUNTABILITY FOR THEIR ACTIONS. DECEITFUL COUNSEL HID RECORDS FROM, WITH FRAUD DID NOT PRESENT TO TRIBUNAL MY TRUE F.S.H. RECORDS THAT SHOW MY "CONSISTENT, UNWAVERING COMPETENCE" AND ARE FROM, IN SOME INSTANCE, SENIOR PHYSICIANS' RECORDS. FROM SUCH SOURCES ARE LIKELY NOT SO EASY TO GET FABRICATED/ALTERED. SEE ADDED RECORD: P. 3 OF 10 (SPECIAL PAGE NO. 5) DISPROVES THEIR LIES
- SEE ATTACH F.S.H. RECORDS (2) F.S.H. SECTION II P. 5 OF 7: SHOWS NO DIAGNOSIS EVER & NO MEDS EVER; SECTION III P. 3 OF 7: NO MEDS AT DEPARTURE

SOME HISTORY AT FLORIDA STATE HOSPITAL (F.S.H.)

UPON ARRIVAL AT F.S.H. IN JULY 2019, I WAS PROMPTLY EVALUATED BY A TEAM OF MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS. THEY ASSESSED ME AS COMPETENT, & COULD NOT UNDERSTAND WHY "COUNSEL" SENT ME TO F.S.H. THEY TRIED TO SEND ME BACK TO COUNTY, GOT OPPOSITION FROM COUNSEL, SO HAD A 2ND TEAM EVALUATE ME. THEY ALSO ASSESSED ME AS COMPETENT, AND SAID TO ME, "YOUR COUNSEL WANTS YOU HERE. WHY IS THAT?" I SAID I DIDN'T KNOW & THAT I QUIT TALKING TO THEM A WHILE AGO (LAST YEAR). THEY MISREPRESENT ME AND FALSELY ACCUSE ME OF THIS CRIME(S), SO I DON'T TALK TO THEM. SHORTLY THEREAFTER, SOME OF THE TEAM BROUGHT ME INTO A CONFERENCE ROOM SO THEY COULD (SPEAKER-PHONE) CALL COUNSEL & INFORM THEM I'M COMPETENT AND THEY ARE SENDING ME PROMPTLY BACK TO COUNTY. COUNSEL SOPP FLIPPED-OUT, SHE VEHEMENTLY FORBID F.S.H. STAFF TO SEND ME BACK TO COUNTY SO SOON; AND INCLUDED THREATS/COERSON TO MAKE THEM AGREE TO HER "WAY OF THINKING" (HER DEMANDS), THREATS SUCH AS: THEY WOULD BE IN VIOLATION OF JUDGE'S ORDER AND COULD LOSE THEIR FREEDOM (GO TO JAIL); THEY COULD LOSE THEIR LICENSE TO PRACTICE IN MEDICAL FIELD AND LOSE THEIR JOBS. NEEDLESS-TO-SAY, THEY HAD NEVER EXPERIENCED SUCH VENOM FOR "DOING THEIR JOBS" - IT IS THEIR LEGAL RIGHT TO ASSESS ME COMPETENT AND SEND ME BACK TO COUNTY. BUT IN SHOCK AND FEAR THEY FOLDED TO DECEITFUL SOPP'S DEMANDS (HER SCHEME) AND KEPT ME THERE 3RD MONTHS.

OF COURSE, MY "COMPETENT" STATUS NEVER UNWAVERED NOR CHANGED. MY F.S.H. MEDICAL RECORDS WERE PRISTINE SHINY GLOWING REPORTS OF MY CONSISTENT UNWAVERING COMPETENCY; THAT NO MENTAL DIAGNOSIS WAS GIVEN EVER, NOR ANY PSYCH. MEDS PRESCRIBED EVER. THEN, IT IS NO COINCIDENCE NOR ACCIDENT THAT MY RECORDS GET "FABRICATED FALSIFIED" TO SAY NEGATIVE DEROGATORY LIES. AND ONLY THAT REPORT (LIES) IS WHAT COUNSEL DISPLAYED IN COURT. THEY HID, AND IN NO WAY PRESENTED THE TRUE & POSITIVE REPORT OF MY CONSISTENT STEADFAST COMPETENCY. DECEITFUL COUNSEL KNOWINGLY INTENTIONALLY WITH FRAUD MISREPRESENTED ME IN THIS WAY.

(NOTE: MY PRISON MENTAL HLTH MED. RECORDS ARE ALSO FABRICATED W/ FALSE DIAGNOSIS TO THIS VERY DAY. CONFLICT OF INTEREST COUNSEL WORKING HARD TO COVER THEIR TRACKS FOR THEIR INTENTIONAL MISREPRESENTATION & FRAUD: THEY COLLECT \$ ON HER BY FRAUD SEE: P. 22 L. 1-3 SENTENCE HEARING

- (B) DECEITFUL COUNSEL WITHOUT MY KNOWLEDGE OR CONSENT WITHOUT REGARD TO INJURY IT CAUSED ME, IN FRAUD THEY SUBMITTED MOTION "2" ON 11-18-2020 - EVEN THO COUNSEL & I HAD NOT TALKED TO EACH OTHER SINCE 12/2018!?! COUNSEL DID THIS WITH INTENT TO BENEFIT THEMSELVES &/OR ANOTHER KNOWING THEIR INTERESTS ARE ADVERSE TO MINE. I REFUTE/REBUT THEIR LIES IN THE MOTION WITH THE TRUTH:

1.) LIGHT SCRATCH ON MY CHEEK IS FROM BRANCH WHILE OUT RIDING MY BICYCLE

2.) I WAS NOT CLOSE TO MRS. JOLEN CUMMINGS - I ONLY WORKED AT TANGLES SALON (WHERE WORK TOGETHER) APPROX. 2 1/2 MOS.:

FROM END FEB./BEGIN. MAR. 2018 TO MAY 12, 2018.

SEE ATTACH P. 2131 SUPPRESS. MOTION 2

(TO CONTRAST MY TRUTH W/ THEIR LIES)

(IN MOTION)

(STILL CONT'D) GROUND 2

COUNSEL WITH GUILE, DECEIT, FRAUD, USED THIS MOTION AS A PLATFORM TO MISREPRESENT ME, ACCUSE ME (FALSELY) OF CRIME(S), INFER GUILT.

THEY MISREPRESENT & FALSELY ACCUSE ME OF PHYSICAL (& OTHER) FIGHTING WITH MRS. J.C. AND OF KILLING HER; ALL OF WHICH IS LIES,

HEARSAY, SPECULATION, FABRICATION. I HAD NO PROBLEM WITH MRS. J.C. AND DID NOTHING TO HER. I WAS FRAMED. I AM INNOCENT.

I WAS PREJUDICED. BRADY ERROR. VIOLATION DUE PROCESS. PER SE PREJUDICIAL ERROR. PER SE CONFLICT OF INTEREST.

GROUND 3

MY DUE PROCESS RIGHTS WERE EGREGIOUSLY VIOLATED WHEN COUNSEL FAILED TO OBJECT TO BOTH JURY AND DEFENDANT NOT PHYSICALLY PRESENT IN,

BUT BOTH ABSENT FROM COURTROOM FOR ANNOUNCING OF THE VERDICT — THEREFORE VERDICT IS NOT VALID.

SUPPORTING FACTS:

SOURCE: VOL. 2: CHAPTER 13. THE TRIAL. § 13.07. THE JURY VERDICT. (1.) INTRODUCTION. FOR A VERDICT TO BECOME VALID, IT MUST BE ANNOUNCED IN THE COURTROOM IN THE PRESENCE OF THE DEFENDANT AND JURORS.

PRESENCE, STATE OF BEING PRESENT IN A CERTAIN PLACE; OPPOSITE OF "ABSENCE." THE CERTAIN PLACE IS THE COURTROOM, AND THE PARTIES REQUIRED TO BE PRESENT WERE NOT. THEREFORE, VERDICT IS NOT VALID.

SEE ATTACH. P. 1982-1984 (PARAPHRASE) NEITHER JURY NOR DEFENDANT PHYSICALLY PRESENT IN COURTROOM FOR ANNOUNCING OF VERDICT.

P. 1982 L. 5-20 IN THIS THE JUDGE PRIMA FACIE CORRECTED/AMENDED TRIAL TRANSCRIPT DIALOGUE TO FALSELY SAY WHAT HE WISHED THAT I SAID (WHAT HE NEEDED SAID) TO COVER HIS "STUFF" AND TO CONCEAL THAT HE VIOLATED MD 1, 5, 6, 14 AMEND. RIGHTS — DUE PROCESS RIGHTS.

P. 1982 L. 21 STATES "DEFENDANT REMOVED FROM COURTROOM." I DID NOT, AS JUDGE FALSELY STATES IN HIS "CORRECTED PRIMA FACIE FAB'D RECORD," REQUEST TO LEAVE. I WAS "REMOVED." REMOVED TO PUT FROM ITS PLACE. TO TAKE AWAY.

P. 1982 L. 24 THEN JURY PRESENT — VIA ZOOM NOT PHYSICALLY PRESENT — AFTER DEFENDANT REMOVED.

P. 1983 L. 13-25 & P. 1984 L. 1-4 VERDICT ANNOUNCED IN COURTROOM WITHOUT PHYSICAL PRESENCE OF BOTH JURY & DEFENDANT IN THIS SAME COURTROOM AT THIS SAME TIME FOR THIS SAME EVENT.

TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS ARE "PRIMA FACIE" AND THESE ONES ARE HIGHLY FABRICATED — I REFUTE REBUT THEM, AS IS MY RIGHT, AND AS I MUST.

JURY WATCHED, CENSORED TRIAL VIA ZOOM APP IN REMOTE LOCATION — NOT IN COURTROOM. NEVER SAW ME, NEVER HEARD ME SPEAK.

WE WERE KEPT SEPARATE THE ENTIRE TRIAL. JURY WAS NEVER PHYSICALLY PRESENT WITH ME IN THE SAME ROOM AT THE SAME TIME

EVER. THEY NEVER WITH THEIR OWN EYES & EARS PHYSICALLY PRESENT WITH ME IN THE SAME ROOM AT THE SAME TIME SAW OR HEARD

ME DO/SAY ANYTHING THE FAB'D TRANSCRIPT FALSELY SAYS. VIOLATION DUE PROCESS. AND NOW FAB'D VIDEO RECORDS. I REBUT THEM.

*SHAW V. FL. "UNSURPRISINGLY, WE HAVE NOT FOUND ANY CASE LAW ADDRESSING VOLUNTARINESS IN THIS UNIQUE CIRCUMSTANCE." (HE WAS ABSENT FROM A PORTION OF HIS TRIAL); ROSEN V. FL. KANGAROO COURTS; SHEPPARD V. MAXWELL: PREJUDICIAL... TRIAL; PER SE CONFLICT OF INTEREST.

GROUND 4

MY 1, 5, 6, 14 AMENDMENT RIGHTS WERE NOT RESPECTED WHEN COUNSEL KNOWINGLY INTENTIONALLY WITH FRAUD, DECEIT MISREPRESENTED ME.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST. COUNSEL'S PART IN EXCLUDING ME FROM MY ENTIRE TRIAL; THEIR CONSPIRACY WITH OTHERS ON THIS; AND MORE.

SUPPORTING FACTS: (A, B, C BELOW; SEE ATTACHED FOR BELOW IN "EXHIBITS")

(A) COUNSEL KEPT ME FROM PARTICIPATION IN YOUR DIRE/JURY SELECTION (PARAPHRASED) (P. 201-202) (NOTE: I WAS KEPT OUT OF ALL JURY SELECTION)

(CONT'D) GROUND 4

(A) P. 201 L. 18-21 JUDGE SAID BRING UP DEFENDANT FROM DOWNSTAIRS

P. 201 L. 22-25 COUNSEL SAYS "NO."

P. 202 L. 1-25 JURY SELECTION CONTINUES WITHOUT DEFENDANT

P. 202 L. 14-17 ONE OF MANY SECRET OFF-RECORD TALKS BETWEEN COUNSEL & JUDGE (NOTE: PREJUDICED THIS WAY, TOO, VIOLATION DUE PROCESS)

P. 202 L. 1-15, L. 18-25 COUNSEL (FALSELY CLAIMS) KEPT ME OUT FOR STRATEGIC REASONS (FALSE IMPLY FOR MY BENEFIT)

(B) MISREPRESENTED ME TO JURY & TRIBUNAL SAYING: (ATTACH P. 1899 L. 19-24) (PARAPHRASE)

P. 1899 L. 19-24 FALSELY SAYS DEFENDANT ABSENTED HERSELF FROM HER OWN TRIAL; FALSELY IMPLY, "THIS IS HOW SHE WANTS IT"

(C) CONSPIRING BY FRAUD/DECEPTIVE TRICK WITH PROSECUTION & JUDGE ON WHAT TO SAY TO JURY ABOUT MY "FORECASTED ABSENCE" BEFORE TRIAL BEGAN:

ALWAYS KEPT JURY SEPARATE FROM ME; JURY NEVER HEARD ME SPEAK, NEVER SAW ME EVER. VIOLATION 1ST AMEND. FREE SPEECH; VIOLATION DUE PROCESS; 14TH AMEND.

(SEE ATTACH "EXHIBITS" P. 723-726) (PARAPHRASE BELOW)

P. 723 L. 1-4 SCHEME CONTRIVE "CURATIVE INSTRUCTION" FOR MY ABSENCE - ABSENCE THEY WANT, NOT ME. NO ONE ABSENTS THEMSELVES FOR TRIAL.

P. 725 L. 24-25 MILLER DOES NOT WANT JURY TO SPECULATE - BECAUSE THEY ARE LIEING ON ME & THEY'RE TRYING TO HIDE IT.

P. 724 L. 1 → 726 L. 25 THEY SAID, "WHAT SHOULD WE TELL JURY ABOUT HER ABSENCE?"; THEY FABRICATE "JUST SAY SHE'S DISRUPTIVE!"

AND THEY FABRICATE "SAY SHE VOLUNTARILY ABSENTED HERSELF!"

THE ABOVE "A B C" SOLIDLY SHOWS THAT: I NEVER AGREED TO BE ABSENT FROM MY TRIAL, NOR DID ANYTHING TO BE ABSENT FROM TRIAL. ANY ALLEGATIONS

TO THE CONTRARY ARE FALSE. THAT'S WHY THEY KEPT JURY SEPARATE FROM ME FOR ENTIRE TRIAL; JURY NEVER SAW NOR HEARD ME - BECAUSE THEY

LIED ON ME & DIDN'T WANT JURY TO FIND OUT.

JURY WAS NEVER PHYSICALLY PRESENT WITH ME IN ANY ROOM EVER: THEY CAN ATTEST THEY NEVER LIVE, IN-PERSON IN THE SAME ROOM AT THE SAME

TIME SAW OR HEARD ANY OF THE FABRICATIONS IN THE "PRIMA FACIE CORRECTED/AMENDED TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS: I REBUTE THEM - AS IS MY RIGHT.

STANDARD 4.3 FAILURE TO AVOID CONFLICTS OF INTEREST; STANDARD 4.6 LACK OF CANDOR; PER SE PREJUDICIAL ERROR; VIOLATION DUE PROCESS;

SHAW V. FL UNLAWFULLY ABSENT FROM PORTION OF TRIAL; SHEPPARD V. MAXWELL. MASSIVE... PREJUDICIAL... TRIAL...; ROSEN V. FL KANGAROO COURT.

GROUND 5

MY DUE PROCESS RIGHTS WERE FURTHER VIOLATED WHEN I WAS NOT REPRESENTED BY COUNSEL AT TIME OF SENTENCING.

SUPPORTING FACTS:

1.) DEFENDANT NOT PRESENT, PHYSICALLY OR OTHER, IN TRIAL COURTROOM FOR SENTENCING.

2.) CONFLICT OF INTEREST COUNSEL RAISED NO OBJECTION TO THIS.

3.) "ME (DEFENDANT) IN BASEMENT OF COURTHOUSE AS "COUNSEL IS UPSTAIRS IN TRIAL COURTROOM" AT TIME OF SENTENCING IS ERROR.

PER SE PREJUDICIAL ERROR; PER SE CONFLICT OF INTEREST; VIOLATION DUE PROCESS; CUMULATIVE ERRORS; TRIAL PREJUDICE.

GROUND 6

COUNSEL INEFFECTIVE IN THEIR FAILURE TO DEFEND RESPECT MY 6TH AMEND. RIGHT TO A SPEEDY TRIAL, AND ADDITIONAL FAILURE TO FILE MOTION

TO DISMISS AFTER SPEEDY TRIAL TIME EXPIRED. (NOTE: ARREST IN MAY 2018, TRIAL IN DEC 2021, SENTENCE IN JAN. 2022)

SUPPORTING FACTS:

ROUGHLY JULY/AUGUST 2018, I REQUESTED COUNSEL SOPP TO ASSIST ME IN GETTING MY RIGHT TO A SPEEDY TRIAL. SOPP REPLIED, "JUDGE SAID 'NO'."

(CONT'D) GROUND 6

(NOTE: THIS WAS ONE OF THE MAIN REASONS I CEASED ALL COMMUNICATION TO COUNSEL -- ALL COMM. CEASED APPROX 12/2018 - 1/2019.)

THEN, EVEN THOUGH ALL COMM. CEASED BETWEEN US, DECEITFUL COUNSEL WITHOUT MY KNOWLEDGE OR CONSENT CONTINUED MISREPRESENTING ME IN POSSIBLY EVERY IMAGINEABLE WAY, ESP. AT TRIAL, AND ESP. BY NOT ENSURING MY 6TH AMEND. RIGHT TO A SPEEDY TRIAL.

PER SE PREJUDICIAL ERROR... PER SE CONFLICT OF INTEREST... VIOLATION DUE PROCESS... CUMULATIVE ERRORS... TRIAL UNFAIR

GROUND 7

FURTHER COUNSEL INEFFECTIVELY FAILED TO OBJECT TO MY DUE PROCESS RIGHTS VIOLATED IN DENYING MY 6TH AMEND. RIGHT TO A PUBLIC TRIAL:

THEY DID THIS DELIBERATELY TO HIDE FROM PUBLIC THAT MY TRIAL WAS UNFAIR. PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT, DEPRIVATION OF COUNSEL, "BRADY ERROR",

PREJUDICE, VIOLATIONS OF DUE PROCESS INFECTED THE ENTIRE TRIAL WITH UNFAIRNESS.

SUPPORTING FACTS: ("2" EXAMPLES OF "EXTRA WAYS KEPT PUBLIC OUT OF TRIAL" BELOW)

① PUBLIC: MICHELLE LEWIS HARASSED TERRIBLY FOR BEING EVEN IN THE PUBLIC PARKING LOT OF MY TRIAL. ALL DONE WITHOUT JURY'S PRESENCE

OR KNOWLEDGE. JURY NOT SEQUESTERED... THIS WAS UNREASONABLE. P. 1847-1853 NOT IN EXHIBITS - LET ME KNOW IF YOU WANT & I'LL SEND THEM.

② PUBLIC: THE JURY. JURORS ARE SELECTED FROM THE PUBLIC AND ARE AND FOREVER SHALL BE THE PUBLIC; THE PUBLIC FROM WHENCE THEY CAME.

IN THIS I STATE THE JURY'S FUNCTION AS THE EYES, EARS, AND VOICE TO AND FOR THE PUBLIC. JURY WAS NOT IN COURTROOM FOR ENTIRE TRIAL.

PUBLIC. THE PEOPLE. GENERAL BODY OF MANKIND: INDEFINITELY: POPULACE, (ADJ.) OPEN TO ALL. <PUBLIC LIBRARY>

PUBLIC TRIAL. A TRIAL THAT ANYONE MAY ATTEND OR OBSERVE. IF IT IS OPEN TO THE PRESS, THEN IT MUST ALSO OPEN TO THE PUBLIC -- MUST BE

OPEN TO ALL. YET MY TRIAL WAS NOT; IT WAS NOT OPEN TO THE PUBLIC; IT WAS NOT OPEN TO THE JURY -- IT WASN'T EVEN OPEN TO ME (GROUND 1 & 4)

ESSENTIAL PART OF A PUBLIC TRIAL IS HAVING JURY & DEFENDANT PHYSICALLY PRESENT IN THE SAME COURTROOM THE PROCEEDINGS ARE HELD IN DATE, TIME, &

PLACE, AND CONSISTENTLY DONE SO FOR THE ENTIRETY OF THE TRIAL. IT IS MY 6TH AMEND. RIGHT TO HAVE THIS AND 14TH AMEND. RIGHT TO EQUALITY.

YET I WAS DEPRIVED OF THESE BASIC FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS. VIOLATION DUE PROCESS. NEITHER JURY NOR I WAS IN COURTROOM FOR ENTIRE TRIAL.

JURY WAS CENSORED FROM EVER SEEING / HEARING ME IN TRIAL COURTROOM -- EVER AT ALL ACTUALLY ("3" EXAMPLES BELOW) (PARAPHRASE) (ATTACHMENTS)

① EXAMPLE P. 8 L. 13-14 COURT SAID BRING DEFENDANT UP - NO JURY PRESENT

P. 10 L. 5 (DEFENDANT PRESENT) - NO JURY PRESENT

P. 11 L. 2 (DEFENDANT REMOVED) - NO JURY PRESENT

P. 11 L. 17 (JURY PRESENT VIA ZOOM) - THEN JURY PRESENT, AFTER DEFENDANT REMOVED

② EXAMPLE P. 990 L. 8 (DEFENDANT PRESENT) - NO JURY PRESENT

P. 991 L. 2 (DEFENDANT REMOVED) - NO JURY PRESENT

P. 995 L. 3 (JURY PRESENT VIA ZOOM) - THEN JURY PRESENT, AFTER DEFENDANT REMOVED

③ EXAMPLE P. 1331 L. 13 (DEFENDANT PRESENT) - NO JURY PRESENT

P. 1332 L. 11-12 (JUDGE HAS THE DEFENDANT REMOVED) - NO JURY PRESENT

P. 1332 L. 15 (DEFENDANT REMOVED) - NO JURY PRESENT

P. 1334 L. 16 (JURY PRESENT VIA ZOOM) - THEN JURY PRESENT, AFTER DEFENDANT REMOVED

AND FABRICATED VIDEO RECORDS

"CORRECTED AMENDED" (B.K.A. FICTIONAL) TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS WERE FAB'D ALTERED TO CONCEAL THAT MY 1, 4, 5, 6, 14 AMEND. RIGHTS WERE VIOLATED.

TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS ARE "PRIMA FACIE". I REFUSE REBUT THEM, AS IS MY RIGHT. MY TRUE DIALOGUE WAS ADMITTED AND FALSE DIALOGUE PUT IN TO CONCEAL

(CONT'D) GROUND 7

THAT THEY VIOLATED MY DUE PROCESS RIGHTS. I NEVER CONSENTED REQUESTED TO BE ABSENT FROM MY TRIAL; I WAS NEVER DISRUPTIVE NOR DISRESPECT-

FUL; ANY ALLEGATIONS TO THE CONTRARY ARE FALSE.

JURY Zoom-Rooms THESE ARE ROOMS THE JURY REMOTELY VIEWED MY CENSORED TRIAL FROM VIA ZOOM APP ON A COMPUTER. THIS JURY WAS BASIC-
ALLY IN EVERY ROOM EXCEPT THE ONE WHERE MY TRIAL WAS ACTUALLY HELD. ("2 EXAMPLES: (A) & (B) BELOW (PARAPHRASE) (ATTACHMENTS))

(A) P. 993 L. 16-25 JUDGE TOLD JURY HOW THEY WILL BE IN A MORE SPACIOUS (Zoom) ROOM ON THAT DAY. (JURY ABSENT TRIAL COURTROOM FOR ENTIRE TRIAL)

(B) P. 1335 L. 1-13 JUDGE EXPLAINING ALL THE DIFFERENT ROOMS THE JURY WILL REMOTELY VIEW (CENSORED) TRIAL FROM.

KANGAROO COURT A COURT CHARACTERIZED BY IRREGULAR PROCEDURES, ESP., SO AS TO RENDER A FAIR TRIAL IMPOSSIBLE: A SHAM LEGAL PROCEEDING.

MY TRIAL HAD HIGHLY IRREGULAR (& PREJUDICIAL) PROCEDURES: HAVING BOTH DEFENDANT & JURY ABSENT FROM TRIAL COURTROOM AND FROM EACH OTHER

FOR ENTIRE TRIAL IS HIGHLY IRREGULAR & PREJUDICIAL PROCEDURES. I HAD KANGAROO COURT. PER SE PREJUDICIAL ERROR. VIOLATION DUE PROCESS.

GROUND 8

VIOLATION DUE PROCESS AS CONFLICT OF INTEREST COUNSEL SOPP INEFFECTIVELY ASSISTED IN KNOWINGLY NOT MOVING FOR CHANGE OF VENUE WHEN

I REQUESTED IN 7/2018 (APPROX.); AND INSTEAD INTENTIONALLY FILED FOR IT IN 12/2021-- YEARS AFTER I REQUESTED & YEARS AFTER ALL COMMUN-

ICATION BETWEEN US CEASED. PER SE CONFLICT OF INTEREST; LACK OF CANDOR; STANDARD 4.4 LACK OF DILIGENCE; CUMULATIVE ERROR; TRIAL UNFAIR.

SUPPORTING FACTS: IN 7/2018 I REQUESTED VENUE CHANGE. DECEITFUL SOPP SAID "NO" BECAUSE (HER OPINION) "EVERYONE KNOWS YOUR CASE."

ALL COMM. BETWEEN ME & COUNSEL CEASED 12/2018-1/2019 (APPROX.). THEN, IN 12/2021, 9 YEARS & 4 MOS AFTER I REQUESTED

VENUE CHANGE, SOPP FILES IT: YEARS AFTER I REQUESTED IT & YEARS AFTER WE CEASED COMMUNICATING. (SEE ATTACHED)

P. 980 L. 24-25 PROSECUTION BRINGS UP COUNSEL'S MOTION VENUE CHANGE

P. 981 L. 1-5 REFUSED BECAUSE COUNSEL PUT IN MOTION TOO LATE. (I WAS PREJUDICED.)

RULE 4-3.2 LAWYER SHALL MAKE REASONABLE EFFORTS TO EXPEDITE LITIGATION CONSISTENT WITH CLIENT'S INTERESTS; HUYNH V. KING; DELAY IN FILING.

GROUND 9

COUNSEL INEFFECTIVE IN HIS FAILURE TO AVOID CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AS HE, JORDAN T. BEARD, IS KIN COUSIN TO MISSING PERSON (VICTIM) IN

MY CASE MRS. JOLEEN CUMMINGS. HE MISREPRESENTED ME WITH FABRICATED & HEARSAY EVIDENCE / FALSELY ACCUSED ME AT FEB. 2020 COURT PROCEED-

ING. HIS INTERESTS ARE ADVERSE TO MINE WITH INTENT TO BENEFIT HIMSELF OR ANOTHER, AND CAUSED ME INJURY & POTENTIAL FURTHER INJURY.

SUPPORTING FACTS:

TANGLES SALON: FOR A SHORT PERIOD OF TIME, 2 1/2 MOS. IN 2018, I WORKED AT TANGLES SALON WITH MRS. JOLEEN CUMMINGS; WE WORKED THERE

IN OUR TRADE AS FLA. LIC. COSMETOLOGISTS. IT WAS THERE THAT I HEARD MRS. J.C. SPEAK OF HER FAMILY'S GOV'T EMPLOYMENT, SAYING THEY "ALL

WORK IN GOVERNMENT." SHE SAID IT A COUPLE TIMES IN THE SALON FOR CUSTOMERS AND AM PRESENT TO HEAR. SHE WAS HAPPY ABOUT AND PROUD OF

HER GOV'T FAMILY -- & I WAS HAPPY FOR HER. SHE SPOKE OF HER STEP-DAD WHO RUNS NASSAU CO. JAIL (DIRECTOR JOHNSON IN 2018); AND OF HER COUSINS

JORDAN & JOSHUA BEARD WHO WORK IN GOV'T, TOO; JORDAN AS PUBLIC DEFENDER AND JOSHUA AS DEPUTY IN LAW ENFORCEMENT.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST COUNSEL JORDAN T. BEARD BEGAN ON MY CASE APPROX. 12/2019-1/2020. HE MISREPRESENTED ME HORRENDOUSLY AT 2/2020

COURT PROCEEDING. AFTER THAT SHOCKING ABUSE, AT EVERY PROCEEDING THEREAFTER, I VERBALIZED HIS KINSHIP IN COURT FOR ALL TO HEAR -- I

NEVER SAW HIM AGAIN. P. 3676-3855 NOT IN EXHIBITS - BUT IF YOU REQUEST I'LL SEND COPIES OF MINE.

(CONT'D) GROUND 9

CONTINUED CONFLICT OF INTEREST & PREJUDICE: EVEN THOUGH ALL COMM. HAD CEASED WITH COUNSEL SOPP & TOWNSEND (CEASED SINCE 12/2018 APPROX)

THEY CONTINUED TO MISREPRESENT ME WITHOUT MY KNOWLEDGE OR CONSENT WITH FILING FABRICATED FALSITIES OF WHO-KNOWS-WHAT. I PER-
EVERED IN THE ONLY WAY I COULD TO DEFEND MYSELF BY STATING AT EVERY COURT PROCEEDING HIS KINSHIP/RELATIONS TO MRS. J.C. (JORDAN T. BEARD)

"PUBLIC DEFENDER JORDAN T. BEARD IS MRS. JOLEEN CUMMINGS' COUSIN" WITH ONLY SLIGHT VARIATIONS FOR BREVITY & FLOWN, EXAMPLE:

"JORDAN BEARD IS JOLEEN'S COUSIN. I DID NOTHING TO MRS. J.C., BUT HER FAMILY'S DETERMINED TO FALSELY PIN THIS CRIME ON ME. MAYBE THEY DID IT

TO COLLECT LIFE INSURANCE ON MRS. J.C. - THEY DEFINITELY DID ON THE \$25,000 CRIME COMPENSATION FUND THEY COLLECTED. THAT \$25,000 FUND

IS FOR L.E.O. - NOT FOR HAIRRESSER WHO O.D. IN A TRAP HOUSE. (NEAR BOTTOM OF EXHIBITS)
SEC: SPECIAL P.22 L.1-3 → FROM SENTENCING HEARING

U.S. V. WILLIAMS, A PER SE CONFLICT OF INTEREST REQUIRES AUTOMATIC REVERSAL WITHOUT A SHOWING OF PREJUDICE; PER SE (LATIN) THRU ITSELF, BY MEANS

OF ITSELF; NOT REQUIRING EXTRANEUS EVIDENCE/SUPPORT TO ESTABLISH ITS EXISTENCE; STANDARD 4.3 FAILURE TO AVOID CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.

FREEMAN V. CHANDLER, AS TO CONFLICT, IF THERE IS ANY ADVERSE EFFECT ON ATTORNEY'S PERFORMANCE, PREJUDICE IS PRESUMED AND THE DEFENDANT'S

ARGUMENT PREVAILS.

GROUND 10 (LOG'S IN G-10)

NOT ONLY WAS COUNSEL INEFFECTIVE WHEN THEY FAILED TO OBJECT TO JURY INSTRUCTIONS THAT ARE CONTRARY TO ESTABLISHED FEDERAL LAW, BUT ALSO

COUNSEL'S LACK OF CANDOR AS THEY WORK CONSPIRE WITH PROSECUTION & JUDGE WITH PREJUDICE IN CREATION OF FAULTY JURY INSTRUCTIONS AND INSTRUCTING

REQUIRING JURY TO AGREE TO FAULTY JURY INSTRUCTIONS - THEREBY BIASED ENTIRE JURY AGAINST ME IN YOUR DIRE/JURY SELECTION BEFORE TRIAL EVER

BEGAN; ALSO, ESP., CLOSING ARGUMENT; ALSO, ESP. NOTEWORTHY (2) (B); COUNSEL INSTRUCTS JURY THEY WILL NOT DEPEND ME.

SUPPORTING FACTS: (1 → 6 BELOW; PARAPHRASE; ATTACHMENTS)

(1) COUNSEL, PROSECUTION, & JUDGE WORK CONSPIRE WITH PREJUDICE & CREATE JURY INSTRUCTIONS THAT ARE CONTRARY TO ESTABLISHED FEDERAL LAW.

P.488-490 SCHEME PLOT FORECAST MY ABSENCE FROM TRIAL (PARAPHRASE 4)

P.488 L.16-17 PROSECUTION TO JUDGE WITH QUESTION

P.488 L.22-25 DO WE NEED JURY INSTRUCTION FOR DEFENDANT ABSENT JURY SELECTION & TRIAL?

P.489 L.1 JUDGE SAID IF YOU ASK I'LL GIVE IT.

P.489 L.2 APPOINTED COUNSEL MILLER SAYS, "YES, I'M WORKING ON THAT." NOTE: HE SHOULDN'T BE, ESP. SINCE I NEVER SPOKE TO HIM EVER.

P.489 L.3-5 JUDGE SAID WOULD GIVE INSTRUCTION THAT DEFENDANT ABSENT FROM TRIAL.

P.489 L.6-8 MILLER SAID HIS (JURY) INSTRUCTION IS A CURATIVE FOR TRIAL & FINAL INSTRUCTIONS. NOTE: STANDARD 4.6 LACK OF CANDOR & STANDARD 4.3

CONFLICT OF INTEREST (FOR THIS FRAUD ALONE) IS AUTOMATIC REVERSAL. I NEVER SAID "ABSENT ME" FROM ANYTHING TO ANYONE. AGAIN, I

NEVER SPOKE TO MILLER EVER - AND FOR REASONS LIKE THIS IS WHY HAVEN'T TALKED TO SOPP & TOWNSEND SINCE 12/2018 - THIS WAS 12/2021.

P.489 L.9-14 JUDGE SURPRISED THAT PROSPECTIVE JURORS NOT EVEN NOTICE THAT I WAS NOT IN COURT ROOM FOR YOUR DIRE/JURY SELECTION.

P.489 L.15-20 MILLER SAID KEEP IT THAT WAY (KEEP 'EM IN THE DARK) THEN SET SORT THRU THEM AT PHASE 2 - KEEP PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE ABOUT MY

ABSENCE MINIMAL. ("PHASE 2" PROSPECTIVE JURORS WERE ONLY "35" IN NUMBER.)

"BRADY ERROR"

P.490 L.10 MILLER SAID WOULD HAVE IT READY TOMORROW (JURY INSTRUCTION "FORECASTING" MY ABSENCE) VIOLATION DUE PROCESS.

(2) (A) COUNSEL INSTRUCTS JURY IT'S O.K. DEFENDANT'S NOT AT HER TRIAL (O.K. TO VIOLATE DUE PROCESS RIGHTS), AND REQUIRES TO AGREE. P.895 L.17 → 899 L.25

→ (2) (B) COUNSEL REQUIRES JURY TO AGREE WITH "COUNSEL'S NOT DEFENDING THE DEFENDANT" - DOES NOTHING, DOES A CROSSWORD PUZZLE INSTEAD.

P.898 L.21-25 → P.899 L.1-12 VIOLATION 6TH AMEND: RIGHT TO COUNSEL PER SE PREJUDICIAL ERROR - DEPRIVATION OF COUNSEL 14TH AMEND

(CONT'D) GROUND 10 (10G'S + G-10)

- ③. COUNSEL REMINDS JURY, "REMEMBER, YOU AGREED THAT IT'S O.K. THE DEFENDANT IS ABSENT FROM HER TRIAL." [P. 190 L. 4-8]. COUNSEL GOES ON TO
EVOKE EMOTION AGAINST DEFENDANT, SUPPORTS PROSECUTION'S FABRICATED EVIDENCE/HEARSAY BRIBED THREATENED WITNESSES (SEE GROUND 12), AND
(FALSELY) PRESENTS IT ALL AS "TRUE" TO THE JURY — NO ADVERSARIAL TESTING NO IMPEACHING WITNESSES, ETC; COUNSEL DEFENDS/SUPPORTS
PROSECUTION/GOV'T. [P. 190 L. 4-25]
- ④. COUNSEL DID NOT OBJECT TO JURY INSTRUCTIONS THAT ARE CONTRARY TO ESTABLISHED FEDERAL LAW: THESE FORBID JURY FROM DISCUSSING TALKING
ABOUT (VIOLATION 1ST AMEND. FREE SPEECH), CONSIDERING OR EVEN THINKING ABOUT WHY DEFENDANT IS ABSENT FROM HER TRIAL. WITH THESE INSTRUCT-
IONS THE JUDGE CONTROLLED THE JURY'S THOUGHTS (MINDS), SPEECH DISCUSSIONS IN DELIBERATIONS, AND ULTIMATELY CONTROLLED THE VERDICT. [P. 195B L. 4-14]
- ⑤. COUNSEL DID NOT OBJECT TO JUDGE'S JURY INSTRUCTION THAT SAYS/INFERS: "IT IS CONSTITUTIONALLY O.K. FOR DEFENDANT TO HAVE NO DEFENSE — COUNSEL
WHO WON'T DEFEND." [P. 195A L. 10-11; P. 195T L. 17-19] VIOLATION 6TH AMEND. RIGHT TO COUNSEL; 14TH AMEND. EQUALITY; VIOLATION DUE PROCESS.
- ⑥. COUNSEL NOT OBJECT TO UNCONSTITUTIONAL MYSTERY STATEMENT (FAB'D HEARSAY) THAT COURT (FALSELY) ALLEGES DEFENDANT MADE AND THEY UNLAW-
FULLY INCLUDED IT IN JURY INSTRUCTIONS IN DIRECT VIOLATION OF 6TH AMEND. RIGHT TO BE INFORMED OF NATURE AND CAUSE OF ACCUSATION AND
TO KNOW WITNESSES AGAINST HIM; ALSO 14TH AMEND DUE PROCESS & EQUAL PROTECTION VIOLATIONS. [P. 195B L. 15-25; P. 195A L. 1-8]
DUE PROCESS VIOLATIONS ABOUND TARR-OUT CASE/TRIAL. TRIAL INFECTED WITH UNFAIRNESS.

GROUND 11 (THE BIG STIP. ~~2~~ ~~3~~ B)

- ①. DEFENDANT HAD INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL WHEN THEY FAILED TO OBJECT TO WEAPON CHARGE, AND INSTEAD, WITH DECEIT LACK OF CANDOR,
CONFLICT OF INTEREST — BECAUSE THEIR LOYALTIES & INTERESTS ARE ELSEWHERE, CONSPIRES WITH PROSECUTION TO FABRICATE ONE JUST DAYS BEFORE TRIAL.

SUPPORTING FACTS (FOR ①): [ATTACH] P. 977 L. 15-25 → P. 978 L. 1-12 (PARAPHRASE)

- SOPP TO PROSECUTION: WE HAVE NO MURDER WEAPON. NOTE: FROM MAY 2018 TO DEC. 2021, OVER 3 1/2 YRS, COUNSEL & PROSECUTION WORK CONSPIRE TOGETHER
TO FABRICATE A WEAPON — & COULDN'T FAB. IT SOONER.
- PROSECUTION HAS NO REPLY.
- SOPP: WE STILL NEED TO HAVE SOMETHING AS THE MURDER WEAPON. NOTE: ETHICAL PROFESSIONAL COUNSEL WOULD SAY, "IF YOU DON'T HAVE A WEAPON,
THEN YOU CAN'T HAVE A WEAPON CHARGE. DROP THE CHARGE." BUT CONFLICT OF INTEREST COUNSEL'S LOYALTY IS ELSEWHERE.
- SOPP'S BEEN PREJUDICED AGAINST ME FROM DAY 1; AND THAT INCREASED EXPONENTIALLY WHEN I REVEALED COUNSEL JORDAN T. BEARD'S
KINSHIP WITH MRS. JOLEEN CUMMINGS (MISSING PERSON VICTIM) — REVEALED THEY'RE COUSINS AT COURT. SOPP VEHEMENTLY PROTESTED; SHE'S
VERY PROTECTIVE OF HIM. MRS. J.C. SAID ALL HER FAM WORKS IN GOV'T. PER SE CONFLICT OF INTEREST.

- ③. COUNSEL WAS INEFFECTIVE WHEN THEY FAILED TO OBJECT TO JURY INSTRUCTIONS THAT ARE CONTRARY TO ESTABLISHED FEDERAL LAW WHICH FORCE JURY
TO AGREE TO UNLAWFUL STIPULATION: TO ACCEPT ALL WITNESS(ES) AS TRUE. [SEE: P. 1029 L. 17-23]

SUPPORTING FACTS (③): [P. 1029 L. 17-23] (PARAPHRASE EXACT WORDS OF JUDGE)

JUDGE TO JURY: "ALL RIGHT LADIES & GENTLEMEN, I'M GOING TO READ YOU A STIPULATION BETWEEN THE DEFENSE AND THE STATE. A STIPULATION IS
MERELY AN AGREEMENT AND YOU ARE TO ACCEPT WHAT THE PARTIES HAVE SAID AS BEING TRUE WITHOUT NEEDING ANY FURTHER PROOF."

INTERPRETATION: THE PARTIES IN STIPULATION ARE COUNSEL, PROSECUTION, & JUDGE — NOT ME! FOR ALL TO BE ACCEPTED AS "TRUE" MEANS COUNSEL,
PROSECUTION, & JUDGE ARE ALL ON THE SAME SIDE & PREJUDICED AGAINST ME. IN THIS THEY DENIED THE JURY THEIR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT
TO DECIDE FOR THEMSELVES WHAT IS TRUE OR FALSE & WHAT THE VERDICT SHOULD BE; THEY BIASED ENTIRE JURY AGAINST ME AND GAVE

(CONT'D) GROUND 11

ME ILLEGAL "GUILTY" VERDICT.

① KANGAROO COURTS COURT CHARACTERIZED BY UNAUTHORIZED IRREGULAR PROCEDURES, ESP., SO AS TO RENDER A FAIR PROCEEDING IMPOSSIBLE.

② A SHAM LEGAL PROCEEDING.

SUMMARY: THE ABOVE SOLIDLY SHOWS THAT FALSE CHARGES, FABRICATED EVIDENCE, BRIBED THREATENED FALSE HEARSAY WITNESSES ALL GO COMPLETELY UNCHALLENGED, WITH BIASED "PUPPET JURY" - CONTROLLED BY PREJUDICED STIPULATIONS - THE COMBINATION OF WHICH GETS ME FALSELY CONVICTED OF CRIME(S). DEPRIVATION OF COUNSEL. PER SE PREJUDICIAL ERROR. UNRESTRAINED PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT. BRADY ERROR. TRIAL UNFAIR. VIOLATION DUE PROCESS. I WAS FRAMED. I AM INNOCENT. 14TH AMEND. DUE PROCESS & EQUALITY VIOLATED.

GROUND 12

I WAS FURTHER SUBJECTED TO INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL IN COUNSEL'S FAILURE TO OBJECT TO JURY INSTRUCTIONS THAT ARE CONTRARY TO ESTABLISHED FEDERAL LAW IN THAT THEY PERMIT ALL WITNESSES TO BE BRIBED, THREATENED, DISHONEST, &/OR FELONS CONVICTED FOR FALSE TESTIMONY.

SUPPORTING FACTS:

ATTACHED: P. 3415-3416
P. 1955 L. 21 → 1956 L. 10; P. 3487-3488

"WEIGHING THE EVIDENCE"

IN "WEST'S FLORIDA CRIMINAL LAWS & RULES 2018" BY LAW THERE IS "10". THE JUDGE UNLAWFULLY OMITTED 4 OF THE 10 - SPECIFICALLY OMITTED NOS. 6, 7, 9, & 10. HE KEPT 1-5 & 8, AND RENUMBERED THEM 1-6. THE FOLLOWING IS THE 4 THAT THE JUDGE UNLAWFULLY OMITTED FROM THE JURY INSTRUCTIONS:

P. 3415-3416 BEFORE HE OMITTED THEM; P. 3487-3488 WHAT HE GAVE THE JURY AFTER HE OMITTED THEM

- HAS THE WITNESS BEEN OFFERED OR RECEIVED ANY MONEY, PREFERRED TREATMENT, OR OTHER BENEFIT IN ORDER TO GET WITNESS TO TESTIFY?
- HAD ANY PRESSURE OR THREAT BEEN USED AGAINST THE WITNESS THAT AFFECTED THE TRUTH OF THE WITNESS TESTIMONY?
- HAS THE WITNESS BEEN CONVICTED OF A FELONY OR MISDEMEANOR INVOLVING DISHONESTY OR FALSE TESTIMONY?
- DOES THE WITNESS HAVE A GENERAL REPUTATION FOR DISHONESTY OR TRUTHFULNESS?

IF THE ABOVE HAD NOT BEEN OMITTED FROM THE JURY INSTRUCTIONS - BUT WERE INSTEAD INCLUDED AS THEY LAWFULLY SHOULD HAVE BEEN - THEN PROSECUTION WOULD HAVE HAD NO EVIDENCE/WITNESS AT ALL AND THEIR FABRICATED CASE AGAINST ME WOULD COME TO NOTHING.

PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT. BRADY ERROR. PER SE PREJUDICIAL ERROR. VIOLATION DUE PROCESS. TRIAL WAS UNFAIR. 14TH AMEND.

GROUND 13

I HAD INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL IN THEIR FAILURE TO OBJECT TO "ENHANCED PENALTY § 7B2.06(2) FLA. STAT. THAT IS NOT APPLICABLE: MRS. J.C. IS AN OFF-DUTY HAIRDRESSER AT TIME SHE WENT MISSING; SHE'S NOT ON-DUTY I.E.O. ENGAGED IN LAWFUL PERFORMANCE OF LEGAL DUTY.

SUPPORTING FACTS:

§ 7B2.06(2) FLA. STAT. ENHANCED PENALTY WAS UNLAWFULLY INCLUDED IN JURY INSTRUCTIONS OF LESSER INCLUDED CRIMES AND BIASED JURY AGAINST ME TO (WRONGLY) GIVE BIGGEST, HARSHEST PENALTY. EXAMPLE: BATTERY ON LEO, WITH ENHANCED PENALTY, GETS "LIFE".

UNLAWFULLY INCLUDED ENHANCED PENALTY § 7B2.06(2):

ATTACH: P. 1939 L. 7-11, L. 19-23; P. 3470; P. 3474; 1944 L. 3-7

- MURDER 1ST DEG.
- MANSLAUGHTER
- FELONY BATTERY
- CULPABLE NEGLIGENCE
- MURDER 2ND DEG.
- AGGRAVATED BATTERY
- BATTERY

(CONT'D) GROUND 28

3. NO BODY: SOME FABRICATED & HEARSAY EVIDENCE, AND STILL NO BODY. PERMITS ALL EVIDENCE TO BE FAB'D, & IT IS PROVED GROUND 12.

(A) FALSELY POINTS TO APPARENT DEMISE. SEE: GROUND 26 & 27.

(B) NO LAB REPORTS TO BACK-UP "LIP-SERVICE ONLY" FALSE CLAIM OF D.N.A. IN THIS GROUND 29 P. 1522 L. 11-17, 20-21 NO D.N.A. 1912 L. 24-25, 1913 L. 1-2

SUPPORTING FACTS:

ABSTRACT OF RECORD (CASE ABSTRACT FILING): A COMPLETE HISTORY IN SHORT ABBREVIATED FORM OF THE CASE AS FOUND IN THE RECORD. ITS PURPOSE IS TO

"BRING BEFORE THE APPELLATE COURT IN ABBREVIATED FORM AN ACCURATE AND AUTHENTIC HISTORY OF ALL THE PROCEEDINGS IN THE CASE AS THEY WERE HAD

IN THE COURSE OF THE TRIAL BELOW. IT WOULD HAVE TO BE COMPLETE ENOUGH TO SHOW THAT THE QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW [BY THE APPELLATE

COURT] HAVE BEEN PROPERLY PRESERVED IN THE CASE. SOURCE: BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY.

ELEMENTS: THE CONSTITUENT PARTS OF A CRIMINAL OFFENSE WHICH THE PROSECUTION MUST PROVE BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT TO SUSTAIN A CONVICTION.

SEE: RECORD ON APPEAL INDEX P. 1-16 AND CASE ABSTRACT FILING INDEX P. 17-30. THERE IS NO D.N.A. REPORTS ANYWHERE IN THE RECORD. AND WITH THE

FOLLOWING, THEY DON'T HAVE TO HAVE D.N.A. OR D.N.A. REPORTS — THEY ONLY HAVE TO SAY THEY DO:

JURY INSTRUCTIONS: ① ALL WITNESS ARE FALSE & ALL EVIDENCE FABRICATED P. 3487-3488 GROUND 12 EXPANDS ON THIS

② STIPULATION THAT JURY MUST ACCEPT ALL FALSE WITNESS & FAB'D EVIDENCE AS TRUE. P. 1028 L. 17-23 SEE GROUND 11(B)

③ COUNSEL WON'T DEFEND (WON'T IMPEACH WITNESSES) P. 898 L. 21-25 → P. 899 L. 1-12 SEE GROUND 10(2)(B) (DEFICIENT UNDER AEDPA)

• BECAUSE I AM INNOCENT OF THIS CHARGE, THEY ONLY WAY THEY COULD CONVICT ME IS WITH FALSE WITNESSES & FABRICATED EVIDENCE — AND THAT'S WHAT THEY DID. (↑ ABOVE)

THEY NEED HER DECLARED DECEASED SO THEY COULD COLLECT INSURANCE MONEY \$ AND CRIME COMP. FUND (VIA FRAUD) \$. P. 22 L. 1-3 SENTENCE HEARING

• THEY CAN'T COLLECT \$ ON A JUNKIE WHO O.D. IN A TRAP HOUSE OR DISAPPEAR BECAUSE SHE OWES THE DOGMAN.

WILLIAMS V. ALLEN (11TH CIR 2008). JOHNSON V. SEC., DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS (11TH CIR 2011). BRADY ERROR, BRADY V. MARYLAND (1963). VIOLATION DUE PROCESS.

GROUND 29 (B) UNLAWFUL CHANGE PLEA

MY DUE PROCESS RIGHTS WERE FURTHER VIOLATED BECAUSE OF INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL AT TRIAL. (SEE: ① NO ELEMENTS, & ② FALSIFIED MY PLEA) ↓

SUPPORTING FACTS: (SEE ATTACH FOR ALL BELOW)

(A) COUNSEL FAILED TO OBJECT TO JURY INSTRUCTIONS THAT ARE CONTRARY TO ESTABLISHED FEDERAL LAW: JUDGE UNLAWFULLY ALTERED JURY INSTRUCTIONS TO CONCEAL

FACT THAT "MISCONDUCT = FIDEL PROSECUTION" DID NOT CONJURE ENOUGH FABRICATED EVIDENCE TO MEET ELEMENTS NECESSARY TO SUSTAIN CONVICTION OF (FAB'D) GRAND

TH. AUTO CHARGE. BOTH ELEMENTS MUST BE PRESENT IN THEIR ENTIRETY TO CONVICT ON THIS — AND THEY ARE NOT. AND I AM INNOCENT OF THIS FAB'D CHARGE.

• P. 3482 UNLAWFULLY ADDED "OR" IN "No 2" — THIS IS FINISHED JURY INSTRUCTION. (COUNT NO. IS WRONG — SEE GROUND 32 FOR MORE INFO)

• P. 3446 SHOWS "RIGHT" COUNT 2 FOR G. TH. AUTO CHARGE; AND SHOWS NOTES FOR THE UNLAWFUL CHANGE HE WILL MAKE (SEE GROUND 32 ON SWITCH CNT NO. S)

• DECENTFUL COUNSEL TOWNSEND WORK WITH PROSECUTION TO FALSELY ACCUSE ME OF THIS CHARGE. I HAD TALKED WITH TOWNSEND ABOUT THIS, APPROX. MAY

22-30 OF 2018, NO ONE ELSE. PERJURY ON POLICE FOR STATING OTHERWISE. MAS. J.C. LEAVE WITH FRIEND(S) SATURDAY AFTER WORK — ASKED ME TO MOVE

HER VEHICLE SHE TOO TIPSEY UNDER INFLUENCE TO DO IT HERSELF. SILON CAMARAS SHOWN THIS IS TRUE.

ELEMENTS. CONSTITUENT PARTS OF A CRIMINAL OFFENSE WHICH PROSECUTION MUST PROVE BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT TO SUSTAIN A CONVICTION.

→ (B) COUNSEL LACK OF CANDOR (STANDARD 4.6) AND FAILURE TO AVOID CONFLICTS OF INTEREST (STANDARD 4.3): COUNSEL WITHOUT MY KNOWLEDGE OR CONSENT

FABRICATED UNLAWFULLY CHANGED MY PLEA FROM "NOT GUILTY" TO NOW CONTENDORE; ALSO MISCONDUCT ON ALL WHO AIDE & ABET IN THIS.

• P. 20 CASE ABSTRACT FILING: SEE 7-1-2018 SAYS "CONFIDENTIAL IN COURT FILING"; SEE 7-2-2018 FALSELY SAYS "DEFENDANT ENTERED A PLEA OF NO PLEA FOR

(CONT'D) GROUND 29

CNT. 1, SEE (NEXT) 7-2-19 TRIAL TYPE NO TRIAL REQUIRED FOR CNT. 1. I HAD NOT TALKED TO CONFLICT OF INTEREST COUNSEL SINCE 2018. THEY KNOW ONLY INTENTIONALLY FALSIFIED MY PLEA. MY PLEA ALWAYS "NOT GUILTY" VIOLATION DUE PROCESS. 14TH AMEND.

• P. 5 RECORD ON APPEAL INDEX # 55. NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION WITHIN COURT FILING 11-1-2019 P. 2029-2033. SEE ATTACH P. 2029-2033. THEY ARE BLANKED-OUT WITH "CONFIDENTIAL" TO HIDE THEY FRAUDULENTLY WITHOUT MY KNOWLEDGE OR CONSENT FAB'D / CHANGE MY PLEA. [SEE TOP R.H. CORNER THEY CROSS-OUT 373 WITH 374]

• P. 2440 SHOWS MY PLEA "NOT GUILTY" AS IT WAS BEFORE THEY WITHOUT MY KNOWLEDGE OR CONSENT WITH FRAUD CHANGED IT. G. TH. AUTO CNT. 2 2018-CF-373

MORE COUNSEL FRAUD CHANGING PLEAS / SWITCHING COUNT NO.S - CHARGES ON DAY OF SENTENCING 2. FABRICATING FOLLY:

• P. 15 RECORD ON APPEAL INDEX # 346. SAYS PRESENTENCE INVESTIGATION ON 1-27-2022 WHICH IS DAY OF SENTENCING & REFERS TO P. 3535-3555 WHICH ARE BLANKED-OUT WITH "CONFIDENTIAL" TO HIDE THEIR FRAUD OF SWITCHING COUNT NO.S / CHARGE ORDER AND CHANGED MY PLEA (AGAIN) WITHOUT MY KNOWLEDGE OR CONSENT FROM "NOT GUILTY" TO NOLO CONTENDERE ON DAY OF SENTENCING. NO ONE CHANGES PLEA ON DAY OF SENTENCING.

• P. 29 CASE ABSTRACT FILING 1-27-2022. NO ONE CHANGES PLEA ON DAY OF SENTENCING. OVER A MONTH AFTER TRIAL OVER AND VERDICT IN 1-27-2022 (FALSELY) SAYS DEFENDANT ENTERED A PLEA OF NO PLEA CNT. 1. MY PLEA ALWAYS "NOT GUILTY". THEY LIED. KANGAROO COURT WITH COUNSEL KEPT ME IN BASEMENT OF COURTHOUSE FOR MY TRIAL AND SWITCHED CHARGES & DATES / COUNT NO.S AND PLEAS BACK & FORTH & BACK AGAIN.

• (MORE) P. 29 CASE ABSTRACT FILING 1-27-2022. MANY 1-27-2022, SO 10 DOWN FROM TOP: LIFE IN STATE PRISON FACILITY - D.O.C. - CNT. 1. THIS PROVES CNT. 1 IS 1ST DEG. MURDER - CAN'T HAVE LIFE SENTENCE ON GR. TH. AUTO CHG. SO CNT. 1 IS 1ST DEG. MURDER AND SEE ABOVE ↑ P. 29 THEY HAVE CNT. 1 AS NOLO CONTENDERE PLEA (THEY FAB'D MY PLEA) BUT THE POINT IS THERE'S NO TRIAL WITH A NOLO CONTENDERE PLEA.

AND THERE'S NO TRACE OF SENTENCING NOTHING FOR THEIR FAB'D CNT. 2: GRAND TH. AUTO CHG. IN REC. ON APPEAL / CASE ABSTRACT FILING INDEXES.

SHAM CHARGES, SHAM COUNT NO.S, SHAM TRIAL, SHAM EVERYTHING. AND PLEASE KNOW MY PLEA ALWAYS "NOT GUILTY" FOR ALL CHG.

WRIGHT V. GRAMLEY... LINDSTADT V. KEANE... BRADY ERROR... PER SE PREJUDICIAL ERROR... VIOLATION DUE PROCESS... STRICKLAND V. WASHINGTON.

GROUND 30

MOREOVER I DID NOT RECEIVE EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL AT TRIAL, THEY FAILED TO: ⁽¹⁾ INVESTIGATE MY DEFENSE. ONE EASY TO PROVE DEFENSE ALTHOUGH REQUESTED TO DO SO BY ME AND FAILS TO SUBPOENA WITNESSES IN SUPPORT OF THE DEFENSE, IT CAN HARDLY BE SAID THE DEFENDANT HAD EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL. ⁽²⁾ ADEQUATELY INVESTIGATE AND INTRODUCE INTO EVIDENCE RECORDS THAT DEMONSTRATE MY FACTUAL INNOCENCE OR THAT RAISES SUFFICIENT DOUBT TO THAT QUESTION TO UNDERMINE CONFIDENCE IN THE VERDICT RENDERS DEFICIENT PERFORMANCE; ⁽³⁾ OBJECT TO IRRELEVANT IMMATERIAL ISSUE RAISED BY THE PROSECUTION, RENDERS DEFICIENT PERFORMANCE.

SUPPORTING FACTS: IRRELEVANT IMMATERIAL ISSUE: MY NAME, MY ONLY NAME FROM 1999-2018 JENNIFER MARIE SYBERT IS IRRELEVANT IMMATERIAL TO MY CASE. PROSECUTION WITH CONFLICT OF INTEREST COUNSEL FABRICATED IT INTO CASE AGAINST ME TO (ATTEMPT TO) SULLY MY REPUTATION BECAUSE

^(B) THERE IS NO MOTIVE. THEY ARE DESPERATE TO FABRICATE A MOTIVE - SO THEY FABRICATE RIDICULOUS MOTIVE AND "WEAVE" MY "A.K.A. NAME" INTO IT SO THEY CAN (FALSELY) HAVE ELEMENT THEY NEED TO CONVICT.

HISTORY & INFO THAT REFUTES REBUTS MISCONDUCT- FILLED PROSECUTION'S FABRICATIONS: IN 1999 I BECAME LIVED WITH NAME JENNIFER MARIE SYBERT. IT IS NOT ALIAS, IT IS NOT ASSUMED NAME, IT IS A.K.A. ALSO KNOWN AS / NAME CHANGE. IT IS ONLY NAME FROM 1999 TO MAY 2018 - GO BACK TO BIRTH NAME AT ARREST. FROM 1999-2018, WORKED WITH INTEGRITY TO ESTABLISH AND CARE FOR SELF AS NAMED JENNIFER MARIE SYBERT AND ALL THAT GOES WITH THAT.

• IN 1999, PASSED EXAM & DRIVER'S LICENSE; ALSO ACQUIRED / PURCHASED VOLVO (OLD), REGISTRATION & INSURANCE

(CONT'D) GROUND 30

- IN 2000 ESTABLISHED MY "I" CREDIT CARD CITIBANK VISA: HAVE 20 YEARS APPROX. FROM 2000-2018 OF PAID IN FULL BALANCE EVERY MONTH (TO TIME OF ARREST IN MAY 2018). APPROXIMATELY 20 YEARS STABLE CREDIT HISTORY DISPLAYING MY TRUSTWORTHY RESPONSIBLE STABLE FAITHFULNESS.
- JC³ OVERLAND PARK, KS 1999-2000 TOOK TWO COLLEGE CLASSES "MICROSOFT OFFICE 2000" 3,8/3,9 GPA; I PAID FOR TO BE PROICIENT AT WORK.
- IN 2001 ACQUIRED G.E.D. - ALL THIS DID AS NAMED, MY NAME, JENNIFER MARIE SYBERT - TOOK TEST AT TECH SCHOOL IN ST. AUG., FL.
- IN 2004-2005 CLASSES AT SJRCC: 20+ CREDITS, 3,8/3,9 GPA, & COLLEGE LOAN DEBT, IN 2006 PAID THAT OFF: STUDENT LOAN PAID IN FULL.
- PURCHASED 4 " MOTORCYCLES (OVER THE YEARS) BRAND NEW OFF SHOW-ROOM FLOOR: '05 YAMAHA SPORT-TOUR, '06 NINJA ZX6R, '08 SUZUKI GXR6, '08 NINJA ZX6R
- NOTE: COST-EFFECTIVE FORM OF TRANSPORTATION. ALL PAID IN FULL. THE LAST ONE WAS IN STORAGE WITH TITLE IN MY FIREPROOF SAFE.
- 2016 KIA SAIL I GOT IN 2015. I HAD MADE THE PAYMENTS (AT TIME OF ARREST) 5 MONTHS IN ADVANCE. NOT MANY PEOPLE MAKE PAYMENTS IN ADVANCE, MUCH LESS THAT FAR IN ADVANCE - BUT I DID. I'VE ALWAYS BEEN POOR, BUT I'M VERY RESPONSIBLE WITH LITTLE THAT I HAVE.
- BANK ACCOUNTS ALL PRISTINE BALANCED CHECKBOOK - NO PROBLEMS.
- TAXES AS ALL DO, FILED 2017 BY 4-15-2018. I OWED THAT YEAR - ONLY OWE 2⁰⁰ MY WHOLE LIFE. HAD 2017 HURRICANE HARDSHIP & I.R.S. FORGAVE DEBT, (APPROX. \$400) - YET, I STILL PAID \$500 TOWARD IT - AGAIN, I DIDN'T HAVE TO; PAID IN 4/2018, JUST 1 MONTH BEFORE ARREST. I AM TRUSTWORTHY IN ALL MY DOINGS/DEALINGS: FEDERAL GOV'T KNOWS THIS.
- I HAD NO PROBLEM WITH MRS. JOLEN CUMMINGS. MISCONDUCT PROSECUTION & DECEITFUL COUNSEL FABRICATED THEIR FRIEND PROBLEMS WITH MRS. J.C. SO THEY COULD HAVE THE NECESSARY ELEMENT "MOTIVE" THAT'S NEEDED TO CONVICT. TRUTH: I DID NOTHING TO MRS. J.C.; THERE IS NO MOTIVE, NO ELEMENTS, NO VIABLE CASE AGAINST ME. THEY FALSELY CONVICTED ME BY DOING THE FOLLOWING:
 - JURY INSTRUCTION THAT PERMIT ALL WITNESSES TO BE FALSE & ALL EVIDENCE FABRICATED [P. 3487-3488] [GROUND 12 EXPLAINS] [P. 3415]
 - STIPULATION THAT JURY MUST ACCEPT ALL (FALSE) WITNESS & (FAB'D) EVIDENCE AS TRUE [P. 1029 L. 17-23] [SEE GROUND 11(B)]
 - COUNSEL DECLARES WILL NOT DEFEND ME. [P. 898 L. 21-25 → P. 899 L. 11-12] [SEE GROUND 10 (2) (B)] (DEFICIENT UNDER AEDPA)
 - JURY WAS NOT IN COURTROOM FOR ENTIRE TRIAL & KEPT SEPARATE FROM ME; THEY NEVER SAW OR HEARD ME. [GROUND 1 (2)] [GROUND 3]
 - I WAS NOT IN COURTROOM FOR ENTIRE TRIAL [SEE GROUND 1] (DID NOT GET TO CHOOSE JURY - NOTHING) [AND SEE GROUND 4 (c)]
 - CONFLICT OF INTEREST COUNSEL SET ME UP WITH (BY FRAUD) AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE - (LIED ON ME) THEY WANT DEFEND ME, & THEY KEEP ME IN THE BASEMENT OF COURTHOUSE SO I CAN'T DEFEND MYSELF & SET ME UP W/ GUARANTEED CONVICTION.
- GROUND 34 EXPLAINS THIS:
 - SET ME UP WITH A BIASED JURY. (50 SHADES OF EVILS) [SEE GROUND 36] - I DID NOT GET TO CHOOSE ANY JURY. [GROUND 4 (c)]
 - REPT COUNSEL JORDAN T. BEARD IS (MISSING PERSON/VICTIM) MRS. J.C.'S CAUSIN. [GROUND 9] CONFLICT OF INTEREST.
- I AM INNOCENT. THEY LIED ON ME. I REFUTE THEIR LIES WITH THE FOLLOWING: I HAVE 20 YEARS OF RECENT & 30 YEARS MY WHOLE LIFE WITH NO WORK HISTORY TO PROVE IF I HAVE SLIGHTEST PROB DISCOMFORT AT WORK - I QUIT AND GET A NEW JOB. I NEVER ARGUE, FIGHT, QUARREL - NONE OF IT. IF I'M UNHAPPY, THEN I PEACEFULLY SPEAK WITH MANAGER, SEE HOW MUCH NOTICE THEY WANT, FULFILL IT & LEAVE. I TALKED WITH MGR. ANH MORGAN END MAR. BEGIN APRIL 2018 ABOUT LEAVING (QUIT) BUT SHE TALKED ME INTO STAYING. [SEE GROUND 20 & 24]
- IN MY PERSONAL HISTORY STATED EARLIER IN THIS GROUND, I HAVE ALWAYS BEEN "MONETARILY CHALLENGED", BUT I AM UNWAVERING IN MY FAITHFUL DETERMINATION TO DO THE RIGHT THING AND STAY ON THE STRAIGHT & NARROW PATH. DON'T LET THEM FOOL YOU WITH ALL THEIR FABRICATIONS/LIES; KEEP YOUR FOCUS ON WHAT TRULY NEEDS ADDRESSED: WHO NEEDED MRS. J.C. DECLARED DEAD SO THEY CAN COLLECT ON LIFE INS. POLICY? THEY DID ON \$25,000 CRIME COMP. FUND. [SEE P. 22 L. 1-3 FROM SENTENCE HEARING] "BRADY ERROR" EGREGIOUS PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT.

GROUND 31

IN ADDITION TO THE ABOVE ARGUMENTS, MY DUE PROCESS RIGHTS WERE FURTHER EGREGIOUSLY VIOLATED WITH COUNSEL'S INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE & FAILURE TO AVOID CONFLICTS OF INTEREST WITH DECEIT, FRAUD, MISREPRESENTED ME & FILED WITHOUT MY KNOWLEDGE OR CONSENT MOTIONS SUPPRESSING EVIDENCE THAT PROVES MY INNOCENCE:

"BRADY ERROR" BRADY V. MARYLAND (1993)

SUPPORTING FACTS: P. 1743 L. 16-18 CRYSTAL METH IN MRS. J.C.'S BAG - MRS. J.C.'S METH P. 1744 L. 3

* CASE REPORT FOR DOMESTIC VIOLENCE THAT OCCURRED 5.9.2018 AND SHE DISAPPEARED 5.12.18 → 5.13.18 (3-4 DAYS LATER) P. 2218-2219

* MR. JASON GEE BOYFRIEND & DRUG DEALER ^{SUPPLIER} OF MRS. J.C.'S DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ON MRS. J.C. & HER CHILDREN BY HIM. P. 2214-2215, #4-5

* P. 2216 #2 (ABOUT 1/2 WAY DOWN) A BURGLARY AND AN ALTERCATION A VIOLENT STRUGGLE AT CUMMINGS' RESIDENCE, ... POLICE MISCONDUCT FOR

FALSELY SAYING OCCURRED A LONG TIME BEFORE SHE WENT MISSING: DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ON 5.9.2018 TO 5.12.18 - 5.13.18 "3-4 DAYS LATER"

IS NOT A LONG TIME. POLICE & PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT - THEY LIED. "BRADY ERROR" P. 31 REC. ON APPEAL HAS DAYS SHE WENT MISSING.

* P. 919 L. 2-9 A PROSPECTIVE JUROR SPEAKS ABOUT MRS. J.C.'S BOYFRIEND JASON GEE: SHE SEARCHED HER PROPERTY THINKING HE MIGHT'VE BURIED MRS. J.C. ON IT SOMEWHERE. PROSECUTION & COUNSEL DEFINITELY DID NOT CHOOSE HER FOR JURY (THEY KEPT ME IN BASEMENT FOR EVERYTHING.)

INFO THAT PROVES MY INNOCENCE: DECEITFUL COUNSEL & PROSECUTION HIDE MRS. J.C.'S WILD RECKLESS PERSONAL LIFE:

① HER BOYFRIEND MR. JASON GEE COMMIT DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ON HER & HER CHILDREN DAYS (3-4) BEFORE SHE GO MISSING.

② HER BOYFRIEND MR. JASON GEE IS HER DOPE-MAN; HIS EXTENSIVE CRIMINAL HISTORY ALL ABOUT CRYSTAL METH - MRS. J.C.'S CRYSTAL METH.

③ BURGLARY ALTERCATION VIOLENT STRUGGLE - SHE OWED HIM MONEY FOR METH; AND NASTY DIVORCE CUSTODY BATTLE WITH MR. CUMMINGS - MRS. J.C. HAD A LOT GOING ON. DID HER BOYFRIEND DRUG DEALER MR. JASON GEE SELL HER INTO SEX SLAVERY TO PAY-OFF HER DRUG DEBT SHE OWED HIM? DID SHE G.D. IN THE TRAPHOUSE? SHE & MR. CUMMINGS STILL MARRIED & GOING THRU MESSY DIVORCE & CUSTODY BATTLE.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST, COUNSEL & THEIR CONTINUED LACK OF CANDOR: NO COMMUNICATION BETWEEN ME & COUNSEL SINCE APPROX 12/2018 AND THEY FILED THIS 4/10/2021 MOTION YEARS AFTER ALL COMM CEASED. I NEVER AUTHORIZE THEM TO FILE ANYTHING. I ONLY AUTHORIZE "NOT GUILTY" PLEA FOR CHARGES (AND THEY DIDN'T EVEN GET THAT RIGHT - BUT THAT'S A DIFFERENT GROUND (29)). ALL THEY DID I REFUTE REBUT & NOT AUTHORIZE THEIR FABRICATIONS.

GROUND 32 (Ramsammy v. Florida: EVIDENCE INSUFFICIENT...)

I WAS DENIED EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL AT TRIAL. COUNSEL FAILED TO OBJECT TO EGREGIOUS PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT AND INSTEAD, IN THEIR CONFLICT OF INTEREST & LACK OF CANDOR CONSPIRED WITH THEM IN SWITCHING COUNT NO./ORDER, CHARGES, AND DATES.

IN (1.) BELOW, HAS ³¹ PAGES WITH CHARGE/COUNT ORDER RIGHT (CORRECT) TO REFUTE THEIR NONSENSE OF IT BEING OTHERWISE.

IN (2.) BELOW, HAS THEIR FABRICATING FOLLY WITH CONTRADICTING ARREST DATES, VICTIM DISAPPEAR DATES, COUNT/CHG ORDER, ETC.

SUPPORTING FACTS: "(1.) & (2.) BELOW" 14TH AMEND. VIOLATION DUE PROCESS; "BRADY ERROR"

(1.) THE TRUE COUNT NO./ORDER OF CHARGES:

* COUNT 1: 1ST DEG. MURDER - 2018-CF-BIS: DETAINED MON. 5.14.18 CHARGED TUE. 5.15.18

* COUNT 2: GRAND TH. AUTO - 2018-CF-313: CHG W/ THIS APPROX. 5.25.18 - 6.2.18 W/ THIS ADDITIONAL FAB'D CHG/FAB. DATE 9/2018 ^{THEY FAB'D 9/2018 DATE}

PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT: (A) THEY CAN'T HAVE 1ST DEG. MURDER CHARGE ON ME FOR "MISSING PERSON", WHO, AT TIME THEY ARREST ME FOR THIS

CHG, SHE MISSING 2-3 DAYS AND NO BODY - SHE'S STILL MISSING. (B) THEIR WHOLE SHAM CASE AGAINST ME FALLS APART IF THEY KEEP

CHGS IN TRUE COUNT ORDER: FABRICATED POISONOUS FRUIT FROM THE POISONOUS TREE. EGREGIOUS MISCONDUCT OF PROSECUTION.

(CONT'D) GROUND 32

THE FOLLOWING ³⁵~~34~~ PAGES: ³⁷~~36~~ TIMES RIGHT/CORRECT CHARGE ORDER IS EITHER READ ALOUD BY JUDGE & WRITTEN ON DOCUMENTS;

THE BELOW IS NOT ALL INCLUSIVE - THERE'S MORE! JUST ASK & I'LL GIVE YOU - PROVIDE IT TO YOU. (SEE ATTACH "EXHIBITS")

• COVER PAGE OF TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS (FRONT HAS NO PAGE #) & INDEX (ON THE BACK, HAS NO PAGE #) (TOP R.H. CORNER FOR BOTH)

• P. 1 (TOP R.H. CORNER) • P. 1 RECORD ON APPEAL (TOP R.H. CORNER) • COVER PAGE INITIAL BRIEF OF APPELLANT (HAS NO PAGE #)

• P. 982 (TOP R.H. CORNER) • P. 2 RECORD ON APPEAL (TOP R.H. CORNER) • CERTIFICATE OF CLERK (NO PAGE #, BUT P. 2005 ON BACK)

• P. 1324 (TOP R.H. CORNER) • P. 2558 (TOP R.H. CORNER) • P. 2556 (TOP R.H. CORNER)

• P. 1844 (TOP R.H. CORNER) • P. 3674 (TOP R.H. CORNER) • P. 2024 (TOP R.H. CORNER)

• (SPECIAL PAGE NO. 3) P. 1 OF 10 "ORDER FINDING DEFENDANT..." (TOP R.H. CORNER) • P. 2563 & P. 2564 (TOP R.H. CORNER FOR BOTH)

• (SPECIAL PAGE NO. 5) P. 1 SENTENCE HEARING (TOP R.H. CORNER) • P. 2 INITIAL BRIEF OF APPELLANT - 1ST PARA.

• P. 3467 (TOP R.H. CORNER) HAS JUDGE'S HAND-WRITTEN SIGNATURE ON THIS DOCUMENT

• P. 3499 VERDICT PAGE FROM JURY - COUNT 1: 1ST DEG. MURDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUROR ON THE BACK - P. 3500

• P. 3469 STATEMENT OF CHARGES - THESE WERE READ ALOUD BY JUDGE TO JURY & GIVEN TO JURY IN WRITTEN FORM.

• P. 3472 "MURDER 1ST DEG. - COUNT 1"

• P. 31 & P. 36 FROM REC. ON APPEAL: INDICTMENT COUNT 1 MURDER IN 1ST DEG. (THEY FABRICATED 9/2018 DATE)

• P. 3573 SAYS (AS TO COUNT 1) MURDER IN 1ST DEG.; SENTENCED TO DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS; P. 3574 SAYS LIFE SENTENCE FOR (CNT: 2) CHARGE

• P. 3445 COUNT 1 / CULP NEGLIGENCE (1ST DEG. M.) P. 3446 COUNT 2 GRAND THEFT AUTO

• P. 21 L. 6-9, L. 13-15; P. 996 L. 7-8; P. 1897 L. 22-23; P. 1939 L. 3-4; P. 1941 L. 15-16 ← JUDGE SAYS "COUNT 1: 1ST DEG. MURDER"

• P. 1962 L. 11-14, L. 15-16 NOTE: AFTER I SUBMIT POSTCONVICTION, WITHOUT MY KNOWLEDGE OR CONSENT WITH FRAUD THEY DID MOTION TO HIDE THIS: APPENDIX G

(2.) FABRICATING FOLLY WITH CONTRADICTING ARREST DATES, VICTIM DISAPPEAR DATES, COUNT/CHARGE ORDER, ETC.:

(2.) (i) P. 2132 #1 SAYS MAY 16, 2018 IS WHEN THEY DETAINED ME; BUT TRUTH IS MAY 14, 2018 I WAS DETAINED AND MAY 15, 2018 THEY ARRESTED ME FOR 1ST DEG. MURDER - ON MISSING PERSON, WHO IS STILL MISSING - NO BODY, NO D.N.A., NO PROB. CAUSE, NOTHING.

NOTE: P. 2132 #1. THEY (NCSO) FABRICATE THE DATE TO LATER DATE 5-16-18, WHEN TRUE DATE IS MON. 5-14-18. NCSO DETAINED ME &

TRIED TO ARREST ME IN SJC (ST. JOHN'S COUNTY) NOT EVEN THEIR COUNTY. SJSO (ST. JOHN'S SHERIFF'S OFFICE) BOOKED ME ON 5-15-18

AND HAVE TRUE PICTURES & BOOKING REPORT THAT COMPLETELY CONTRADICT NCSO'S FAB'D ONES. NCSO CUT SJSO OUT OF THE LOOP SO THEY DON'T HAVE TO "PAY THEM OFF" TO MAKE SJSO'S ARREST RECORDS AGREE WITH NCSO'S FABRICATED ONES.

(2.) (ii) P. 2 REC. ON APPEAL INDEX: HAS MY CHARGE DATE AS 9-7-2018 WITH NO CHARGE BEFORE IT. IN THEIR FABING FOLLY THEY FORGOT TO PUT ANY CHARGE IN FOR MAY 2018. NOTE: THERE IS NO GRAND TH. AUTO CHARGE IN INDEX AT ALL. I WROTE CLERK FOR IT, THEN RECEIVED MORE NONSENSE.

P. 2 REC. ON APPEAL INDEX: INDICTMENT FILED 9-7-2018 P. 31-33 & "ARREST & BOOKING 9-13-18 P. 34-38" PAGE 38 & 36 STATE CORRECTLY. (COUNT NUMBER)

"COUNT 1: 1ST DEG. MURDER"; THEY FABRICATED THE 9-7-2018 DATE. THIS CONTRADICTS THEIR FALSE CLAIM THAT CNT: 2 IS 1ST DEG. MURDER. (COUNT 1)

(2.) (iii) (SPECIAL PAGE NO. 5) P. 1 OF 2 (2 OF 2 ON BACK) "NCSO ARREST RECORD" NOT IN REC. APPEAL INDEX AT ALL. I WROTE CLERK FOR THIS RECORD. THEIR

FAB'D ARREST DATE OF 5-19-2018 FOR THEIR GR. TH. AUTO FAB'D CNT: 1 FAB'D CHG. CONTRADICTS THEIR FAB'D 5-16-18 DATE ON P. 2132 #1 FOR THIS.

(2.) (iv) P. 40 #2 SAYS MRS. J.C. DISAPPEARED 5-17-2018 AND CONTRADICTS P. 40 #5 (REC. ON APPEAL) THAT SAYS I'M "EXIL..." (A IN JAIL) SINCE 5-13-18.

HOW CAN I BE ACCUSED OF HER MURDER ON 5-13-18 WHEN SHE WAS SEEN ALIVE & WELL & DIDN'T DISAPPEAR UNTIL 5-17-2018? THEN

P. 2132 #1 SAYS I'M ARRESTED 5-16-18. IF I'M IN CUSTODY 5-13-18 OR EVEN 5-16-18, I CAN'T MAKE HER DISAPPEAR ON 5-17-2018 -

(STILL CONT'D) GROUND 32

IT'S IMPOSSIBLE. EGREGIOUS PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT: FAB'D SWITCHED COUNT NO.'S/DATES SO MUCH TRYING TO HIDE THEIR MISCONDUCT -

THIS IS JUST SOME OF THEIR FAB'D NONSENSE. VIOLATION DUE PROCESS. CONFLICT OF INTEREST COUNSEL. PER SE PREJUDICIAL ERROR.

(2)(v) P. 17, CASE ABSTRACT FILING INDEX (REC. ON APPEAL) DOCKET DATE & DOCKET DESCRIPTION: FAB'D FALSE CHARGES, IN FAB'D FALSE CNT ORDER:

SHOWS "CNT: 2" OCCURS IN THEIR FALSE RECORD "3" MONTHS BEFORE "CNT: 1" THAT'S IMPOSSIBLE - BUT THEY FAB'D IT UP ANYWAY.

P. 17 "CASE ABSTRACT FILING INDEX" (REC. ON APPEAL) IN TOP R.H. CORNER: "CASE FILE BEGIN" AND "CASE FILE END" DATES BOTH SHOW "12/30/1899."

THEY FABRICATED AND SWITCHED DATES, CHARGES, COUNT NO.'S SOOO MUCH - NOW DATE OUTRAGEOUSLY SHOWS "12/30/1899" SHAM CASE.

FABRICATED POISONOUS FRUIT FROM THE FABRICATED POISONOUS TREE. EGREGIOUS PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT. KANGAROO COURT.

GROUND 33

BESIDES THE PREVIOUS ARGUMENTS, I WAS DENIED EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL AT TRIAL IN THAT COUNSEL FAILED TO OBJECT TO FAULTY JURY

INSTRUCTION THAT MIS-DEFINES A WEAPON AS "ANY OBJECT."

VIOLATION DUE PROCESS.

SUPPORTING FACTS:

P. 3473 JUDGE'S INSTRUCTION TO JURY THAT DEFINITION OF "DANGEROUS WEAPON" IS "ANY OBJECT."

HOWEVER, FLORIDA CRIMINAL LAWS AND RULES DEFINES A WEAPON AS A WEAPON - NOT AS AN OBJECT OR ANY OBJECT.

THE JUDGE UNLAWFULLY DID THIS AND BY SO DOING FURTHER BIAS/PREJUDICE JURY AGAINST ME TO CONVICT OF CRIME(S) I NOT

COMMIT. THERE WAS NO MURDER - NOT FROM ME, AND DEFINITELY NO MURDER WEAPON - SO THEY CALL IT "ANY OBJECT."

GROUND 34

WHAT IS MORE, I WAS DENIED EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL AT TRIAL IN THAT COUNSEL WITHOUT MY KNOWLEDGE OR CONSENT SET ME

UP WITH "AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE" THAT HAS BURDEN THAT DEFENDANT PROVE SELF-DEFENSE, AND WITH COUNSEL'S LACK OF CANDOR & CONFLICT OF

INTEREST GOT GUARANTEED CONVICTION OF CRIME(S) I NOT COMMIT.

SUPPORTING FACTS:

FIRST COUNSEL DID JUST AS THEY INSTRUCTED JURY; THEY DID NOT DEFEND ME. P. 898 L. 21 → P. 899 L. 12

THEN COUNSEL MISREPRESENT ME TO JURY & MORE OF FIGHTING WITH MRS. J.C., WITH FRAUD DECEIT INFERIMALLY KILLED HER. P. 1922 L. 21-25

P. 1912 L. 18-20

LASTLY COUNSEL KEPT ME OUT OF TRIAL COURTROOM IN BASEMENT OF COURTHOUSE SO THAT I COULD NOT DEFEND MYSELF - AND WITH "AFFIRMA-

TIVE DEFENSE" SET ME UP FOR GUARANTEED CONVICTION OF CRIMES I NOT COMMIT. (TRIAL IN DEC. 2021) GROUNDS: 1, 3, 14, 16

* THIS #1 REASON ALL COMM. TO COUNSEL CEASED (DEC. 2018); THEY MISREPRESENT & FALSELY ACCUSE ME OF CRIME(S). COUNSEL DID ALL WITHOUT

MY KNOWLEDGE OR CONSENT - NO AUTHORIZATION: MISREPRESENTED ME FROM 2018-2022. PER SE CONFLICT OF INTEREST.

* I NEVER FOUGHT DISAGREE WITH MRS. J.C. - HAD NO PROBLEM WITH HER. ANY ALLEGATION TO THE CONTRARY IS FALSE. VIOLATION DUE PROCESS.

GROUND 35

MY DUE PROCESS RIGHTS VIOLATED IN COUNSEL'S INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE AT TRIAL IN THEIR FAILURE TO AVOID CONFLICTS OF INTEREST: COUNSEL SEPP WAS

FOR A PERIOD OF TIME FORMER COUNSEL & FALSELY TESTIFIED AGAINST ME. COUNSEL MILLER ALSO FALSE TESTIFIED/WITNESS AGAINST ME. BOTH WERE

ACTIVELY "DEFENSE COUNSEL" THRU TO END OF TRIAL, WITH FRAUD DECEIT MISREPRESENTED ME.

(WRAP-UP)

(CONT'D) REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

D. YOU SHOULD HAVE JUST COMPLETED READING GROUNDS THAT SUPPORT QUESTIONS, AND ARE HERE FOR WRAP-UP:

E. FROM P. 7 OF "GUIDE 13, REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION":

1. SENTENCE 3.(A): TRY TO SHOW... WHY THE DECISION OF THE LOWER COURT MAY BE ERRONEOUS, AND

2. SENTENCE 4.(C): IT IS IMPORTANT TO SHOW... THE WAYS THE DECISION OF THE LOWER COURT IN YOUR CASE WAS ERRONEOUS;

3. DUE TO KANGAROO TRIAL COURT'S SHAM INFLUENCE ON MY LOWER COURTS, THEY (LOWER COURTS) MAIN SHAM FOCUS IS IN:

(A) FALSE CLAIMS/FABRICATED RECORDS AGAINST MY JURISDICTION, ORDERS BELOW, AND PROPERLY/TIMELY FILED;

4. IN SECTION "JURISDICTION 14.1 (A)... P. 2-4 (APPENDIX A), I SOLIDLY DISPROVED U.S. CT. OF APPEALS 11TH CIR'S SHAM ORDER 4:23:2025 RECEIVED BY ME ON 5:8:2025 (APPENDIX A (F));

(B) APPENDIX B SHOWS THE SHAM IN U.S. CT. OF A. 11TH CIR ALLOWS MY CASE TO BE DENIED IN THE WRONG COURT - WRONG DIVISION/JAX DIV: VIOLATION 14TH AMEND. RIGHTS OF DUE PROCESS & EQUALITY: 28. § 1406 (A)... TRANSFER... CASE...

5. IN SECTION "STATEMENT OF THE CASE" P. PARAGRAPH C. (1-7), I BRIEFLY SUMMARIZED FOR ALL LOWER COURTS (APPENDIX A-H); AND

(B) SHOW FOR "SENTENCE 3 (A.) (ABOVE) FOR JURISDICTION, ORDERS BELOW, & PROPERLY/TIMELY FILED" (APPENDICES A-H);

6. IF YOU ARE ALREADY CONVINCED OF U.S. DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT FLORIDA (JAX DIVISION/WRONG DIVISION)'S VIOLATION OF MY 14TH AMEND. RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS & EQUALITY IN THEIR FALSE CLAIMS AND PARTICIPATION IN PRESENTING FALSE RECORDS (FROM KANGAROO TRIAL COURT) IN THEIR SHAM "ORDERS 2:24:25, E-FILED 2:24:25", THEN PLEASE GO ON AHEAD TO PARAGRAPH G. ON P.;

7. BUT, IF YOU ARE NOT ENTIRELY CONVINCED, OR IF YOU JUST WANT TO FOLLOW ALONG, THEN PLEASE GO TO (NEXT) PARAGRAPH F. AND PULL APPENDIX D;

F. APPENDIX D: "ORDER 2:24:2025, E-FILED 2:24:25" FOCUS ON PAGES 4 & 3 OF ORDER: RETALIATION AND FALSE CLAIMS:

U.S. DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT FLORIDA (JAX DIV./WRONG DIV.) WRONG DIVISION DENIED MY HABEAS.

1. ALL OF: WRONG VENUE / WRONG DIVISION / WRONG COURT (APPENDICES D (A) & B (C)), WITH FACT DENIED VENUE CHANGE 28. § 1406 (A)... TRANSFER... CASE TO ANY DISTRICT OR DIVISION... (APPENDIX B) & DENIED CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT 14TH AMEND. DUE PROCESS & EQUALITY, BROUGHT FORTH THE "6:12:25 WRIT OF CERT"; BUT NOW IS CONSOLIDATED INTO THIS WRIT OF CERT & MAINLY REPRESENTED IN APPENDIX B. ← APRIL 7, 2025 FIRST, THEN 6:12:25

2. BEGIN WITH PAGE 4 OF ORDER 2:24:2025, E-FILED 2:24:2025:

(A) RETALIATION BY JUDGE: TERMINATION OF MY IEP IF I APPEAL (APPENDIX D (2))

(B) LOOK AT PG. 4: CLERK SHALL TERMINATE (IEP)... SUCH TERMINATION SHALL SERVE AS DENIAL OF (APPEAL)... BUT

(C) MY IEP IS VALID, SEE DOCKET HISTORY (EFD) ENTRY 1:23:25 IT'S APPROVED (APPENDIX A (F) (1));

(D) THE JUDGE VIOLATED 14TH AMEND. RIGHTS OF DUE PROCESS & EQUALITY IN HER UNCONSTITUTIONAL DENIAL (RETALIATION) OF MY IEP IF I APPEAL HER DENIAL OF MY HABEAS IN HER "ORDER 2:24:25, E-FILED 2:24:25"

(STILL CONT'D) REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

③ REBUT JUDGE'S FALSE CLAIM ON C.O.A., MENTIONED ON P. 4 OF ORDER 2-24-25, E-FILED 2-24-25 WITH:

(a) "MOTION C.O.A. SHALL ISSUE: TITLE 28, § 2253, APPEAL (c)(2) SENT 3-11-25 DATESTAMP" (APPENDIX A (F)(4))

(b) SHOWS I WAS DENIED A CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT, AND THEREFORE C.O.A. SHALL ISSUE. (APPENDIX A (F)(4))

④ "PG. 3 OF ORDER 2-24-2025, E-FILED 2-24-25: (APPENDIX D (4)) STATE REMEDIES ARE EXHAUSTED SEE:

(a) "AMEND. POST-CONVICTION 3.850 8-22-2024" (APPENDIX POST → HABEAS);

(b) "ORDER E-FILED 9-7-24" SEE: MIDDLE OF PAGE: THEY (TRIAL CT) SAID THEY RECEIVED IT;

(c) "DOCKET HISTORY (STATE)" (2 PGS) SEE 10-5-24 ENTRY DATE SAYS DENIED POST 10-5-24;

(d) "THIS WAS MY NOTIFICATION" OF MY POSTCONVICTION GETTING DENIED ON 10-5-24 —

(e) "THEY FORGOT TO NOTIFY ME — I FOUND OUT 42 DAYS LATE VIA A DOCKET HISTORY (THAT I REQUESTED)

(f) "THEY INTENTIONALLY VIOLATED MY 14TH AMEND. RIGHTS OF DUE PROCESS & EQUALITY.

⑤ "PG. 3 OF ORDER 2-24-25, E-FILED 2-24-25": FURTHER IN REGARD TO STATE REMEDIES ARE EXHAUSTED:

(a) "PER TITLE 28, § 23.4 (a)(ii)(7) MUST SUBMIT HABEAS CORPUS WITHIN 1 YEAR;

(b) AND I DID: "HABEAS CORPUS 12-16-2024" (APPENDIX POST → HABEAS)

⑥ "SEE E-FILED 3-13-2025 → ORDER 2-24-2025 PG. 1-4":

(a) SAME AS "ORDER 2-24-25, E-FILED 2-24-25" — EXCEPT THE E-FILED DATES ARE DIFFERENT; BUT

(b) WHY THE DIFFERENT E-FILED DATES... ?!

⑦ SUMMARY FOR "ORDER 2-24-2025 - E-FILED 2-24-25":

(a) ALL ABOVE SOLIDLY REBUTS/DISPROVES ALL JUDGE'S FALSE CLAIMS IN "ORDER 2-24-25, E-FILED 2-24-25";

(b) NOTE: STATE OFFICIALS CONFISCATED MANY DOCUMENTS/THINGS FROM ME — BUT I HAVE:

(i) "DOCKET HISTORY- FEDERAL" & "PGS. 3 & 4 OF ORDER 2-24-25, E-FILED 2-24-25" — THANKS TO YOU.

(ii) I COPIED YOU WITH THESE DOCUMENTS, AND YOU RETURNED THEM TO ME — GOD BLESS YOU.

ALL FOR ORDER 2-24-25 E-FILED 2-24-25 REBUTTED/DISPROVED: END REVIEW APPENDIX D

⑧ FROM P.T. GUIDE...: 13 REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION; SENTENCE 3(b): TRY TO SHOW... THE NATIONAL IMPORTANCE OF HAVING THE SUPREME COURT DECIDE THE QUESTION INVOLVED";

1) WHAT HAS HAPPENED IN MY CASE IN REGARDS TO:

(a) RULE 10 (a): A UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS... HAS SO FAR DEPARTED... OR SANCTIONED SUCH A DEPARTURE BY A LOWER

(AND STILL CONT'D) REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

COURT, ...¹, AND

(b.) ALL THE KANGAROO TRIAL COURT SHAM / § 31.3 PER SE PREJUDICIAL ERRORS THAT GOES WITH IT;

(c.) ALL OF THIS GOES AGAINST ALL THAT OUR COUNTRY STANDS FOR AND IS FOUNDED ON;

(d.) "TO ESTABLISH JUSTICE... AND SECURE THE BLESSINGS OF LIBERTY..." PREAMBLE OF THE CONSTITUTION; AND

(e.) 14TH AMEND.: DUE PROCESS AND EQUALITY.

(f.) NO WHERE DOES IT SAY TO THROW ALL THAT AWAY — OUR JUSTICE, OUR LIBERTY, OUR DUE PROCESS AND EQUALITY — TO THROW IT ALL AWAY THROUGH INJUSTICE / MEDIA SENSATIONALIZATION & FABRICATION — TO MAKE A DOLLAR / FOR PROFIT;

(g.) THE ONLY ONES IN MY TRIAL COURTROOM WERE MEDIA AND THEM (KANGAROO TRIAL COURT);

(h.) NO ME, NO PUBLIC, NO JURY; — THAT'S WHY THEY KEPT JURY AND PUBLIC OUT: NO WITNESSES TO WHAT THEY DID — FABRICATED RECORDS / ALL RECORD INCLUDING & ESP. VIDEO RECORDS FAB'D: E.G. OF ME AND JURY KEPT OUT OF COURTROOM SEE QUESTIONS 1 & 3.

(i.) THE MEDIA IS NOT A "501(C)(3) NOT FOR PROFIT." THEY ARE "FOR PROFIT"; AND THEY WILL DO/SAY ANYTHING "FOR PROFIT" — AND IN MY CASE: THEY DID.

(j.) THEY, KANGAROO TRIAL COURT AND MEDIA, MADE A TON OF MONEY THROUGH FABRICATIONS OF, NOT ONLY COURT RECORDS, MED. / MENTAL HEALTH RECORDS, ETC., BUT ALSO OF FABRICATED VIDEO RECORDS / RECORDINGS;

(k.) WITH TECHNOLOGY TODAY, A.I., ETC, ANYTHING CAN BE EASILY FABRICATED / ALTERED — AND THEY DID — FOR PROFIT.

(l.) I REBUT/DISPROVE ALL THEIR FABRICATIONS AGAINST ME — I HAVE PROOF: JURY AND THE PUBLIC: EVEN IN THEIR ABSENCE — ARE MY WITNESSES. THEY NEVER HEARD OR SAW ME DO OR SAY ANY OF THE FALSE CLAIMS AGAINST ME — MATTER OF FACT THEY NEVER HEARD/SAW ME SAY/DO ANYTHING AT ALL.

(m.) AGAIN, THAT'S WHY KANGAROO TRIAL COURT KEPT THE JURY AND THE PUBLIC OUT OF THE TRIAL COURT-ROOM: NO WITNESSES TO WHAT THEY DID TO ME — THE TRUTH OF WHAT REALLY HAPPENED: BUT THEY'RE STILL MY WITNESSES — THEY DID NOT SEE/HEAR ANY OF THE FALSE CLAIMS AGAINST ME.

2.) AND AMERICA'S WATCHING: FABRICATION, EXPLOITATION OF THE POOR, FRAUD, MISREPRESENTATION:

ALL THEY DID TO ME IN THIS SHAM CASE — KANGAROO TRIAL COURT INFLUENCE ON LOWER COURTS — ¹RULE:

10(a) A U.S. COURT OF APPEALS HAS... SO FAR DEPARTED... OR SANCTIONED SUCH A DEPARTURE BY A LOWER COURT...¹ — THIS IS OF NATIONAL IMPORTANCE, AND ^{FRAUD}THIS IS NOT WHAT OUR COUNTRY STANDS FOR.

(END: SENT. 3 (b): SHOW NATIONAL IMPORTANCE.)

H.) FROM P. 7 GUIDE...¹ 13. REASONS FOR GRANTING...¹ SENTENCE 4 (b): THE IMPORTANCE OF THE CASE NOT ONLY TO YOU BUT TO OTHERS SIMILARLY SITUATED,¹

(AND STILL CONT'D...) REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION


- 1.) WHAT HAPPENED IN MY CASE: KANGAROO TRIAL COURT / PER SE PREJUDICIAL ERRORS (§ 31.3) / ¹ Rule 10(a) A.U.S.
COURT OF APPEALS HAS... SO FAR DEPARTED..., OR SANCTIONED SUCH A DEPARTURE...²; AND ALL THAT GOES
WITH THAT IN FABRICATIONS OF:
 - (a) COURT RECORDS,
 - (b) MED. / MENTAL HEALTH RECORDS,
 - (c) VIDEO RECORD, RECORDINGS — WITH TECHNOLOGY NOWADAYS IT'S EASY TO FAB. ANYTHING; (AND THEY DID.)
- 2.) AND I BELIEVE THIS HAPPENED MAINLY DUE TO MY FINANCIAL STATUS / POVERTY:
 - (a) UNABLE TO GET GOOD DEFENSE WITH A HIRED GOOD ATTORNEY;
 - (b) STUCK WITH EGREGIOUS, UNJUST, GREEDY, IN RE: TO JORDAN BEARD; RELATED TO VICTIM/MISSING PERSON,
GREEDY FOR FAME AND FORTUNE PUBLIC DEFENDERS; AND
 - (c) THE IMPORTANCE OF THIS CASE TO ALL THE POOR IN THIS COUNTRY:
 - (i) THERE ARE MANY POOR IN THIS COUNTRY, AND
 - (ii) THE POOR ARE ALWAYS AT RISK, BUT
- 3.) THIS CASE IS ALSO OF IMPORTANCE TO ANY ONE IN ANY FINANCIAL SITUATION AS,
- 4.) § 31.3 PER SE PREJUDICIAL ERROR; KANGAROO COURT; ¹ Rule 10(a)... A DEPARTURE...²;
- 5.) CAN DESTROY ANYONE.
- 6.) AND THIS GOES AGAINST ALL THAT OUR GREAT NATION IS FOUNDED ON:
 - (a) ¹... TO ESTABLISH JUSTICE... AND SECURE THE BLESSINGS OF LIBERTY...² PREAMBLE OF THE CONSTITUTION; AND
 - (b) 11TH AMENDMENT RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS AND EQUALITY.
- 7.) PLEASE, I PRAY, THAT THE GREATEST COURT IN THE WORLD IN THE GREATEST COUNTRY IN THE
WORLD — THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES — SEES THAT THE GRANTING OF THIS
PETITION IS OF HELP TO US ALL.

GOD BLESS U.S.A.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

 - J81354
KIMBERLY LEE KESSIER - J81354

Date: SEPTEMBER 10, 2025