

25-6013 REH'G EN BANC TRIAL DE NOVO
No.

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

KIMBERLY LEE KESSLER — 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)

REHEARING EN BANC TRIAL DE NOVO

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

PER RULE 14.1(c)(vi); TITLE 28, § 753(b)(3): ... TRANSCRIPT... RECORD SHALL BE DEEMED PRIMA FACIE...
PRIMA FACIE, SUFFICIENT... UNLESS DISPROVED OR REBUTTED. (OVERTHROWN BY EVIDENCE, ARGUMENT, OR PROOF.)
I REBUT & DISPROVE THEIR FABRICATIONS; PLEASE COMPARE MY RECORDS IN APPENDICES TO WHAT THEY GIVE YOU.

KIMBERLY LEE KESSLER - 181354
(Your Name)

11120 N.W. GAINESVILLE RD.
(Address)

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

LOWELL C.I. MAIN UNIT
(Phone Number)

PROVIDED TO:
Lowell Correctional Main Unit
JAN 20 2026
BY KJK for mailing

PER RULE 44.2: ADD Q0 & Q11:

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED:

QUESTION 0: 11TH CIR. NOTICE ADVISED DISMISSAL DATE THEY DID NOT ADHERE TO IN ORDER TO RUIN MY JURISDICTION:

I DID ADHERE TO THEIR NOTICE'S DISMISSAL DATE: VIOLATION DUE PROCESS & EQUALITY: PROVE MY JURISDICTION IS GOOD.

↑
[REVEAL SHAM WITH TRIAL COURT]

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

① CHARACTERIZED BY IRREGULAR OR UNAUTHORIZED PROCEDURES... SOURCE: BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 9TH EDITION.

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

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

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

QUESTION 5: KANGAROO COURT WITH COUNSEL INTUXTS JURY: COUNSEL'S NOT DEENDING ME.

QUESTION 6: KANGAROO COURT (COUNSEL, PROSECUTOR, JUDGE) TWICE FABRICATE WHAT TO TELL JURY, WITHOUT MY KNOWLEDGE OR CONSENT, ABOUT THEIR PREDICTION OF MY ABSENCE FROM TRIAL BEFORE TRIAL EVER BEGAN.

QUESTION 7: KANGAROO COURT CONSPIRES WITH PROSECUTOR TO HIDE MISCONDUCT IN 4TH, 5TH, 14TH AMEND. VIOLATIONS AND SWITCH COUNT No.s w/ FAB'D DATES & FABRICATED ADDER CHARGE: CAN'T HAVE 1ST DEG. MURDER SHG. ON ME FOR A MISSING PERSON WHO WHEN THEY ARRESTED ME FOR THIS SHE'S MISSING 2-3 DAYS, NO D.M.A. NO BODY & SHE'S STILL MISSING; THEIR WHOLE SHAM CASE AGAINST ME FALLS APART. IF THEY KEEP THE TRUE COUNT/CHG ORDER: CNT. 1: 1ST DEG. MURDER 201B-CF-BIS; CNT. 2: GRAND THEFT AUTO 201B-CF-373; (AFTER I SENT POSTCONV. THEY DID FRAUD MOTION TO HIDE THIS: (APPENDIX G))

QUESTION 8: KANGAROO COURT GIVES STIPULATION TO JURY THAT THEY MUST ACCEPT ALL WITNESS & EVIDENCE AS TRUE

↑ (FALSE) ↑ (FAB'D)

QUESTION 9: KANGAROO COURT GIVES JURY INSTRUCTIONS THAT ALLOW ALL WITNESS TO BE FALSE & ALL EVIDENCE FAB'D.

QUESTION 10: KANGAROO COURT ALLOWS DECEITFUL COUNSEL TO CHANGE MY PLEA WITHOUT MY KNOWLEDGE OR CONSENT TO HOLD CONTENDERE.

QUESTION 11: I CAN'T GET AN AUTHENTIC TRUE UNTAMPERED WITH PETITION TO YOU BECAUSE MY MAIL IS TAMPERED WITH.

(KANGAROO TRIAL COURT 11TH CIRCUIT JURISDICTION)

LIST OF PARTIES

All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

↑ 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, NO. 25-6013 (WRIT NO. 25-10811) WRIT OF CERT. TO SUPREME COURT OF THE U.S.
- KESSLER V. FLORIDA, No. 25-5266, E.W. OF HABEAS CORPUS TO SUPREME COURT OF THE U.S.

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

- KESSLER V. FLORIDA, No. 25-10811J, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS 11TH CIR., PER RULE 10(a) DEPARTED ^{RULES OF THE SUPREME COURT} 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-MCA-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. 3.85D(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 E)
- 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
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....	8-11
CONCLUSION.....	12

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 - CLARK 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** → 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 9-10-2025:** SHOWS SHAM IN 11TH CIRCUIT RE: No. 25-6013 SENT 9-10-2025.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>STRICKLAND V. WASHINGTON</u>. A REASONABLE PROBABILITY IS PROBABILITY SUFFICIENT TO UNDERMINE CONFIDENCE IN THE OUTCOME. [410 U.S. 1028 (1984)] 	→ APPLIES TO ALL Q'S = G'S
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "BRADY ERROR" <u>BRADY V. MARYLAND</u> (1963), ... SUPPRESSED... EVIDENCE... [373 U.S. 83 (1963)] 	→ APPLIES TO ALL Q'S = G'S
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>SHAW V. FLORIDA</u>. <u>AARON RAMON SHAW V. STATE OF FLORIDA</u>. OPINION SEPT. 11, 2020; OPINION { 302 So. 3d 504 } JUDGE NORTH CUTT. 	→ Q1: P. ; Q3: P. ; Q6: P. ;
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>SHEPPARD V. MAXWELL</u> (1966) MASSIVE, PIERVASIVE, AND PREJUDICIAL PRETRIAL PUBLICITY AND CIRCUS-STYLE ATMOSPHERE AT TRIAL. [384 U.S. 333 (1966)] 	→ APPLIES TO ALL Q'S = G'S
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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 GRABING THE VICTIM BY THE NECK..., WHILE POTENTIALLY AN ADMISSION OF A CRIME LIKE DOMESTIC BATTERY, DID NOT EVINCE GUILT FOR 2ND DEG. MURDER. CONVICTION REVERSED... FOR JUDGMENT OF ACQUITTAL. [43 So. 3d 100; 2010 Fla. App. LEXIS 11750; 35 FLA. 1. WEEKLY 1825; No. 4208-7028 AUGUST 11, 2010, DECIDED] 	→ APPLIES TO ALL Q'S = G'S
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>U.S. V. WILLIAMS</u> (2d Cir. 2004). A PER SE CONFLICT OF INTEREST REQUIRES AUTOMATIC REVERSAL WITHOUT A SHOWING OF PREJUDICE [372 F.3d 96, 103 (2d Cir. 2004)] 	→ APPLIES TO ALL Q'S = G'S

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 INJURY OR POTENTIALLY SERIOUS INJURY TO THE CLIENT. SERIOUS

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 NEGLIGENCE 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.

PRIMA FACIE: SUFFICIENT... UNLESS DISPROVED OR REBUTTED.

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.
IN THE
I HAVE PROOF.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

TITLE 28, § 703 (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 FAB 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 THIS PETITION & QUESTION C
[] 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 & APPENDIX G.
[] 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 E)

A.K.A. QUESTION

JURISDICTION RULE 14.1(e), "RULE 10(a); U.S. COURT OF APPEALS... DEPARTED," AND "RULE 20.1 EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES"

RULE 14.1(e)(1) A CONCISE STATEMENT OF THE BASIS FOR JURISDICTION IN THIS COURT, SHOWING: THE DATE THE JUDGMENT OR ORDER SOUGHT TO BE REVIEWED WAS ENTERED; IF THE DATE OF ITS ENTRY IS DIFFERENT FROM THE DATE RULE 14.1(i)(i):

I REBUT DISPROVE THEIR FRAUD FALSE 4-23-25 DATE: FINDINGS OF FACT RULE 14.1(i)(i): THEIR DISMISSAL NOTICES STATED DIFFERENTLY.

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 POWERS;

RULE 20.1 THAT EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES WARRANT THE EXERCISE OF THE COURT'S DISCRETIONARY POWERS.

ATTACH IN APPENDIX A:

APPENDIX A FOR ALL BELOW UNLESS STATED OTHERWISE

A) REVIEW OF... APRIL 23, 2025... JURISDICTION... RULE 14.1(e) FROM AUG 4, 2025 CLERK LETTER RE: USA211 No. 25-10811, RECEIVED AUG 11, 2025. IN APPENDIX MAIL. ALL BELOW WILL CLARIFY MY JURISDICTION IS GOOD & REVEAL U.S. COURT OF APPEALS SHAM/FRAUD'S

B) U.S. COURT OF APPEALS 11TH CIR. SAID IN THEIR 3-13-25 DATED DOCKET NOTICE THAT MY APPEAL HABEAS CORPUS SENT 3-17-25 (ATTACH) WOULD BE DISMISSED WITHIN 14 DAYS OF THIS NOTICE... BE DISMISSED WITHOUT FURTHER NOTICE; I RECEIVED 3-13-25 NOTICE ON 3-24-2025 SEE ENVELOPE 3-24-25 DATESTAMP RECEIVED.

- 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 APPEAL - 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 AND REFILE BUT THAT THEY PUT THE WRONG DATE;
- 5) THEREFORE, PER THEIR 3-13-25 NOTICE W/ 14 DAY DEADLINE MY APPEAL HABEAS CORPUS WAS DISMISSED ON 3-27-2025; THAT'S 3-13-25 DATE PLUS 14 DAY DEADLINE EQUALS 3-27-25; JUDGMENT DATE/JURISDICTION DATE ENTERED SHOULD BE 3-27-25; THEY DID NOT ADHERE TO THEIR NOTICE, BUT I DID;

C) THEIR 4-1-25 DATE NOTICE - NO DEADLINES EXTENDED SUPPORTS 3-27-25 DISMISSAL DATE: JURISDICTION DATE ENTERED SHOULD BE 3-27-2025; THEY DID NOT ADHERE TO THEIR NOTICE, BUT I DID;

D) IN RULE 10(a) DEPARTED FASHION, U.S. CT. OF APPEALS 11TH CIR. SENT 4-2-25 DATED DISMISSAL NOTICE THAT SAYS CONTRADICTIONS AND CONFUSION SEE 4-2-2025 NOTICE DISMISSAL (ATTACH) & 4-7-25 NOTICE NO DEADLINES EXTENDED (ATTACH);

- 1) APPEAL WILL BE DISMISSED WITHOUT FURTHER NOTICE UPON THE EXPIRATION OF 14 DAYS FROM DATE OF THIS NOTICE - BUT THEIR LAST 2 NOTICES ADVISED IT WAS DISMISSED ON 3-27-25 & WITH NO DEADLINES EXTENDED...!?
- 2) THEY SAID TO FILE SUCH AND SUCH (UNCONSTITUTIONAL), AND
- 3) I DID NOT FILE ANYTHING BECAUSE MY APPEAL HABEAS CORPUS WAS ALREADY DISMISSED 3-27-25 (PER 3-13-25 NOTICE);

4) SO NOW I HAVE ANOTHER DISMISSAL DATE 4:16:2025; THAT'S 4:2:25 NOTICE DATE PLUS 14 DAYS DEADLINE EQUAL 4:16:25; MY APPEAL HABEAS CORPUS SENT ON 3:17:25 WAS DISMISSED TWICE: 3:27:25 & 4:16:25. (CRAZY).

5) I TIMELY PROPERLY SUBMITTED PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS TO (YOU) SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES ON 4:18:2025 (APPENDIX A). THEY DID NOT ADHERE TO THEIR OWN NOTICES; BUT I DID.

6) THEIR NOTICES ADVISED 3:27:25 & 4:16:25 AS APPEAL DISMISSAL DATES; RIGHTFULLY 3:27:25 OR 4:16:25 IS JUDGMENT ENTERED DATE.

E) U.S.C. 18 § 1341(D) USE OF MAIL IN EXECUTION OF SCHEMES; RULE 10(A) U.S. COURT OF APPEALS... HAS SO FAR DEPARTED...

PLEASE NOTE: THE 3:13:25 DATE ON THEIR NOTICE (DOCKET) IS WRONG — SERIOUSLY WRONG. (APPENDIX A FOR ALL BELOW)

1) THEY ADDRESSED MY 3:17:25 SENT APPEAL HABEAS CORPUS IN THEIR 3:13:25 DATED NOTICE DOCKET & 14 DAY (CASE No.);

2) HOW CAN THEY ADDRESS MY APPEAL H.C. I SENT 3:17:25 IN THEIR 3:13:25 DATED NOTICE — ASSIGN CASE No./DOCKET INFO?

(a) BECAUSE THEIR 3:13:25 DATE IS WRONG.

3) HOW CAN THEY SAY IN THEIR 3:13:25 DATED NOTICE TO REFUSE & INCLUDE... (UNCONSTITUTIONAL) WITH THE REVEILED 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 3:13:25 FRAUD DATE WAS RECEIVED ON 3:24:2025; SEE ENVELOPE WITH 3:24:25 DATE STAMP

RECEIVED;

(a) BECAUSE THEIR 3:13:25 DATE IS WRONG.

5) THEY DID "RULE 10(A) SO FAR DEPARTED" & "U.S.C. 18 § 1341(D) MAIL SCHEMES ON POSTAGE ON ENVELOPE";

(a) SEE THEIR METERED EASY TO FABRICATE FRAUD POSTAGE DATE; USE OF MAIL IN EXECUTION OF SCHEMES; U.S.C. 18 § 1341(D)

(b) TO SEE MORE OF WHAT THEY'VE DONE IN "SO FAR DEPARTED" CRIMINAL OFFENSE SEE APPENDIX MAIL WITH ADDED QUESTION; RULE 44

E) THEN, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS ENTERS FRAUD FALSE 4:23:25 JUDGMENT DATE; THEY DID NOT ADHERE TO THEIR NOTICES ADVISED DATES

OF 3:27:25 & 4:16:25. (SEE PARAG'S B, C, D ABOVE); THEIR OTHER FALSE CLAIMS IN "ORDER 4:23:25 REBUT/DISPROVE WITH;

1) "DOCKET HISTORY — FEDERAL" SEEMS I'M APPROVED "IFP" ON 1:23:2025;

2) "IN FORMA PAUPERIS (IFP) MOTION" 1:9:2025; APPENDIX C; THIS MOTION GOT THE 1:23:25 APPROVAL (ABOVE);

3) I REBUT/DISPROVE THEIR C.I.P. DEMANDS WITH BELOW; — THEY VIOLATED MY DUE PROCESS & EQUALITY WITH IT.

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

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

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

4) MY MOTION C.O.A. SHALL ISSUE; U.S.C. 28 § 2253, APPEAL(C)(2) SENT 3:11:2025;

(a) THEY VIOLATED MY DUE PROCESS WHEN THEY MOORED MY "MOTION C.O.A. SENT 3:11:25" WITH THEIR UNCONSTITUTIONAL C.I.P. DEMAND — IT DOESN'T APPLY; I'M NOT A CORPORATION.

(b) IN THIS MOTION I PROVED I WAS DENIED A CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT; I MADE A SUBSTANTIAL SHOWING OF IT;

- (c) THE GROUNDS IN C.O.A. MOTION MIRROR QUESTIONS IN MY PETITION WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS;
 (d) THEY USED FALSE UNCONSTITUTIONAL C.I.P. DEMAND TO FALSELY MOOT MY "MOTION C.O.A. 3-11-25"; AND,
 (e) THEY DENIED MY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO APPEAL, AND 14TH AMEND. RIGHTS DUE PROCESS & EQUALITY.

(4) SUMMARY: ALL FALSE CLAIMS IN ORDER 4-23-25 DISPROVED REBUTED ABOVE ESP PARAGRAPH F; (U.S. COURT OF APPEALS);
 1) JURISDICTION RULE 14.1 (e) PROVED IN PARAGRAPH'S B-F ABOVE; REVEALED THEIR SHAM IN FRAPID 4-23-25 DATE;
 2) THEIR SHAM FALSE CLAIMS & FABRICATED FALSE DATES: THEY DID IT ALL FOR KANGAROO TRIAL COURT; THEY SANCTIONED
 SUCH A DEPARTURE BY A LOWER COURT; RULE 10 (a); THIS WARRANTS THE EXERCISE OF THE COURT'S DISCRETIONARY
 POWERS; RULE 20.1 (U.S. COURT OF APPEALS 11TH CIRCUIT).

H. IT IS IMPORTANT TO SHOW... THE WAYS THE DECISION OF THE LOWER COURT IN YOUR CASE WAS ERRONEOUS. (SOURCE: P. 7 OF
 "GUIDE... REASONS FOR GRANTING... SENTENCE 4 (c).")

MY RESPONSE:

- 1) FOR THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT FLORIDA (JAX DIX) SEE ORDER 2-24-25 E-FILED 2-24-25 IN (APPENDIX D)
 I REBUT DISPROVE ALL THEIR FALSE CLAIMS WITH:
 (a) MY IEP IS VALID; SEE FEDERAL DOCKET HISTORY ENTRY DATE 1-23-2025 IN (APPENDIX A (F) (1));
 (b) I WAS DENIED A CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT; SEE C.O.A. MOTION: 28. § 2253. APPEAL. (c)(2) SENT 3-11-25 (APPENDIX A (F) (4));
 (c) STATE REMEDIES ARE EXHAUSTED; SEE:
 (i) AMEND. POSTCONVICTION 3.850 SENT 8-22-24 (APPENDIX G);
 (ii) ORDER E-FILED 9-7-2024 (APPENDIX G); SEE MIDDLE OF PAGE: THEY SAID THEY RECEIVED IT;
 (iii) STATE DOCKET HISTORY (2 PGS) SEE: ENTRY DATE 10-5-24 POSTCONVICTION DENIED (APPENDIX G)
 (d) I MUST SUBMIT HABEAS CORPUS WITHIN 1 YEAR; TITLE 28. § 23.4 (a)(ii)(1); AND I DID:
 (i) HABEAS CORPUS SENT 12-10-24; THEY SAID THEY GOT IT, SEE: FED. DOCKET HISTORY (APPENDIX A (F) (4)); &
 (ii) MEMORANDUM DATED 12-31-24; THEY SAID THEY GOT IT; (APPENDIX C (5)).

SUMMARY FOR "H" ↑ ABOVE: SHOWS U.S. DIST. COURT MIDDLE DIST. FLORIDA (JAX DIX), THEIR DECISION WAS ERRONEOUS (SHAM) IN THEIR ORDER 2-24-25 E-FILED 2-24-25 (APPENDIX D).

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 QUESTION O & 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 _____.

An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) in Application No. ___ A ____.

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, ^{AGAINST} 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 (OR TREATED) AS HARMLESS ERROR."

SOURCE: FED. HAB. CORPUS PRAC. & PROC.:

§ 31.4 STANDARDS, CRITERIA, & PROCEDURES FOR ASSESSING HARMLESSNESS (S.) 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. 28, § 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."

"U.S.C. 28, § 89. FLORIDA FERNANDINA BEACH IS IN NASSAU COUNTY AND IS COUNTY WHERE MY TRIAL WAS IN — FERNANDINA BEACH IS CORRECT DIVISION FOR MY CASE; (NOT JAX DIVISION). (JAX DIV. IS HOME OF CORRUPT TRIAL COURT JUDGE — HIS SPHERE OF CORRUPT INFLUENCE.)"

"U.S.C. 28, § 23.4 (a) (ii) (T) REQUIRING EXHAUSTION WOULD CAUSE IRREPARABLE INJURY TO THE PETITIONER'S RIGHTS FOR SOME OTHER REASON, INCLUDING ~~REASON~~ THAT LINDRE DELAY IN STATE COURT'S RISKS MOOTING PETITIONER'S FEDERAL RIGHTS BEFORE HE REACHES FEDERAL COURTS."

"U.S.C. 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 CONSTITUTION: TO ESTABLISH JUSTICE ... AND SECURE THE BLESSINGS OF LIBERTY TO OURSELVES AND OUR POSTERITY ...

PREAMBLE OF BILL OF RIGHTS: EXTENDING THE CIRCUM OF PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN THE GOVERNMENT, WILL BEST ENSURE THE BENEFICIENT ENDS OF ITS INSTITUTION.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE: Rule 14.1 (g):

A) Rule 14.1 (i) (vi) ANY OTHER MATERIAL WHO UNDERSTAND THE PETITION, APPLIES THROUGH-OUT THIS PETITION:

- 1) PLEASE USE RECORDS ATTACHED IN APPENDICES, AND COMPARE MY RECORDS TO WHAT THEY GIVE YOU;
- 2) THIS IS IMPORTANT BECAUSE AT TRIAL I HAD KANGAROO COURT THAT AFFECTED ALL MY LOWER COURT PROCEEDINGS;
- 3) I REBUT DISPROVE THEIR FABRICATIONS FALSE RECORDS/TRANSCRIPTS, E.S.P. VIDEO RECORDS WITH:
 - (a) U.S.C. 28. § 753 (b)(3): TRANSCRIPT RECORD SHALL BE DEEMED PRIMA FACIE.
 - (b) PRIMA FACIE SUFFICIENT... UNLESS DISPROVED OR REBUTTED. REBUT OVERTHROWN BY ARGUMENT, EVIDENCE, OR PROOF.
 - (c) AND I DO HAVE PROOF: e.g. G11/Q11: Clerk in YOUR MAINROOM IS MY WITNESS - THEY RECEIVE MY MAIL TAMPERED WITH: LATE & MORE.

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

- 1) STATEMENT OF THE CASE: U.S. COURT OF APPEALS 11TH CIRCUIT UNDER THE PREJUDICIAL INFLUENCE OF KANGAROO TRIAL COURT WITH § 31.3 PER SE PREJUDICIAL ERROR DENIED MY APPEAL HABEAS CORPUS SENT 3:17:25 (APPENDIX A) WITH FAB'D RECORDS AND FALSE CLAIMS ALL ARE DISPROVED IN P. 2-4 OF THIS PETITION; PROVE MY JURISDICTION IS GOOD. I AM IN CUSTODY IN VIOLATION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES, U.S.C. § 2241 (c)(3); THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT PARTICIPATED IN TRIAL COURT'S SHAM BECAUSE: RULE 10(a) H 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 DID NOT GET A FAIR PROCEEDING, HAD NO CHANCE TO DISPROVE REBUT THEIR FALSE CHARGES AGAINST ME? VIOLATION DUE PROCESS & EQUALITY.

C) 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.

- 1) THE BASIS IS: I HAD KANGAROO TRIAL COURT & ALL THE SHAM THAT GOES WITH IT: RULE 10(b) A U.S. COURT OF APPEALS... HAS SO FAR DEPARTED... OR SANCTIONED SUCH A DEPARTURE BY A LOWER COURT, AS TO CALL FOR AN EXERCISE OF THIS COURT'S SUPERVISORY POWER. I NEED YOUR HELP - AN EXERCISE OF YOUR SUPERVISORY POWER.

END: STATEMENT OF THE CASE

RULE 44.2: ADD Q0 & Q11

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION: Rule 14.1 (h):

QUESTION 0: 11TH CIRCUIT NOTICE ADVISED OF DISMISSAL DATE THAT THEY DID NOT ADHERE TO IN ORDER TO RUIN MY JURISDICTION; I DID ADHERE TO THEIR NOTICE'S DISMISSAL DATE: VIOLATION DUE PROCESS & EQUALITY. SEE P. 2-4 JURISDICTION FOR THIS; ALSO REVEALED SHAM FRAUD IN TRIAL COURT/LOWER COURTS WITH THEIR FALSE CLAIMS; PROVE MY JURISDICTION IS GOOD; P. 2-4 THIS PETITION.

REVEAL SHAM WITH TRIAL COURT

Rule 44.2: ITS GROUNDS SHALL BE LIMITED TO INTERVENING CIRCUMSTANCES OF A SUBSTANTIAL OR CONTROLLING EFFECT OR TO OTHER SUBSTANTIAL GROUNDS NOT PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED. SO THE GROUNDS ARE LIMITED TO GROUND 0 (ABOVE).

AND GROUND 11 (NEXT):

QUESTION II: I CAN'T GET AN AUTHENTIC TRUE UNTAMPERED WITH PETITION TO YOU BECAUSE MY MAIL IS TAMPERED WITH:

(11TH CIRCUIT JURISDICTION). MY MAIL TO YOU/COURT ESP. PETITIONS IS EAGEROUSLY TAMPERED WITH BEFORE YOU EVER RECEIVE

IT SO THAT YOU NEVER AUTHENTIC TRUE RECEIVE WHAT I SENT: e.g. 9-10-25 DATESTAMP WRIT OF HABEAS (SEE 9-10-25

PROOF OF SERVICE PAGE DATESTAMP ON PETITION) THAT I SENT TO YOU AND THE TAMPERED WITH CRAZY VERSION THAT YOU RECEIVED (54) DAYS LATER

AND DOCKETED 11-3-25 (SEE "DOCKET HISTORY" IN "APPENDIX 9-10-25") IS NOT THE SAME "9-10-25 WRIT OF HABEAS" I SENT. THEY TAMPERED WITH IT (54) DAYS BEFORE THEY LET YOU HAVE IT. VIOLATION DUE PROCESS & EQUALITY. THEN IT WAS DENIED.

A) THEY, 11TH CIR. & KANSAS TRIAL COURT, HAVE AN ESTABLISHED PATTERN OF TAMPERING WITH MY MAIL ESP. PETITIONS TO YOU:

① LOOK WHAT THEY DID TO MY HABEAS CORPUS SENT 6-17-25 (APPENDIX MAIL) SEE "AUG. 4, 2025 CLERK LETTER RE: 25-5266

RECEIVED AUG. 11, '25" IT STATES 6-17-25 HABEAS CORPUS WAS PLACED ON DOCKET AUG. 4, '25 - THAT'S (48) DAYS LATER AFTER I

SENT IT: THEY TAMPERED WITH IT (48) DAYS BEFORE THEY LET YOU HAVE IT. THEN THE TAMPERED WITH CRAZY VERSION YOU

RECEIVED GOT DENIED (SEE "OCT. 10, 2025 CLERK LETTER" IN "APPENDIX MAIL"): IT DOESN'T SAY WHY IT WAS DENIED; I

NEVER GOT THE PETITION BACK TO SEE WHAT HAPPENED WITH IT, TAMPERED WITH HABEAS. VIOLATION DUE PROCESS & EQUALITY.

② LOOK WHAT THEY DID TO MY "REH'G HABEAS CORPUS SENT NOV. 10, '25" (APPENDIX MAIL):

• "NOV. 3, '25 CLERK LETTER" TELLS WHY NOV. 10, '25 REH'G HABEAS WAS SENT; (APPENDIX MAIL):

• "COVERSHEET NOV. 10, 2025 DATESTAMP REH'G HABEAS" SHOWS IT WAS SENT NOV. 10, '25: (APPENDIX MAIL);

• "DOCKET HISTORY" SHOWS RECEIVED & DOCKETED ON NOV. 25, 2025 (APPENDIX MAIL) - (15) DAYS LATER - THEY TAMPERED WITH IT (15) DAYS BEFORE THEY LET YOU HAVE IT. 11TH CIR./K. TRIAL COURT

• THEN THE TAMPERED WITH CRAZY VERSION WAS DENIED, SEE "DEC. 15, '25 CLERK LETTER" (APPENDIX MAIL): IT DOESN'T SAY WHY AND I NEVER GOT THE PETITION BACK TO SEE, ALTHOUGH I'VE REQUESTED THEM BACK MANY TIMES.

③ SEE APPENDIX MAIL UNDER HEADING: "MAIL FROM CLERK TELLS MY MAIL RECEIVED LATE IS TAMPERED WITH...": PATTERN OF LATE MAIL SHOWS PATTERN OF MY MAIL IS TAMPERED WITH:

• ON EACH CLERK LETTER IT LISTS MAIL ENCLOSED THAT IS LATE ^{WHETHER} THE CLERK USES IT OR I DO:

• WITHIN "APPENDIX 9-10-25" & "APPENDIX MAIL" SHOWS THAT WITHIN 11TH CIRCUIT JURISDICTION IS AN ESTABLISHED PATTERN THAT MY MAIL IS TAMPERED WITH & PROOF THAT MY PETITIONS WERE TAMPERED WITH: [To You] [To You]

VIOLATION 14TH AMEND. DUE PROCESS & EQUALITY

"PER RULE 19.3 COUNSEL SHALL ENTER APPEARANCES. I AM MY OWN COUNSEL - PRO SE; I REQUEST THE COURT LET ME ENTER MY APPEARANCE - PHYSICALLY IN-PERSON - IN THE LEAST TO ENSURE THAT MY PETITION THAT YOU RECEIVE IS AUTHENTIC TRUE UNTAMPERED WITH."

END OF EXPLAINING QUESTION 0 & QUESTION II

A.) IT IS IMPORTANT TO READ "RULE 10" AND ADDRESS WHAT COMPELLING REASONS EXIST FOR THE EXERCISE OF THE COURT'S DISCRETIONARY JURISDICTION. (SOURCE: P.T. GUIDE... WRIT OF CERT.)

MY RESPONSE:

I BELIEVE, AND ALSO THAT THE COURT WILL AGREE, THAT QUESTIONS 0-11 IN THIS PETITION ARE COMPELLING REASONS FOR THE EXERCISE OF THE COURT'S DISCRETIONARY JURISDICTION; ESP. SINCE THEY DID FRAUD IN JURISDICTION SEE QUESTION 0. SEE QUESTIONS PRESENTED PAGE

B.) IT IS IMPORTANT TO SHOW... THE WAYS THE DECISION OF THE LOWER COURT IN YOUR CASE WAS ERRONEOUS. (P.T. GUIDE...)

MY RESPONSE:

- 1.) SEE QUESTION 0 & P. 2-4 OF THIS PETITION; SHOWS SHAM LOWER COURTS DID TO RUIN MY JURISDICTION;
- 2.) ESP. TRIAL COURT SHAM SAY "POSTCONVICTION" IS PENDING;
- 3.) SEE DOCKET HISTORY STATE (APPENDIX G); MY "AMENDED POSTCONVICTION WAS DENIED 10.5.2024."

C.) TRY TO SHOW... THE NATIONAL IMPORTANCE OF HAVING THE SUPREME COURT DECIDE THE QUESTION INVOLVED. (P.T. GUIDE)

MY RESPONSE:

- 1.) I HAD KANGAROO TRIAL COURT AND RAISED THOSE ISSUES IN QUESTIONS 1-10 IN WRIT OF CERT SENT 9.10.2025; BUT,
- 2.) THE ISSUES NEVER MADE IT TO YOU THE COURT DUE TO MAKE SHAM FROM KANGAROO TRIAL COURT / 11TH CIRCUIT / AND "RULE 10 (a) SO FAR DEPARTED" MISCONDUCT; SO,
- 3.) I RAISED THOSE ISSUES IN QUESTION 0 & QUESTION 11 IN THIS REH-G PETITION:
QUESTION 0: THEIR, (11TH CIRCUIT & KANGAROO TRIAL COURT), FRAUD SHAM IN JURISDICTIONS, AND,
QUESTION 11: THEIR KEEPING MY PETITIONS, FROM MR AN INCARCERATED INDIVIDUAL, FROM EVER REACHING THE COURT UN TAMPERED WITH —
- 4.) THEY VIOLATED 14TH AMEND. RIGHTS OF DUE PROCESS & EQUALITY AND HAVING THE SUPREME COURT DECIDE THESE IMPORTANT QUESTIONS IS OF NATIONAL IMPORTANCE.

D.) THE IMPORTANCE OF THE CASE NOT ONLY TO YOU BUT TO OTHERS SIMILARLY SITUATED. (P.T. GUIDE... WRIT OF CERT)

- 1.) I WOULD LIKE TO BEGIN WITH THAT I BELIEVE ALL THIS INJUSTICE WENT AS FAR AS IT DID DUE TO MY FINANCIAL STATE / POVERTY;
- 2.) UNABLE TO HIRE AN ATTORNEY — STUCK WITH EGREGIOUS "RULE 10 (a) SO FAR DEPARTED" CREW; 11TH CIRCUIT & KANGAROO TRIAL COURT AND BEING INCARCERATED WITHIN THEIR EGREGIOUS JURISDICTION (TAMPERING WITH MY PETITIONS TO YOU) —
- 3.) THE CASE IS IMPORTANT TO ME AS I HOPE TO SOMEHOW GET REFORM WITHIN 11TH CIRCUIT'S JURISDICTION — THE INJUSTICE CORRUPTION MISCONDUCT I WITNESSED WAS/IS SHOCKING.
- 4.) THE IMPORTANCE OF THE CASE IS FOR ALL THE POOR WHO ARE SIMILARLY SITUATED; THE POOR ARE ALWAYS AT RISK AND NEED HELP;

5) BUT I WISH TO EMPHASIZE THIS CASE IS IMPORTANT TO ANYONE IN ANY FINANCIAL SITUATION AS KANGAZOO
COURT AND RULE 10(a) SO FAR DEPARTED MISCONDUCT CAN DESTROY ANYONE.

6) AND THAT GOES AGAINST ALL THAT OUR GREAT NATION IS FOUNDED ON:

7) "TO ESTABLISH JUSTICE... AND SECURE THE BLESSINGS OF LIBERTY." (PREAMBLE OF CONSTITUTION), AND,
THE 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHTS DUE PROCESS & EQUALITY.

8) 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

REH'G EN BANC TRIAL DE NOVO

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

 - J81354

Kimberly Lee Kessier - J81354

Date: JANUARY 28, 2026 WED.

PROVIDED TO:
Lowell Correctional Main Unit on:

~~JAN 20 2026~~

BY: JKK for mailing

PROVIDED TO:
Lowell Correctional Main Unit on:

JAN 28 2026

BY: JKK for mailing

**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**