

No. 25-6190

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

In Re STEVEN DALE BRADLEY — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

VS,

GOVERNOR, KIM REYNOLDS — RESPONDENTS
ATTORNEY GENERAL, BRENNAN BIRD

REHEARING
ON PETITION FOR ~~WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS~~

IOWA SUPREME COURT - LAST RESORT

REHEARING
ON A PETITION FOR ~~WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS~~

Steven Dale Bradley # 0207216
(Your Name)

I. S. P. - P. O. Box 316
(Address)

Fort Madison, IA 52627
(City, State, Zip Code)

N/A
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

How can this U.S. Supreme Court honor a void judgment that you, yourself state, can never stand?

How can petitioner have been advised of the consequences of the plea when not made aware of the blockades until after he tried to appeal?

Why should petitioner be denied his right to a jury trial when the promises of the plea have not been met?

How can these sentences and convictions stand where co-defendant redacted her lies and those lies created false information to be published in newspapers?

When petitioner offered to this U.S. Supreme Court to take a polygraph for any concerns about his release, or about any facts of the cases, how can you justify denying the certiorari or polygraph?

And if petitioners certiorari was insufficient to prove what was necessary to Grant certiorari then why wasn't petitioner given counsel to assist?

Can petitioner please take the polygraphs to prove his actual innocence in spite of the documentary evidence?



112
111

LIST OF PARTIES

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

RELATED CASES

STEVEN DALE BRADLEY V. IOWA, No. 25-6190,
UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT, Filed on October 24,
2025, Placed on Docket November 20, 2025.

(all other companion cases are listed therein)
(petitioner does not have a copy of this)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT ^{REHEARING}	6
CONCLUSION.....	9

INDEX TO APPENDICES

- APPENDIX A - Letter showing Certiorari denied
- APPENDIX B - PCR Hearing - words of Trial counsel, Mr. Thomas
- APPENDIX C - January 31, 1995, Plea Negotiations
- APPENDIX D - February 1, 1995, Guilty plea hearing
- APPENDIX E - Iowa plea agreement
- APPENDIX F - Iowa sentencing order
- APPENDIX G - Missouri sentencing order
- APPENDIX H - Missouri Docket sheet and Barna case
- APPENDIX I - Letter from attorney, Gary Brotherton
- APPENDIX J - Letter from Gregory Mermelstein

TABLE OF CONTENTS
INDEX OF APPENDICES (cont.)

APPENDIX K - letter from attorney Harris to Judge Dial

APPENDIX L - letter from attorney Harris to petitioner

APPENDIX M - an order from Judge Dial

APPENDIX N - Missouri guilty plea hearing

APPENDIX O - Missouri Code 558.031 (1)

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

In certiorari petition 25-6190
petitioner does not have a copy of it

STATUTES AND RULES

Missouri Code 558.031(1)

8

OTHER

In certiorari petition 25-6190
petitioner does not have a copy of it

1

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of mandamus issue.

OPINIONS BELOW

For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

- reported at _____; or,
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

- reported at _____; or,
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished.

For cases from **state courts**: *I do not have a copy of the Appendix but Appendix numbers are in 25-6190.*
The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

- reported at _____; or,
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished.

The opinion of the Polk County District Court court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

- reported at _____; or,
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was _____.

No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

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

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

For cases from **state courts**: *This information is in 25-6190 certiorari
I do not have a copy of it.*

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was _____.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix _____.

A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

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

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

same as Certiorari case no. 25-6190

I do not have a copy of it.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

In Petitioner's Certiorari - he provided solid evidence of his illegal sentence and actual innocence. And unless the Case Analyst removed items or kept this Court from seeing everything submitted, petitioner cannot understand why this Court would not Grant Certiorari on the merits.

And when petitioner submitted his Certiorari he also submitted a petition for the appointment of counsel that was never filed, but rather returned to me stating that this Court does not appoint counsel for the purpose of filing briefs - which to petitioner makes zero sense when the brief is the most important part.

Then petitioner also submitted a Request For Oral Argument and Transport Order of which held a solid provision that if this Court had any doubts concerning anything factual or otherwise, that petitioner would take a polygraph to prevent any potential of denial and/or adverse ruling of which this Court either did not observe or had no concern of allowing petitioner to prove the truth and rather opted to continue with the injustice in this case.

And it shall be duly noted that there were two female co-defendants, Angel Stewart and Angel Chamberlain that both told deliberate lies about petitioner giving petitioner credit for what co-defendant Shaffer did, or said, Stewart has recently redacted her statements and petitioner is in the process of retrieving that

STATEMENT OF THE CASE (cont.)

redacted statement.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Appendix A = Letter showing certiorari denied on January 26, 2026.

Appendix B = clearly illustrates that petitioner's understanding and belief of his alleged concurrent sentences is that if they were actually concurrent that petitioner would be released if one of the sentences or convictions were overturned. This was the deciding factor to enter the plea agreement because petitioner knew he was in fact innocent.

Appendix C = clearly reflects in these plea negotiations that unless it is agreed upon that petitioner's sentences are concurrent and appeal rights preserved, we will go to trial - and petitioner is being denied his right to a jury trial where his sentences are not concurrent as promised and guaranteed.

Appendix D = clearly reflects the court binding itself to concurrent sentences and a glimpse of petitioner's actual innocence.

Appendix E = Iowa plea agreement that promises appeal rights and concurrent sentences.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION (cont.)

Appendix F = Iowa sentencing order that confirms the Iowa sentence is to be concurrent with Missouri's sentences.

Appendix G = Missouri sentencing order that confirms the sentence is to be concurrent with Iowa's.

Appendix H = Docket sheet and Barng case which clearly reflects that due to petitioner not being delivered into the Missouri Department of Corrections to initiate his sentence, the lower court lacks subject-matter jurisdiction to honor an appeal - thus - petitioner's sentence is not, nor can it be concurrent.

Appendix I = letter from attorney Brotherton saying the same things as App. H, above.

Appendix J = sentences numbered 1 and 2, clearly reflect that they have no knowledge of how to help petitioner, yet Rule 29.07(d) was an available remedy petitioner was made aware of in 2020 by a U.S. District Judge.

Appendix K = letter from attorney Harris showing petitioner's sentence has not started because not in MDOC.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION (cont.)

Appendix L = same as App. K.

Appendix M = An order reflecting the same, that petitioner's sentence in Missouri has not yet begun and therefore not concurrent as promised and ordered.

Appendix N = transcript pages from Missouri, clearly reflects as part of the agreement petitioner was to serve his time in Iowa, yet, noone bothered to tell petitioner that this would not allow for concurrent sentences or deny him to proceed on appeal in Missouri - that is not justice or a fair proceeding especially where both of those were the crux of the guilty plea.

Appendix O = Missouri Code 558.031 (i) that clearly reflects that petitioner is required to enter into MDOC to initiate his Missouri sentence and noone told petitioner of this blockade for concurrent sentences therefore the sentences are not legal as they cannot be concurrent per Missouri statute 558.031 (i) where petitioner per agreement was to serve his time in Iowa and petitioner clearly stated in App. C that unless petitioner's sentences are concurrent and appeal rights preserved, we will go to trial - therefore this U.S. Supreme Court has a duty to order jury trials in both States for petitioner.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a ~~writ of mandamus and/or prohibition~~ ^{REHEARING} should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven Dale Bradley

Date: February 11, 2026

No. 25-6190

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

STEVEN DALE BRADLEY - PETITIONER

vs.

GOVERNOR, KIM REYNOLDS - RESPONDENTS
ATTORNEY GENERAL, BRENNA BIRD

ON PETITION FOR REHEARING

IOWA SUPREME COURT - LAST RESORT

CERTIFICATION OF COUNSEL (PRO SE)

Steven Dale Bradley # 0207216

I.S.P. - P.O. Box 316

Fort Madison, Iowa 52627

N/A
phone number

That petitioner brings forth this certification of counsel pro se, asserting that it is restricted to intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect and to other substantial grounds not previously presented and that it is presented in Good Faith and not for delay.

1s/ Steven Dale Bradley

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

10

No. 25-6190

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

STEVEN DALE BRADLEY, PETITIONER

STATE OF IOWA, VS.
GOVERNOR, KIM REYNOLDS, RESPONDENT
ATTORNEY GENERAL, BRENNA BIRD.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Steven Dale Bradley, declare that on this date
February, 2025, as required by Supreme Court Rule 29,
I served all enclosed motions/petitions on all interested
parties by placing a copy of the same in the U.S. Mail,
postage pre-paid, First-class, for REHEARING, and
Certification of Counsel (Pro Se).

The names and addresses of those served are as follows:

Governor Kim Reynolds, Capitol Bldg., 1007 East Grand Avenue,
Des Moines, IA 50319 / Attorney General Brenna Bird,
Hoover State Office Bldg., 2nd Floor, 1305 East Walnut Street,
Des Moines, IA 50319.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is
true and correct. Executed on February 11, 2025.

Steven Dale Bradley