

25-6216
No. _____

FILED
JUL 28 2025
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Fred L. Williams — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

State of Arkansas — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

Arkansas Supreme Court
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Fred L. Williams - 093355
(Your Name)

P.O. Box 970
(Address)

Marianna, Ark 72360
(City, State, Zip Code)

None
(Phone Number)

RECEIVED
AUG 22 2025
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- 1) Does Arkansas Supreme Court Brady analysis conflict with other circuits in this July 17, 2025 order?
- 2) Did the Prosecution violate Brady-defendant's due process, under 14th and, in this July 17, 2025 petition?
- 3) Did State deprive defendant of a fair trial, impartial jury, full strength of cross-examination on form of first-aid-CRR" performance? under 6th and, and 14th amendment, in this July 17, 2025 order?
- 4) Did Arkansas Court deny defendant due-process regarding amending his writ of Error Coram Nobis?

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

Williams v. State, 316,468 S.W.3d 776,777 (Ark. 2015)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	
CONCLUSION.....	

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A Arkansas Supreme Court's Order-July 17, 2025

APPENDIX B Autopsy report page(9) State Police report

APPENDIX C Letter from Supreme Court Clerk-July 17, 2025

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

	PAGE NUMBER
Williams v. State, 316 A.2d 776, 779 (Md. 1975)	3
Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963)	1
U.S. v. Bagley, 473 U.S. 676 (1985)	1
Sfrickler v. Greene, 527 U.S. 263 (1999)	1
Howard v. State, 2012 Ark. 177, 403 S.W.3d 38	2
U.S. v. Rivas, 337 F.3d 195 (2d Cir. 2004)	3
Davis v. Alaska, 415 U.S. 308 (1974)	2
Milner v. Pate, 386 U.S. 1, 87 S.Ct. 785, 17 L.Ed.2d 690 (1966)	2
Amadeo v. Zant, 486 U.S. 214 (1988)	3
Kyles v. Whitley, 514 U.S. 419 (1995)	1

STATUTES AND RULES

United States Constitutional amendments - 6. and 14th

OTHER

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

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

OPINIONS BELOW

[] For cases from **federal courts**:

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

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

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

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

For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

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

The opinion of the _____ 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**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was July 17, 2025.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix A.

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

U.S. Constitutional amendments 6 and 14

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

In 2014, Williams was convicted of first-degree murder and abuse of a corpse, for which a jury convicted him and sentenced to concurrent terms of life and 20 years imprisonment. He appealed, on direct appeal the Arkansas Supreme Court affirmed, See Williams v. State, 316, 468 S.W.3d 776, 777 (Ark 2015). Later, he filed state collateral review under Ark. R. Crim. P. 37 denied and affirmed, Williams v. State, 586 S.W.3d 148, 151-55 (Ark 2019). Now, Williams files for review of (coram nobis petition), Williams v. State Ark - CR 14-1088 challenging State violated Brady v. Maryland (1963) and his due-process by withholding impeachment evidence, with this U.S. Supreme Court, and review of Constitutional error, U.S. Const. 14, 14 in the Arkansas Supreme Court Order July 17, 2025 denying his petition. Further, Williams takes issue with state actors mishandling his legal mail and ex-attorney general officials acting as justice in this matter.

Williams argues, he was deprived of the full strength of cross-examination, to bring out through these officers exactly what occurred or, was reported. Such detail, was vital to the jury's understanding of the case, on points, such as manner of death, what form of medical aid was given, and culpability. Williams had assert, Walton's death was accidental, resulting from his seizure episode during sex, and weight plausibly preventing air intake - and her injuries likely occurred during frantic CPR processes. The strategy of using this impeachment evidence could have weakened an already weak circumstantial evidence case, which likely would resort in acquittal or finding of a lesser included offense. *Howard v. State*, 2012 Ark 177, 403 S.W.3d 38.

whereas, the State's closing argument is false. Williams's central argument of the withholding of impeachment evidence, is the Arkansas Supreme Court's opinion conflicts, with other circuit's, Arkansas subserves, inculpatory evidence used as impeachment evidence is exempt in *Brady* and finds this claim as "moot" erroneously July 17, 2025. The non-disclosure changed, the whole tenor of the case, it prevent evidence bearing on "intent" to be heard. This deprive Williams of a key argument - showing his CPR attempts undercuts the State first-degree murder theory. *Miller v. Pate*, 386 U.S. 1, (1966). Williams was prejudice, in his trial preparation and presentation of his defense, as well as full and complete confrontation of State witnesses aforementioned. *Davis v. Alaska*, 415 U.S. 308 (1974). Had the CPR theory been put forth before jury, it would have corroborated Williams's defense and medical evidence not report to the medical examiner.² See- Appendix-B