

25-6374

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ORIGINAL

FILED
NOV 19 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

Darin Lee Jones — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

VS.

L.T. More Ak Doc — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

United States Court of Appeals Ninth district
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Darin Lee Jones
(Your Name)

1400 E 4th Ave
(Address)

Anchorage, AK 99501
(City, State, Zip Code)

N/A
(Phone Number)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Was LT. More the officer who housed Mr. Jones in segregation?
2. Did LT. More sign the standard log book at 1630?
3. Is the signature on the housing log book LT. Mores signature?
4. Does the signatures on the standard log book and the segregation log book match?
(see exhibit #10 and SOA 02154)
5. Why did LT. More deny signing the housing log book in his declaration?

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:

C.O. McCollough STATE OF ALASKA
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

RELATED CASES

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

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

I am a pro se litigate and I have little access to the digital law library, the computers have been down so I have not been able to research relevant case law, statutes, rules or any other authorities the evidence of this case speaks for itself.

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 No. 23-3871; 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 is unpublished.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 3:18-cv-00249 RRB; 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[] is unpublished.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 _____ 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 September 4th 2025
July 18, 2025

[] 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: September 4th 2025, 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 _____.
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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Mr. Jones was negligently housed in a cell with a dangerous inmate. LT. More housed Mr. Jones in segregation cell #6 with inmate Grundy. Grundy has an extensive institutional history of violence against cell mates and is well known by staff. Mr. Jones was placed in segregation cell #6 by LT. More this can be verified by the signature in the housing log book. Mr. Jones was violently assaulted by Mr. Grundy and should have never been housed with Mr. Grundy. LT. More denies housing Jones with Grundy and denies signing the housing log book.

This case was denied by the ninth circuit court of appeals on the basis that Mr. Jones failed to prove that LT. More did indeed assign Mr. Jones to cell #6. This case should have proceeded, LT. More has denied housing Jones in cell #6 and says that the handwriting in the segregation log is not his handwriting however here is a copy of the housing log book and the standard log book both books appear to have been signed by LT. More so unless there is multiple corrections staff writing and signing the official log books as LT. More than it is safe to say that LT. More did house Mr. Jones in cell #6.

Jones was violently assaulted in cell #6 by his cellmate inmate Grundy at the beginning of the altercation CO McCollough watched the incident accelerate and instead of interfering he allowed it to take place. McCollough states that he called the response team from the bubble however the response team members reports indicate that McCollough was at the door to cell #6. McCollough allowed Mr. Jones to be violently assaulted and then lied on the official records to cover up his negligence and culpability. Jones was seriously hurt in this incident and this would not have happened if not for the negligence of LT. More and CO McCollough. All documentation and official reports are attached to this filing.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

This appeal was denied stating that Mr. Jones failed to prove LT. More housed him in segregation cell #6. See exhibit #10 and SOA 02154 showing LT. More's signature on the housing log book and standard log book, although he denies that his signature is on the housing log book it is clear that whoever signed the housing log book also signed the standard log book. I find it hard to believe that there is multiple corrections staff involved in forgery or that this is a standard practice among DOC employees to sign official records for or as someone else. The only conclusion is that LT. More did indeed house Mr. Jones in segregation cell #6 and that LT. More did sign off on it in the official record. Why would LT. More deny signing the log book or housing Mr. Jones in cell #6 unless he was negligent in his duties as a corrections officer. This writ should be granted in the pursuit of justice and to right a wrong done to Mr. Jones.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Daren Jones

Date: 11-18-25