

No. 25-6810

ORIGINAL

FILED

DEC 30 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

TERENCE E. MANNING Jr. PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

vs.

State of Iowa — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

In the Iowa Supreme Court No. 23-1398  
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

TERENCE Edward MANNING Jr.  
(Your Name)

1550 "L" Street  
(Address)

Fort Dodge, IA 50501  
(City, State, Zip Code)

N/A  
(Phone Number)

### QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

Does conflict exist between the decision from the Court of Appeals of Iowa and the relevant decision of the Iowa Supreme Court?

Does the numerous objections reflect argument to the evidentiary errors?

Was there prejudicial harm from not having an adequate foundation and improperly authenticating video evidence?

Does the record reflect sua sponte the trial was unfair?

## 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

Case No. 23-1390 State V MANNING

Case No. 5771 SRCR365958 State V MANNING

## 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	Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus Case No. 24-1868
APPENDIX B	Decision of the Iowa Supreme Court Review Case No. 23-1390 Filed Oct 3, 2025
APPENDIX C	Decision of State Court of Appeals of Iowa Case No. 23-1390 Filed Feb 19, 2025
APPENDIX D	Decision of State Trial Court Case No. 5771 SRCR365958
APPENDIX E	
APPENDIX F	

# TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

## CASES

## PAGE NUMBER

Appendix C page (8 of 16)

State V Burdorf

861 N.W.2d 273, 276 (Iowa Ct. app 2014)

APP C (12 of 16)

State V Khalsa

542 N.W.2d 263, 268 (Iowa Ct app. 1995)

APP B (11 of 14)

State V Toney

206 N.E.3d 1153, 1155 (Ind Ct app. 2023)

APP C (10 of 16)

State V Canady

4 N.W.3d 661, 668 (Iowa 2024)

Appendix B (8 of 14)

State V Stangle

97 A.3d 634, 637 (N.H 2014)

Appendix B (7 of 14)

People V Taylor

956 N.E.2d 431, 438 (Ill. 2011)

APP C (15 of 16)

State V Hirston

825 N.W.2d 531, 539 (Iowa 2013)

APP C (15 of 16)

State V Nims

## STATUTES AND RULES

357 N.W.2d 608, 609 (Iowa 1984)

Iowa Rules of Evidence

① 5.901, 5.901(b)(9)

② 5.103(a)

③ 5.1001(e), 5.1003, 5.1008

④ 5.106

## 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 B 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 of Appeals of Iowa court appears at Appendix C to the petition and is

☒ reported at 20 N.W. 3d 516; 2025 Lx38839 153; 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 Oct 3, 2025.  
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix B.

☐ 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

Iowa Rule Evidence 5.901

"Requires authentication... As a condition precedent to admissibility."

("Authentication is a threshold requirement for admissibility.")  
State v. Burgdorf 861 N.W.2d 273, 276 (Iowa Ct. App. 2014)

Iowa Rules Evidence 5.1001(e), 5.1003

"A genuine question is raised about the original's authenticity or the circumstances make it unfair to admit the duplicate."

~~SEE~~ Appendix C page 12 of 16



## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Requesting review of the substantial rights that were violated when there is a clear serious dispute upon the District Court's error and abuse of its discretion in admitting an exhibit over both authentication and best evidence objections, which that contention was paired ~~with~~ also with the rule of completeness.

Requesting review of the remedy to the District Court's Premature "Inadequate" admission of the video evidence without proper foundation and authentication which caused harm and prejudice.

Consider reviewing the Iowa Supreme Court decision on 10/3/2025.

### REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Especially in the times of new technologies and artificial intelligence, it is the utmost importance for the public's best interest for authentication being a threshold requirement to admissibility of evidence.

Beyond the particular facts this request is to call for an exercise of this Court's Supervisory power to resolve any substantial rights from all conflicts and decide on being in agreement with the Court of appeals of Iowa after their careful review.

**CONCLUSION**

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

*Terence E. Manning J.*

Date: 12-29-2025