

26-5135

No. _____

FILED

NOV 06 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

ORIGINAL

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Juan Baldeas

(Your Name)

— PETITIONER

vs.

Rolando Gonzalez

— RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

7th Circuit Court

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Juan Baldeas

(Your Name)

2014 Wisconsin St

(Address)

Sturtevant, WI. 53177

(City, State, Zip Code)

N/A

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

The issue concerns a false arrest violation of the 4th Amendment conflicting accurements to file for injury.

Does a person who did not go through court proceedings accurement to file for injury start when they are ~~harmed~~^{ARMED} with the facts when they get a separate Child Services record?

Can a police officer knowingly trick a person into believing they are lawfully arresting them for a known allegation and accurement starts the they the police tricked them?

Does a person's ignorants of the law include being ignorant to police tricks effecting accurement?

Does Under W.R Stat. §93-57 states I have 3 years to file concluding that I filed timely?

LIST OF PARTIES

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

[y] 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:

Rolando Gonzalez, David Carbral
Antony Martinez and Christine Rutherford

List all parties

U.S. v. Kubrick **RELATED CASES** 444, 124 US 111 (1979)

Chine v. Bruseff 661 F.2d 108, 110 (9th Cir 1981)

Lavelle v. Lisi: NO. 78-334 611 F.2d 1129 (5th Cir 1980)

Bireline v. Seagondollar 567 F.2d 260 (4th 1977)

Wallace v. City of Chicago 432 F.3d 421 (2006)

Nieves v. McSweeney 241 F.3d 46 52-53 (1st Cir 2001)

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	Balderas V. Gonzalez perial 6/28/24 Case NO. 22CV1098
APPENDIX B	Balderas V. Gonzalez Affirmation decided 9/3/24 NO. 24-3096
APPENDIX C	Balderas V. Gonzalez reconsideration denied 10/6/24 NO. 24-3096
APPENDIX D	
APPENDIX E	
APPENDIX F	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

US v. Kubrick 444, 124 U.S. 111 (1979) 1

wallace v. Kato 549 U.S. 384, 388 (2007) 1

STATUTES AND RULES

42 U.S.C.A. 1983

US Constitution 4th Amendment 1

W.I. Stat. 893.57

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 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 United States district court 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.

☐ 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 10/6/25.

☐ 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 _____.
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

United States Constitution 4th amendment
right to not be falsely arrested.

42 U.S.C.A. 1983

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner on 7/23/19 was arrested for a known allegation that he believed was a lawful ~~law~~ arrest.

On 2/16/22 Petitioner got the facts that his arrest was illegal in violation of the 4th Amendment.

Petitioner has presented Court documents from a separate case that tell when he was given the facts on 2/16/22 in this case. But, defendant argues he is time barred citing Wallace v.

Kato US 384,388 (2007) arguing that his 9/21/22 filing is time barred, then argue that Petitioner plead him self out citing Milchtein v. Milwaukee County 42 F.4th 814, 822 (7th Cir 2022).

Petitioner argues US v. Kubrick 444 US 111, 123, 123 (1979) as one of many examples that he is timely and accurate starting on 2/16/22 when he is armed with the facts. And he nor others should be ignorant to police tricks concerning a Civil Law Violation. i.e. arresting someone for a known violation allegation, but saying they have no warrant - what defendants did in this case, Confusing them to timely investigate for a false arrest.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

to help decide when accurement starts given these conflicting case laws; the day the arrest occurred or the when the Plaintiff is armed with the facts?


Without proper law this issue will continue to be confusing. these courts can help establish that law given the facts in my case.

to help decide if law enforcement can trick a person effecting their need to investigate for injury by that Law enforcement officer,

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: 1/19/26