

26-5147

ORIGINAL

No. _____

FILED

MAY 31 2026

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JEANMAX DARBOUZE PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

JEANMAX DARBOUZE
(Your Name)

P.O. BOX 409090
(Address)

IONE, CA 95640
(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- 1). Whether the failure of the trial and appeallate courts to evaluate material exculpatory evidence submitted by the defense violates the due process clause of the fourteenth amendment.
- 2). Whether as conviction obtained through false testimony, undisclosed inducements, and suppression or disregard of exculpatory evidence violates clearly established federal law.
- 3). Whether admission of uncertified and unreliable translation evidence, without the presence of or qualified interpreter subject to cross-examination, violates the confrontation clause.
- 4). Whether denial of a requested interpreter to a non-English speaking defendant deprives him of due process and a fair trial.
- 5). Whether ineffective assistance of counsel and failure to address a defendant's mental disability violates the sixth and fourteenth amendments.
- 6). Whether the failure of the trial court and appellate courts allowed the defendant has been charged twice for the offense, same day, same time, same incident, count 4 and count 5. There two criminal threats, those additional illegal charges violates defendant's 6th amendment and 14th amendment rights of the U. S. Constitution. (See attached Exhibit.)

LIST OF PARTIES

A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is provided below. If a party is a corporation with a stock ticker symbol, that symbol is also included.

Jeanmax Darbouze v. people of the state of California

Petitioner: Jeanmax Darbouze

Respondent: People of the state of California

RELATED CASES

People v. Jeanmax Darbouze, Los Angeles County Superior Court
Case no: LA083387. In re Jeanmax Darbouze California Court of
Appeal case no: B287958. Partial judgment date: 1/23/2020.

In re Jeanmax Darbouze, California state supreme court, case
no: S260806. Petition denied; 04/01/2020.

Jeanmax Darbouze U.S. district court control district case no:
2:21-cv-04868 - cjc -jde. Decision denied, 11/17/2021.

Jeanmax Darbouze ninth circuit court of California case no:
22-55-298. Petition denied 5/26/2023.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Constitutional Authorities:

- U.S. Const. Amend. V - Double jeopardy clause
- U.S. Const. Amend. VI - Right to a counsel
- U.S. Const. Amend. VI - Right to confrontation
And interpretation assistance
- U.S. Const. Amend. XIV - Due process clause.
- Cal. Const. Art. I § 15 - Right of criminal defendants.

CASES CITED

- Falsified translation documents inaccurate interpretation. (5
(See Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963) Napue v. Illinois,
360 U.S. 264 (1959) Miller v. Pate 386 U.S. (1967) People v.
Aguilar 35 Cal. 3d 785 (1984)).
- 2 - Denial of interpreter. Mendoza v. United States, 755 F. 3d
821 (7th cir. 2014) United States Exrel. Negron v. New York
436 F. (2d 386; 2d cir. 1970) People v. Carreon, 151 Cal. app
3d 559 (1984) California Evidence Code §762.
- 3.--Ineffective assistance of counsel. Strickland v. Washington
466 U.S. 668 (1984) United States v. Cronin 466 U.S. 648 (1984)
Padilla v. Kentucky 559 U.S. 356 (2010) People v. Ledesma, 43
Cal. 3d 171 (1987).
- 4 - Double jeopardy / charged twice for the same offense. Block-
burger v. United States, 284 U.S. 299 (1932), Brown v. Ohio,
432 U.S. 161 (977); Benton v. Maryland 395 U.S. 784 (1959).
- 5 - California Penal Code §654. People v. Pearson, 42 Cal. 3d
351 (1986).

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 Appellate district in the court of appeals of the state
of California.

APPENDIX B Superior court of California.

APPENDIX C Supreme court of California.

APPENDIX D Motion for reconsideration with exhibits.

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

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 C 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 APPELLATE COURT court 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.

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 3/18/2026.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix C.

☒ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: 4/14/2026, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix C.

☐ 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

The right of a state prisoner to seek federal habeas corpus relief is guaranteed under 28 USC §2254. The standard for relief under "AEDPA" is in 28 USC §2254(d)(1).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner Jeanmax Darbouze was convicted based primarily on allegations made by the alleged victim. The conviction was obtained despite the existence of substantial exculpatory evidence submitted by the defense, which the courts failed to properly evaluate. The defense submitted a USB drive containing critical evidence, including: videos, photographs showing the alleged victim engaged in sexual activity with her boyfriend on January 22, 2015, the same day as the alleged incident. Evidence contradicting the alleged victim's statement to the police that she was playing basketball at the time. Text messages in which the alleged victim admitted she lied to law enforcement. A written letter expressing regret and stating that she was instructed by her mother to make false allegations. Evidence showing the alleged victim misrepresented facts to her younger siblings falsely identifying the individual involved.

This evidence directly undermines the credibility of the prosecution's case. However, the courts failed to meaningfully consider or evaluate this material. Additionally, the alleged victim had exposure to criminal charges and entered into an arrangement with the prosecution to testify against petitioner in exchange for favorable treatment.

The proceedings were further compromised by the admission of translation documents that were not certified, nor prepared by a qualified interpreter, nor introduced without the translator being present in court. These translations, involving French Creole were not subject to cross-examination and were materially unreliable. Petitioner, who does not speak English, requested a French Creole interpreter, but was denied one. Instead, the court instructed him to "speak lowly", preventing meaningful participation in his own defense.

Petitioner also informed the court that his attorney failed to meet with him or prepare him adequately for trial. Petitioner suffers from mental disability, which was not properly evaluated or accommodated. Additional concerns include inconsistent handling of evidence, alleged investigative misconduct, and irregularities in bail proceedings; including a significant increase in bail after initial release.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Petitioner respectfully request that the court grant this petition because substantial constitutional violations occurred during the proceedings. These issues include alleged juror misconduct, the use of inaccurate or falsified translated documents, denial of a qualified interpreter, ineffective assistance of counsel, and the failure to properly consider exculpatory evidence.

Petitioner further asserts that newly discovered evidence support the need of an evidentiary hearing. These errors raise important questions concerning due process, the right to confront, under the fifth, sixth, and fourteenth amendments to the United States Constitution. Also, the witness, and the right to a fair trial under the United States Constitution.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

JEANMAX DARBOUZE

Date: 07/06/2026