No. 9:24CV31

FILED
JUN 09 2026

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

USDC # 9:24CV31

In Re Nickolas Wolford — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Nickolas Wolford
(Your Name)

9601 SPur 591
(Address)

Amarillo Tx, 79107
(City, State, Zip Code)

None
(Phone Number)

U.S. Supreme Ct. Rule 14
Questions

(1) In Ground One, Exhibit #1, Was the Court Coordinator in Violation of the 14th Amendment Ordering and Signing the motion And Granting the Removal of the Judicially Appointed Counsel Carter Mayers?

(2) In Ground two, Exhibit #2 to Exhibit #3 The Defendant being Charge with One Charge of 22.01(b)(1) 3F, then Indicted for 22.01(a)(1) And (B-2) then enhanced Double to a 1st Degree by Using the Same Prior Conviction twice Violate the 5th Amendment?

(3) Was Texas Penal Code 12.42(a) Violated by State Trial Court by enhancing from Exhibit #2 to Exhibit #3 without Any type of hearing, Rulings or Court Proceedings?

(4) Is it a Constitutional Error that the

U.S. Supreme Ct. Rule 14

Questions

State Court Arrested and Charged the Defendant for a 22.01 (b)(1) Assault on Public Servant And at which was a 3rd DeGree As seen on Exhibit#2 and then Indicted for a whole Diffrent Assault on Peace officer a 2nd DeGree 22.01 (a)(1) & (b-2) Is this Constitutional Error Render Actual Innocence by Constitutional Error?

⑤ Did the District Attorney Violate the Defendant in Ground three?

⑥ Did David Cervantes Assist the Defendant Ineffective As Counsel by failing to object to Any Ground Raised?

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: ① Pam Fletcher: 349th Dist. of Houston Co. Trial Court

② Christine Stetson: USDC, Lufkin 104 N. 3rd St Lufkin TX 75901

③ Don Willett: U.S. 5th circuit Court of Appeals

④ Unknown Judges Court: Criminal Court of Appeals of Texas

RELATED CASES

Conrad V State 537 SW 2d 755, 757 (Tex crim. App. 1976.)

Spivey V Zant 1083 F2d 881 Stearnes V Clinton 780 SW 2d 216

Buntion V Harmon 827 SW 2d 945, 949 (Tex crim App 1992

Townsend V Sain 372 US 293, 312 (1963)

Keeney V Tamayo-Reyes 504 US 1, 10 (1992)

Stone V Powell 428 US 465, 494-95 & n. 37 (1976)

Freer V Duffer 935 F2d 213, 222 (11th cir 1991)

Mars V Mounts 895 F2d 1348 1251-52 (11th cir 1990)

Peter V Rose 724 F2d 525, 528 (6th cir 1984)

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

CASES PAGE NUMBER

see Table of Contents Attached
2 pages

STATUTES AND RULES

See Table of Content Attached
2 pages

OTHER

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of habeas corpus issue.

OPINIONS BELOW

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

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix 28567 to the petition and is

[✓] reported at No. 24-40438 | 2024 WL 5237644; 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 96109 to the petition and is

[✓] reported at 2024 LX 27077 | 2024 WL 2783735; or,

[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

[ ] is unpublished.

[✓] For cases from **state courts:** WR 95,250-01, WR-95,250-02, WR 95,750

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at WR 95,250-0 Appendix _____ to the petition and is

[ ] reported at _____; or,

[X] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

[X] is unpublished.

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

[ ] reported at _____; or,

[X] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

[X] is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

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

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was November 11th 2024, No: 24-40438

[X] 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:** unknown

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was unknown.
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

14th Amendment - No Due Process of law

5th Amendment - Double Prior Jeopardy

6th Amendment - Ineffective ~~of~~ assistance of Counsel

28 USC § 2254 (b); ~~28 USC § 2241~~ AW

Fed. Rule App. P. Rule 22(b)(1)

STATEMENT OF THE CASE
& RULE 20.4(A) STATEMENT

In Re Nickolas Wolford has set out and has Exhausted all State of Texas 11.07 writs and also filed Federal Habeas CorPus Petitions; Ive filed Exessive State and Federal writs and Appeals in the 5th Circuit Court of Appeals of the USA And Been Denied A Fed. R. App. Proc Rule 22. A Certificate of Appeal-Ability which Under Provisions 28 USC § 2254 (b) ReQuires which Justifies Granting a Writ of habeas CorPus, The Petitioner has filed a Writ of Mandumus In the USA Supreme Court of the USA to have the HiGhest Jurisdictional Courts Review all Exceptional Attempts the Prisoner a Pro se Applicant has made at GettinG Relief And the Applicant is Retro-Actively filinG Writs and motions still in the United States District Courts and 5th Circuit Court of Appeal of the USA and Even the Criminal Appeals Court of Texas and the State Court at which a title 42 USC §1983 Deprivation of Rights Civil suit # 9:23CV43 has been filed in Federal USDC of Lufkin Texas which all Attempts Made by the Prisoner has Failed And Upon Review of All Exhibits the Court will find merit

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

In Re Nicholas Wofford was Represented By Barred Counsel and has the Right to effective Assistance by Counsel Under the 6th Amendment which upon Review of the Exhibits 1-5 the Court will find a Constitutional Error Exist that Proves Actual Innocence by the Constitutional Error that from Exhibit#2 to Exibit#3 Shows An Error of Law Exist! A Charge of Assault on Public Servant, A 3rd Degree Felony 22.01(b)(1) in Exhibit#2 Should Also be the Charge on the Indictment Exhibit#3 the Error of Degree And Charge are Not As Charged by the Arresting officer, the Assalt on Public Servant Change to Assalt on Peace officer from 22.01(b)(1) to 22.01(a)(1) & (b-2) ~~the~~ now From a 3rd Degree felony to a 2nd Degree Felony which is an Enhancement made in Violation of the Texas Penal Code 12.42(a) and then A Double enhancement, enhancing the Charge without Any type of Court hearings, Rulings or Order which Violates the 14th and 5th Amendment At which a Double enhancement was made enhancing the 2nd Degree to a 1st Degree by using the Only Prior Cause # 13CR008 twice and Exhibit#1

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of habeas corpus should be granted.

Respectfully submitted, with Prayer by

Arkeiks Wolford

Date: 7-31-2025