26-6173

No. _____

ORIGINAL

FILED
NOV 1 1 2026
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Jonathan Joseph Corbett — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

State of Minnesota — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

JONATHAN JOSEPH CORBETT
(Your Name)

910 Pickett St N
(Address)

Bayport, MN 55003
(City, State, Zip Code)

N/A
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. Whether the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments require meaningful judicial inquiry into juror partiality when the record shows that a juror disclosed a family relationship connecting her husband to a State witness and, during deliberations, asked whether she could tell the other jurors about that witness's character, but no evidetiary hearing was held.

2. Whether a state postconviction court may deny an evidentiary hearing solely through a procedural time bar where the petitioner alleges that trial counsel failed to challenge the juror and appellate counsel failed to present the federal juror-bias issue, without providing a hearing at which the alleged partiality and counsel failures can be factually tested.

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:

The parties are Jonathan Joseph Corbett, petitioner, and the State of Minnesota, respondent.

RELATED CASES

Related proceedings presently include: State v. Corbett, Ramsey County District Court No. 62-CR-12-7811; State v. Corbett, Minnesota Court of Appeals No. A14-0290 (direct appeal); Corbett v. State, Minnesota Court of Appeals No. A25-2041 (Postconviction appeal); and Corbett v. State, Minnesota Supreme Court No. A25-2041 (petition for further review denied August 12, 2026).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW 1

JURISDICTION 2

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED 3

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 4-6

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT 6-8

CONCLUSION 9

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A Minnesota Court of Appeals order opinion denying merits No. A25-2041 filed May 21, 2026 Page A-1 to A-5

APPENDIX B Ramsey County District Court order Denying Post conviction Relief and memorandum No. 62-CR-12-7811 filed October 6, 2025 Page B-1 to B-6

APPENDIX C Minnesota Supreme Court order Denying Petition for Futher review No. A25-2041, Filed August 12, 2026 Page C-1

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
Irvin v. Dowd, 366 U.S. 717 (1961)	Page # 6
Remmer v. United States, 347 U.S. 227 (1954)	Page # 6
Smith v. Phillips, 455 U.S 209 (1982)	Page # 6
Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668 (1984)	Page # 7
v	

STATUTES AND RULES	
U.S. Const. amend. VI	Page # 3
U.S. Const. amend XIV	Page # 3
28 U.S.C. § 1257(a)	Page # 3, 7
Minn. Stat § 590.01; Subd. 4 X	Page #
Minn. Stat § 590.04 X	Page #

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.

[X] For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix A to the petition and is Minnesota Court of Appeals denied May 21, 2026 as untimely

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

The opinion of the Minnesota Court of Appeals court appears at Appendix A to the petition and is denied as untimely

[ ] reported at _____; or,
[ ] 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 _____.

[ ] 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 August 12, 2026. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix C.

[ ] 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

U.S. Constitution, Amendment VI. In all Criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury... and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence.

U.S. Constitution Amendment XIV, § 1. No State shall... deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

28 U.S.C § 1257 (a). Provides for Supreme Court review by Writ of Certiorari of qualifying Final Judgments or decrees of the highest Court of a State where a federal right is Specially Set up or Claimed.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner Jonathan Joseph Corbett was tried in Ramsey County, Minnesota, in 2013. The district-court record states that the jury returned guilty verdicts on Counts 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7 and a not-guilty verdict on Count 4. The Minnesota Court of Appeals affirmed the conviction and sentence on direct appeal in No. A14-0290, and the Minnesota Supreme Court denied review in 2015.

On August 28, 2025, petitioner filed a petition for postconviction relief asserting, among other grounds, ineffective assistance of trial and appellate counsel and juror bias. The district court denied the petition without an evidentiary hearing on October 6, 2025

Petitioner's reply in the postconviction proceedings alleged that a juror stated during voir dire that her husband had a work relationship with a state witness. Petitioner further alleged that during deliberations, the juror asked whether she could tell the other jurors about the witness's character. Petitioner argued that trial counsel failed to challenge the juror and that appellate counsel failed to raise the issue on direct appeal.

The district court did not conduct an evidentiary hearing on those allegations. It concluded that the juror-bias claim was time-barred and that petitioner knew or should have known of the juror issue at the time of trial. It also concluded that any ineffective-assistance ~~of~~ claim concerning appellate counsel was known by 2015 and should have been brought within the statutory period.

On May 21, 2026 the Minnesota Court of Appeals affirmed. It held that petitioner knew or should have known of the juror-bias and ineffective-

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

-assistance claims in 2015, but did not file the post-conviction petition until August 2025. It rejected the interest-of-justice exception because the asserted injustices were the same substantive claims rather than a separate injustice that caused petitioner to miss the statutory deadline. The court therefore concluded that the claims were time-barred and affirmed the summary denial.

Petitioner sought further review in the Minnesota Supreme Court. On August 12, 2026, that Court entered a one-page order stating that the petition for further review was denied.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

1. The Petition Presents a Federal question Concerning the Constitutional Requirement of an impartial Jury, and a Meaningful inquiry into Alleged Juror partiality.

The Sixth Amendment protects the right to trial by an impartial Jury, and that protection applies in State Criminal proceedings through the Fourteenth Amendment. Petitioner's Claim is not merely that the State Court misapplied a State evidentiary rule. He alleges that a Sitting Juror had a Connection, through her husband, to a State witness and later Sought during deliberations to Communicate information Concerning that witness's Character.

This Court has repeatedly treated Juror impartiality as a Constitutional Concern. In Irvin v. Dowd, 366 U.S. 717 (1961), the Court addressed the Constitutional requirement of an impartial Jury. In Remmer v. United States, 347 U.S 227 (1954), the Court required Judicial inquiry into a Serious allegation of outside influence on a Juror. Smith v. Phillips, 455 U.S. 209, 215 (1982), explains that allegations of Juror partiality are addressed through a hearing at which the defendant has an opportunity to prove actual bias.

Petitioner's allegations, if accurately reflected in the trial record, raise a Concrete question about whether the Constitutional guarantee of an impartial Jury received any factual inquiry at all. The postconviction Court denied relief Without a hearing and resolved the matter through the Statutory time bar.

2. The Absence of an evidentiary hearing prevented Factual Development of the alleged Juror Connection and the related Counsel Claims.

The allegations identified Specific evidence: the Juror's Voir dire disclosure,

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

a communication during deliberations, and the trial judge's response. Petitioner's postconviction reply maintained that these matters were in the existing record and that counsel failed to act on them.

A hearing would permit a court to determine what the juror knew, what relationship actually existed between the juror's husband and the state witness, what the juror intended to communicate to others jurors, what information reached the jury, and what trial and appellate counsel knew and did. Without that factual development, the federal impartial-jury claim was never tested through the mechanism described in Smith.

3. The interaction between the state procedural bar and the federal counsel claim warrants review only to the extent the federal issue was preserved and is not foreclosed by an adequate and independent state ground.

The district court relied on Minnesota's two-year postconviction limitation period. That procedural ruling is therefore central to this case. Petitioner alleged, however, that appellate counsel failed to raise the juror issue and that this failure contributed to the claim not being presented earlier. Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668 (1984), supplies the governing federal framework for claims of constitutionally ineffective assistance of counsel.

Petitioner respectfully ask this Court to determine whether, on the actual record and the Court of Appeals decision, the federal impartial-jury and counsel questions remain reviewable under 28 U.S.C. § 1257. This section of the petition must be conformed to the precise reasoning of the Minnesota Court of Appeals before filing, because this Court does not review a judgment resting on an adequate and independent state-law ground.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

4. This case presents the issue in a concrete record rather than as an abstract claim.

Petitioner's claim identifies a particular juror, a particular relationship to a prosecution witness, an alleged communication during deliberations, and specific alleged failures by trial and appellate counsel. The requested review therefore concerns whether those allegations required factual inquiry before the federal impartial-jury claim could be rejected, not a request for this court to reweigh trial evidence generally.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan Joseph Corbett

Date: November 10, 2026

Jonathan Joseph Corbett
Petitioner, Pro Se
MCF-Stillwater
970 Pickett St N
Bayport, MN 55003