1 2 ROBERT A. GIBBS P.O. BOX 881 3 FOWLER, CA. 93625 4 5 б 7 PETITION FOR HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF 8 10 11 IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT 12 13 COMES NOW, THE PETITIONER IN THIS HABEAS CORPUS PETITION, ROBERT A. GIBBS 14 AND DOES RESPECTFULLY SUBMIT THE FOLLOWING SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF AND LEGAL ARGUMENT TO THIS HONORABLE COURT FOR THE PURPOSES OF FULLY BRIEFING THE 15 COURT ON FACTS AND LEGAL ISSUES GERMAINE TO THIS PETITION. 16 17 18 FACTS OF THE CASE: 19 20 PETITIONER IS THE DEFENDANT IN THE FOLLOWING SHASTA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT CASES: 14F5854, 14F6355, 15F5464, 15F5736. A PLEA OF NO CONTEST (PURSUANT TO 21 PEOPLE V. WEST) WAS ENTERED BY THE DEFENDANT ON NOVEMBER 21ST, 2018 IN 22 SHASTA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT. DEFENDANT WAS SENTENCED TO 6 AND ONE HALF YEARS IN THE STATE PRISON WITH CREDIT FOR TIME SERVED PRE-TRIAL. CUSTODIAL 23 CREDITS WERE 1,162 DAYS ACTUAL AND 1,162 DAYS CONDUCT CREDIT, FOR A TOTAL OF 24 2,336 DAYS. DEFENDANT PLED NO CONTEST TO TWO COUNTS OF CRIMINAL THREATS (422 P.C.), ONE COUNT OF (MISD.) FALSE IMPRISONMENT AND ONE COUNT OF CHILD 25 ABUSE (ENDANGERMENT), 273 (a) (a). DEFENDANT WAS INCARCERATED PRE-TRIAL IN 26 27 28

1 2 ROBERT A. GIBBS P.O. BOX 881 3 FOWLER, CA. 93625 4 5 б 7 HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL (CONT.) 8 10 11 IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT 12 13THE SHASTA COUNTY JAIL. DEFENDANT HAD NUMEROUS ATTORNEYS ASSIGNED 14 DURING THE PENDENCY OF HIS CASES, TO INCLUDE; MR. ADAM RYAN, MR. ROBERT HAMMONDS, MR. RICHARD COTTA, MS. CORINNE WEST, MR. JOSEPH AHART, MR. SHON 15 NORTHAM, MR. TED SOMERS, MR. JOHN CARELLI, MR. RYAN BIRSS. THE ATTORNEYS 16 THAT HAD THE DEFENDANTS CASE THE LONGEST WERE MR. SHON NORTHAM (APPROX. 17 MOS.), MR. TED SOMERS (8 MOS.), MR. RYAN BIRSS (5 MOS.) AND MR. JOHN CARELLI. 17 THE DEFENDANT COMPLAINED FROM THE BEGINNING OF HIS INTERACTION WITH THE 18 COURT AND HIS LAWYERS, THAT LAWYERS WERE EITHER REFUSING TO PREPARE HIS CASE OR WERE MAKING REPEATED EXCUSES, BUT NOT FOLLOWING THROUGH ON 19 THEIR PROMISES TO PREPARE THE CASE. DEFENDANT COMPLAINED FIRST, THAT 20 ATTORNEY RICHARD COTTA HAD SPENT ONLY TEN MINUTES PREPARING FOR THE DEFENDANTS FIRST PRELIMINARY HEARING, HAD NOT CONTACTED NOR PREPARED ANY 21 WITNESSES AND WAS NOT PREPARING OR FIELDING AN AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE AT THIS 22 DEFENDANTS FIRST PRELIMINARY HEARING IN CASES 14F4858 AND 14F6355 14F5854 AND 14F6355. DEFENDANT INVOKED HIS RIGHT TO AN AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE. 23 AT HIS PRELIMINARY AND MOVED UNDER THE MARSDEN PROCESS TO REMOVE MR. 24 COTTA AS ATTORNEY FOR FAILING TO PREPARE AND FIELD AN AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE. AFTER SEVERAL MARSDEN HEARINGS, MR. COTTA WAS RELIEVED AS ATTORNEY OF 25 RECORD. 26

27

2

3 P.O

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

24

25

26

27

28

ROBERT A. GIBBS P.O. BOX 881 FOWLER, CA. 93625

> HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT

AT HIS MARSDEN HEARING, THE DEFENDANT INFORMED THE COURT THAT HIS LAWYER WAS UNPREPARED, HAD NOT INTERVIEWED EXCULPATORY WITNESSES, HAD NOT GIVEN SUFFICIENT NOTICE TO HIS CLIENT TO BRING WITNESSES TO COURT AND THAT THE DEFENDANT'S TRUST IN HIS ATTORNEY WAS ALREADY ERODED. THE DEFENDANT INFORMED THE COURT THAT HE WAS INVOKING HIS RIGHT TO AN AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE AT HIS PRELIMINARY, AS WELL AS A P.C. 17 (b) MOTION, AMONG OTHER THINGS PRIOR TO HIS PRELIMINARY. DEFENDANT INFORMED THE COURT THAT HE HAD NOT EVEN BEEN SHOWED A COPY OF THE POLICE REPORT PRIOR TO THAT (THE MARSDEN) HEARING. THE COURT SEEMED TO SUGGEST THAT A PRELIMINARY HEARING WAS JUST A FORMALITY, NOT REALLY IMPORTANT, AND TOOK MR. COTTA'S WORD THAT HE WAS PREPARED OVER THE VERY STRENUOUS OBJECTION FROM THE DEFENDANT. THE PRELIMINARY WAS THEN HELD AND THE ATTORNEY FAILED TO PRE-INTERVEIW AND CALL SEVERAL CRUCIAL WITNESSES. FAILED TO PROPERLY INVESTIGATE FACTS OR OTHERWISE PREPARE A COMPETENT AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE AND AS A RESULT OF THE ATTORNEYS UN-PREPAREDNESS, THE DEFENDANTS WAS HELD TO ANSWER ON ALL COUNTS. BECAUSE OF THIS VIOLATION OF FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS OF THE DEFENDANT, THE DEFENADANT AGAIN MOVED FOR A MARSDEN HEARING AND EVENTUALLY, MR. COTTA WAS REMOVED. MR JOSEPH AHART WAS THEN ASSIGNED AS ATTORNEY OF RECORD AND IMMEDIATELY BEGAN REFUSING TO WORK THE CASE, INSTEAD TELLING THE DEFENDANT HE WAS "GUILTY AND SHOULD...

(3)

FOWLER, CA. 93625

HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT

...JUST PLEAD OUT". THE DEFENDANT WAS ADAMANT THAT HE WAS NOT GUILTY AND BECAUSE THE ATTORNEY'S STANCE WAS INSISTANT AND RECALCITRANT. COMMUNICATION BETWEEN ATTORNEY AND CLIENT COMPLETELY DETERIORATED AND ATTORNEY WAS REMOVED AT HIS OWN REQUEST AFTER THE RELATIONSHIP WAS IRRECONCILABLE. THE NEXT ATTORNEY ASSIGNED WAS MR. ROBERT HAMMONDS, WHO WAS REMOVED ALMOST IMMEDIATELY FOR A CONLICT OF INTEREST. AT SOME POINT. MR. ADAM RYAN WAS ASSIGNED FOR SEVERAL MONTHS BEFORE BEING ASSIGNED TO THE BENCH IN SHASTA COUNTY. IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT THE DEFENDANT WAS IN CUSTODY, HELD AT THE SHASTA COUNTY JAIL THROUGHOUT THIS ENTIRE PERIOD, WHILE THIS MUSICAL CHAIRS OF LAWYERS WENT ON. EACH LAWYER HAD THE DEFENDANTS CASE FOR AT LEAST TWO MONTHS, WHICH MEANS IN WAS MANY MONTHS INTO THE PENDENCY OF PROCEEDINGS AND THE DEFENDANTS CUSTODY WHILE LAWYERS CONTINUED TO BE ASSIGNED TO THE CASE. THE NEXT ATTORNEY TO BE ASSIGNED WAS MR. SHON NORTHAM. MR. NORTHAM WAS A RECENT TRANSFER TO THE SHASTA COURTS FROM SACRAMENTO AND STILL HAD CASES THERE, AS WELL AS IN TEHAMA COUNTY. HE WAS COMMUTING BACK AND FORTH FROM SACRAMENTO AND WORKING MANY CASES, INCLUDING COMPLEX MURDER CASES IN SEVERAL COUNTIES. MR. NORTHAM, DESPITE MANY ASSURANCES TO THE DEFENDANT, ABSOLUTELY FAILED IN HIS DUTIES TO PREPARE THE DEFENDANTS CASE TO TRIAL. MR. NORTHAM SPENT THE MAJORITY OF HIS ENERGIES ON OTHER CASES, ON HAVING THE DEFENDANT EXAMINED FOR COMPETENCY A SECOND TIME AND DEFENDING HIS REPRESENT -...

26

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

1 ROBERT A. GIBBS 2 P.O. BOX 881 3 FOWLER, CA. 93625 4 5 б 7 HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.) 8 10 11 IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT 12 13 14 ...ATION IN MARSDEN HEARINGS. MR. NORTHAMS REPRESENTATION OF THE DEFENDANT AMOUNTED TO SPENDING THE NEXT 17 MONTHS FIGHTING HIS OWN CLIENT. REFUSING 15 TO PREPARE AN AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE AT HIS CLIENTS SECOND TWO PRELIMINARY 16 HEARINGS, REFUSING TO REMOVE HIMSELF FROM THE CASE DESPITE NO LESS THAN 15 MARSDEN HEARINGS, REFUSING TO PREPARE HIS CLIENTS CASE TO TRIAL, REFUSING 17 TO RESPECT HIS CLIENTS CHOSEN LINES OF DEFENSE, FAILING TO RETAIN A 18 PSYCHIATRIC FORENSIC EXAMINER DESPITE MANY REQUESTS FROM HIS CLIENT, EVENTUALLY AMBUSHING HIS OWN CLIENT INTO HIS PRELIMINARY AND CREATING 19 INSURMOUNTABLE ENMITY BETWEEN HIMSELF AND HIS CLIENT. WHEN ASKED TO 20 REQUEST A BAIL REDUCTION HEARING (BAIL WAS SET UNCONSTITUTIONALLY, WITHOUT INVESTIGATION INTO DEFENDANTS ABILITY TO PAY, AT \$405,000.00), MR NORTHAM 21 REPLIED "THE JUDGE WILL NEVER GO FOR IT". WHEN ASKED TO FIND AND ENGAGE A 22 PSYCHIATRIC FORENSIC EXAMINER TO AID THE DEFENSE AT TRIAL, MR. NORTHAM SAID REPEATEDLY THAT HE WAS "WORKING ON IT" (HE WAS STILL "WORKING ON IT" 23 SEVENTEEN MONTHS LATER WHEN HE WAS FINALLY REMOVED FROM THE CASE). WHEN 24 ASKED TO PREPARE AN ACTUAL INNOCENCE, DIMINISHED ACTUALITY DEFENSE TO THE CRIMINAL THREATS CHARGES (THE MOST SERIOUS AGAINST THE DEFENDANT) MR. 25 NORTHAM BELITTLED THIS DEFENSE INCESSANTLY AND INSISTED INSTEAD ON.... 26 (5) 27 28

ROBERT A. GIBBS P.O.BOX 881 FOWLER, CA. 93625

HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT

...AN N.G.I. (NOT GUILTY, INSANE) DEFENSE. TO THIS DAY. MR. NORTHAM CLAIMS THAT FOR ANY DEFENDANT WHO WISHES TO FIELD A PSYCHIATRIC DEFENSE, N.G.I. IS "THE ONLY WAY TO GO". BECAUSE THIS DEFENDANTS DEFENSE WAS NOT THAT HE WAS INSANE AT THE TIME OF THE OFFENSES. BUT ONLY THAT HIS PSYCHIATRIC DIFFICULTIES HAD PLAYED A SIGNIFICANT PART AND NEGATED HEAVILY THE ELEMENT OF INTENT NECESSARY TO CONSTITUTE A VIOLATION OF MOST OF THE STATUTES ALLEGED TO HAVE BEEN VIOLATED. TO INSIST HIS CLIENT, ESSENTIALLY PLEAD INSANE AND BE COMMITTED TO STATE HOSPITAL IN ORDER TO FIELD A PSYCHIATRIC DEFENSE WAS A VERY UNNECESSARY AND WHOLLY INACCURATE INTERPRETATION OF THE LAW. WHILE IN JAIL PRE-TRIAL, THIS DEFENDANT STUDIED THE LAW VERY CAREFULLY, AS IT APPLIED TO HIS CASES. IT CAME AS A GREAT SURPRISE TO THIS DEFENDANT TO DISCOVER THAT, CONTRARY TO BEING GUILTY, HE WAS, IN FACT, SIMPLY A VICTIM OF A RUSH TO JUDGEMENT, A FAILURE BY POLICE TO ADEQUATELY INVESTIGATE THE ALLEGED CRIMES, SUFFERING FROM EXTREME PSYCHIATRIC DISORDERS AND GENERALLY LACKING IN FORMING THE INTENT NECESSARY TO CONSTITUTE A VIOLATION OF THE PENAL CODE STATUTES ALLEGED TO HAVE BEEN COMMITTED (422) P.C.). WHEN CONFRONTED WITH WHAT HIS CLIENT HAD LEARNED, MR. NORTHAM SEEMED UNABLE TO UNDERSTAND FULLY THE IMPLICATIONS OF DIMINISHED ACTUALITY (ACTUAL INNOCENSE) AND CONTINUOUSLY ARGUED WITH HIS CLIENT AND REFUSED...

(6)

28

23

24

25

26

1 2 ROBERT A. GIBBS P.O. BOX 881 3 FOWLER, CA. 93625 4 5 б 7 HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.) 8 10 11 IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT 12 13 ...PREPARE THIS DEFENSE. BECAUSE ANY DEFENSE BASED UPON DIMINISHED 14 ACTUALITY WOULD NECESSARILY REQUIRE AN IMMEDIATE EXAMINATION OF THE DEFENDANT BY A PSYCHIATRIC FORENSIC EXAMINER, TO DETERMINE THE THOUGHT-15 PROCESSES PRESENT AT THE TIME OF THE ALLEGED CRIMES. THIS DEFENDANT 16 CONSISTENTLY AND REPEATEDLY REQUESTED OF HIS LAWYERS THAT A PSYCHIATRIST BE RETAINED FOR THIS PURPOSE AND SADLY NONE EVER DID. ONE ATTORNEY (MR. 17 ADAM RYAN) WAS CORRESPONDING WITH ONE PSYCHIATRIST AND DID BRIEFLY RETAIN 18 HIM AND SEND HIM DOCUMENTS FROM THE CASE, BUT MR. RYAN WAS THEN RE-ASSIGNED TO THE SHASTA BENCH. WHEN A LATER ATTORNEY, MR. TED SOMERS, 19 REQUESTED FUNDING FOR THIS DOCTOR TO CONTINUE HIS WORK, HE WAS TOLD BY 20 SUPERVISOR OF THE CONFLICT DEFENDER THAT THERE "WAS NOT ENOUGH MONEY IN THE BUDGET". ALSO PART OF THIS DEFENDANTS CHOSEN LINES OF DEFENSE WAS THAT 21 THE CHARGES IN CASE 15F5736 WAS THAT HE DID NOT MAKE ANY THREATS AGAINST 22 THE POLICE OFFICERS, AS ALLEGED, AND THE DEFENDANT REPEATEDLY REQUESTED A TRANSCRIPT OF THE RECORDED CALL SO HE COULD RECOLLECT EXACTLY WHAT HE 23 HAD SAID. THIS CRUCIAL PIECE OF EVIDENCE WOULD BE WITHHELD FROM THE 24 DEFENDANT FOR NEARLY THREE YEARS AND WHEN IT WAS FINALLY SUPPLIED BY ATTORNEY TED SOMERS (THE ONLY LAWYER WHO ACTUALLY WORKED THE CASE), 25 THERE WERE NO SPECIFIC THREATS AGAINST SPECIFIC OFFICERS AT ALL IN THE... 26

27

ROBERT A. GIBBS P.O. BOX 881 FOWLER, CA. 93625

HABEAS CORPUS
SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT

...TRANSCRIPT. WHILE THE TRANSCRIPT IS VERY GRAPHIC AND THERE ARE A GREAT MANY BLUSTERY AND EMOTIONAL THREATS TO COMMIT VIOLENT ACTS, THOSE ACTS WERE SIMPLY NEVER DIRECTED AT THE ALLEGED VICTIMS AND THIS IS CLEAR ON ITS FACE BY SIMPLY READING THE TRANSCRIPT. IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT. WHILE THE DEFENDANT WAS ACCUSED OF THREATENING TWO OTHER OFFICERS, BEFORE THE RECORDING OF THE CALL WAS INITIATED, THIS TOO WAS MIS-INTERPRETED AND DID NOT VIOLATE THE 422 STATUTE. WITHOUT GOING INTO TOO MUCH DETAIL, AS THERE IS A CHANCE THE DEFENDANT MAY BE RE-TRIED AND THIS BRIEF COULD BE VIEWED BY PROSECUTORS, THE DEFENDANT WAS NOT GUILTY OF THESE ALLEGED 422 P.C. VIOLATIONS EITHER, BUT HE COULD NOT GET HIS LAWYERS TO PROPERLY INTERVIEW THE COMPLAINING WITNESS TO CLARIFY WHAT WAS ACTUALLY SAID. AT ANY RATE, THE DEFENDANT WAS CONFIDENT THAT THESE TWO CHARGES COULD BE EASILY REBUTTED AND WAS NOT CONCERNED ABOUT THESE AT TRIAL, HOWEVER, BECAUSE THE RECORDED PORTION WAS ALLEGED TO CONTAIN THREATS THAT DID VIOLATE 422 P.C., AND BECAUSE THE DEFENDANT WAS DEPRIVED HIS RIGHT TO EXAMINE THAT "EVIDENCE", THE TWO SETS OF ALLEGATIONS ACTED TO BULWARK EACHOTHER AND SEEM OVERWHELMING TO THE DEFENDANT TO DEFEND AGAINST. AGAIN, THIS WAS THE DEFENDANTS BELIEF, WHILE HE SAT IN A JAIL CELL FOR THREE YEARS BEFORE HE WAS FINALLY ALLOWED TO SEE THE ALLEGED "EVIDENCE" AGAINST HIM AND REALISED...

26

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

1 2 ROBERT A. GIBBS P.O. BOX 881 3 FOWLER, CA. 93625 4 5 б 7 HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.) 8 10 11 IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT 12 13 ...THAT HE DID NOT MAKE ANY (422 P.C.) THREATS AT ALL, BUT THAT PROSECUTORS HAD 14 SIMPLY MIS-REPRESENTED THE CONTENTS OF THAT CALL AND WITHHELD THIS CRUCIAL EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE FROM THE DEFENSE FOR THREE YEARS. WHILE DEFENSE 15 ATTORNEY SHON NORTHAM WAS ALLOWED TO HEAR THE ACTUAL RECORDING OF THE 16 CALL, HE FAILED TO CHALLENGE THE CLEAR MIS-REPRESENTATION AT THE DEFENDANTS SECOND PRELIMINARY HEARING AND ALLOWED THIS 17 MIS-REPRESENTATION OF FACTS TO CONTINUE. FURTHERMORE, COUNSEL FAILED TO 18 ALERT THE DEFENDANT THAT THERE WERE NO 422 P.C. THREATS ON THE ACTUAL RECORDING AND FAILED TO PROVIDE A TRANSCRIPT TO THE DEFENDANT FOR HIS OWN 19 EXAMINATION. IN ANOTHER CASE, THE ALLEGED BATTERY OF A COHABITANT, THE 20 DEFENDANT WAS ATTACKED BY HIS GIRLFRIEND (A CONVICTED CHILD MOLESTER) AND DEFENDED HIMSELF BY THROWING HER TO THE GROUND. SHE THEN CALLED POLICE 21 AND ALLEGED THAT SHE HAD BEEN ATTACKED AND FAILED TO MENTION THAT SHE WAS. 22 IN FACT, THE INSTIGATOR. WHEN SHASTA COUNTY SHERIFFS SHOWED UP AT THE RESIDENCE, THEY IMMEDIATELY ATTEMPTED TO TAKE THE DEFENDANT INTO CUSTODY 23 AND NEVER INVESTIGATED INTO THE ACTUAL FACTS OF THE INCIDENT. UPON TAKING 24 THE DEFENDANT INTO CUSTODY AND PLACING HIM INTO THE PATROL CAR, DEPUTY GONZALES ASKED THE DEFENDANT IF HE WISHED TO MAKE A STATEMENT. BECAUSE 25 THE DEFENDANT WAS VERY UPSET AND WAS ALREADY BEING ARRESTED, HE AT FIRST... 26 (9)27 28

1 ROBERT A. GIBBS 2 P.O. BOX 881 3 FOWLER, CA. 93625 4 5 б 7 HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.) 8 10 11 IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT 12 13 ...DECLINED TO MAKE A STATEMENT, BUT THEN IMMEDIATELY REVERSED HIMSELF AND 14 STATED "HELL YES, I WANT TO MAKE A STATEMENT". DEPUTY GONZALES (WHO WAS AT THAT TIME A DEFENDANT IN A FEDERAL U.S.C. 1983 CIVIL RIGHTS LAWSUIT FILED BY 15 GIBBS) TOLD THE DEFENDANT "NO, NO. YOU SAID YOU DIDN'T WANT TO MAKE A 16 STATEMENT" AND THEN GAVE A KNOWING LOOK TO DEPUTY SCOMA WHO WAS SEATED IN THE PASSENGER SIDE OF THE PATROL CAR. NOT REALISING THE IMPLICATIONS OF 17 REMAINING SILENT AND AT THAT TIME BEING UNAWARE THAT THER WERE LARGE 18 BRUISES ON THIS DEFENDANTS CHEST WHERE THE ALLEGED VICTIM HAD GRABBED THE DEFENDANT AND TWISTED, THE DEFENDANT REMAINED SILENT AND WAS TAKEN TO JAIL. 19 LATER, THE DEFENDANT REALISED THAT DEPUTY GONZALES HAD DELIBERATELY 20 SQUELCHED HIM TO AVOID ANY INFORMATION THAT MIGHT EXCULPATE THE DEFENDANT AND THE KNOWING LOOK TO THE OTHER DEPUTY WAS TO SEE IF HE WOULD 21 INTERVENE IN GONZALES DELIBERATE FAILURE TO INVESTIGATE. AFTER BONDING OUT. 22 THE DEFENDANT DISCOVERED THE LARGE BRUISES (CLEAR EVIDENCE OF MISDEMEANOR MUTUAL COMBAT, IF NOT SELF-DEFENSE) AND TOOK A PICTURE OF THE 23 INJURIES AND SHOWED SEVERAL PEOPLE. UPON BEING RE-ARRESTED SEVERAL DAYS 24 LATER ON THE 422 P.C. CHARGES, THE DEFENDANT'S PHONE, CONTAINING THE PICTURE WAS RELEASED TO THE DEFENDANTS GIRLFRIEND (AND ALLEGED VICTIM) WHO WOULD 25 GO ON TO DENY TO INVESTIGATORS FOR THREE YEARS THAT SHE HAD THE PHONE... 26 (10)27

1 2 ROBERT A. GIBBS P.O. BOX 881 3 FOWLER, CA. 93625 4 5 б 7 HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.) 8 10 11 IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT 12 13 ...IN A DELIBERATE ATTEMPT TO WITHHOLD CRUCIAL EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE. 14 EVENTUALLY, AND TO HIS GREAT CREDIT, INVESTIGATOR DONALD R. LUSTER BECAME ANGRY AND INDIGNANT OVER THE STATE OF AFFAIRS AND WENT TO THE ALLEGED. 15 VICTIMS HOUSE. HE TOLD HER HE HAD GOOD REASON TO BELIEVE THAT SHE HAD THE 16 PHONE AND THREATENED TO SUBPOENA HER TO COURT. UPON HEARING THIS THREAT, THE ALLEGED VICTIM ADMITTED SHE HAD THE PHONE AT ONE TIME, BUT HAD 17 DESTROYED IT. UPON A DIRECT QUESTION FROM THE INVESTIGATOR IF SHE HAD 18 RETAINED ANY OF THE PHOTOS, SHE ADMITTED SHE HAD AND SURRENDERED THE PHOTO. ON THE PHOTO, THERE CAN BE SEEN CLEARLY VERY LARGE BRUISING TO THE 19 DEFENDANTS CHEST. THROUGHOUT THE PENDENCY OF HIS CASES, THE DEFENDANT 20 MADE REPEATED REQUESTS OF HIS LAWYERS AND INVESTIGATORS TO SPEAK TO SEVERAL WITNESSES IN THIS CASE ABOUT THIS DEFENDANTS INTERACTION WITH THE 21 ALLEGED VICTIM, THE FIGHT IN QUESTION, THE ALLEGED VICTIMS CHARACTER AND 22 PROPENSITY TO LIE AND OTHER FACTS RELATING TO THIS CASE. INVESTIGATORS CONSISTENTLY FAILED TO DO THIS. IT WOULD BE THREE YEARS BEFORE INVESTIGATOR 23 DONALD LUSTER WOULD INTERVIEW WITNESS CANDY HOOVER. CANDY RELATED HOW 24 THE DAY AFTER THE DEFENDANT HAD BONDED OUT ON THE DOMESTIC CASE, HE HAD COME TO HER HOUSE AND SHOWED HER HIS CHEST AND RELATED THE INCIDENT TO 25

27

26

28

HER. THIS DEFENDANT DID NOT EVEN REMEMBER SHOWING HER THE BRUISES UNTIL HE READ THE INVESTIGATORS REPORT. MS. HOOVER STATED THAT SHE HAD SEEN THE....

ROBERT A. GIBBS
P.O. BOX 881
FOWLER, CA. 93625

4

5

б

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT

...BRUISES AND STATED THAT THEY LOOOKED EXACTLY LIKE SOMEONE HAD GRABBED THE DEFENDANT'S CHEST AND TWISTED VERY HARD. THIS WITNESS WAS CRUCIAL TO UNDERSTANDING THE TRUE NATURE OF THE DEFENDANTS RELATIONSHIP WITH THE ALLEGED VICTIM. IN ADDITION TO THE CIRCUMSTANTIAL, BUT COMPELLING STATEMENTS ABOUT THE BRUISING AT THE TIME OF THE INCIDENT, THE WITNESS WAS ALSO PRIVY TO MUCH OF WHAT HAD BEEN GOING ON IN THE RELATIONSHIP AND HOW THE DEFENDANT HAD BEEN TRYING VERY HARD TO RECONCILE WITH THE VICTIM AFTER SHE HAD LEFT HIM AND TAKEN THEIR NEW-BORN DAUGHTER TO LIVE WITH ANOTHER MAN. SHE WAS INTIMATELY AWARE OF THE DEFENDANTS TRUE SINCERITY TO WORK ON THE RELATIONSHIP, SEEK COUNSELING AND RE-UNITE THE FAMILY. SHE ALSO KNEW THAT THE ALLEGED VICTIM HAD LIED TO BOTH HERSELF AND THE DEFENDANT ABOUT HER CO-HABITATION WITH ANOTHER MAN AND HAD SHOWN HERSELF TO BE INSINCERE ABOUT RECONCILING. DESPITE MANY REQUESTS BY THE DEFENDANT THAT HIS INVESTIGATORS ASK MS. HOOVER SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS, INVESTIGATORS ASKED ONLY GENERAL QUESTIONS AND SO THEY DIDN'T ELICIT CERTAIN FACTS ABOUT THE ALLEGED VICTIMS HISTORY AND PROPENSITY TO LIE. INVESTIGATORS LIKEWISE FAILED TO PROPERLY INTERVIEW ANOTHER WITNESS (ROBERT WILLIS) ABOUT THESE SAME ISSUES AS WELL AS THE DEFENDANTS DETERIORATING MENTAL HEALTH IN RECENT MONTHS. IT IS THE DEFENDANTS FIRM BELIEF THAT DEFENSE INVESTIGATORS REQUIRE SPECIALIZED TRAINING TO DEVELOP TECHNIQUES TO ELICIT MORE ACC

(12)

1 ROBERT A. GIBBS 2 P.O. BOX 881 3 FOWLER, CA. 93625 4 5 б 7 HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.) 8 10 11 IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT 12 13 ...URATE INFORMATION (DEFENDANT HAS ACTUALLY FILED A RECENT LAWSUIT IN 14 THE EASTERN DISTRICT RELATING TO THIS MATTER). IN ANOTHER CASE, ALLEGING CHILD ABUSE. THE DEFENDANT WAS STOPPED BY HIGHWAY PATROL BECAUSE 15 MOTORISTS HAD COMPLAINED THAT THE DEFENDANT WAS DRIVING RECKLESSLY AND 16 CROSSING OVER DOUBLE YELLOW LINES. WHEN CONFRONTED BY THE OFFICER, THE DEFENDANT WAS ONLY ASKED BY THE OFFICER IF HE WAS CROSSING DOUBLE YELLOW 17 LINES. BECAUSE THE DEFENDANT REFUSED TO INCRIMINATE HIMSELF OR MAKE ANY 18 STATEMENT, THE OFFICER RETALIATED BY INFLATING THE OFFENSE TO CHILD ENDANGERMENT AND REFERRED THE CASE TO PROSECUTORS WHO TOOK SEVERAL 19 MONTHS TO CHARGE. THE DEFENDANT BELIEVES THE ULTIMATE DECISION TO CHARGE. 20 IN THIS CASE BY PROSECUTORS WAS ALSO RETALIATORY FOR AN EARLIER CASE WHERE THE DEFENDANT WAS CHARGED WITH THREATENING HIS GIRLFRIENDS PAROLE 21 AGENT. DEFENDANT INFORMED HIS LAWYERS THAT HE HAD NOT DRIVEN RECKLESSLY, 22 HAD ONLY CROSSED ON DOUBLE YELLOW LINE, ONE TIME AND HAD WITNESSES WHO STRENUOUSLY CONFIRMED THIS. BOTH THE DEFENDANTS GIRLFRIEND AS WELL AS HIS 23 OTHER PASSENGER (EDWARD MCGUINESS) BOTH GAVE STATEMENTS THAT THE 24 DEFENDANT HAD ONLY CROSSED A DOUBLE YELLOW LINE, SAFELY, ONE TIME. THE GIRLFRIEND (CHERI DUBUQUE) FIRST GAVE A WRITTEN STATEMENT THAT WAS 25 PRESENTED IN COURT AND WHEN THAT WAS IGNORED, SHE WENT TO SEE PROSEC -...

(13)

26

27

1 2 ROBERT A. GIBBS P.O. BOX 881 3 FOWLER, CA. 93625 4 5 б 7 HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.) 8 10 11 IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT 12 13 ...CONDITIONS SO THAT THE DEFENDANT COULD ACCURATELY DEMONSTRATE TO HIS 14 LAWYERS AND THE COURT WHAT HAD ACTUALLY OCCURED AND FOR USE IN HIS DEFENSE. DESPITE THE FACT THAT THIS STRETCH OF ROADWAY IS ONLY 20 MILES 15 FROM THE OFFICES OF ATTORNEYS AND INVESTIGATORS IN SHASTA COUNTY. NONE 16 EVER ATTEMPTED TO DO THIS SIMPLE TASK. NETHER DID INVESTIGATORS INTERVIEW COMPLAINING WITNESSES TO CLARIFY WHAT THEY SAW, DESPITE MANY REQUESTS BY 17 THE DEFENDANT. AT HIS PRELIMINARY ON THIS CHARGE, DEFENDANT REQUESTED THAT 18 HIS ATTORNEY, MR. RICHARD COTTA, CHALLENGE THE USE OF THE OFFICER, IN ABSENSE OF COMPLAINING WITNESSES TO LAY FOUNDATION AT THE DEFENDANTS 19 FIRST PRELIMINARY, AS THE OFFICER HIMSELF DID NOT SEE THE DRIVING BEHAVIOR 20 ALLEGED TO HAVE OCCURRED. DEFENDANT ALSO REQUESTED THAT THE ATTORNEY DEMAND THE DEFENDANT BE ALLOWED TO CALL WITNESSES DUBUQUE AND 21 MCGUINESS TO TESTIFY AT HIS PRELIMINARY AND THE ATTORNEY ALSO FAILED TO 22 ADEQUATELY ARGUE TO THE JUDGE THAT THESE WITNESSES WERE NECESSARY. IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT MR. MCGUINESS SOON THEREAFTER MOVED AWAY AND 23 COULD NOT BE LOCATED, AS WELL AS THE FACT THAT MR. COTTA NEVER 24 MEMORIALIZED HIS STATEMENT, IT WOULD HAVE BEEN BENEFICIAL TO THE DEFENSE TO HAVE HIM TESTIFY AT THE PRELIMINARY. ALSO, ALL THREE OF THE DEFENDANTS 25 WITNESSES (THE DEFENDANT, MR. MCGUINESS AND CHERI DUBUQUE) HAD GIVEN STATEMENTS THAT THE C.H.P. OFFICER HAD LIED IN HIS REPORTS DELIBERATELY... 26 27 (15)28

FOWLER, CA. 93625

HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT

...THEREFORE REBUTTAL AND IMPEACHMENT TESTIMONY WAS CRITICAL TO THIS PARTICULAR DEFENDANTS DEFENSE. TO IGNORE, WHOLESALE, NUMEROUS SOURCES OF IMPEACHMENT EVIDENCE WAS NOT SIMPLY INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE, BUT MORE ACCURATELY, A SUPPRESSION OF THIS DEFENDANTS LINES OF DEFENSE, I DO BELIEVE THAT PROSECUTORS WERE COMPLICIT AND KNOWING IN WITHHOLDING EVIDENCE, BUT NEITHER WERE MY LAWYERS SEEKING OUT THIS EVIDENCE. I DO BELIEVE THAT BECAUSE OF THE NUMEROUSITY OF CHARGES, EVERYONE WAS SIMPLY CONTENT TO WAIT FOR ME TO TAKE A DEAL, AND THEY JUSTIFIED THIS TO THEMSELVES BY BELIEV-ING THAT I MUST BE GUILTY OF SOMETHING (OR WHY SO MANY CHARGES), BUT I HAD A RIGHT TO REBUT EACH AND EVERY CHARGE, TO SEE EVERY PIECE OF EVIDENCE, TO DEFEND MYSELF WITH THE FULL BENEFIT OF DUE PROCESS AND THIS WAS SIMPLY NOT AFFORDED TO ME IN THESE CASES. LAWYER AFTER LAWYER AFTER LAWYER MADE PROMISES TO DEFEND ME, TO COLLECT EVIDENCE, TO SPEAK TO WITNESSES AND LAWYER AFTER LAWYER CAME BACK TO ME EMPTY-HANDED, WITH EXCUSES AND APOLOGIES. BUT APOLOGIES AND PROMISES DO NOT BUILD DEFENSES. AFTER BEING IN THE JAIL FOR NEARLY THREE YEARS, I WAS ASSAULTED BY DEPUTY'S WEBB AND BARNHART FOR DEMANDING A GRIEVANCE. WEBB CHOKED ME AND BROKE MY NOSE BY STRIKING ME WITH HIS ELBOW. HE THEN CLAIMED THAT I ASSAULTED HIS ELBOW WITH MY FACE. THERE IS A PENDING CIVIL RIGHTS SUIT IN THE EASTERN REGARDING....

(17)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

ROBERT A. GIBBS P.O. BOX 881 FOWLER, CA. 93625

4 5

б

7 8

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26 27

28

HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT

...THIS INCIDENT. THIS CASE IS VITAL TO UNDERSTANDING MY PROSECUTION BECAUSE THERE WERE NUMEROUS WITNESSES WHO SIGNED SWORN STATEMENTS IMMEDIATELY AFTER THIS ASSAULT. CONTRADICTING THE DEPUTEES VERSION OF EVENTS. ALL STATEMENTS WERE UNIFORM IN STATING THAT I WAS SEATED ON MY BUNK. NOT RESISTING OFFICERS IN ANY WAY WHEN WEBB STRUCK ME. IT IS OBVIOUS BY READING THE TWO SEPERATE INCIDENT REPORTS GENERATED BY DEPUTEES THAT THEY WERE CONTRADICTING THEIR OWN VERSIONS AND IT WAS LAUGHABLE THAT THEIR REPORT TRIED TO SAY I HAD HEAD-BUTTED WEBB, WITH MY FACE, STRIKING HIS ELBOW. I IMMEDIATELY WROTE TO PROSECUTOR CODY JONES AND WARNED HER NOT TO CHARGE ME, TELLING HER EXACTLY WHAT HAD HAPPENED. SHE DID NOT CHARGE ME FOR SEVEN MONTHS AND I BELIEVE THIS IS PROOF POSITIVE THAT SHE KNEW I HADN'T ASSAULTED WEBB AND REALLY DIDN'T WANT TO BRING THE CHARGES AT ALL. SHE WAITED UNTIL THREE YEARS HAD PASSED WITH ME STILL FIGHTING MY CASE AND ONLY DROPPED THE CHARGES THEN TO ADD EVEN MORE PRESSURE FOR ME TO TAKE A DEAL. AND IT WORKED, BECAUSE THERE WERE SIMPLY SO MANY CHARGES BY THEN, I WAS READY TO SAY OR DO ANYTHING TO JUST MAKE IT ALL GO AWAY. THE PROSECUTORS PRIMARY TACTIC, IN SHASTA COUNTY, AND NOT JUST IN MY CASE, HAS ALWAYS BEEN TO DELIBERATELY OVERCHARGE DEFENDANTS FROM THE BEGINNING, DELIBERATELY TO DISCOURAGE DEFENDANTS FROM FIGHTING AND MY CASE IS THE PERFECT EXAM-PLE OF HOW PREJUDICIAL THIS PRACTICE IS TO DEFENDANTS AND LAWYERS...

(18)

HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT

...VIRTUALLY OVERWHELMING AND INTIMIDATING DEFENDANTS FROM EXERCISING THEIR RIGHT TO TRIAL AND DEFENSE AND RUTHLESSLY AND UNCONSCIONABLY EXPLOITING AN ALREADY PATHETICALLY UNDERFUNDED AND OUT-CLASSED PUBLIC DEFENDER SYSTEM. THE SHASTA COURTS ARE NOT VENUES FOR TRUTH AND JUSTICE. THEY ARE JUDICIAL CONVEYOR-BELTS OF GUARANTEED CONVICTIONS AND IMPRISONMENT OF THE INNOCENT AND GUILTY ALIKE. WHO NEEDS FACTUAL CHARGES, WHEN ONE CAN SIMPLY USE THE NUMEROUSITY OF CHARGES TO OVERWHELM DEFENSES AND RIG THE GAME? AND THIS ESSENTIAL TO UNDERSTANDING HOW MY CASE WAS PROSECUTED, BECAUSE I DO BELIEVE PROSECUTORS KNEW EXACTLY WHAT THEY WERE DOING. I BELIEVE THEY DELIBERATELY AND WANTONLY ABANDONED THEIR OBLIGATIONS TO BE NEUTRAL AND FAIR AND I BELIEVE IT AMOUNTED TO PROSECUTORIAL MIS-CONDUCT. AND I BELIEVE THAT IT IS INDICUS OF THE REAL REASON MY NUMEROUS LAWYERS DIDN'T FIGHT BACK: THEY SIMPLY COULDN'T. IT'S HARD ENOUGH FIGHTING REAL CHARGES WITHOUT BEING EXPECTED TO FIGHT A LAUNDRY LIST OF MERITLESS GHOST CHARGES. PROSECUTORS AS WELL AS POLICE, IN MY CASES, DELIBERATELY USED BOTH THE GRAVITY AND NUMBER OF CHARGES IN AN EFFORT TO MUDDY THE WATERS, TO CONFUSE AND EXASPERATE MY DEFENSE AND I BELIEVE THIS IS VERY COMMON PRACTICE IN SHASTA COUNTY AND AMOUNTS TO A SYSTEMATIC DENIAL OF DUE PROCESS AND DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE TO CIVIL RIGHTS. I HAVE ALLEGED THUSLY IN RECENT U.S.C. 1983 FIL-INGS IN THE EASTERN DISTRICT AND I BELIEVE A JURY WILL AGREE.

27

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

2

3

ROBERT A. GIBBS P.O. BOX 881

FOWLER, CA. 93625

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

24

25

26

27

28

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

HABEAS CORPUS

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT.

THROUGHOUT THE PENDENCY OF THESES PROCEEDINGS, THIS DEFENDANT DID RE-QUEST OF HIS VARIOUS ATTORNEYS THAT THEY PREPARE AND FIELD THE FOLLOWING DEFENSES: THE DEFENSE OF MISADVENTURE (FOR PRESUMING THAT DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL FESER WOULD UNDERSTAND THIS DEFENDANTS FEELINGS OF SEVERE EMOTIONAL TURMOIL AND WOULD NOT TAKE HIS THREATENING COMMENTS LITERALLY, WOULD NOT RELAY THOSE COMMENTS OR ANY OF HIS CONVERSATION WITH ANYONE ELSE AND WOULD REACT WITH COMPASSION AND UNDERSTANDING, NOT FEAR OR OVER-REACTION), THE DEFENSE OF LESSER OF TWO EVILS (FOR BELIEVING THAT IT WAS MORE IMPORTANT TO TELL SOMEONE OF THIS DEFENDANTS HOMICIDAL FEELINGS THAN TO CONTINUE TO SUBLIMATE THOSE FEELINGS AND ACT UPON THEM), THE DEFENSE OF DIMINISHED ACTUALITY (FOR BEING IN A PSYCHOLOGICALLY COMPROMISED STATE DURING SAID CONVERSATION AND NEVER CONTEMPLATING THAT DEP. ATTORNEY GENERAL FESER WOULD TAKE THIS DEFENDANTS COMMENTS AS MORE THAN RAW FEELINGS AND RHETORIC OR THAT HE WOULD RELAY SAID COMMENTS TO ANY THIRD PARTY), THE DEFENSE OF NECESSITY (TO EXPOSE SAID FEELINGS BEFORE THEY OVERWHELMED THIS DEFENDANT AND SAID FEELINGS WERE ACTED UPON), THE DEFENSE OF UN-CLEAN HANDS (FOR THE ACTIONS OF PAROLE AGENT CROFOOT THAT DID DIRECTLY LEAD TO THIS DEFENDANTS THREATENING TEXT MESSAGE). THE DEFENSE OF SELF-DEFENSE (FOR THROWING CHERI DUBUQUE TO THE GROUND AFTER SHE GRABBED THIS DEFENDANTS CHEST VICIOUSLY WITH ASSAULTIVE INTENT), THE DEFENSE OF ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVELEGE (OF THIS DEFENDANTS...

(20)

1 2 ROBERT A. GIBBS P.O. BOX 881 3 FOWLER, CA. 93625 4 5 б 7 HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.) 8 10 11 IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT. 12 13 ...CONVERSATION WITH FESER, AS IT RELATED TO ON-GOING CIVIL LITIGATION OF A 14 PERSONAL NATURE AND THIS DEFENDANT BELIEVED THAT ANY INFORMATION SHARED WITH FESER WOULD BE KEPT STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL), THE DEFENSE OF ACTUAL 15 INNOCENSE (RELATING TO ALL CHARGES WHERE THIS DEFENDANT WAS 16 OVER-CHARGED AND/OR THERE WAS NO EVIDENCE OF A CRIME BEING COMMITTED), THE DEFENSE OF FAILURE TO INVESTIGATE (BY OFFICERS AND DISTRICT ATTORNEYS 17 INTO THE ACTUAL FACTS OF THE VARIOUS CASES, BOTH THROUGH THEIR 18 INCOMPETENCE AS WELL AS DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE TO THIS DEFENDANTS RIGHTS), THE DEFENSE OF CONFIRMATION BIAS (WHEREBY INVESTIGATING OFFICERS AND 19 DISTRICT ATTORNEYS IGNORED EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE CONTINUOUSLY, IN FAVOR 20 OF SKEWING FACTS TO BOLSTER THEIR CASES AGAINST ME), THE DEFENSE OF ILLEGAL RECORDING OF A TELEPHONE CONVERSATION (BY FESER) AND THE ILLEGAL SHARING 21 WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT OF PRIVELEGED COMMUNICATIONS (BY FESER), THE DEFENSE 22 OF UN-QUALIFIED WITNESSES (WHEREBY LAY WITNESSES CHARACTERIZED THIS DEFENDANTS DRIVING AS RECKLESS, A LEGAL TERM THAT CALLS FOR AN EXPERT 23 OPINION SUCH AS A TRAFFIC OFFICER TO PREVENT AGAINST WITNESSES MAKING 24 UN-QUALIFIED DETERMINATIONS BASED ON LAY OBSERVATIONS). 25 (21)26 27 28

1 ROBERT A. GIBBS P.O. BOX 881 FOWLER, CA. 93625
4 5 6 7 8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT.

THIS DEFENDANT MADE REPEATED REQUESTS OF COUNSEL THAT THEY SUBPOENA THIS DEFENDANTS STATE HOSPITAL RECORDS, AS WELL AS RECORDS OF OTHER PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALISATIONS TO FURTHER DEMONSTRATE THIS DEFENDANTS LONG HISTORY OF BI-POLAR AND PSYCHIATRIC DISTURBANCE. COUNSELS FAILED OR REFUSED TO SUBPOENA THESE RECORDS. THIS DEFENDANT MADE REPEATED REQUESTS OF COUNSEL THAT THEY SUBPOENA RECORDS OF THIS DEFENDANTS CIVIL SUITS AGAINST SHASTA COUNTY AND STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS TO CONTEXTUALISE THIS DEFENDANTS RELATIONSHIP WITH DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL JOHN M. FESER AS WELL AS TO SHOW THE ON-GOING CONFLICTS BETWEEN THIS DEFENDANT AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT. COUNSELS FAILED OR REFUSED TO SUBPOENA THESE RECORDS. THIS DEFENDANT DID MAKE REPEATED, EMPHATIC REQUESTS TO COUNSEL TO PRE-INTERVIEW DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL FESER AND TO ASK SPECIFIC QUESTIONS OF HIM TO ELICIT EXCULPATORY INFORMATION RELATING TO ACTUAL VERBAGE USED BY THIS DEFENDANT, CONTEXT, EMOTIONAL STATE, INTENT, AND PREVIOUS CONTACT. COUNSELS FAILED OR REFUSED TO INTERVIEW FESER (IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT ATTORNEY SHON NORTHAM DID SUBPOENA FESER TO THIS DEFENDANTS PRELIMINARY HEARING, BUT NEVER CALLED HIM, HE ALSO QUESTIONED FESER FOR FIVE MINUTES AT THAT PROCEEDING, BUT ONLY ASKED HIM GENERIC QUESTIONS AND ALLOWED HIM TO SIMPLY RE-ITERATE WHAT HE HAD SAID IN THE PAST. MUCH LATER, MY INVESTIGATOR DID TRY TO CONTACT FESER, BUT FESER...

(22)

HABEAS CORPUS

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT.

...REFUSED TO RETURN PHONE CALLS. THIS DEFENDANT DID MAKE REPEATED REQUESTS FOR ATTORNEYS TO MAKE MOTIONS TO CHALLENGE VENUE AS BOTH I AND SEVERAL OF MY ATTORNEYS BELIEVED I WAS GETTING "SPECIAL TREATMENT" BY THE COURT AND ESPECIALLY THE PROSECUTOR. BECAUSE MY ALLEGED VICTIMS WERE LAW ENFORCEMENT. NO MOTIONS WERE EVER MADE. THIS DEFENDANT DID MAKE REPEATED. REQUESTS TO ATTORNEYS THAT THEY PREPARE MOTIONS TO DISMISS FOR DENIAL OF SPEEDY TRIAL, ATTORNEYS FAILED OR REFUSED TO MAKE THESE MOTIONS. THIS DEFENDANT DID MAKE REPEATED REQUESTS TO ATTORNEYS THAT THEY REVIEW AND COMPARE REPORTS FROM THE COURTS OWN (P.C. 1368) DOCTORS TO INFORM THEMSELVES OF THE STRIKING CORRELATIONS BETWEEN OBSERVATIONS OF THESE DOCTORS OF THIS DEFENDANTS BEHAVIORAL CHARACTERISTICS AND THE BEHAVIOR EXHIBITED DURING THE ALLEGED CRIMES. ATTORNEYS REFUSED AND/OR FAILED. THIS DEFENDANT DID MAKE REPEATED REQUESTS OF ATTORNEYS THAT THEY MOVE UNDER C.C.P. 170.1 TO REMOVE JUDGES FLYNN AND BEATTY FOR EXTREME BIAS. WHILE ATTORNEY TED SOMERS DID SUCCESSFULLY REMOVE FLYNN, SUBSEQUENT ATTORNEYS FAILED AND/OR REFUSED TO MOVE TO REMOVE BEATTY, DESPITE HER EGREGIOUSLY BIASED AND PREJUDICIAL STATEMENTS IN OPEN COURT AT VARIOUS TIMES DURING THE PROCEEDINGS, AS WELL AS HER STRIKINGLY FLAWED JUDGEMENTS AND PRONOUNCEMENTS. THIS DEFENDANT DID MAKE REPEATED REQUESTS OF...

(23)

28

24

25

26

1 2 ROBERT A. GIBBS P.O. BOX 881 3 FOWLER, CA. 93625 4 5 б 7 HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.) 8 10 11 IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT. 12 13 ...ATTORNEYS TO CONTACT AND INTERVIEW NUMEROUS WITNESSES SUCH AS MR. 14 ROBERT WILLIS, MS. CHERI DUBUQUE, MS. CANDY HOOVER, MR. KEN COCKERIL, MR. LEONARD MOTY, DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL ALBERTO GONSALEZ, MR. EDWARD 15 MCGUINESS. MR. JOHN MOREAUX AND OTHERS TO CLARIFY FACTS IN THESE CASES. 16 NONE OF THESE WITNESSES WERE CONTACTED FOR NEARLY THREE YEARS AND, EVEN WHEN CONTACTED, INVESTIGATORS FAILED TO ASK QUESTIONS AS DIRECTED BY THIS 17 DEFENDANT, WITH SPECIFICITY AND ALLOWED WITNESSES TO SIMPLY RE-ITERATE 18 PREVIOUS STATEMENTS. THIS IS CRITICAL BECAUSE WITNESSES OFTEN DO NOT UNDERSTAND THE LAW OR HOW THEIR KNOWLEDGE MAY BE EXCULPATORY. IT MUST BE 19 UP TO DEFENSE TEAMS AND INVESTIGATORS TO UNDERSTAND THE NEXUS BETWEEN 20 THE ALLEGED OFFENSES AND THE DEFENDANTS DEFENSE AND ENDEAVOR TO SEEK OUT THE SPECIFIC INFORMATION THAT MAY EXCULPATE THE DEFENDANT. THERE WAS 21 A BROAD, UNDERLYING CONDITION IN THESE CASES OF THIS DEFENDANTS BEHAVIOR 22 BEING VIEWED IN A VERY LITERAL WAY BY POLICE AND INVESTIGATORS. PROSECUTORS AND WITNESSES REPEATEDLY OVER-LOOKED OR DELIBERATELY IGNORED FACTS AND 23 CHARACTERISED THIS DEFENDANTS ACTIONS IN THE WORST POSSIBLE LIGHT, INSTEAD 24 OF SIMPLY STATING FACTS. FOR INSTANCE, THIS DEFENDANT HAS NEVER DENIED. MAKING "THREATENING STATEMENTS", BUT PROSECUTORS AND POLICE PRESENTED 25 THE CASE AS IF IT WERE FACT THAT THIS DEFENDANT MADE CRIMINAL THREATS. I DO NOT BELIEVE THAT PROSECUTORS EVER TRULY SCRUTINISED WHAT WAS ACTUALLY... 26

27

1 2 ROBERT A. GIBBS P.O. BOX 881 3 FOWLER, CA. 93625 4 5 б 7 HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.) 8 10 11 IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT. 12 13 ...SAID. PROSECUTORS PRESENTED THE CASE DELIBERATELY IN AN INFLAMMATORY 14 WAY, BY ACCENTUATING VIOLENT, GENERAL THREATS, WHILE IGNORING AND FAILING TO SHOW ANY FACTS WHICH WERE EVIDENCE OF SPECIFIC CRIMINAL THREATS. BY 15 CONTINUOUSLY PRESENTING SHOCKING THREATS OF ATTACKING SCHOOL CHILDREN. 16 THE PROSECUTORS WERE USING FEAR AND SHOCK TO CONCEAL THE FACT THAT THERE WAS VERY LITTLE OR NO EVIDENCE OF SPECIFIC CRIMINAL THREATS AS 17 ALLEGED. THIS TACTIC WAS SO SUCCESSFUL, THAT IT AFFECTED MY DEFENSE TEAMS 18 AND EVEN THE JUDGE IN MY PRELIMINARY. NEITHER WAS THERE ANY PRESENTATION OF ANY EVIDENCE OF INTENT OR EVIDENCE THAT THIS DEFENDANT INTENDED OR EVEN 19 CONTEMPLATED THAT HIS ANGRY RANT WOULD BE ANYTHING BUT A PRIVATE. 20 PRIVELEGED CONVERSATION. WHILE INTENT MAY HAVE BEEN ULTIMATELY A DETERMINATION FOR A JURY, THE FAILURE OF NUMEROUS ATTORNEYS TO CHALLENGE 21 THE ACTUAL ABSENCE OF CRIMINAL THREATS, IN THE DOCUMENTS BEING THEMSELVES 22 OFFERED AS PROOF, ESPECIALLY AT MY PRELIMINARY, WAS INARGUABLY INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE. I DO NOT BELIEVE THAT MY LAWYER, SHON NORTHAM EVER READ OR 23 EVEN REQUESTED A TRANSCRIPT OF THE RECORDING BEING USED AS "PROOF". I 24 MYSELF DID NOT RECEIVE A TRANSCRIPT FOR THREE YEARS AND WHEN I SAW THAT THERE WERE NO CRIMINAL THREATS IN THE TRANSCRIPT, I WAS ASTONISHED THAT SO 25 MANY ATTORNEYS "REPRESENTATION" WAS SO NON-EXISTANT AS TO MISS SUCH A 26 BASIC DISCREPANCY (A DISCREPANCY THAT WOULD AUTOMATICALLY HAVE REMOVED.. 27 (25)

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

ROBERT A. GIBBS P.O. BOX 881 FOWLER, CA. 93625

> HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT.

...THREE OF THE STRIKE FELONY CHARGES AGAINST ME AND WOULD VERY LIKELY HAVE CHANGED THE DYNAMICS OF ANY UNIVERSAL SETTLEMENT OF THE CASE. TWO OTHER CRIMINAL THREATS CHARGES COULD HAVE EASILY BEEN CHALLENGED BY PROPERLY INTERVIEWING DEP. ATTORNEY GENERAL FESER. HAD FESER BEEN ASKED ABOUT THE FIRST TWO COUNTS OF ALLEGED CRIMINAL THREATS (FESER HAD ALLEGED THAT I THREATENED TWO OTHER OFFICERS BEFORE HE ACTIVATED A TAPE RECORDER), HE WOULD LIKELY HAVE ADMITTED THAT THERE WAS NO EVIDENCE THAT I HAD ANY INTENT THAT MY COMMENTS WOULD BE SHARED WITH ANYONE. ALSO, IT WAS MY ADAMANT CONTENTION, THAT MY COMMENTS ABOUT HURTING THOSE TWO "VICTIMS" WAS BASED UPON A DIRECT QUESTION BY FESER, WHEREBY I SIMPLY ADMITTED MY ANGRY FEELINGS TO FESER. HAD FESER ADMITTED EITHER OF THESE TWO CONTENTIONS, IT WOULD HAVE NEGATED CRIMINAL THREATS. SADLY, NONE OF MY ATTORNEYS WOULD QUESTION FESER ABOUT THESES FACTS AND INDEED, FESER MADE IT NEARLY IMPOSSIBLE BY REFUSING TO CO-OPERATE. I DO BELIEVE HOWEVER, THAT ATTORNEYS SHOULD HAVE ENDEAVORED MUCH MORE DILIGENTLY TO CONFRONT FESER WITH THESE FACTS AND GET THE TRUTH, CONSIDERING THE LEVEL OF JEOPARDY AND LOSS OF LIBERTY I WAS FACING. I ALSO COMPILED A LIST OF PERTINENT QUESTIONS FOR FESER AND PRESENTED THEM TO ATTORNEYS. THESE QUESTIONS WERE TO GO TO THE HEART OF MY DEFENSE, THAT I WAS EMOTIONALLY AND PSYCHOLIGICALLY COMPROMISED, THAT FESER KNEW THIS AND THAT MY UNDER-LYING EMOTIONS WERE NOT JUST ANGER, BUT ALSO FEAR AND GUILT (FOR FAILING TO SHEILD MY DAUGHTER...

(26)

2 ROBERT A. GIBBS P.O. BOX 881 FOWLER, CA. 93625

4

5

б

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT.

...FROM THE TURMOIL THESE CASES WERE CAUSING TO MY NEW-BORN DAUGHTERS FAMILY ENVIRONMENT AND AN ON-GOING AND INTENSE FEAR OF POLICE AND BEING FALSELY ARRESTED AGAIN). I ALSO BELIEVE I WAS SUFFERING FROM A SEVERE CASE OF POST-PARTEM DEPRESSION FROM MY DAUGHTERS BIRTH. THIS WAS ONE OF THE MOST EMOTIONALLY CHARGED PARTS OF MY LIFE AND FESER KNEW ALL OF THIS. I HAD BEEN VERY CANDID WITH MR. FESER BECAUSE HE HAD PRESENTED HIMSELF AS CARING ABOUT MY WELL-BEING (IN FACT, IT WAS FESER WHO INITIALLY CONTACTED ME ABOUT THE CASE IN FEDERAL COURT AND HAD TOLD ME HE WAS MAKING HIMSELF AVAILABLE TO ME "TO TALK" BECAUSE HE HAD HEARD THAT I WAS SUFFERING FROM SEVERE P.T.S.D. AS A RESULT OF A POORLY PLANNED RAID OF MY HOME WHERE FISH AND WILDLIFE OFFICERS HAD NOT IDENTIFIED THEMSELVES BEFORE POINTING AUTOMATIC RIFLES AT MY HEAD AND FORCING ME TO THE GROUND). AS FESER ADMITS TO INVESTIGATING OFFICERS IN THEIR OWN POLICE REPORT IN THE THREATS CASE, FESER HAD SPOKEN TO ME "15 OR 16" TIMES AND I HAD CONSISTENTLY "RANTED" ABOUT MY ENCOUNTERS WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT. HE WOULD LATER TELL INVESTIGATING OFFICERS THAT HIS INTENT IN SPEAKING WITH ME WAS NOT FRIENDLY AT ALL, BUT WAS, IN FACT, AN ATTEMPT TO CONVINCE ME TO DROP MY LAW-SUITS. ALL OF THIS, WAS OF COURSE RELEVENT TO MY CURRENT CHARGES AND ALL OF THIS WAS RELAYED TO EACH OF MY ATTORNEYS. WHAT FESER WAS IN FACT DOING WAS INTERFERING IN A LAWFUL SUIT, AND INFLAMING AN ALREADY CONTENTIOUS CIVIL CASE. FESER DELIBERATELY BEFRIENDED ME AND ENCOURAGED ME TO TALK ABOUT...

(27)

1 ROBERT A. GIBBS P.O. BOX 881 FOWLER, CA. 93625

HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT.

...MY FEELINGS. FESER ALSO KNEW THAT I HAD BEEN SEEKING COUNSELING FOR MY PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEMS AND HAD BEEN HAVING TROUBLE FINDING A THERAPIST. FESER SET HIMSELF UP TO BE MY CONFESSOR, FOR HIS OWN NEFARIOUS REASONS, AND WHEN I ADMITTED TO HIM THAT I WAS HAVING HOMICIDAL IDEATIONS. HE TURNED ME OVER TO THE VERY PEOPLE WHO I WAS ALREADY STRUGGLING WITH. THOSE POLICE, THEN HAD EVERY REASON TO RUSH TO A JUDGEMENT AGAINST ME, IGNORE OR REFUSE TO INVESTIGATE FOR EXCULPATORY FACTS AND TO INVERT THE SITUATION, TO MAKE THE VERY DEFENDANTS AND AGGRESSORS IN MY CIVIL SUIT, INTO "VICTIMS" OF A VERY "DANGEROUS" PERSON. OF COURSE, AFTER I HAD ALREADY BEEN ARRESTED AND CHARGED WITH FIVE FELONY COUNTS OF CRIMINAL THREATS AND AFTER AN IMMENSE AMOUNT OF PRESS COVERAGE (BROUGHT ABOUT WHEN "INVESTIGATING" DETECTIVES FED THE STORY DIRECTLY TO LOCAL NEWS OUTLETS), THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY WAS NEVER GOING TO ACTUALLY SCRUTINISE THE FACTS OF THE CASE OR REMAIN NEUTRAL. THE PROSECUTOR WAS GOING TO SIMPLY DEFEND HER FRIENDS IN LAW ENFORCEMENT (AND PICK UP SOME POLITICAL POINTS BY DEMONISING ME AND MAKING A SHOW OF PROTECTING THOSE IN LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT), AND RIDE THE WAVE OF FEAR AND LOATHING OF THE LITTLE-UNDERSTOOD MAN WHO HAD THREATENED TO ATTACK SCHOOL CHILDREN AND THE LOCAL COMMUNITY. GIVEN THIS SET OF FACTS, IT IS NO WONDER THAT NUMEROUS ATTORNEYS AND EVEN JUDGES REFUSED TO FIGHT FOR ME OR UP-HOLD MY RIGHTS AS A DEFENDANT. THIS WAS NOT A PROSECUTION...

27

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

ROBERT A. GIBBS P.O. BOX 881 FOWLER, CA. 93625

> HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT.

..BUT A VERY NASTY AND HIGHLY POLITICISED WITCH-HUNT. I WOULD GO ON TO DICOVER A CASE (U.S. VS. HAYES), WHICH I WILL ANNOTATE IN THE LEGAL ARGUMENT PORTION OF THIS BRIEF AND WHICH I PRESENTED TO MY ATTORNEYS AS CORRELATING DIRECTLY TO MY DEFENSE. IN HAYES. A MAN WAS HAVING SEVERE PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEMS AND SHARED HOMICIDAL IDEATIONS ABOUT KILLING A FEDERAL OFFICER. BECAUSE HE HAD EXPOSED HIS RAW FEELINGS AND BECAUSE THOSE FEELINGS WERE OF COMMITTING HOMICIDE TO ANOTHER, HE WAS CHARGED AND CONVICTED OF MAKING THREATS. HOWEVER, THE HIGHER COURTS OVER-RULED AND POINTED OUT THAT IT WAS IMPORTANT TO RECOGNISE THAT HAYES WAS MENTALLY ILL AND WANTED HELP FOR HIS FEELINGS, NOT TO ACTUALLY CARRY THEM OUT OR TO CRIMINALLY ATTEMPT TO FRIGHTEN ANYONE. I THINK IT IS CRITICAL TO UNDERSTANDING MY CASE. TO UNDERSTAND THAT I AM TRULY A NON-VIOLENT PERSON AND THAT THE LEVEL OF MY FEELINGS, AT THAT MOMENT WAS EVIDENCE OF SEVERE MENTAL TRAUMA. I WOULD POINT OUT TO THIS COURT, THAT SEVERAL OF THE SUPERIOR COURTS OWN DOCTORS PERFORMING (P.C. 1368) EVALUATIONS OF MY PERSON DURING THAT SAME TIME PERIOD MADE CLINICAL OBSERVATIONS OF SEVERE STRESS AND EMOTIONAL INSTABILITY IN THIS DEFENDANT, AS WELL AS DIAGNOSIS OF SEVERE ATYPICAL DEPRESSION, POST-PARTEM DEPRESSION AND P.T.S.D. OF COURSE, MY ATTORNEYS IGNORED U.S. V. HAYES AS WELL AS THE COURTS OWN DOCTORS. AT BARE MINIMUM, ATTORNEYS SHOULD HAVE PREPARED EVIDENCE AND SOUGHT SUBPOENA OF THESE RECORDS. (29)

23

24

25

26

27

2

3

ROBERT A. GIBBS

FOWLER, CA. 93625

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2324

25

26

27

28

HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT.

I SHOULD ALSO POINT OUT TO THE COURT THAT THIS DEFENDANT WOULD LATER BE CHARGED WITH FELONY DISSUADING A WITNESS FOR SENDING A LETTER TO PAROLE AGENT CROFOOT, ASKING HIM TO CONSIDER COMMUNICATING WITH MY ATTORNEYS. THIS LETTER CONTAINED NO THREATS OR VIOLENCE AND WHILE IT MAY HAVE BEEN IN-APPROPRIATE OR A VIOLATION OF SOME LAW, IT WAS AGAIN MIS-PORTRAYED BY PROSECUTORS AS SOME KIND OF VIOLENT THREAT. I BELIEVE THIS ACTION BY PROSECUTORS WAS DELIBERATE MIS-CONDUCT BY PROSECUTORS BECAUSE AGAIN. THEY SIMPLY DIDN'T CARE IF THE FACTS SUPPORTED THE CHARGE, BUT WERE WILLING TO SIMPLY OVER-COMPLICATE AND INCREASE THE SHEER LEVEL OF CHARGES AGAINST THIS DEFENDANT IN ORDER TO COERCE A PLEA. I WOULD REMIND THIS COURT AGAIN. OF THE CHARGES OF RESISTING EXECUTIVE OFFICERS (FILED SOME EIGHT MONTHS AFTER THE EVENT) WHERE PROSECUTORS HAD ALREADY WITHIN THREE DAYS RECEIVED FROM THIS DEFENDANT A LETTER CLAIMING THAT OFFICERS HAD ASSAULTED THIS DEFENDANT AND WERE FILING FALSE REPORTS TO COVER IT UP. I THINK IT SPEAKS VOLUMES, THAT IN EACH OF THESE CASES, WHILE PROSECUTORS MADE NO ATTEMPT WHATSOEVER TO INVESTIGATE THESE ALLEGATIONS, THEY WERE MORE THAN WILLING TO TAKE OFFICERS WORD FOR EVENTS AND EVEN CHARGE THIS DEFENDANT WHEN THE EVIDENCE DIRECTLY CONTRADICTED OFFICERS ALLEGATIONS AND THIS EVIDENCE WAS NOT ONLY IN THE PROSECUTIONS POSESSION, BUT WAS BEING USED AS THEIR "EVIDENCE" AGAINST ME. I WOULD POINT OUT TO THIS COURT, THAT THESE ACTIONS WERE A KIND OF POLITICISATION OF MY CASES BY PROSEC -...

(30)

1 2 ROBERT A. GIBBS P.O. BOX 881 3 FOWLER, CA. 93625 4 5 б 7 HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.) 8 10 11 IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT. 12 13 ...UTORS. ESSENTIALLY THEY WERE ALLOWING THE CONTEST TO BE NOT WHETHER OR 14 NOT I WAS GUILTY OF ANY CRIMES, BUT MORE A CONTEST BETWEEN A CITIZEN WHO WAS DECRYING HIS MIS-TREATMENT BY POLICE AND THE SYSTEM "DEFENDING" IT'S 15 ACTIONS BY DEMONIZING AND CRIMINALISING THAT CITIZEN. I WOULD RESPECTFULLY 16 ASK THIS COURT TO CONSIDER IF IT COULD, BASED SIMPLY ON THE RECORD, DETERMINE HOW MUCH OF THE COURTS ACTIONS WERE LEGITIMATE PRESENTATION 17 OF SUSPECTED CRIMINAL ALLEGATIONS AND HOW MUCH WAS AN OPAQUE AND BROAD 18 CAMPAIGN BY PROSECUTORS TO DEFEND THE "HONOR" OF LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT. SHASTA COUNTY IS A VERY CLOSE-KNIT COMMUNITY AND LAW ENFORCEMENT IS 19 PROMINENT AND TO A HIGH DEGREE, INTER-RELATED. MY PROSECUTION, BECAUSE MY 20 ALLEGED VICTIMS WERE LAW ENFORCEMENT, BECAME PERSONAL TO PROSECUTORS AND BLINDED THEM FROM THEIR OBLIGATIONS TO REMAIN NEUTRAL. EVEN MY 21 LAWYERS WERE AWARE OF THIS BIAS AND CONSIDERED EVEN THE JUDGES AS BEING 22 KNOWINGLY OR MORE LIKELY, UNKNOWINGLY GETTING CAUGHT UP IN IT. IT WAS THE REASON WHY JUDGE FLYNN WAS RECUSED BY ATTORNEY TED SOMERS FOR BIAS AND I 23 BELIEVED THAT THE BIAS WAS AFFECTING HIS REPLACEMENT, JUDGE BEATTY AS WELL. 24 I WOULD ASK THIS COURT HOW I COULD HAVE EVER POSSIBLY GOTTEN FAIR TREATMENT FROM A COUNTY AS SMALL AS SHASTA COUNTY, WHEN I HAD BECOME SO 25 THOROUGHLY ENTANGLED WITH THEM IN LITIGATION AND THE STRUGGLE HAD BE-... 26 (31)27 28

HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT.

...COME SO CONTENTIOUS AND ACERBIC THAT THIS DEFENDANT HAD THREATENED TO ATTACK THE ENTIRE COMMUNITY. IT IS ASTONISHING THAT THE COURT DID NOT IMMEDIATELY RECOGNISE THE INHERENT RISK OF BIAS AGAINST A DEFENDANT OF THIS TYPE. IN SUCH A SMALL. PRO LAW-ENFORCEMENT COMMUNITY AND MOVE TO PROTECT THAT DEFENDANTS RIGHTS BY TRANSFERRING THE CASE OUT OF COUNTY. I DID ASK MY LAWYERS ABOUT SUCH A TRANSFER AND THEY AGREED THAT THE LEVEL OF ACTUAL OR POTENTIAL BIAS WAS TOO HIGH TO BE ACCEPTABLE, BUT NONE MOVED TO HAVE THE CASE TRANSFERRED. I WOULD POINT OUT TO THIS COURT THAT MOST OF MY LAWYERS AGREED WITH MOST OF MY ANALYSIS OF THESES CASES, ESPECIALLY THE BIAS AND POLITICISATION, BUT SIMPLY DID NOT FOLLOW UP ON ANY DEFENSE OF MY PERSON. IT WOULD HAVE BEEN DIFFERENT IF LAWYERS AND THIS DEFENDANT SIMPLY DIS-AGREED ABOUT THE PROPER DIRECTION THE DEFENSE SHOULD TAKE AND ULTIMATELY PREPARED SOME DEFENSE, EVEN IF IT DID NOT COMPORT WITH THIS DEFENDANTS CHOSEN LINES OF DEFENSE, BUT IT IS CLEAR THAT NOT ONLY DID ATTORNEYS REFUSE TO RECOGNISE THIS DEFENDANTS OWN CHOSEN LINES, BUT ALSO FAILED TO DEFEND THIS DEFENDANT ALONG OTHER LINES OR TO PREPARE SUCH A DEFENSE. IN THIS CASE, BY IGNORING THE DEFENSES THAT WERE APPARENT AND BEING DEMANDED BY THIS DEFENDANT, THE LAWYERS LEFT A VACUUM WHEREBY THIS DEFENDANT WAS LEFT COMPLETELY DEFENSE-LESS AND WAS FORCED TO CHOOSE BETWEEN GOING TO TRIAL UTTERLY UN-PREPARED (NOT TO MENTION WITH NO CON-..

27

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

2 ROBERT A. GIBBS P.O. BOX 881

FOWLER, CA. 93625

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

24

25

26

27

28

HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT.

..FIDENCE OR TRUST IN HIS TRIAL ATTORNEY), OR TO BE SIMPLY COERCED INTO A PLEA AGREEMENT. I BELIEVE IT SPEAKS VOLUMES OF BOTH MY INNOCENSE (OR RELATIVE INNOCENSE) AS WELL AS MY DETERMINATION TO FIGHT MY CHARGES, THAT I CONTINUED TO FIGHT FOR OVER THREE YEARS. FROM A CELL AND REPLACED NUMEROUS ATTORNEYS AND EVEN A JUDGE. I BELIEVE IT SPEAKS VOLUMES THAT I CONSISTENTLY ASKED FOR THE SAME DEFENSE, FOR OVER THREE YEARS AND NEVER WAIVERED IN MY VERSION OF EVENTS AND ONLY PLED NO-CONTEST AFTER SO LONG IN JAIL, WITH SO MANY INEFFECTIVE ATTORNEYS, AFTER PROSECUTORS SIMPLY DUMPED ONE MERIT-LESS CHARGE AFTER ANOTHER UPON MY PERSON, UNTIL I SIMPLY BROKE AND GAVE UP. I DID NOT PLEAD GUILTY, I PLED "UNCLE". IF MY CASE IS ALLOWED TO STAND, IT WILL SET A PRECEDENT OF PROSECUTORS BEING ALLOWED TO FORCE PROSECUTIONS, RATHER THAN EARNING THEM THROUGH A FAIR AND TRANSPARENT PROCESS. EVEN MY INCARCERATION WAS NOT WITHOUT RETALIATION BY THE SHERIFFS DEPUTEES IN THE JAIL. UPON MY INCARCERATION ON THE LAST CRIMINAL THREATS CASE, JAIL DEPUTEES ASSAULTED ME IN BOOKING AS A PREMISE FOR PLACING ME INTO ADMINISTRATIVE SEGREGATION ("THE HOLE"). I WOULD SPEND ALMOST MY ENTIRE INCARCERATION IN AD-SEG. JAIL DEPUTEES CONTINUOUSLY TRIED TO PAINT ME AS VIOLENT AND WHEN THEY HAD NO VIOLENCE THEY COULD POINT TO JUSTIFY THIS ESSENTIALLY PERMANENT PLACEMENT, THEY USED TERMS LIKE "THREATENING" AND MADE UP AND FALSIFIED CHARGES TO JUSTIFY IT. IN FACT, IT WAS RETALIATION FOR BEING PERCEIVED AS HAVING THREATENED SHERIFF'S AND IT BEGAN AT MY BOOKING.

(33)

ROBERT A. GIBBS P.O. BOX 881 FOWLER, CA. 93625

4

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

20

21

22

24

25

26

27

28

HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT.

THIS RETALIATION BY JAIL DEPUTEES ALSO TOOK THE FORM OF FALSE AND INVIDIOUS "DISCIPLINARY" ACTIONS AND SANCTIONS, INCLUDING LOSS OF PRIVELEGES, VISITATION WITH MY DAUGHTER AND OTHERS AND A NEAR PERPETUAL STATE OF "CHAIN-ALL" STATUS. THIS STATUS FURTHER PREJUDICED MY DEFENSE AS IT FORTIFIED PROSECUTORS ATTEMPTS TO PAINT ME AS VIOLENT OR OUT OF CONTROL AS I ROUTINELY APPEARED IN COURT IN HANDCUFFS AND LEG-IRONS. I WOULD POINT OUT TO THIS COURT, THAT THIS DEFENDANT HAS FILED NUMEROUS LAWSUITS AGAINST SHASTA COUNTY, MOST OF WHICH HAVE BEEN DISMISSED FOR FAILURE TO PROSECUTE. THIS IS IMPORTANT BECAUSE IT DEMONSTRATES THAT THIS DEFENDANT HAS MADE THESE CLAIMS CONSISTENTLY, DESPITE HIS LEGAL INEXPERIENCE AND ALSO BECAUSE THIS DEFENDANT WISHES TO IMPRESS UPON THIS COURT THAT THE CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS THIS DEFENDANT HAS ALLEGED TO HAVE BEEN COMMITTED AGAINST HIM ARE SO NUMEROUS, AGAINST SO MANY SEPARATE DEFENDANTS, THAT IT HAS BEEN NEARLY IMPOSSIBLE TO PROSECUTE THEM IN FEDERAL COURT IN ANY MEANINGFUL WAY. I WOULD ALSO RESPECTFULLY CAUTION THIS HONORABLE COURT, THAT THIS DEFENDANT IS QUITE AWARE THAT HIS CLAIMS ARE SO SERIOUS AND AGAINST SO MANY DEFENDANTS. THAT IT WOULD BE EASY TO DISCOUNT THIS DEFENDANTS CLAIMS AS BEING TOO INCREDIBLE TO BE TRUE, BUT I WOULD RESPECTFULLY ASK THIS COURT TO CONSIDER THAT MANY OF MY CLAIMS ARE CLEAR FROM THE RECORDS THEMSELVES AND MANY MORE ARE QUITE BELIEVABLE WHEN ONE IS ACQUANITED WITH THE BASIC PSYCHOLOGIES OF HOW PEOPLE BEHAVE.

FOWLER, CA. 93625

HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT

MY FINAL THREE LAWYERS WERE MSSRS. JOHN CARELLI, TED SOMERS AND RYAN BIRSS. MR. CARELLI (A FORMER SHASTA COUNTY SHERIFF) HAD MY CASE FOR APPROXIMATELY 5 MONTHS AND DID ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO PREPARE MY CASE TO TRIAL. HE WAS REMOVED BY WAY OF THE MARSDEN PROCESS LITERALLY ON MY TRIAL DATE. MR. CARELLI HAD ON AT LEAST TWO OCCASIONS, MIS-REPRESENTED FACTS TO MY JUDGE IN AN ATTEMPT TO HAVE HIMSELF REMOVED FROM MY CASE. HE HAD ALSO SHARED INFORMATION ABOUT MY CASE WITH ASSOCIATES OF HIS AT THE SHERIFF'S DEPT. WHILE MY CASE WAS PENDING. HE DID ABSOLUTLELY NOTHING TO DEFEND ME FROM BEING ASSAULTED AND ABUSED BY JAIL DEPUTEES AND OUR RELATIONSHIP WAS MARKED BY DISTRUST AND CONSTANT DISAGREEMENTS. MR. TED SOMERS (THE ONLY ATTORNEY IN THREE AND A HALF YEARS TO WORK MY CASE) BEGAN HIS REPRESENTATION OF ME BY MOVING TO REMOVE JUDGE DAN FLYNN FOR OBVIOUS BIAS. MR. SOMERS THEN MOVED FOR BAIL (DENIED) AND MADE A 17 (b) MOTION TO DISMISS THREE OF THE CRIMINAL THREAT ALLEGATIONS FOR LACK OF EVIDENCE (DENIED). MR. SOMERS BELIEVED COMPLETELY IN MY INNOCENSE AND DECLARED TO ME ON SEVERAL OCCASIONS THAT BOTH THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY AND THE COURT WAS BIAS AGAINST ME. THIS INCLUDED MY NEW JUDGE (CARA BEATTY). HE MADE THIS DETERMINATION AFTER JUDGE BEATTY ALLOWED THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY TO MAKE FALSE STATEMENTS TO THE JUDGE, TELEGRAPHED HER DISDAIN FOR HIS MOTIONS BEFORE SHE HEARD THEM AND BELITTLED PERSUASIVE AUTHORITY IN THE...

27

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

28

(35)

HABEAS CORPUS
SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT

..."HUMPHREYS" - ABILITY TO PAY BAIL DECISION) AND BY USING CIRCULAR LOGIC AND PRESUMPTION OF INTENT TO DENY HIS SINGULARLY MERITORIOUS MOTION TO DISMISS THREE OF THE CRIMINAL THREATS CHARGES AGAINST THIS DEFENDANT (A MOTION THAT IF GRANTED. WOULD HAVE TAKEN MUCH WIND OUT OF THE PROSECUTIONS CASE. AND CHANGED THE ENTIRE COMPLEXION OF MY PROSECUTION). MR, SOMERS ALSO ATTEMPTED TO SECURE FUNDING FOR A FORENSIC PSYCHIATRIST, BUT WAS DENIED BY THE SUPERVISOR OF THE CONFLICT DEFENDERS FOR COST REASONS. A FURTHER UNCONSTITUTIONAL, PREJUDICIAL AND TERMINAL BLOW TO MY RIGHTS AS A DEFENDANT. UNFORTUNATELY, AFTER DOING MUCH GOOD, OR AT LEAST TRYING TO, MR. SOMERS TRANFERRED BACK TO THE PUBLIC DEFENDERS OFFICE AND WAS REMOVED FROM MY CASE. SO AFTER FURTHER DELAY, OF EIGHT MONTHS, WHILE I SAT IN A JAIL CELL, I WAS STARTING OVER WITH LAWYER NUMBER TEN. WHICH BRINGS US TO MY LAST LAWYER, AND ARGUABLY THE WORST. MR. RYAN BIRSS. MR. BIRSS' FIRST WORDS TO ME, ON OUR FIRST MEETING WERE "I KNOW YOUR CASE IS REALLY FUCKED UP, I'VE HEARD ALL ABOUT IT, I'M LIKE YOUR TENTH LAWYER AND NO-ONE IS PREPARING YOUR CASE." THIS IS IMPORTANT TO NOTE BECAUSE IT INDICATES NOT ONLY THAT IT WAS COMMON KNOWLEDGE AMONG THE LAWYERS IN DIVISION ONE THAT I WAS BEING SCREWED OVER, BUT ALSO THAT MR. BIRSS CAME ON TO THE CASE KNOWING FULL WELL THE TORTURED HISTORY OF MY CASE. BY THIS TIME, I NO LONGER BELIEVED THAT ANY LAWYER WOULD PREPARE MY CASE, IN ANY REASONABLE AMOUNT OF....

27

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

ROBERT A. GIBBS P.O. 881 FOWLER, CA. 93625

HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT

...TIME. THERE IS A SAYING THAT JUSTICE DELAYED IS JUSTICE DENIED. WITNESS ROB WILLIS DIED WHILE I WAS IN JAIL. WITNESS EDWARD MCGUINESS MOVED AWAY AND COULD NOT AGAIN BE LOCATED. MEMORIES FADED. I NO LONGER HAD FAITH IN THE SYSTEM OR MY LAWYERS. I INFORMED MR. BIRSS OF THE ENTIRE HISTORY OF THE CASE AND WHAT LITTLE MY PREVIOUS LAWYERS HAD ACCOMPLISHED. I TOLD HIM THAT I HAD ALREADY SERVED MORE TIME PRE-TRIAL THAN I WAS EVER LIKELY TO GET IF I WAS FOUND GUILTY OF ALL CHARGES. I MADE IT ABUNDANTLY CLEAR THAT I WAS MOSTLY IF NOT ENTIRELY INNOCENT, THAT I WAS OVER-CHARGED AND THAT THE CASE WAS HIGHLY POLITICIZED BECAUSE OF PUBLICITY AND BECAUSE MY ALLEGED VICTIMS WERE LAW ENFORCEMENT. I TOLD HIM, AND HE AGREED FULLY, THAT THE JUDGE WAS BIAS AGAINST ME AND THAT I WAS NEVER GOING TO GET A FAIR TRIAL. I TOLD HIM THAT. AT SOME POINT, A DEFENDANT SHOULD CONCENTRATE ON GETTING OUT OF JAIL AND TRY TO APPEAL TO A HIGHER COURT, EVEN IF IT MEANS TAKING A PLEA. I TOLD HIM THAT I HAD WATCHED NINE OTHER LAWYERS TAKE MONTHS AND YEARS TO DO VERY LITTLE OR NOTHING AND THAT IN MY BEST ESTIMATION, THE CASE WAS ONLY 15 PERCENT PREPARED FOR TRIAL. I TOLD MR. BIRSS THAT NO MATTER WHAT PROMISES HE MADE TO ME OR HOW SINCERE HE SEEMED TO BE, THAT I DID NOT THINK HE WAS GOING TO BE ANY BETTER. I TOLD HIM THE LAW GUARANTEES SPEEDY TRIAL AND THAT I HAD ALREADY BEEN DENIED THAT LONG BEFORE, BUT THAT I WOULD GIVE HIM 60 DAYS...

(37)

28

21

22

23

24

25

26

(38)

27

1 2 ROBERT A. GIBBS P.O. BOX 881 3 FOWLER, CA. 93625 4 5 б 7 HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.) 8 10 11 IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT 12 13 ...FROM HIM. HE HAD "MEANT" TO CONTACT A WITNESS, BUT HIS SECRETARY WAS OUT 14 OF TOWN. HE WAS "GOING TO" ASK THE CONFLICT DEFENDER AGAIN TO FUND A FORENSIC PSYCHIATRIST. BUT THE SUPERVISOR WAS ON SICK LEAVE. HE WAS 15 "SERIOUSLY CONSIDERING" FILING A MOTION TO DISMISS FOR SPEEDY TRIAL. BUT WAS 16 "WORKING ON OTHER CASES AND DIDN'T GET AROUND TO IT" I HAD HEARD SIMILAR EXCUSES FOR NEARLY THREE YEARS FROM NINE OTHER LAWYERS. I MET SEVERAL 17 TIMES WITH MR. BIRSS DURING THAT TIME AND MOST OF THOSE TIMES MY 18 INVESTIGATOR DONALD LUSTER WAS PRESENT. I WAS POLITE AND CO-OPERATIVE AND TOLD MR. BIRSS WHAT MY DEFENSES WERE AND WHAT NEEDED TO BE PREPARED JUST 19 AS I HAD WITH ALL OF MY OTHER ATTORNEYS. I TOLD MR. BIRSS AND MR. LUSTER 20 REPEATEDLY THAT THE ENDLESS DELAYS WERE A VIOLATION OF MY RIGHTS TO SPEEDY TRIAL AND REMINDED THEM THAT I WAS IN CUSTODY. I TOLD THEM NUMEROUS TIMES 21 THAT IF MY CASE WAS NOT PREPARED SOON, THAT I WAS GOING TO ALLOW MY PLEA TO 22 BE COERCED, BECAUSE THERE WAS SIMPLY NO REASON TO CONTINUE MY INCARCERATION UN-NECESSARILY WHEN IT WAS QUITE CLEAR THAT NO LAWYER WAS 23 GOING TO PREPARE MY CASE. THIS HONORABLE COURT MUST BELIEVE ME WHEN I SAY 24 THAT MY TREATMENT BY MY LAWYERS HAD LONG-BEFORE ALREADY CROSSED THE RUBICON INTO BEING ABUSIVE AND DELIBERATELY INDIFFERENT TO MY RIGHTS, MY 25 LENGTHY INCARCERATION AND MY DETERIORATING MENTAL STATE. MR. BIRSS JUST DIDN'T GIVE A DAMN AND NO-ONE WAS GOING TO HOLD HIS FEET TO THE FIRE. 26 27 (39)

1 ROBERT A. GIBBS P.O. BOX 881 FOWLER, CA. 93625
4 5 6 7 8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT

DURING THE ENTIRE PENDENCY OF MY CASES, I HAD MADE REPEATED OBJECTIONS VERBALLY TO THE COURT, AS WELL AS HABEAS IN THE SUPERIOR COURT AND WRITTEN MOTIONS, THAT MY RIGHTS UNDER THE CONSTITUTION TO EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL, DUE PROCESS AND SPEEDY TRIAL WERE BEING VIOLATED, NONE OF THESE MOTIONS WERE EVER RULED UPON BY THE COURT. I REQUESTED NUMEROUS TIMES THAT ATTORNEYS FILE SIMILAR MOTIONS AND NONE OF MY ATTORNEYS FOLLOWED THROUGH WITH THEIR PROMISE TO DO SO. TO BE CLEAR, MY ATTORNEYS WERE UNIFORMLY IN AGREEMENT WITH ME THAT MY RIGHTS WERE BEING VIOLATED AND WERE WILLING TO FILE SUCH MOTIONS, BUT SIMPLY NEVER DID. SEVERAL ATTORNEYS, INCLUDING NORTHAM, SOMERS AND BIRSS TOLD ME ON SEVERAL OCCASIONS THAT I WAS OVERCHARGED, THAT MY CASES WERE BEING POLITICIZED BECAUSE MY ALLEGED VICTIMS WERE LAW ENFORCEMENT AND THAT THE COURT AND PROSECUTION WERE BIASED AGAINST ME. MR. SOMERS (MY NINTH AND NEXT TO LAST LAWYER) TOLD AT LEAST TWO JUDGES, THAT MY PREVIOUS ATTORNEYS HAD SUPPRESSED MY CASES AND THAT I DID HAVE COGENT DEFENSES THAT HE WAS PREPARING, BUT THAT PREVIOUS LAWYERS HAD FAILED IN THEIR DUTY TO PREPARE. I BELIEVE THIS IS VERY STRONG EVIDENCE THAT ANY ARGUMENT THAT I SOMEHOW DID NOT HAVE A DEFENSE OR THAT LAWYERS HAD DONE ALL THEY COULD, SHOULD BE STRONGLY DISCOUNTED. I ALSO BELIEVE, THAT BECAUSE IT WAS MY NINTH LAWYER, NEARLY THREE YEARS...

(40)

1 ROBERT A. GIBBS 2 P.O. BOX 881 3 FOWLER, CA. 93625 4 5 б 7 HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.) 8 10 11 IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT 12 13 ...INTO THE PENDENCY OF MY CASES, THAT IT CREATES A GRAVE DOUBT IF MY 14 DEFENSE WAS NOT ALREADY UNRECOVERABLE BY THAT POINT. IN ANY CASE, FOR MR. SOMERS TO SAY THE THINGS HE SAID AND TO SOON THEREAFTER WITHDRAW FROM MY 15 CASE GIVES RISE TO QUESTIONS ABOUT WHETHER FURTHER DELAY WAS NOT 16 EXTREMELY PREJUDICIAL, WHETHER THE NEXT LAWYER WOULD PICK UP WHERE MR. SOMERS HAD LEFT OFF OR WOULD SIMPLY UNDERPERFORM LIKE THE PREVIOUS 17 LAWYERS AND IN WHAT MENTAL STATE HIS WITHDRAWAL WOULD LEAVE THE 18 DEFENDANT. I BELIEVE THAT I WAS ALREADY THOROUGHLY DISCOURAGED. WHATEVER HOPE, OR FAITH IN THE SYSTEM AND MY LAWYERS THAT MR. SOMERS HAD GIVEN ME BY 19 VIGOROUSLY DEFENDING ME, WAS SURELY LOST AT HIS DEPARTURE. I REMEMBER 20 THINKING THAT IF IT TOOK NINE LAWYERS BEFORE I HAD ONE THAT WOULD FIGHT, HOW MANY MORE LAWYERS WOULD I HAVE TO WAIT FOR IN A JAIL CELL, BEFORE ONE WOULD 21 FIGHT AGAIN? I DO BELIEVE, THAT HAD MR. SOMERS REMAINED ON MY CASE, HE WOULD 22 HAVE SOON AFTER MOVED TO RECUSE JUDGE BEATTY. HE WOULD HAVE MADE NUMEROUS MOTIONS TO DISMISS FOR DUE PROCESS AND SPEEDY TRIAL AND HE 23 WOULD HAVE APPEALED ANY NEGATIVE DECISIONS TO HIGHER COURTS. I BELIEVE 24 THAT IT SHOWS THE GREATEST CONTRAST IN MY CASES BETWEEN A DILIGENT LAWYER AND AN INEFFECTIVE ONE BY SIMPLY COMPARING MR. SOMERS TO MR. NORTHAM. ONE 25 LAWYER CHALLENGED HIS CLIENTS TREATMENT BY THE COURT AND ONE REMAINED SILENT. ONE LAWYER RESPECTED HIS CLIENTS VERY REASONABLE LINES OF DE-... 26 27 (41)28

2

ROBERT A. GIBBS

FOWLER, CA. 93625

4

3

5

6

7

8

-

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

20

21

22

24

25

26

27

28

HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT

....FENSE AND ONE SPENT THE ENTIRETY OF 17 MONTHS FIGHTING WITH HIS OWN CLIENT AND REFUSING TO DO ANYTHING THAT WOULD BENEFIT HIS CLIENT (UNLESS YOU COUNT TRYING TO HAVE HIM DECLARED INCOMPETENT AND SENT TO STATE HOSPITAL, WHICH I DO NOT). TO CONTINUE WITH MR. BIRSS, I TOLD HIM UPON OUR FIRST MEETING THAT NO MATTER HOW DISCOURAGED I WAS BY THE PERFORMANCE OF PREVIOUS ATTORNEYS. I WAS WILLING TO GIVE HIM A FAIR CHANCE TO SHOW ME THAT HE WOULD DILIGENTLY DEFEND ME. HE ASSURED ME THAT HE UNDERSTOOD MY ON-GOING DILEMNA AND THAT I WAS MENTALLY FATIGUED. HE ASSURED ME THAT HE WOULD FIGHT. AFTER THE INITIAL 60 DAYS I GAVE HIM TO PREPARE AND AFTER WHICH HE HAD DONE NOT ONE SINGLE THING TO PREPARE MY DEFENSE, HAD NOT FILED ONE MOTION HE PROMISED TO FILE, HAD NOT INVESTIGATED ONE FACT IN ORDER TO PREPARE FOR A TRIAL, I GAVE HIM ANOTHER 60 DAYS. I SAT IN JAIL, DEPRESSED AND SUICIDAL, BEING HELD FOR THE ENTIRETY OF MY INCARCERATION IN ADMINISTRATIVE SEGREGATION, BEING ABUSED PHYSICALLY AND MENTALLY BY JAIL DEPUTEES AND I WAITED ANOTHER 60 DAYS FOR MY LAWYER TO DO HIS JOB. I TOLD MR. BIRSS AGAIN. IN FACT SEVERAL MORE TIMES, THAT IF HE DID NOT PREPARE MY CASE FOR TRIAL, I WAS GOING TO ALLOW MY PLEA TO BE COERCED BY THE COURT SO I COULD END MY VERY LENGTHY AND PSYCHOLOGICALLY DAMAGING INCARCERATION. IN FACT, I TOLD HIM, AT THIS POINT I BELIEVE IT IS WHAT THE COURT IS WAITING FOR. I BELIEVE IT IS MORE OR LESS DELIBERATE AND I DO NOT BELIEVE I WILL EVER GET A FAIR TRIAL.

(42)

ROBERT A. GIBBS P.O. BOX 881 FOWLER, CA. 93625

4

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

24

25

26

27

28

HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT

DURING THE PENDENCY OF MY CASES, I WAS OFFERED SEVERAL PLEA AGREEMENTS BY THE ASSIGNED DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEYS FOR NO STRIKE DEALS AND EITHER TIME SERVED OR SMALLER PRISON SENTENCES THAN I ULTIMATELY SERVED AND WAS SENTENCED TO. IN EACH CASE. WHEN I AGREED TO THESE PLEA AGREEMENTS. THEY WERE THEN WITHDRAWN BECAUSE THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY INTERVENED AND DEMANDED A HARSHER SENTENCE. I BELIEVE THAT THE DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEYS WERE ACTING MORE OR LESS IN GOOD FAITH, BUT THAT THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY HERSELF WAS INTENT ON OVER PUNISHING ME TO DEMONSTRATE THAT SHE WOULD BE "TOUGH" ON ANYONE WHO WAS PERCEIVED TO HAVE THREATENED LAW ENFORCE-MENT OFFICIALS. BECAUSE SHE WAS NOT AS FAMILIAR WITH THE FACTS AS THE DEPUTY ATTORNEYS WERE, I BELIEVE THIS PREJUDICED THE PROCESS. THE DEPUTY ATTORNEYS WERE OFFERING DEALS THAT WERE COMMENSURATE WITH THE FACT THAT THE STATE DID NOT HAVE GOOD CASES AGAINST ME. WHILE THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY SIMPLY DID NOT CARE ABOUT THE FACTS OF THE CASE. THIS INTEREFERED WITH BOTH THE NORMAL PLEA AGREEMENT PROCESS, BUT ALSO MY TRUST IN MY ATTORNEYS. THIS PRACTICE CONTINUED LITERALLY UP TO THE MOMENT OF MY ACTUAL PLEA. ALREADY FATIGUED AND HAVING NO FAITH WHATSOEVER IN THE PROCESS, I WAS OFFERED A PLEA AGREEMENT FOUR DAYS BEFORE MY FINAL PLEA FOR ONE STRIKE. TIME-SERVED AND I WOULD RETAIN MY FULL APPEAL RIGHTS. HOWEVER, WHEN I ACCEPTED THIS PLEA, MY ATTORNEY INFORMED ME IT WAS AGAIN WITHDRAWN AND...

(43)

1 2 ROBERT A. GIBBS P.O. BOX 881 3 FOWLER, CA. 93625 4 5 б 7 HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.) 8 10 11 IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT 12 13 ...I WOULD NOW HAVE TO PLEAD TO TWO STRIKES. I CANNOT STRESS UPON THE COURT 14 ENOUGH, THAT I WAS NOT IN MY RIGHT MIND AT ALL AT THIS POINT AND I WAS LITERALLY SICK AT THE ROLLER-COASTER OF EVENTS IN MY CASE. I REMEMBER 15 TELLING MY ATTORNEY AT THIS POINT. THAT I SIMPLY DIDN'T CARE ANYMORE. IF THEY 16 WERE CONTENT TO SIMPLY WEAR ME DOWN UNTIL I TOOK ANYTHING THEY WERE OFFERING, I NO LONGER HAD THE STRENGTH TO FIGHT THEM. I TRULY BELIEVED, THAT I 17 HAD DEMONSTRATED CLEARLY FOR THE RECORD WHAT WAS TRANSPIRING IN MY 18 CASES, THE LACK OF COMPETENT REPRESENTATION WAS CLEAR, MY WILLINGNESS TO CONTINUE TO PROTEST MY INNOCENSE WAS CLEAR, THE COMPLETE LACK OF DUE 19 PROCESS WAS CLEAR. IT WAS TIME TO AVAIL MYSELF TO HIGHER COURTS. MY LAWYER 20 THEN INFORMED ME THAT THE JUDGE (CARA BEATTY) WAS DEMANDING THAT I WAIVE MY APPEAL RIGHTS IF I ACCEPTED THIS AGREEMENT. I REMEMBER SHOUTING AT MY 21 LAWYER "SHE CAN'T DO THAT, IT'S ILLEGAL". I COULD NOT FATHOM UNDER WHAT 22 LEAGAL THEORY THE JUDGE COULD REJECT A PLEA AGREEMENT BASED UPON A DEFENDANT WAIVING APPEAL RIGHTS. ONE COULD SAY THAT MY THINKING WAS 23 COGENT AT THIS TIME BECAUSE I UNDERSTOOD WHAT WAS HAPPENING AND WAS 24 COMMUNICATING WITH MY LAWYER, BUT IN FACT, I WAS NO LONGER ACTING WISELY

IN MY BEST INTEREST. WHAT I WAS DOING WAS THROWING IN THE TOWEL. I REMEMBER

LAUGHING VERY SARCASTICALLY AT MY LAWYER AT THIS POINT AND TELLING HIM "IDON'T CARE ANYMORE, IT'S ALL BEEN DIRTY TRICKS. THEY AREN'T GOING TO QUIT....

(44)

28

25

26

ROBERT A. GIBBS

HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT

...UNTIL THEY COERCE MY PLEA". I INSTRUCTED MY LAWYER TO ACCEPT THE PLEA, BUT ONLY AFTER STRENUOUSLY OBJECTING TO THE JUDGES DEMAND THAT I WAIVE MY APPEAL RIGHTS, WHICH HE DID. I CANNOT STRESS ENOUGH TO THE COURT, THAT I WAS UNDER THE FULL BELIEF THAT MY ATTORNEY WOULD KEEP HIS PROMISE TO WAIT UNTIL I WAS OUT OF CUSTODY AND THEN INFORM THE COURT THAT THE PLEA WAS COERCED. MY ATTORNEY AND I HAD DISCUSSED ON NUMEROUS OCCASIONS, THAT WE BOTH FELT THAT THIS WAS NOT AN ORDINARY CASE OR CIRCUMSTANCE. WE BOTH HAD AGREED THAT THE COURT WAS ESSENTIALLY BIAS AGAINST ME, OR AT LEAST INDIFFERENT TO MY DUE PROCESS RIGHTS. WE BOTH AGREED THAT THE COURT WAS ESSENTIALLY EXPLOITING MY CUSTODIAL HANDICAP IN ORDER TO FORCE MY PLEA. OUR AGREED UPON LEGAL STRATEGY WAS TO GET ME OUT OF JAIL WHERE I COULD MORE EASILY GET LEGAL HELP AND CONTACT HIGHER COURTS. THIS STRATEGY INCLUDED ENTERING INTO A DELIBERATELY COERCED PLEA. I BELIEVE THAT THIS COURT SHOULD SERIOUSLY CONSIDER THAT IN THESE CASES, FOR WHATEVER REASON, THE JUDGES WERE NOT ATTEMPTING TO SAFEGUARD MY RIGHTS IN ANY WAY. IT WOULD BE LUDICROUS FOR ANYONE TO SAY THAT THE COURT COULD NOT SEE WHAT WAS GOING ON AND HOW IT WAS IMPACTING MY RIGHTS. I HAD BEEN IN JAIL OVER THREE YEARS. I HAD REJECTED MULTIPLE PLEA AGREEMENTS. I WAS DENIED MEANINGFUL BAIL AND BAIL HEARING. I HAD REMOVED ONE JUDGE FOR BIAS. I HAD REMOVED SEVERAL ATTORNEYS BY WAY OF THE MARSDEN PROCESS. WHAT, PRECISELY DID THEY THINK WAS GOING ON?

(45)

28

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1 2 ROBERT A. GIBBS P.O. BOX 881 3 FOWLER, CA. 93625 4 5 б 7 HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.) 8 10 11 IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT 12 13 IN HER REMARKS AT MY PLEA HEARING, JUDGE BEATTY SAID ESSENTIALLY THAT SHE 14 WAS GOING TO DEMAND MY WAIVER OF APPELLATE RIGHTS BECAUSE I "WAS A GOOD." WRITER". SHE WAS REFERRING TO MY MANY HABEAS AND MOTIONS TO THE COURT. 15 WHEREIN I HAD MADE SOME VERY GOOD LEGAL ARGUMENTS. THE ONLY CONCLUSION 16 ONE CAN DRAW FROM THIS EXCHANGE IS THAT THE JUDGE WAS OPENLY STATING THAT SHE WAS GOING TO BLOCK MY APPEALS SO THAT THE CASE WOULDN'T BE 17 OVERTURNED. THIS IS A HIGHLY INFLAMMATORY AND PREJUDICIAL POSITION TO TAKE. 18 I DO NOT HAVE TO REMIND THIS COURT THAT JUDGES ARE SUPPOSED TO BE IMPARTIAL. THEY ARE NOT SUPPOSED TO TAKE DEFENSIVE STANCES TO BULWARK A BAD CASE, BUT 19 THIS IS PRECISELY WHAT JUDGE BEATTY DID. THIS IS CLEAR FROM THE RECORD ITSELF 20 AND HER OWN COMMENTS. AGAIN, THOROUGHLY DISGUSTED AND FATIGUED, I SIMPLY DIDN'T CARE ANYMORE. THE WRITING WAS ON THE WALL AS THEY SAY. I TRUSTED MY 21 LAWYER TO HELP ME CHALLENGE THE PLEA AS SOON AS I WAS OUT OF CUSTODY. IN-22 STEAD MY LAWYER BETRAYED THAT TRUST AND REFUSED TO HELP ME AFTER I WAS SENTENCED. THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY AND THE COURT THEN RETALIATED FURTHER BY 23 PLACING ME ON PAROLE (EVEN THOUGH I HAD SERVED MORE TIME THAN THEY WERE 24 OR CONCEIVABLY COULD SENTENCE ME TO) AND THE D.A. THEN MANIPULATED PAROLE TO HAVE MY PAROLE BE SERVED IN FRESNO COUNTY (SOME 400 MILES AWAY). PAROLE 25 WOULD GO ON TO REFUSE TO LET ME TRAVEL BACK TO SHASTA TO ATTEND FAMILY... 26 (46)27

HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT.

...COURT. TO MAINTAIN MY PROPERTY IN SHASTA COUNTY OR TO ACCESS MY FORMER LAWYERS AND WITNESSES TO ATTEMPT TO PREPARE MY CASE TO THE HIGHER COURTS. THIS RESTRICTION UPON MY TRAVEL TO SHASTA COUNTY DID FURTHER IMPAIR MY EFFORTS TO BRING FACTS TO LIGHT AND TO PREPARE ANY APPEALS OR PETITIONS IN A TIMELY MANNER, WHEN I WAS ASSIGNED AN APPELATE LAWYER (MRS. CONNESS THOMPSON), SHE TOLD ME MY CASE WAS "ONE OF THE WORST CASES SHE HAS EVER SEEN", BUT THAT, BECAUSE I HAD "WAIVED" MY DIRECT APPEAL, SHE WAS ONLY ALLOWED TO BRING UP ISSUES OF MY SENTENCING. SHE STRENUOUSLY SUGGESTED THAT I FILE A HABEAS CORPUS MOTION ONCE MY DIRECT APPEAL (SUCH AS IT WAS), WAS CONCLUDED. I DID FILE THIS PETITION PREVIOUSLY, BUT WAS DIRECTED BY THE (EASTERN DISTRICT) JUDGE TO WAIT UNTIL ALL MY APPEALS WERE EXHAUSTED. AS OF THIS DATE, ALL MY APPEALS HAVE BEEN DENIED OR ABANDONED ON THE ADVICE OF MRS. THOMPSON. I WAS ADVISED BY MRS. THOMPSON, THAT HABEAS CORPUS IS THE ONLY RELIEF AVAILABLE TO A DEFENDANT WHO HAS BEEN DENIED OR HAS WAIVED. DIRECT APPEAL AND/ OR WHO WISHES TO RAISE DUE PROCESS OR INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL CLAIMS. I HAVE SPENT MUCH OF THIS TIME ATTEMPTING TO GET LAWYERS AND INVESTIGATORS IN MY CASE TO PROVIDE DECLARATIONS TO PROVIDE TO THE HIGHER COURT IN ORDER TO CLARIFY CERTAIN ASPECTS OF THE CASE. IT TOOK UNTIL 2019 TO GET A DECLARATION FROM MY PRIMARY INVESTIGATOR. MR. DONALD LUSTER. IN HIS DECLARATION. MR. LUSTER ADMITS THAT COUNSEL WERE INEFFECTIVE, THAT THIS PETITIONER WAS DENIED DUE PROCESS AND THAT THIS

27

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT.

...WAS HELD, ESSENTIALLY, AS A POLITICAL PRISONER. I HAVE ASKED DONALD TO CLARIFY WHAT HE MEANS BY THIS ON SEVERAL OCCASIONS AND HE IS ADAMANT THAT. IN HIS OPINION, THIS PETITIONER WAS HELD IN JAIL DELIBERATELY BY THE COURT AS A TACTIC TO EXPLOIT THIS PETITIONER'S CUSTODIAL HANDICAP, SPECIFICALLY BECAUSE THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY HAD POLITICIZED MY CASES, BOTH BECAUSE OF PRESS COVERAGE. AS WELL AS TO "DEFEND THE HONOR" OF THE POLICEMEN I WAS ALLEGED. TO HAVE THREATENED. IN DONALDS' OPINION, AND THIS PETITIONER DOES AGREE, THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY WAS SO BLINDED BY HER INDIGNANCE AND ZEAL, THAT MY PRE-TRIAL INCARCERATION AND PROSECUTION BECAME MERE AFTER-THOUGHTS OF HER HELL-BENT DETERMINATION TO PUNISH ME EXCESSIVELY AND AT ALL COSTS. OBVIOUSLY THIS IS A BIAS AND AMOUNTS TO DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE TO MY CIVIL RIGHTS AND, ONCE AGAIN, I HAVE BEEN FORCED TO ALLEGE AS SUCH IN A SECTION 1983 (CIVIL RIGHTS) ACTION IN THE EASTERN DISTRICT. I HAVE BEEN IN CONTACT WITH ATTORNEY'S NORTHAM AND BIRSS, TO ELICIT A DECLARATION FROM THEM AS WELL. NORTHAM HAS MADE STATEMENT'S SINCE MY SENTENCE, THAT THE COURT WAS BIASED AGAINST ME, THAT THE COURT WAS GOING TO "GET ME" ONE WAY OR ANOTHER AND THAT IT WAS HIS BELIEF THAT I HAD TO PLEAD N.G.I. IN ORDER TO GET A PSYCHIATRIC DEFENSE. HE HAS PROMISED TO WRITE ME A DECLARATION ON SEVERAL OCCASIONS BECAUSE HE "THINKS I KIND OF GOT SCREWED", BUT HAS NEVER FOLLOWED THROUGH. LIKEWISE, MR. BIRSS HAS READILY ACKNOWLEDGED AND ADMITTED TO MUCH OF WHAT I HAVE ALLEGED HERE AND HAS PROMISED TO ...

(48)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

2 ROBERT A. GIBBS
P.O. BOX 881
FOWLER, CA. 93625

4

5

б

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT.

...WRITE A DECLARATION AS WELL, BUT AGAIN CONSISTENTLY FAILS TO FOLLOW THROUGH. AS OF THIS DATE (12-22-20), I AM STILL ATTEMPTING TO GET MR. BIRSS TO FOLLOW THROUGH WITH HIS PROMISE. I WOULD RESPECTFULLY INFORM THIS COURT, THAT I WOULD NOT HAVE TAKEN THE PLEA I TOOK IF I HAD NOT BEEN RELYING ON MR. BIRSS' PROMISE TO IMMEDIATELY CHALLENGE THE PLEA AND I BELIEVE THAT MR. BIRSS IS RELUCTANT TO ADMIT THIS FACT. I HAVE TOLD HIM ON NUMEROUS OCCASIONS THAT I DO NOT BELIEVE THAT IT WAS WRONG FOR HIM TO KNOWINGLY ENTER A COERCED PLEA, GIVEN THE TORTURED CIRCUMSTANCES OF MY CASE AND MY INCARCERATION, ONLY THAT HE NEEDS TO FOLLOW THROUGH WITH HIS PROMISE TO ADVISE THE COURT OF THE TRUE NATURE OF THE PLEA. I HAVE TOLD HIM THAT, BY ENTERING THE COERCED PLEA, HE WAS ONLY ATTEMPTING TO DO WHAT WAS RIGHT FOR HIS CLIENT, WHICH SHOULD BE HIS PRIMARY OBJECTIVE. MY CASE WAS NOT AN ORDINARY CASE BY ANY MEANS. IT WAS OUR BELIEF, AND WE WERE IN FULL AGREEMENT, THAT THE COURT WAS, IN FACT, EXPLOITING MY CUSTODIAL HANDICAP AND WOULD SIMPLY LEAVE ME IN JAIL AS LONG AS IT TOOK TO COERCE THE PLEA. IF THERE WAS NEVER GOING TO BE ANY FAIR TRIAL, IF THE COURT WAS CONSISTENTLY BIAS AGAINST THE DEFENSE, IF THERE WAS IMMENSE PRESSURE ON THE COURT TO AVOID A LAWSUIT BY SECURING A CONVICTION AND THE COURT WAS ACTING ON THIS PRESSURE BY GOING SO FAR AS TO MAKE ME A POLITICAL PRISONER. THEN IT CANNOT BE NEGATIVELY ATTRIBUTED TO MY LAWYER THAT HE STARTED THINKING OUTSIDE THE BOX. BOTH MY LAWYER AND MYSELF WERE IN COMPLETE AGREEMENT THAT ONLY THE HIGHER COURTS COULD...

(49)

ROBERT A. GIBBS
P.O. BOX 881
FOWLER, CA. 93625

5

б

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT.

...SOMEHOW DEFEND MY RIGHTS AS A DEFENDANT. MR. BIRSS HAS CLEARLY COMPLICATED MATTERS BY ENTERING THE COERCED PLEA AND THEN FAILING TO KEEP HIS PROMISE TO HELP ME TO GET THE PLEA WITHDRAWN AFTER MY RELEASE FROM CUSTODY. THIS PETITIONER RESPECTFULLY CONTENDS THAT IT WAS MUCH MORE THAN MR. BIRSS' REPRESENTATION THAT CALLS INTO QUESTION THE LEGITIMACY AND VOLUNTARINESS OF MY PLEA. FIRST OF ALL. WAS THE ALL-OUT BATTLE THAT THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY WAS MAKING OF MY CASES, THIS ALONE WAS PRESSURE ENOUGH TO CAUSE THE COMMON DEFENDANT TO ENTER A PLEA, GUILTY OR NOT. SECONDLY, MY INCARCERATION PRE-TRIAL WAS EXCESSIVE AND LITLLE OR NO EFFORT WAS MADE TO SECURE A BAIL OR OTHER TYPE OF RELEASE FOR ME BY MY LAWYERS. THIRDLY WAS THE MENTAL AND EMOTIONAL TOLL MY INCARCERATION AND PROSECUTION WERE TAKING ON MY PERSON, A CONDITION THAT ONLY WORSENED AS TIME WENT ON. ANOTHER ISSUE THE COURT SHOULD CONSIDER IS THE WAY MULTIPLE OFFERS WERE OFFERED TO ME THROUGH MY LAWYERS, ONLY TO BE CHANGED AND/OR WITHDRAWN WHEN I ACCEPTED THEM OR LITERALLY AT THE LAST MINUTE. IF THE COURT WERE TO COMPARE THESE OFFERS WITH MY ULTIMATE PLEA AGREEMENT, IT WOULD SEE THAT THESE OFFERS VARIED GREATLY FROM TIME SERVED, NO STRIKE DEALS AT THE BEGINNING OF MY INCARCERATION TO 6 YEAR, MULTIPLE STRIKE OFFERS AT THE END OF MY CASE. I BELIEVE THAT THESE OFFERS ONLY INCREASED THE LONGER I WAS INCARCERATED TO JUSTIFY MY INCARCERATION, A CONDITION THAT I BELIEVE IS A TYPE OF BIAS AND A DUE PROCESS VIOLATION. IN OTHER WORDS, THE LONGER...

(50)

FOWLER, CA. 93625

HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT.

...MY INCARCERATION WENT ON, THE MORE "SERIOUS" MY CASES BECAME AND THE OFFERS HAD TO BE COMMENSURATE WITH THE LENGTH OF MY PRE-TRIAL INCARCERATION. ANOTHER ASPECT THIS COURT SHOULD CONSIDER IS THE MENTAL EFFECT IT HAS WHEN AN OFFER IS WITHDRAWN OR CHANGED AT THE LAST MINUTE AND THE POSSIBILITY THAT IT PREJUDICES THE DEFENDANT BECAUSE IT WEARS HIM OR HER DOWN AND MAKES IT MORE LIKELY FOR THEM TO THROW UP THEIR HANDS AND SIMPLY ACCEPT WHATEVER OFFER IS STILL ON THE TABLE. THIS PETITIONER RESPECTFULLY SUBMITS, THAT WHATEVER THE AVERAGE PERSON FEELS OR THINKS ABOUT A DEFENDANT UNDER PROSECUTION, TO A DEFENDANT, THE MOMENT BY MOMENT AND DAY TO DAY EVENTS IN THE CASE TAKE ON VERY LARGE AND EVER-PRESENT EMOTIONAL AND MENTAL PRESSURES. SO MUCH SO, THAT EVEN A PERFECTLY SANE AND COMPETENT DEFENDANT CAN MAKE CHOICES THAT ARE NOT IN HIS OR HER BEST INTEREST, BASED SIMPLY ON AN EMOTIONAL OR IRRATIONAL IMPULSE. IMAGINE THEN, A DEFENDANT SUCH AS MYSELF, WHO HAS A LONG HISTORY OF PSYCHIATRIC PROBLEMS, WHO HAS HAD A NUMEROUSITY OF LAWYERS HE SEES DOING NOTHING TO DEFEND HIM, WHO BELIEVES THE COURT IS NOT PROTECTING HIS RIGHTS, WHO HAS NOT SEEN HIS DAUGHTER FOR SEVERAL YEARS OR HAD ANY REAL FAMILIAL VISITATION IN THE JAIL. WHO IS BEING MENTALLY AND PHYSICALLY ABUSED BY JAIL DEPUTEES, HELD IN " ADMINISTRATIVE SEGREGATION" AS RETALIATION FOR ALLEGEDLY THREATENING LOCAL SHERIFF'S DEPUTEES ETC. AT WHAT POINT DOES OUR SYSTEM OF JUSTICE ADMIT THAT ONE BECOMES GUILTY, NOT BECAUSE OF REAL GUILT, BUT BECAUSE...

(51)

28

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

2

3

ROBERT A. GIBBS P.O. BOX 881

FOWLER, CA. 93625

4

5

б

7

8

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT.

...THE VERY OPPRESSIVENESS OF THE CRIMINAL PROCESS WEARS DOWN EVEN INNOCENT DEFENDANTS UNTIL THEY ADMIT SOME GUILT JUST TO RELIEVE SOME OF THE IMMENSE PRESSURE THEY ARE FEELING? I BELIEVE THAT THE "BAIT AND SWITCH" TACTICS UTILISED BY THE PROSECUTION IN MY CASE, VIS A VIS, PLEA OFFERS, SHOULD BE SCRUTINIZED BY THIS COURT. NOT FOUR DAYS BEFORE MY FINAL PLEA, THIS PETITIONER WAS OFFERED A PLEA AGREEMENT FOR TIME SERVED. ONE STRIKE AND FULL APPEAL RIGHTS. LITERALLY IN THE TIME IT TOOK FOR MY LAWYER TO RELAY THIS OFFER TO ME. AND FOR ME TO ACCEPT AND FOR HIM TO GET THE CASE BACK ON CALENDER THE FOLLOWING WEEK, THE OFFER WAS WITHDRAWN AGAIN. I RESPECTFULLY SUBMIT THAT SIMPLY THE CHANGE IN OFFERS, HAVING BEEN DUTIFULLY RELAYED TO ME BY COUNSEL, THEN LITERALLY CHANGED AT THE CHANGE OF PLEA HEARING, CALLS INTO SERIOUS QUESTION THE VOLUNTARINESS OF MY PLEA. THE COURT SHOULD CONSIDER, THE LENGTH OF MY INCARCERATION AT THAT POINT, MY MENTAL STATE, THE TIME I WAS ALLOWED TO FULLY CONSIDER THE CHANGED OFFER (FIVE MINUTES IN THE HOLDING CELL), THE MOTIVES OF PROSECUTORS IN CHANGING THE OFFER, MY ATTORNEYS' ABYSMAL HISTORY OF PREPARING MY CASES TO TRIAL ETC. THE SYSTEM CANNOT SIMPLY BE A MECHANISM FOR BLUDGEONING GUILTY PLEAS FROM INCARCERATED, UNDER-DEFENDED DEFENDANTS. I BELIEVE THAT THE COURT SHOULD CONSIDER THAT JUDGE CARA BEATTY'S INSISTANCE THAT I WAIVE MY APPEAL RIGHTS AT MY CHANGE OF PLEA, AND MY LAWYERS STRENUOUS OBJECTION TO THIS, ALSO CALLS INTO SERIOUS QUESTION THE VOLUNTARINESS OF MY PLEA. I ALSO BELIEVE THAT THIS INSISTANCE WAS AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION BY THE...

(52)

2

3

ROBERT A. GIBBS

P.O. BOX 881 FOWLER, CA. 93625

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

1920

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

FOWLER, CA. 93625

HABEAS CORPUS SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF (CONT.)

IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DISTRICT.

...JUDGE. THE RIGHT TO APPEAL WAS EXPLICITLY NEGOTIATED WITH THE PROSECUTION AND WAS A VERY PRONOUNCED "STICKING POINT". I HAD MADE IT VERY CLEAR TO ALL, THAT I BELIEVED MY RIGHTS WERE BEING VIOLATED AND I INTENDED TO APPEAL ANY PLEA, SENTENCE OR JUDGEMENT TO THE HIGHEST COURTS IN THE LAND. PREVIOUS OFFERS HAD BEEN REJECTED SPECIFICALLY BECAUSE THEY DID NOT ALLOW FOR APPEAL. THE DEFENSE FINALLY GOT THE PROSECUTION TO AGREE TO NOT BLOCK ANY APPEAL AND THEN THE JUDGE DEMANDS IT? THIS WAS HIGHLY IRREGULAR AND CAUGHT THE DEFENSE OFF-GUARD. OUR ONLY OPTION WAS TO OBJECT TO THE VERY DEAL WE WERE ACCEPTING. I BELIEVE THAT THE CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION GUARANTEEING FULL APPEALS FOR DEFENDANTS AND THE OVER-RIDING DUE PROCESS CLAUSE OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION MAKE THE JUDGES' INTERFERENCE WITH A LAWFULLY NEGOTIATED PLEA SETTLEMENT A VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS AND THIS DEFENDANT SHOULD HAVE BEEN ALLOWED A FULL APPEAL PROCESS. THERE WAS ALSO ALOT OF WHAT MY LAWYERS CALLED INAPPROPRIATE STATEMENTS BY THE JUDGE, DESIGNED TO ENCOURAGE ME TO TAKE THE PLEA. THE JUDGE SAID THINGS LIKE "IT'S A BEAUTIFUL DAY OUTSIDE TODAY, I KNOW YOU'VE BEEN IN THE JAIL A LONG TIME. WOULDN'T YOU LIKE TO GET THIS ALL BEHIND YOU AND GO HOME?" IT DID NOT SEEM TO ME THEN, OR NOW, THAT THERE WAS ANY PRESSURE, INDUCEMENT OR DISSUASION, THAT THE COURT WOUD NOT USE TO OBTAIN MY PLEA AND EVENTUALLY, THEY GOT WHAT THEY WERE AFTER. IN NOVEMBER, 2018, I PLED NO CONTEST (WEST PLEA) TO SPECIFIC CRIMES I KNEW I HAD NOT COMITTED, INDEED, CAN PROVE TO THIS DAY I DID NOT COMMIT, SO THAT I COULD JUST...GO....HOME.

(53)