

PROOF OF SERVICE BY AN INMATE

ACCORDING TO PRISONER MAILBOX RULE

THIS MAILING IS DEEMED FILED AND SERVED UNDER ANTHONY V CAMERA, 236 f.3d.563(9th cir.2000)

WHEN THIS MAILING HAS BEEN DELIVERED INTO THE CUSTODY OF CDCR STAFF

This service and mailing was conducted by a party and inmate of CDCR, and was conducted according to California Code Regulations § 3142 and P.C. § 2601(b). This mailing was inspected and sealed in the presence of an on duty correctional officer, into a fully prepaid envelope to be delivered by the U.S.P.S. as addressed to the following parties;

U.S. Supreme Court
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20543

ATTORNEY GENERAL
Box 85266
S.D. CA. 92128

This service contained the following documents;

PETITION FOR REHEARAL

This service was conducted by an adult over the age of 18 years of age and mailed from a state institution, which will be logged by facility mailroom parties as [LEGAL] mail. This mailing was conducted from ;

SAN DIEGO CITY 92179 ZIP CODE

This service was conducted on (DATE) 10/3/20

UNDER THE PENALTY OF PERJURY

THE FORGOING IS TRUTHFUL AND ACCORDING TO BELIEF

(NAME) YABLONSKY JON (SIGNED) [Signature]

My address is 480 AQA S.D. CA. 92179

John Henry Yablonsky AL0373
18-147
480 Alta rd
Sandiego,ca,92179

CLERK OF THE COURT
UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

John Henry Yablonsky,
Petitioner,

CASE NO.#19-7318

vs.

PETITION FOR REHEARING

California
(sanBernardino),
Respondent,

TO: CLERK OF THE COURT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

The united satates constitution guarantees certain rights that are invaluable resources which protect liberty, and within these protected vehicles are shields against governemnt misconduct. Napue v Illionois, 360 US 264((1959) Was decided for this very reasons. ~~Protections~~ from governemnt intrusions into the fairness of a defendants charge during trial. The fundamentals of fairness are that no evidnece, no testimony used by the governemtn would be tainted, unreliable. Although Napue discused the gravity of misconducts. It focused on the results of the "unreliablity of that specific evidence.

Whether or not these evidences affected a reasonable jurists in comparison to all the other evidenece in that specific case. Which in this case is an interrogation trasnscript. The DNA in this case clears me of the time the crime was committed by "several" days and went undisputed by fact finders, although exaggeratingly mistated by post trial defenders of the state.

The "ONLY" other evidences in this case come from a trascript created by the prosecutor himself who changed answers in an interrogation recording to place evidenece into petitioners possession. "A KEY TO THE VICTIMS HOUSE!" There was nothing else that placed me in that house mischievously. But a key to a persons home when there was no responsibility to have one, no agreement for sharing keys, and no relationship which implied that key was loaned for ease of access. The State Courts found that "alleged" adm,ission of having a key to the victims house peculiar, which explains how a reasonable jurist would have also determined that fact....."IF IT WERE TRUE". But because the prosecutor is the one who created the transcript used in trial, it was the prosecutors actions that tainted the right to a fair trial based on truth. In this trial the truth releaes me from the case. Itw as the lies and decept that binds me to the murder. (NAPUE V ILLINOIS((citation ommitted)

March 11. 2020

John Henry Yablonsky