

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.568(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;

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT	ATTORNEY GENERAL
office of the clerk	box 85266
WASHINGTON , D.C.20543	SANDIEGO, CA 92101

This service contained the following documents;

PETITION FOR REHEARING PURSUANT TO RULES OF COURT RULE ~~XXXX~~ 44

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 ;

sandiego,	92179
<u>CITY</u>	<u>ZIP CODE</u>

This service was conducted on (DATE) march 31, 2020

UNDER THE PENALTY OF PERJURY  
THE FORGOING IS TRUTHFUL AND ACCORDING TO BELIEF

(NAME) john henry yablonsdky (SIGNED) \_\_\_\_\_

My address is 480 alta rd, sandiego, ca. 92179

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

2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 CLERK FOR THE COURT  
9 FOR THE UNITED STATES  
10 SUPREME COURT

11 John Henry Yablonsky,  
12 Petitioner,

CASE NO.# 19-7318

13  
14  
15 vs.

PETITION FOR REHEARING PURSUANT  
TO UNITED STATED RULES OF COURT  
RULE 44 SCHULP V DELO513 US 298(1995)

16  
17  
18 California (Sanbernardino),  
Respondent ,

19  
20 To;CLERK FOR THE COURT  
21 STATE OF CALIFORNIA

22  
23 The United States Constitution I Amendment does  
24 guarantee respective rights to seek redress, which in this case  
25 includes government bodies who caused irreperable property damage  
26 to petitioner John Henry Yablonsky (PETITIONER) ina erroneous con-  
27 viction by the use of false evidence. NAPUE V ILLINOIS 360 US 264  
28 (1959). Petitioners collateral attack was timely SCHULP, 513 US 298

THIS PETITION FOR REHEARING IS NOT ERRONEOUS

1  
2           Petitioner does not wish to burden this Court with unsub-  
3 stanciated claims of factual innocence, yet had met that thresh-  
4 old when filing his post trial collateral attacks in California's  
5 Superior Court as a second successive petition for writ of habeas  
6 corpus. SCULP V DELO 513 US 298(1995). The factual grounds of these  
7 allegations were developed through more than 700 writings, letters,  
8 motions, petition for relief, civil cases, demands for discovery  
9 which California deliberately withheld from petitioner in an effort  
10 to hide the gross misconducts which occurred in January 2011 for  
11 case ( Sanbernardion #FVI900518) The proofs of these gross miscond-  
12 ucts were made available after initial direct appeals filings.  
13 (California Court of Appeal 4th District #E055850) Which had these  
14 informations been known would have affected the manner which the  
15 Court of Appeals ruled. The withheld records were substantial in  
16 nature including 5400 pages as well as a compact disc, which after  
17 thorough investigations, comparisons to other discoveries prev-  
18 iously released support that petitioner had been erroneously  
19 convicted United States v Bagley 473 US 667(1985) . When petitioner  
20 was capable of filing the "SECOND SUCCESSIVE" petition for habeas  
21 corpus the state Court of California stated "IT WAS TOO LATE"!

22           This language disagrees with this Courts decision under  
23 SCHULP V DELO 513 US 298(1995) . It is because petitioner is fact-  
24 ually innocent, that his petition must be heard. It is because  
25 petitioners initial collateral attack were not determined on  
26 the merits of the claim, while state Courts deemed 1) That petitioner  
27 had not provided enough evidence to support his claim 2) That  
28 collusory allegations are not enough 3) Denied jurisdiction that

1 escaped the Courts discretion. It is because these filings and  
2 the language in those rulings that made petitioner "second" petition  
3 the equivalent as being the "first". It is in this filing that  
4 petitioner provided tangible proofs that the state used false evid-  
5 ence to reach the initial conviction in 2011 that contradicts this  
6 Courts ruling under NAPUE V ILLIONOIS 360 US 264. The Court stated  
7 that was not enough to meet the federal threshold, ignoring this  
8 Courts language under McQuiggins v Perkins 569 US 383, 133 S.Ct.1924  
9 (2013). For the above reasons this Court is not being used to delay  
10 a process. If petitioner may add, "IT WAS BECAUSE OF THE GROSS  
11 MISCONDUCTS OF CALIFORNIA WHO DELIBERATELY WITHELD THESE FACTS  
12 FOR SEVEN YEARS, THAT DELAYED THIS COURTS PRECIOUS RESOURCES"!

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
FACTUAL BASIS OF THIS CLAIM

On or about September 20, 1985 "someone other than petit-  
itioner" killed Rita Mabel Cobb in her home. Evidences were collected  
with regards to relevant and material values, but "only" stored  
and not processed until three years later when a confession by  
a county coroner named Gregory Randolph was reported to WE-TIP.  
The confession is what instigated the processing of the evidences  
collected from the Cobb residence on September 23, 1985. An arrest  
was made prior to the results of these "late processing" of the  
evidences, which "forced" sheriff to release the primary suspect  
Mr Randolph. In an effort to protect the integrities of the sheriff  
interests with the Cobb murder, they were forced into releasing

1 Mr Randolph, while they chose to protect their investigations, they  
2 altered the "name" in those investigative results to "WILLIAM  
3 BACKHOFF", knowing that Mr Randolph's employment as county coroner  
4 would have been capable of following their investigations onto  
5 Mr Randolph's suspicious confession. A few years later DNA had been  
6 able to advance to the point they could determine culpability  
7 of the evidences collected from the Cobb residence on September 23,  
8 1985, which would have afforded local sheriff sufficient evidence  
9 to reach a conviction. Protecting the valuable resources of the  
10 Court system. Mr Gregory Randolph committed suicide on June 1, 1999.

11 When responders addressed that crime scene they discovered  
12 extraordinary evidences that would have also supported the convict-  
13 ion when they located "numerous" trophies in the residence of Mr  
14 Randolph. These trophies indicated Mr Gregory Randolph was a serial  
15 killer by the photos kept as trophies from "MURDER SCENES OF WOMEN"  
16 whom Randolph had not worked on as county coroner while employed  
17 by the county of San Bernardino. One would believe that Mr Randolph  
18 maintained that job as county coroner to hide his secret, "THAT  
19 HE WAS A SERIAL KILLER"; protected by his employment status so that  
20 he could monitor the progress of his "HOBBY". It was determined  
21 when Mr Randolph committed suicide, right about the time the DNA  
22 for the Cobb murder was reaching conclusions. "THE SUICIDE WAS  
23 NOT A COINCIDENCE TO THE RESULT OF THE EVIDENCE FROM COBB SCENE".!

24 When Mr Randolph committed suicide this case went cold  
25 and then stored into the Sheriff evidence lockers until three very  
26 suspicious government bodies professed to conduct "special" invest-  
27 igations into solving these now "COLD CASES". These bodies were  
28 known as County District Attorney Michale Ramos who employed the

1 illicit skills of county sheriff Robert Alexander and Greg Myler  
2 to help achieve political boosts with solving cold cases that  
3 had been cold for decades. It was the crafty skillset of these  
4 detectives that managed to manipulate facts into "different" mean-  
5 ings, while they "hid" those activities behind the blankets of  
6 color law.

7           Petitioner was arrested 25 years after the murder occurred  
8 on Rita Mabel Cobb. During this arrest an illegal interrogation  
9 occurred outside fourth amendment protections, and recorded while  
10 petitioner was under custodial management by three police agencies  
11 and in a locked detention facility. The results of that interrogation  
12 were then altered after petitioner filed lawsuits in an effort  
13 to protect substantial rights to an impartial panel of jurist when  
14 the county district attorney used petitioners case in a political  
15 campaign. Promising convictions for votes. After the five million  
16 dollar lawsuit was filed and served upon Michel Ramos at his place  
17 of employment, his "CRONIES" manufactured evidences in the case  
18 to ensure and support the charges would reach conviction. Altering  
19 the interrogation transcripts by changing petitioners answers,  
20 placing evidence into petitioners possession which otherwise indic-  
21 ated he did not have. "A KEY TO THE VICTIMS HOME". That evidence  
22 rang throughout the courtroom where petitioner stood behind not  
23 guilty pleas, while the jurors were forced into reasoning why would  
24 a defendants who had no business possessing a key to the victims  
25 home, have one in his possession ?

26           That same evidence rang throughout the entire justice  
27 system of this Country, while district attorney's and attorney  
28 generals cried that petitioner had a key to the victims house!

1           That key was placed into petitioners possession by  
2 Robert Alexander on November 23, 2010 by way of text alterations.  
3 The Deputy District attorney John Thomas then created an audio  
4 version in his home on January 26, 2011 when he created an audio  
5 match to the altered answers by redacting and dubbing sounds from  
6 other answers givin by petitioner into their "NEW HOME" as suggesting  
7 petitioner actual said he had that key...<sup>"</sup>listen to the sound match  
8 the text ! DDA John Thomas then illicited the use of co-conspirator  
9 Ropberty Alexander to place this evidence into the states records  
10 as "AUTHENTIC" and "accuratly transcribed", on January 27, 2011!

11           That evidence was placed into petitioners possession  
12 twenty five years after the crime of murder occured. ( exhibits  
13 41, 42, 43 63, 64) These facts were not discovered until seven  
14 years after the trial at no fault of petitioner who was made to  
15 beg for discvoery from the very first day he was charged with murder.  
16 ( exhibits 1-11) This process took seven years to get ahold of  
17 5400 pages along with a compact disc which support these allegations  
18 of fraud upon the court by government bodies for case (#FVI900519).  
19 The full disclosure was made on January 2016 while petitioner was  
20 in recorvery from a stroke which left him invalent and immobile  
21 as well as visually impaired. Petitioner was forced into comparing  
22 the 5400 pages delivered to his hospital room with several thousand  
23 pages that had been piecemealed to him by trial counsel since  
24 March 11, 2009. ( 300 pages release in June 2009) (1300 pages rel-  
25 eased in July 2011) ( 1600 pages released in July 2014) All these  
26 records were in storage with the department of corrections because  
27 of the medical housing of a stroke recovery. All of thsi would  
28 be insignificant except that petitioner is innocent, his DNA proves

1 his innocence. The only evidence suggesting guilt is the manufactured  
2 evidence that government bodies admit was manufactured as they  
3 belloyed they were immune during briefing stages in a billion dollar  
4 lawsuit. Admitting they acted outside of their discretions and fid-  
5 uciary duties. (CASE #CIVDS1506664) "THE HECK RULE"!

6 Still handicapped, petitioner continued his pleight for  
7 truth and redress through the use of collateral attacks under the  
8 use of petition for habeas corpus, which had been filed at petitioners  
9 earliest possible convenience because of detention and jurisdictional  
10 issues. Acts outside petitioners control because of lack of library  
11 access, full access to the entire files at the same time, visual  
12 impairments which hindered petitioners ability to bring this action  
13 at the very first filing in 2012 ( Case #WHCSS 1200311)( exhibit 57)

14 The most alarming point in this argument is that these  
15 proofs of fake evidences were placed into states records for case  
16 (FVI900518) as states exhibit 49 (compact disc of original recording)  
17 and exhibit 49A a(113 page transcript created at the exact same  
18 time a 136 page transcript was created on November 23, 2010) "NONE"  
19 of the government bodies who partook into the frame up have ever  
20 denied that alterations after petitioner finally got possession of  
21 these proofs, which are now before the Superior Court of California,  
22 Court of appeals for California, and Supreme Court of the state of  
23 California, and rely on the Courts ruling that "IT WAS TOO LATE"  
24 "THAT PROOF DOES NOT REACH THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD", erroneous con-  
25 clusions and contradictory rulings under NAPUE V ILLINOIS 360 US 264  
26 SCHULP V DELO , 513 US 298(1995);UNITED STATES V BAGLEY\* 473 US 667  
27 McQUIGGINS V PERKINS 596 US 383, 133 S.Ct. 1924((2013))(emphasis)  
28



1           On October 9, 2018 a tragic miscarriage of justice occurred  
2 within a territorial state Court, when a spokesperson of the Court  
3 deemed a factual innocence claim as "untimely". The remaining Courts  
4 of the state summarily denied petitioner plea for attention to the  
5 gross miscarriages of justice which prejudiced petitioner. The facts  
6 before the Courts had not been denied, refuted, or disputed to "any"  
7 length, making them factually based as undisputed.

8           Petitioner filed factual innocence petition as a life  
9 without parole inmate arguing newly discovered evidences that had  
10 not been developed until petitioner was handicapped because of a  
11 stroke. Mc Quiggins v Perkins, supra. The petition included discovery  
12 which up until recently then had been withheld by government bodies  
13 United States v Bagley supra-. The petition carried sufficient  
14 allegations of fraud by government body in comparison of all other  
15 evidences in that case, suggesting "deception. Napue v Illinois supra

16           Petitioner brought sufficient discovery to support ineff-  
17 ective assistance of Counsel pursuant to Strickland v Washington,  
18 supra, 466 US 668(1984); United States v Cronin 466 US 648(1984)  
19 Bell v Cone 535 US 685(2002) All of petitioners claims were federally  
20 grounded with regards to violations to protected rights outlined  
21 by the United States Fifth, Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments.

22           The state court does not have the "discretion" to ignore  
23 federal questions of fact or law. This is the case before you today!

24           The "ONLY" culpable evidence in petitioners case was the  
25 evidence manufactured by government bodies in retaliation for being  
26 sued for misusing petitioners case in their campaign smear. The  
27 rule of law states that "NOBODY" is above being held liable for  
28 acts determined as crimes, this includes district attorney's !