

## MEMORANDUM

MENT, NEWTON DIVISION (by a scheduled meeting) to speak with Redden/Homicide Detective(s) Dennis Fanning and Frank Weber.

Detective Fanning addressed Mr. Favor in light of the two suspects ("SECURITY" / "SHOOTER") and in slight clarification to "TRUB" by identification. Mr. Favor held no knowledge to the whereabouts of the "SHOOTER" suspect. Detective Frank Weber did not believe Mr. Favor.

During Mr. Favor phase as self-counsel, Mr. Favor contacted a family member for assistance, it was soon after sought for Mr. Favor to denounce his Propria Persona Status and re-retain Ms. Poage as his defense counsel.

Mr. Favor was sentenced upon April 7, 2009. Mr. Favor addressed the court in respect as well to state his many attempts to prevent any criminal act from moving forward against the employees of A&J Liquor Store in Los Angeles.

Mrs. Lee wife of Paul Lee owner of A&J Liquor Store, appeared to only one court hearing.

Mr. Faver is currently appealing this matter in the California Supreme Court with faith to receive justice.

After Mr. Faver written a term contract revocating his assistance to Mr. Weinberg, in need forthwith, Mr. Faver retained LAW OFFICES OF ALLEN G. WEINBERG, ESCQ as his defense counsel.

In the month of June/July of 2009 while in custody of NORTH KERN STATE PRISON in Delano, California, Mr. Faver were delivered an appellate package in light of the LAW OFFICES OF ALLEN G. WEINBERG, ESCQ, of Beverly Hills, California.

MEMORANDUM  
and in light of Mr. Faver being detained as a suspect to the November 8, 2004, Robbery/Homicide of ABU LIQUIZ where, during the hearing Mr. Faver gained eye contact with Mrs. Lee, once recognized Mr. Faver placed his right hand over his heart. Mrs. Lee, her girl, family members/representatives continued to appear in light of Mr. Faver

MEMORANDUM

## MEMORANDUM

Due to the cause, effects constructed within PEORLE V. FAVOR, BAZ85265 (LOS ANGELES) have resulted within multiple accusations by misconduct ranging from those held within.

Due to no full integrity upon Mr. Favor's behalf, on the examining craft set against Mr. Favor upon November 8, 2004 by a Terrance Holloway which in whom actually formed for the two suspect's "Jay-Bird" ("Security") and the Gunman "SHOOTER" to eliminate Mr. Favor by the weapon carried by the "SHOOTER" (due to an unknown jealousy/poisoning Mr. Favor and additional members of music acts held to the strong favoring of Mr. Favor) in addition to the crafted act-by-thought of Reba Ann Stevens, Mr. Favor's maternal parent.

By the grace of a higher-being (GOD) Mr. Favor was revealed the true findings of November 8, 2004, Mr. Favor then

MEMORANDUM

hand-written the summary, an earnest request assistance of his maternal parent to provide copies to the judicial law enforcement authorities held to the matter...

Reba Ann Stevens held no good meaning to Mr. Favor, let alone his indifference...

Mr. Favor's request for his legal document -  
action and addressing issues, went unheard  
and blatantly ignored by Reba Ann Stevens  
unmedicated gall...

Mr. Favor, is currently retaining the much  
needed support of effective law enforces,  
Tampaing City, State, and Federal, this mat-  
ter has reached the office(s) of the  
United States Supreme Court, United States  
Attorney General and the office(s) of the  
President of the United States of America...

Mr. Favor refusal to be ignored, lawful  
recognition and impenance must be addressed  
in a respectfully, professional form, to be  
submitted within...

- JUSTICE SHALL BE SERVED -

# MEMORANDUM


Mr. Faver new to be addressed and/or recognized as the following:

Officer / Sheikh Amil Jesus Shakur-EI

a proud member of the Moorish Science Temple of America. . . .

Due to the effects cause beforehand on maturity of wisdom, drug/alcohol usage are no longer advocated by personal use, education is highly enforced. . . .

I, Officer / Sheikh Amil Jesus Shakur-EI, declare under PENALTY OF PERJURY that the foregoing is true and correct (by best efforts as to ones recollection of mental thought). . . . Executed this 4th day of December, 2011, at Delano, California.

  
Officer / Sheikh Amil Jesus Shakur-EI

## PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

I, the undersigned, declare as follows: I am over eighteen (18) years of age and a party to the within action. My (TEMPORARY) mailing address is POST OFFICE BOX NO. 5104 DELANO, CALIFORNIA 93216.

On the date indicated below, I served the within

### MEMORANDUM

PEOPLE V FAVOR, (SUPPORT BRIEF)  
[SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA]

\*on each of the following, by placing a true copy thereof in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid, in the United States Mail (Correctional Institution Depository Box) at Delano, California addressed as follows:

1/28/12 Innocence Project  
40 Worth Street, Suite 701  
New York, New York 10013  
ATTN: Chief Executive Legal Director  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

2/22/12 Savannah Guthrie, Attorney at Law  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, NY 10112  
ATTORNEY-CLIENT MAIL: CONFIDENTIAL

2/22/12 National Practice  
Federal Criminal Law Center  
Attorney Marcia G. Shain  
2392 North Decatur Road  
Decatur, Georgia 30833  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

CHECKS / ROBERT  
NOVEMBER 8, 2004  
FRANK WESSLING

2/22/12 United States Department of Justice  
Federal Bureau of Investigation - BANK  
11000 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 1700  
Los Angeles, CA 90024  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

FIRST INVESTING  
WELLS FARGO

1/3/2012 Los Angeles Police Department  
Office of the Police Chief  
100 West 1st Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
ATTN: Charlie Beck, Chief  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

2/21/12 LOS ANGELES COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY OFFICE

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

CLARA SHORTRIDGE FOLTZ CRIMINAL JUSTICE CENTER  
ATTN: STEVE COOLEY, LOS ANGELES COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY  
210 W. TEMPLE ST.  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

2/12/12 CLARA SHORTRIDGE FOLTZ CRIMINAL JUSTICE CENTER  
HONORABLE JUDGE MICHEAL E. PASTOR  
210 WEST TEMPLE STREET  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

2/22/11 LOS ANGELES DISTRICT ATTORNEY OFFICE  
210 W. TEMPLE STREET  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012  
ATTN: ALAN YOCHELSON  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

2/22/12 LOS ANGELES COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY  
MRS. VALERIE AENELLE ROACHA  
210 WEST TEMPLE ST.  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

2/21/11 LOS ANGELES COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY  
MR. MARCUS CHARLES MUSANTE



PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

6230 Sylmar Ave  
Van Nuys, CA 91401  
ATTN: CLERK, DEPT: 201  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

12/22/11

STANLEY-MOSK  
LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT  
HEADQUARTERS, ADMINISTRATIVE  
111 NORTH HILL STREET  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012  
ATTN: PROTHONOTARY  
(DELIVERY FOR COMMISSIONER NANCY SVETICH-FOGUE)  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

1/2/2012

LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT  
FOLTZ CRIMINAL JUSTICE CENTER  
OFFICE OF THE PARALEGAL  
ATTN: SENIOR PARALEGAL, FANNIE OWU  
210 WEST TEMPLE STREET  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

HIS  
KNOWLEDGE  
OF "THE  
BABYS MAMA"  
ATTORNEY VISIT  
2006

2/20/12

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT  
P.O. BOX 30158  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90030  
ATTN: DETECTIVE SALAAM ABDUL

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

1/3/2012 LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT  
P.O. BOX 30158  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90030  
ATTN: DETECTIVE FRANK WEBER  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

1/20/12 LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT  
DETECTIVE ELIZABETH RICO  
P.O. BOX 30158  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90030  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

N/A LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT  
DETECTIVE DENNIS FANNING  
P.O. BOX 30158  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90030  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

1/22/12 LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT  
DETECTIVE TOMMY THOMPSON  
P.O. BOX 30158  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90030  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

DANE R. GILLETTE

CHIEF ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE

300 SOUTH SPRING STREET

LOS ANGELES, CA 90013

CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

LAWRENCE M. DANIELS

SUPERVISING DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL

STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE

300 SOUTH SPRING STREET

LOS ANGELES, CA 90013

CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

LINDA C. JOHNSON

SUPERVISING DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL

STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE

300 SOUTH SPRING STREET

LOS ANGELES, CA 90013

CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

KAMALA D. HARRIS

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CALIFORNIA

1306 I STREET, SUITE 125

SACRAMENTO, CA 94244

CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

2/22/12 GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
GOVERNOR JERRY BROWN  
STATE CAPITOL  
1ST FLOOR  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

3/4/12 LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION PUBLIC AFFAIRS  
3333 K STREET, NORTHWEST, 3RD FLOOR  
WASHINGTON, DC 20007  
ATTN: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CHIEF  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

4/4/12 NATIONAL LEGAL AID ASSOCIATION  
1625 K STREET, NORTHWEST  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006  
ATTN: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CHIEF  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

2/28/12 BET ZEDEK LEGAL SERVICE  
145 SOUTH FAIRFAX AVENUE, 2ND FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90036  
ATTN: CHIEF EXECUTIVE LEGAL DIRECTOR  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL CORRESPONDENCE

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

2/22/12

FEDERAL JUSTICE CENTER  
1 COLUMBUS CIRCLE, NORTHEAST  
WASHINGTON, DC 20002  
ATTN: CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

2/22/12

UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION  
1 COLUMBUS CIRCLE, NORTHEAST  
SUITE NO. 2-500  
WASHINGTON, DC 20002  
ATTN: CHIEF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

2/21/12

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE U.S. COURT  
1 COLUMBUS CIRCLE, NORTHEAST  
WASHINGTON, DC 20544  
ATTN: COURT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE U.S. COURT  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

\* SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
SUPREME COURT BUILDING  
1 FIRST, NORTHEAST  
WASHINGTON, DC 20543  
ATTN: CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN ROBERTS  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

## PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

\*SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
SUPREME COURT BUILDING  
1 FIRST, NORTHEAST  
WASHINGTON, DC 20543  
ATTN: JUSTICE SONIA SOTOMAYOR  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

\*SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
SUPREME COURT BUILDING  
1 FIRST, NORTHEAST  
WASHINGTON, DC 20543  
ATTN: JUSTICE STEPHEN BREYER  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

\*SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
SUPREME COURT BUILDING  
1 FIRST, NORTHEAST, WASHINGTON, DC 20543  
ATTN: JUSTICE CLARENCE THOMAS  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

\*SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
SUPREME COURT BUILDING  
1 FIRST, NORTHEAST  
WASHINGTON, DC 20543  
ATTN: JUSTICE ANTONIN SCALIA  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

## PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

\* SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
SUPREME COURT BUILDING  
1 FIRST, NORTHEAST  
WASHINGTON, DC 20543  
ATTN: JUSTICE ANTHONY KENNEDY  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

\* SUPREME COURT BUILDING  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
1 FIRST, NORTHEAST  
WASHINGTON, DC 20543  
ATTN: JUSTICE RUTH BADER GINSBURG  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

\* SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
SUPREME COURT BUILDING  
1 FIRST, NORTHEAST, WASHINGTON, DC 20543  
ATTN: JUSTICE SAMUEL ALITO  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

\* SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
SUPREME COURT BUILDING  
1 FIRST, NORTHEAST  
WASHINGTON, DC 20543  
ATTN: JUSTICE ELENA KAGAN  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

2/28/12 NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S  
2030 M STREET, NORTHWEST  
WASHINGTON, DC 20036  
ATTN: CHIEF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

2/20/12 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
UNITED STATES FEDERAL HEADQUARTER OFFICE  
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY GENERAL, ERIC H. HOLDER, JR.  
950 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NORTHWEST  
WASHINGTON, DC 20530  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

2/20/12 VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
VICE-PRESIDENT JOE BIDEN  
EISENHOWER EXECUTIVE BUILDING  
WASHINGTON, DC 20501  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL

2/20/12 PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
UNITED STATES PRESIDENT BARACK H. OBAMA  
THE WHITE HOUSE  
1600 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NORTHWEST  
WASHINGTON, DC 20500  
CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL MAIL



PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this TENTH day of APRIL, 2012, at Delano, California.

  
Officer/Sheikh Amil Jesus Shakur-EI

(in light of)

BRANDON ALEXANDER FAVOR (EI)

APRIL 06, 2017

210

DET So what we're going to do is I have to go get the video, I'm going to get the video and then we'll move into another room and then we'll put it and play it on a TV.

Δ

Alright.

COOPERATIONS UNDER LAW & EMT

DET

Okey-doke?.....(inaudible)..... We're going to use that room. Okey-doke? Brandon, we'll go down this way, we're going to go in here and look at two people.

Δ

Alright.

DET

And look at that video recording (inaudible). Now, (inaudible)... Can you see yourself?

Δ

No, Sir.

SELF WOUNDING VISIBLE

FOR RECORD PURPOSES, THE NATURE APPEARS CAUSING PETITION UNDER DETAIN MEASURE TO PROTECT SURROUNDING PERSONS POLICE OFFICERS AGAINST A NATURE BEASTLY SURROUNDING EVILS. SHAKH/OFFICER ANEL SHAKH-EL MAY 11, 2016 BAHOU FAYU-EL

↑ INVESTIGATION YES 4/6/2017

DET

You don't see yourself? 4/6/17

ADVENTURE STORES

Δ

Nope.

CHANGE OF CHANNEL VIDEO OF REWIND TO PRESENT

RAQUEL DOE NAME

DET

(inaudible)

DET

If you look at the front front shot, You don't know who did this?

Δ

No Sir. I didn't go to the store that day.

NO ABLE TO RELEASE ONESELF WHILE UNDER DEFENSE

DET

(inaudible)....

Δ

Right.

RECORD AS RECORD!

RECOGNITION IF ASSISTS AND CARRIED ON SAME LEVEL

DET

(inaudible)...

This petition concerns:

- A conviction
- A sentence
- Jail or prison conditions
- Other (specify): DESCRIPTION OF EVIDENCE
- Parole
- Credits
- Prison discipline

1. Your name: RAYFORD SCOTT
2. Where are you incarcerated? CALIFORNIA STATE PRISON
3. Why are you in custody?  Criminal conviction  Civil commitment

Answer items a through i to the best of your ability.

a. State reason for civil commitment or, if criminal conviction, state nature of offense and enhancements (for example, "robbery with use of a deadly weapon").

MURDER, ATTEMPT MURDER<sup>x2</sup>, SECOND DEGREE ROBBERY<sup>x2</sup>, MURDER WAS COMMITTED IN THE COURSE OF A ROBBERY, ATTEMPTED MURDER WAS COMMITTED WILLFULLY, DELIBERATELY, AND WITH PREMEDITATION, PRINCIPAL WAS ARMED WITH A FIREARM IN THE COMMISSION OF THE OFFENSE

b. Penal or other code sections: 187(a), 664/187(a), 211, 190.2(a)(1)(A), 664(a), 12022(a)(1)

c. Name and location of sentencing or committing court: FOLTZ CLARA SHORTRIDGE CRIMINAL COURTS BUILDING, HONORABLE MICHAEL G. PASTOR, DEPARTMENT 107

d. Case number: BA285265

e. Date convicted or committed: JULY 30, 2008

f. Date sentenced: APRIL 07, 2009

g. Length of sentence: AGGREGATE TERM OF LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE

COURT IMPOSED THE STATUTORY TERM OF LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE, OTHERWISE STAYED ALL OTHER PENDING COURTS

h. When do you expect to be released?

i. Were you represented by counsel in the trial court?  Yes  No If yes, state the attorney's name and address:

NANCY SVETICH POGUE-FANNIE OWU  
210 WEST TEMPLE STREET LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

4. What was the LAST plea you entered? (Check one):

- Not guilty
- Guilty
- Nolo contendere
- Other: NOT WITHSTANDING LEGAL ORDER READING

5. If you pleaded not guilty, what kind of trial did you have?

- Jury
- Judge without a jury
- Submitted on transcript
- Awaiting trial

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

**FILED**

JAN 06 2017

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

BRANDON ALEXANDER FAVOR,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

BABY CASH MONEY RECORDS,  
Recording Artist; LIL WAYNE, (Nikki  
Minaj), individual; NICKI MINAJ,  
(Brandon Favor), individual; DOES,  
Unidentified Victims,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 17-55034

D.C. No. 2:16-cv-01131-JGB-JEM  
U.S. District Court for Central  
California, Los Angeles.

**TIME SCHEDULE ORDER**

The parties shall meet the following time schedule.

**Thu., March 30, 2017**

Appellant's opening brief and excerpts of record shall be served and filed pursuant to FRAP 32 and 9th Cir. R. 32-1.

**Failure of the appellant to comply with the Time Schedule Order will result in automatic dismissal of the appeal. See 9th Cir. R. 42-1.**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

**FILED**

JAN 06 2017

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

BRANDON ALEXANDER FAVOR,  
Halvor T Miller,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v:

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF  
CALIFORNIA,

Respondent - Appellee.

No. 17-55030

D.C. No. 2:16-cv-03903-JGB-JEM  
U.S. District Court for Central  
California, Los Angeles

**TIME SCHEDULE ORDER**

The parties shall meet the following time schedule.

**Tue., May 30, 2017** Appellant's opening brief and excerpts of record shall be served and filed pursuant to FRAP 32 and 9th Cir. R. 32-1.

**Wed., June 28, 2017** Appellee's answering brief and excerpts of record shall be served and filed pursuant to FRAP 32 and 9th Cir. R. 32-1.

**The optional appellant's reply brief shall be filed and served within fourteen days of service of the appellee's brief, pursuant to FRAP 32 and 9th Cir. R. 32-1.**

**Failure of the appellant to comply with the Time Schedule Order will result in automatic dismissal of the appeal. See 9th Cir. R. 42-1.**

**Appellants without representation of counsel in a prisoner appeal may have their case submitted on the briefs and record without oral argument, pursuant to FRAP 34(a).**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

**FILED**

JAN 06 2017

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

BRANDON ALEXANDER FAVOR,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ISIS WILLIAMS, individual, Natasha  
Danette Guidroz; SHACON RON  
WIMFROY, individual, AKA Sharon  
Wimfroy; JOHN DOES, individual;  
JANE DOES, individual; STEFANRO  
FAIR, individual; SAVANAH  
GUTHRY, individual and official  
capacity,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 17-55025

D.C. No. 2:16-cv-00042-JGB-JEM  
U.S. District Court for Central  
California, Los Angeles

**TIME SCHEDULE ORDER**

The parties shall meet the following time schedule.

**Thu., March 30, 2017**

Appellant's opening brief and excerpts of record  
shall be served and filed pursuant to FRAP 32 and  
9th Cir. R. 32-1.

**Failure of the appellant to comply with the Time Schedule Order will result in  
automatic dismissal of the appeal. See 9th Cir. R. 42-1.**

HALVOR T. MILLER, JR.

COCHRAN LAW FIRM

MAKINE ANDERSON

PERSONAL  
LEGALESE MENIAT

RECEIVED

MAR 02 2017

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
BY \_\_\_\_\_ DEPUTY CLERK

EXHIBIT-A

LEGAL CLAIM

COURT

LEGAL

SEX OFFENSES  
COMPLAINTS  
CRIMINAL  
COMPLAINT

UNITED STATES  
DISTRICT COURT



EXHIBIT B

BRANDON  
ALEXANDER  
FAVOR

NANCY  
SVETICH  
FOGUE

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

CASE

SEX OFFENSES  
MINOR

MINOR

BIANCA DEVINE  
SAFETY  
AS A MINOR  
NUMEROUS  
CHILD CALLS  
MAXINE  
ANDERSON

COCHRAN  
LAW  
FIRM  
MICHELLE  
ROME

HARON  
WINFROY

PHONE  
CALL  
DOC

COURT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
HALVON THOMAS  
MULLER, JR.

MAXINE ANDERSON ATTORNEY GENERAL  
MICHELLE  
STEVENS

CRIMINAL  
COMPLAINT  
ATLANTA  
NEW YORK  
TEXAS  
LOS ANGELES  
BIANCA

CLAIM

RELIEF  
LEGAL  
INTERRUPTION

NAKED ISIS

MURDER

LEAK

COURT

SHAWAR USUAINS

PROSECUTOR

MURDER

LEAK SUPERVISION

BENAT ROBERTY JUSTICE GRANDSTORY

MARK  
MURKIN  
STARR 2003  
ANK  
LOS ANGELES  
BEAMING 2004

SET

DEMONS  
FARMING

~~MARK~~  
~~ANK~~  
~~LOS ANGELES~~  
~~BEAMING~~  
BEAST  
CHINA  
2003

LOS

ANGELES 2012

L.A.P.D.

JENEL GUINON  
MICHIGAN 2004

NOVEMBER 08, 2004

ANK  
WEBER  
SHARON  
WERNERSON

MAXINE  
ANDERSON

2003  
ANK

**CONSENT TO RELEASE MEDICAL AND PSYCHIATRIC  
INFORMATON TO ATTORNEY AND OTHERS**

This form or a photocopy thereof shall authorize the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, including the Division of Adult Operations/Division of Adult Programs, Board of Parole Hearings, and Division of Juvenile Justice and their employees or agents to release to any attorneys, employees, and/or representatives of (BRANDON FAVOR, LLP.),  
(Name of law office/organization)  
any and all medical and psychiatric records and information in their possession, and further authorizes the examination and copying of said records and information. This authorization to release, examine, and copy records or information includes, pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 120980, the results of an HIV test and any records or information pertaining to my care and treatment resulting from or subsequent to any such tests.

Such information may be disclosed by the above-named attorneys or their employees or representatives for the purpose of advocating on my behalf with respect to any claim, complaint, or grievance I might have concerning my medical condition or conditions of confinement.

I have been advised that I have a right to receive a copy of this authorization upon demand. This authorization shall be in effect and valid for two (2) years from the date of signature unless it is earlier revoked.

Dated: MAY 08, 2017

BIANCA DEVINE  
Name (print)  
[Signature]  
Signature  
FOR:  
BIANCA  
DEVINE

US ATTORNEY STEPHANIE YONEKURA  
BRANDON FAVOR, LLP

## 6. GROUNDS FOR RELIEF

**Ground 1:** State briefly the ground on which you base your claim for relief. For example, "The trial court imposed an illegal enhancement." (If you have additional grounds for relief, use a separate page for each ground. State ground 2 on page 4. For additional grounds, make copies of page 4 and number the additional grounds in order.)

DUE PROCESS GROUNDS ESTABLISHED UNDER EQUAL PROTECTION CLAUSE MUST PROVIDE EQUAL PROTECTION UPON BOTH PARTIES CLAIMS WHILE HELD UNDER RESPONDENT WITH RELIEF

## a. Supporting facts:

Tell your story briefly without citing cases or law. If you are challenging the legality of your conviction, describe the facts on which your conviction is based. *If necessary, attach additional pages.* CAUTION: You must state facts, not conclusions. For example, if you are claiming incompetence of counsel, you must state facts specifically setting forth what your attorney did or failed to do and how that affected your trial. Failure to allege sufficient facts will result in the denial of your petition. (See *In re Swain* (1949) 34 Cal.2d 300, 304.) A rule of thumb to follow is, *who did exactly what to violate your rights at what time (when) or place (where).* (If available, attach declarations, relevant records, transcripts, or other documents supporting your claim.)

Petitioner fails with confidence to provide claim while held against another person or more than one person where an action involving fatal and/or deadly purpose serving criminal action involves petitioner as a person collectively involved with non-criminal venture.

No suitable relations relieves respondent and/or petitioner without respondent's release from or out of custody to further respondent's claim and/or criminal review while respondent continues to provide evidence information where by parties otherly may seek relief

## b. Supporting cases, rules, or other authority (optional):

(Briefly discuss, or list by name and citation, the cases or other authorities that you think are relevant to your claim. If necessary, attach an extra page.)

*Preschooler II v. Clark Crty. Sch. Bd. of Trs.*, 479 F.3d 1175, 1183 (9th Cir. 2007)  
*Harper v. City of Los Angeles*, 533 F.3d 1010, 1026 (9th Cir. 2008)  
*Hall v. City of Los Angeles*, 697 F.3d 1059, 1068 (9th Cir. 2012)

REBA  
STEVENS

PROBATION

MYCHELLE ROMG

MYCHELLE  
ROMG  
MAXINE

HALVOR  
THOMAS MILLER JR.

HALVOR  
THOMAS MILLER  
JR.

SUPPORT  
REHAB  
MYCHELLE  
STEVENS

DRUG

JAIL

SHARON  
WIMFROY

WRIT OF  
HABEAS CORPUS

MITCHELLE  
ROME  
FESTER

MITCHELLE  
ROME

BIANCA  
BRANDON  
ALEXANDER  
FAVOR



7. Ground 2 or Ground 2 (if applicable):

RIGHT OF BAIL OR BOND UNDER LEGAL TASK WHERE LAW REMAINS KEPT AID WHOLE WITH OR UNDER CONSTITUTION EITHER STATE OR FEDERAL APPROVING CLAIMS LEGALLY WHERE LEGAL AUTHORITY MUST CONDUCT REVIEW BY EVIDENCE, COMMUNICATING INFORMALLY, INVESTIGATING CLAIM ETHICALLY SUPPORTED UNDER DUE PROCESS WITH EQUAL PROTECTION RIGHTS EQUALLY FOUND BUT NOT ADVERSE

a. Supporting facts: Petitioner orders release with bond or bail to assist law authority where missing evidence found support defense / respondent's claims otherwise not found correct or relevant, petitioner seeks legal review where one claim addresses another as a single claim not precluded before submission otherwise carried deliberately intending addressing claim issue not addressing others as same; petitioner reviews remedy conclusions as reasonable or necessary alone as provided required action settled with respondent requested action, if any, previously announced and/or addressed, with or without preclude therefore announcing bail/bond relief and claim strictly begins process before District attorney information submission with police authority claims amended, previously addressed herein mark new evidence claims where witnesses may correct instance entirely well as known remarking suggestion . . . . .

Petitioner respectfully seeks release in effort to serve opposing parties where applicable, petitioner is legally sound where a defense tested legal justification single defense theory with or without complete evidence, however, discussing evidence leads detects without petitioner as a required person addressing same and/or similar claims with further respects detects made petitioner's closing information, including evidence arresting identified persons to be posed legally responsible, with prior reviewed attendance before the original court (trial), including District attorney

Petitioner respectfully prays bond release with original trial bail one million dollars (\$1,000,000.000.00) granted, also with police interview, see Exhibit Minute Order, September 12, 2006, without prejudice.

## b. Supporting cases, rules, or other authority:

Crowley v. Nevada, 678 F.3d 730, 734 (9th Cir. 2012)  
 Johnson, 588 F.2d at 743  
 Long v. County of Los Angeles, 442 F.3d 1178, 1185 (9th Cir. 2006)  
 Baker v. McCollan, 443 U.S. 137, 144 n. 3 (1979)  
 People v Favor BA285265, SEPTEMBER 12, 2006  
 Proscholer II v. Clark Cnty. Sch. Bd. of Trs., 479 F.3d 1175, 1183 (9th Cir. 2007)  
 Harper v. City of Los Angeles, 533 F.3d 1010, 1026 (9th Cir. 2008)  
 Arnold v. Int'l Bus. Mach. Corp., 637 F.2d 1350, 1355 (9th Cir. 1981)

a. Supporting facts: Petitioner during arraignment were not allowed to post bail under circumstances unknown, counsel was appointed Deputy Public Defender Nancy Switch Poque, the communication establishes between Deputy Public Defender Nancy Poque with Brandon Alexander Favor fell victim below standards while evidence remains missing or unconnected service interruption, during Attorney Visit petitioner defendant became upset where gang issues developed answering in which where no relief available prolonged Defense Counsel where defense involving gang theories sought relief in order questioning regarding petitioner defendant acknowledging whereabouts regarding two other persons also supplying defendant during the incident where video surveillance depicts only those present or participants involved, as if a criminal venture ensues wanting or grasping hold therefore criminal promise; petitioner readily expressed his behalf, as well as others, repeating over how the incident occurred and/or his position or defense as voices to remain legally just without providing exact factual detail or factual existence outside where details protecting defense claims are non-accident with or against inscriptions pertaining to petitioner defendant's actions, if so prosecuted, where petitioner defendant may not possess exact cause or reason how or why incident occurred thus forcing defendant's testimony where no reasonable objection may cause perjury or inconsistent statements reaching a verdict of guilty establishing evidence claim, theory, exhibit, circumstantial, subjective findings other opposing defendant's claims with innocence; petitioner must provide cumulative effects where explanation carries legal justification providing supporting evidences may not be same where trial jury evidences display or identify key parts, missing or fewer, lacking support where other evidence claims remain as properties defendant traveled passed or became in contact with prior to the incident, while incident became inchoative, during the incidents contact, during the actual incident, once physical harm being threatening while criminal contacted acted upon properties or persons, during rescue or safety provisions before the public

b. Supporting cases, rules, or other authority:

Johnson v. Duffy, 588 F.2d 740, 743 (9th Cir. 1978)  
 In re BRADON FAVOR, BN010057 (APR 06, 2015)  
 Preschooler II, 179 F.3d at 1183

7. Ground 2 or Ground \_\_\_\_\_ (if applicable):

a. Supporting facts: Petitioner continues to forthly demonstrate areas in where the law continues to stand as lawful approach although petitioner FAVOR (Brandon) was found guilty where trial jury supported verdict claim with guilt established once for all with admitted trial court evidences: (1) Surveillance Footage/ Security Tape, (2) Recorded Interview, (3) Ticket/Clothing, it is established an injury occurred for a criminal action to take place alone (See Exhibit:);  
 petitioner seeks to demonstrate cause with equal protection standards carrying same burdens incongestively with Deputy District Attorney Marcus Charles Musante

b. Supporting cases, rules, or other authority:

Long v. County of Los Angeles, 442 F.3d 1178, 1185 (9th Cir. 2006)  
 Harper v. City of Los Angeles, 533 F.3d 1010, 1026 (9th Cir. 2008)  
 Preschooler II, 479 F.3d at 1183

# EXHIBIT COVER PAGE:

Exhibit: A

Description of this exhibit: EXHIBIT, NOTICE OF MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL

Number of pages of this exhibit: 13 pages

JURISDICTION: (Check only one)

Municipal Court

Superior Court

Appellate Court

State Supreme Court

United States District Court

United States Circuit Court

United States Supreme Court

California Department of Corrections, 602 Exhibit.

Other: SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF

EXHIBIT C

SHARON  
WILLIAMS

SAMANTHA GUTHRIE

SHAMER WILLIAMS

BIANCA RAHMAN HUTCHERSON  
PARIS WILLIAMS

SHAMER  
WILLIAMS

ISIS  
PRECIOUS WILLIAMS

432

1 LAW OFFICES OF THE PUBLIC DEFENDER  
2 Nancy Svetich Pogue, Deputy Public Defender  
3 Bar No.: 106395  
4 900 Third Street, Suite 2041  
5 San Fernando, CA 91340  
6 Telephone: (818) 898-2461  
7 Attorney for Defendant

**FILED**  
Los Angeles Superior Court

SEP 10 2008

John A. Clarke, Executive Officer/Clerk  
By [Signature], Deputy

9 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
10 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

11 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,) No. BA285265  
12 )  
13 Plaintiff,) NOTICE OF MOTION  
14 v. ) FOR NEW TRIAL  
15 ) (PENAL CODE § 1181)  
16 BRANDON ALEXANDER FAVOR,) DATE: Sept. 16, 2008  
17 ) TIME: 8:30 a.m.  
18 Defendant.) DEPT.: 107

19 TO THE HONORABLE MICHAEL E. PASTOR, JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR  
20 COURT, STEVE COOLEY, DISTRICT ATTORNEY FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS  
21 ANGELES, MARCUS MUSANTE, DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY, AND/OR HIS  
22 REPRESENTATIVE:

23 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on September 16, 2008, at 8:30  
24 a.m., in Department NV-107, Defendant Brandon Favor will move  
25 the above-entitled court to vacate and set aside the jury's  
26 special finding on the truth of the robbery-homicide special  
27 circumstance allegation pursuant to Penal Code §  
28 190.2(a)(17)(A).

29 The motion is made pursuant to Penal Code § 1181(6),  
30 insufficiency of the evidence to justify the special finding,  
31 Penal Code § 1385, the interests of justice, and the non-  
32 statutory power of the court to grant equitable relief.

433

1 This motion is based upon the Notice of Motion, Points  
2 and Authorities in support thereof, and such evidence and  
3 argument as may be offered at the hearing on said motion.

4 Dated this 9<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2008.

5  
6  
7 Respectfully Submitted,

8 *Nancy Svetich Fogue*

9 NANCY SVETICH FOGUE  
10 Deputy Public Defender  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

434

POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I.

THE TRIAL COURT HAS THE STATUTORY POWER TO GRANT A MOTION FOR A NEW TRIAL OR MODIFY THE VERDICT, FINDING, OR JUDGMENT TO REFLECT GUILT OF A CRIME OF A LESSER DEGREE TO THAT CRIME OF WHICH DEFENDANT WAS CONVICTED.

A motion for a new trial is a procedure established by the legislature which may be evoked by any convicted defendant. (People v. Sarazzawski (1945) 27 Cal.2d 7.)

"When a verdict has been rendered or a finding made against the defendant, the court may, upon his application, grant a new trial in the following cases only: ...

(6) When the verdict or finding is contrary to law or evidence, but if the evidence shows the defendant to be not guilty of the degree of the crime of which he was convicted, but guilty of a lesser degree thereof, or a lesser crime included therein, the court may modify the verdict, finding, or judgment, accordingly without granting or ordering a new trial, and this power shall extend to any court to which the cause may be appealed;..." (Penal Code Section 1181(6).)

In People v. Redmond (1969) 71 Cal.2d 745, the Supreme Court stated:

"Under Subdivision(6) of Section 1181 of the Penal Code, the trial judge on motion for new trial must consider the probative force of the evidence. This duty must be contrasted with that of an Appellate Court which must resolve all conflicts in favor of the judgment; the trial court must give



435

1  
2  
3  
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  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

the defendant the benefit of its independent conclusion as to the sufficiency of the credible evidence." (Emphasis added.)

The crucial nature of the trial judge's responsibility in re-weighing the probative force of the evidence becomes clear when the standard of review to be used by the trial court in passing on defendant's motion for new trial is compared to that of the appellate court in deciding an appeal based on a claim of insufficient evidence. The appellate standard is such that "when a verdict is attacked as being unsupported, the power of the Appellate Court begins and ends with the determination as to whether there is any substantial evidence, contradicted or uncontradicted, which will support the conclusion reached by the jury." (People v. Bassett (1968) 69 Cal.2d 122.) The Appellate Court is bound by the trial court's resolution of all evidentiary conflict and must find in favor of the judgment if, under any hypotheses, the facts as found will support the verdict.

The trial court, however, is not bound by the jury's determination of evidentiary conflict. It has the power, indeed the duty, of going back and determining what weight should have been given to each item of evidence and then deciding what the fair and proper resolution of each evidential conflict should have been. In People v. Sarazzawski, supra, 27 Cal.2d 7, the Supreme Court stated the following:

"The defendant is entitled to two (2) decisions on the evidence, one (1) by jury and another by the trial judge in passing upon a motion for a new trial. In giving consideration to the important matter of the sufficiency of the evidence to support the jury's verdict, the trial court, in ruling on a motion for new trial, is not bound by conflicts of the evidence, and

436

1  
2  
3  
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  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

the duty is imposed upon it then to consider such additional and not unimportant features as the credibility of witnesses, their manner and appearance in testifying, and the proper weight to be accorded to the evidence. While a solemn verdict of a jury should not lightly be vacated, the responsibility nevertheless rests with the trial court again to review the cause and only after such review to decide the application for a new trial."

The case of People v. Grake (1964) 227 Cal.App.2d 289 compared the difference between the appellate standard and the motion for new trial standard when it stated:

"The motion for new trial is an important right of the defendant in any case involving a conflict in the evidence. In ruling on the motion, the trial court has the duty to determine whether, in his opinion, there is sufficient credible evidence to support the verdict. At this time, the trial court has a broad discretion and is not bound by the jury's decision as to the conflicts in the evidence or inferences to be drawn therefrom. This gives the trial court a greater power to rule upon the evidence than is afforded the appellate courts."

The trial judge's role in independently re-weighing the probative force of the evidence has often been described as the function of the "thirteenth juror." This term, however, is misleading unless carefully applied as it has been construed in case law.

"The judge acting on a motion has been called 'the thirteenth juror,' but neither procedurally nor in function does he occupy any such status. He does not deliberate with the jury in reaching the verdict but makes an independent determination of his own." (Witkin, California Evidence, section 566.)

1           In determining whether the trial judge has, in fact,  
 2 made an independent decision as required under 1181(6) of the  
 3 Penal Code, it is essential to put the word "independent" in  
 4 its proper context. The cases make clear that a distinction  
 5 must be made between (1) re-evaluating the jury verdict to  
 6 determine whether it is based on sufficient credible  
 7 evidence, and (2) re-evaluating the evidence itself to  
 8 ascertain the fair and proper amount probative force to be  
 9 assigned to it, and then deciding whether, when properly  
 10 weighed, such evidence is sufficient to support the verdict.  
 11 The distinction between these two methods of re-evaluation  
 12 is crucial. In the second method, unlike in the first, the  
 13 judge's decision as to whether the verdict is supported by  
 14 sufficient credible evidence is preceded by his own  
 15 independent evaluation of the evidence.

16           In the instant case, the jury's special finding as  
 17 to the truth of the special circumstance allegation was not  
 18 supported by the state of the evidence. The jury made a  
 19 special finding that the robbery-homicide special  
 20 circumstance allegation pursuant to Penal Code §  
 21 190.2(a)(17)(A) was true. Implicit in this special finding  
 22 is the jury's determination that the prosecutor met his  
 23 burden of proving the truth of the special circumstance  
 24 allegation beyond a reasonable doubt.

25           The jury was instructed as to the elements of the  
 26 special circumstance allegation where the defendant was not  
 27 the actual killer.

28  
 29           "If you decide that the defendant is  
 30 guilty of murder in the first degree but  
 31 was not the actual killer, then, when you  
 32 consider the special circumstance of  
 33 murder in the commission of robbery, you  
 34 also must decide whether he acted as a  
 major participant in a robbery and acted  
 with reckless indifference to human life.

438

1  
2  
3  
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  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

In order to prove this special circumstance for a defendant who is not the actual killer but who is guilty of murder in the first degree as an aider and abettor, the People must prove all of the following:

- 1. The defendant's participation in the crime of robbery began before or during the killing;
  - 2. The defendant was a major participant in that crime;
- AND
- 3. When the defendant participated in that crime, he acted with reckless indifference to human life.

A person acts with reckless indifference to human life when he or she knowingly engages in criminal activity that he or she knows involves a grave risk of death.

If the defendant was not the actual killer, then the People have the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt that he was a major participant in the crime of robbery and acted with reckless indifference to human life for the special circumstance of murder in the commission of robbery to be true. If the People have not met this burden, you must find this special circumstance is not true."  
(CALCRIM 703)

In order to find the special circumstance allegation true, the jury determined that the defendant was a major participant in the crime of robbery, and when the defendant participated in the robbery, the defendant acted with reckless indifference to human life.

During closing argument, defense counsel conceded that the facts surrounding defendant's role in committing the robbery supported the conclusion that the defendant was a major participant in the robbery. However, defense counsel argued vehemently that Defendant Brandon Favor did not

1 knowingly engage in criminal activity that he knew involved  
2 a grave risk of death.

3 At trial the evidence against the defendant  
4 consisted primarily of two pieces of evidence -- a videotape  
5 of the actual robbery (including still photographs taken from  
6 the videotape) and defendant's recorded interview with the  
7 police on the day of his arrest. The evidence presented at  
8 trial established that Defendant Brandon Favor was not the  
9 actual killer nor did he intend to kill anyone. The  
10 defendant was not armed with a weapon. The defendant did not  
11 know that the two co-suspects who participated in the robbery  
12 were armed. The defendant did not know that a co-suspect  
13 intended to shoot employees of the liquor store during the  
14 robbery.

15 The evidence established that on November 8, 2004,  
16 the defendant entered the subject liquor store on three  
17 occasions. In the morning the defendant entered the liquor  
18 store two times. The first time, the defendant entered the  
19 store with a man identified as "Troub" (as in "trouble").  
20 Both the defendant and "Troub" looked around the liquor  
21 store, made small purchases, and made observations about the  
22 security of the store. Later that morning, the defendant  
23 entered the store alone and made a small purchase. Finally,  
24 at 4:15 pm the defendant and the other two co-suspects went  
25 in and out of the store several times. At 4:30 pm the liquor  
26 store robbery occurred. The defendant exited the store. The  
27 co-suspect "Security" (he was wearing a jacket with the word  
28 "Security" on the of back of it) closed and locked the door  
29 behind the defendant.

30 The evidence established that "Shooter" (the co-  
31 suspect who fired his weapon) went behind the counter and  
32 fired his weapon at Paul Lee (the owner of the business) and  
33 Jose Huerta (an employee). "Security" opened the door, the  
34

1 defendant entered the store, then "Security" closed and  
2 locked the door.

3 In Defendant Brandon Favor's recorded statement to  
4 the police, he stated that as soon as he entered the store  
5 he observed "Shooter" fire two shots at the clerk in the  
6 storeroom (Pablo Castaneda, the decedent). The defendant  
7 leaned over the counter and took property on display - -  
8 prepaid phone cards, etc. The defendant then went behind the  
9 counter, took money from the register used for store  
10 purchases and other store property.

11 "Security" opened the door for the defendant. The  
12 defendant left the store. "Security" closed and locked the  
13 door. A short time later, "Shooter" and "Security" exited  
14 from the store and walked in the opposite direction from that  
15 of the defendant.

16 Defendant and the two co-suspects met up later, and  
17 Defendant Brandon Favor received about \$800 from the proceeds  
18 of the robbery.

19 The defense contends that the evidence presented at  
20 trial was insufficient to establish beyond a reasonable doubt  
21 the truth of the special circumstance allegation. The jury  
22 was instructed on the prosecutor's burden of proof as to the  
23 special circumstance allegation as follows:

24  
25 "If you find the defendant guilty of  
26 murder in the first degree, then you must  
27 decide whether the People have proved that  
the special circumstance is true.

28 The People have the burden of proving  
29 the special circumstance beyond a  
30 reasonable doubt. If the People have not  
31 met this burden, you must find the special  
circumstance has not been proved.

32 In order for you to return a finding  
33 that a special circumstance is or is not  
34 true, all 12 of you must agree."  
(CALCRIM 700)

441

1 The jury was also instructed about relying on  
2 circumstantial evidence to find the special circumstance true  
3 as follows:

4 "Before you may rely on circumstantial  
5 evidence to conclude that a special  
6 circumstance allegation is true, you must  
7 be convinced that the People have proved  
8 each fact essential to that conclusion  
9 beyond a reasonable doubt.

10 Also, before you may rely on  
11 circumstantial evidence to find that a  
12 special circumstance allegation is true,  
13 you must be convinced that the only  
14 reasonable conclusion supported by the  
15 circumstantial evidence is that the  
16 special circumstantial allegation is true.  
17 If you can draw two or more reasonable  
18 conclusions from the circumstantial  
19 evidence, and one of those reasonable  
20 conclusions supports a finding that the  
21 special circumstance allegation is true  
22 and another reasonable conclusion supports  
23 a finding that it is not true, you must  
24 conclude that the allegation was not  
25 proved by the circumstantial evidence.  
26 However, when considering circumstantial  
27 evidence, you must accept only reasonable  
28 conclusions and reject any that are  
29 unreasonable."  
30 (CALCRIM 704)

31 The seminal case which established the legal  
32 requirements for finding a person who was not the actual  
33 killer liable for a special circumstance allegation is Tison  
34 v. Arizona (1987) 481 U.S. 137.

35 In Tison v. Arizona the Supreme Court held "that  
36 major participation in the felony committed, combined with  
37 reckless indifference to human life, is sufficient to satisfy  
38 the Enmund culpability requirement." (Id. at 145)

39 In Tison v. Arizona three Tison brothers entered an  
40 Arizona state prison and carried a large ice chest filled  
41 with the guns. The Tison brothers armed their father and his

1 cell mate Greenwalt. The group brandished weapons, locked  
2 guards and visitors in a storage closet, and fled from the  
3 prison grounds in the Tyson Ford Galaxy. No shots were fired  
4 at the prison. The Ford was abandoned for a Lincoln. The  
5 Lincoln developed a flat tire. The only spare tire was put  
6 on the car. Two days later the group drove away in the  
7 Lincoln. The Lincoln got another flat tire.

8 The group decided to flag down a passing motorist  
9 and steal a car. One brother Raymond Tison stood outside the  
10 disabled Lincoln. The other four lay in wait by the side of  
11 the road.

12 John Lyons stopped his Mazda to help Raymond. The  
13 four members of the Lyons' family were taken into the desert.  
14 While the Tison brothers went to get water for the Lyons  
15 family, the Tison father and Greenwalt killed the Lyons'  
16 family. The group took the Mazda, guns, and money. The  
17 venture continued for several more days.

18 The Tison brothers were convicted of the murders  
19 under the felony-murder rule. The judgment of death for both  
20 petitioners was affirmed by the Arizona Supreme Court. In  
21 Tison v. Arizona the U.S. Supreme Court held that the Arizona  
22 Supreme Court applied an erroneous standard in making the  
23 findings required by Enmund v. Florida, (1982) 458 U.S. 782.  
24 The judgments below were vacated and the case remanded for  
25 further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion.

26 The U.S. Supreme Court in Tison v. Arizona did not  
27 attempt to precisely delineate the particular types of  
28 conduct and states of mind warranting imposition of the death  
29 penalty or life without possibility of parole. The U.S.  
30 Supreme Court noted in Footnote 12 that although the two  
31 requirements of major participation in the felony committed  
32 and reckless indifference to human life are stated  
33 separately, they often overlap. In fact there are some  
34 felonies as to which one could properly conclude that any



4/3

1 major participant necessarily exhibits reckless indifference  
2 to the value of human life.

3 In that instant case, Defendant Brandon Favor had no  
4 knowledge that the two co-suspects were armed. Unlike the  
5 facts in the Tison v. Arizona case, Defendant Brandon Favor  
6 was not armed. Defendant had no knowledge that co-suspect  
7 "Shooter" intended to kill in order to rob. Based on all the  
8 facts and circumstances surrounding the case, Defendant  
9 Brandon Favor did not know that the robbery involved a grave  
10 risk of death. With Defendant Brandon Favor's actual mental  
11 state, the punishment of life without the possibility of  
12 parole is disproportionate to his level of participation in  
13 the robbery.

14 The jury's finding as to the truth of the special  
15 circumstance was not supported by the state of the evidence.  
16 The jury did not follow the law on evaluating circumstantial  
17 evidence. The jury's finding as to the special circumstance  
18 allegation was based on improper considerations such as  
19 prejudice against Defendant Brandon Favor or sympathy or pity  
20 for the victims and their families. In the interests of  
21 justice, Defendant Brandon Favor should not be held morally  
22 culpable nor legally liable for the special circumstance  
23 allegation.

24  
25 CONCLUSION

26 Based on the foregoing the defense requests that the  
27 Court vacate and set aside the jury's special finding on the  
28 truth of the robbery-homicide special circumstance  
29 allegation, and grant the defendant's Motion for a New Trial  
30 as to the truth of the special circumstance allegation or  
31 order a special finding of "Not True" be entered as to the  
32 truth of the special circumstance allegation.

7. Ground 2 or Ground 3 (if applicable):

PETITIONER'S RELIEF WHERE DEFENDANT MAY SERVE RESPONDENT UPON CRIMINAL NOTICE WHERE ALLEGATIONS SERVED BEFORE INCONGESTIVE RELIEF IMPOSING SENTENCING WHERE EVIDENCE DISCOVERY MAY IMPOSE JURY'S FINDINGS UNDER ESTABLISHED TRIAL EVIDENCE PRODUCING LEGAL JUSTIFICATION TO ACT AS NEWLY DISCOVERED EVIDENCE WHERE PROSECUTION AUTHORITY MAY EITHER DISMISS OR RE TRY (IMPROBABLE DOUBT) OR LOWER ACCUSATIONS TO OPEN THE COURT WHERE DEFENDANT MAY SERVE RELIEF AND BURDEN UPON PROSECUTION AUTHORITY NOT IMPOSING GUILTY VERDICT FOUND BY THE JURY

a. Supporting facts: Petitioner's Bianca Devine with/for Brandon Alexander Favor may submit legal evidence and sound clarification where difficulty arrives with one Sgt Sharon Winproy (Both Bianca Devine, Sharon Winproy suffered mental health injury/ damage, recovery stayed with Brandon Favor, U.P. notification delivered before Mental Health Court house, Ryan, no further relief required) with such relief found legally void to order prosecution elsewhere establishing responsibility with person other than defendant and/or occupants other than defendant same established claim established with police authority, County District Attorney, Attorney General, Department of Mental Health, Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation

## b. Supporting cases, rules, or other authority:

Johnson v. Duffy, 588 F.2d 740, 743 (9th Cir. 1978)  
 Preschooler II, 479 F.3d at 1183  
 Arnold v. Int'l Bus. Mach. Corp., 637 F.2d 1350, 1355 (9th Cir. 1981)

MINUTE ORDER  
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DATE PRINTED: 04/14/09

CASE NO. BA285265

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
VS.  
DEFENDANT 01: BRANDON ALEXANDER FAVOR

INFORMATION FILED ON 12/27/05.

COUNT 01: 187(A) PC FEL  
COUNT 02: 664-187(A) PC FEL  
COUNT 03: 664-187(A) PC FEL  
COUNT 04: 211 PC FEL  
COUNT 05: 211 PC FEL

ON 09/12/06 AT 830 AM IN CENTRAL DISTRICT DEPT 107

CASE CALLED FOR PRETRIAL CONF/TRIAL SETTING

PARTIES: MICHAEL E. PASTOR (JUDGE) SAMMIE BENSON (CLERK)  
MAVIS THEODOROU (REP) VALERIE AENLLE-ROCHA (DA)

THE DEFENDANT IS PRESENT (IN LOCK UP) AND REPRESENTED BY NANCY POGUE DEPUTY PUBLIC DEFENDER

BAIL SET AT NO BAIL

-BKG. #861 8636

AT REQUEST OF DEFENSE COUNSEL AND THE D.D.A. OF RECORD;  
COURT SIGNS AN AFFIDAVIT AND ORDER FOR REMOVAL OF PRISONER  
OF THE ABOVE NAMED DEFENDANT TO BE TRANSPORTED FROM THE  
CUSTODY OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF DEPARTMENT INTO THE  
CUSTODY OF THE LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT AND DETECTIVE  
FANNING AND OFFICER DAVE NUMM FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONDUCTING AN  
INTERVIEW AT THE NEWTON DIVISION DIVISION LOS ANGELES POLICE  
DEPARTMENT ON TODAYS DATE AT 12:00 PM.

THE ABOVE NAMED OFFICERS ARE TO RETURN THE DEFENDANT BACK INTO  
THE CUSTODY OF THE LOS ANGELES SHERIFF DEPARTMENT BY 3:30 P.M.  
TO DAY.

AT 4:00 P.M., CAUSE IS CALLED FOR HEARING. STIPULATED BETWEEN

*ALLEN FAVORING ENLIGHTENED  
NECESSARY ON  
TO PUDGE COURT.  
SUBJECTIVE  
1/1/09*

143

*PROBATION SUPERVISOR  
CIVIL-MINOR TERM (TUD)  
JUDGE-CENTRAL  
REQUEST TO BE RELEASED ON  
BAIL BOND SET 14, 2015 IN  
OWN RECOGNITION  
LAW ENFORCEMENT  
COPIES: SAMMIE BENSON  
UNSURE, WITH ON*

NOVEMBER 8, 2015

*RE-REQUEST BAIL FOR  
OUT OF THE JAIL  
OF OFFICER PASTOR,  
DUE TO THE FACT  
THAT THE DEFENDANT  
WAS UNABLE TO  
RECOGNITION OF  
THE COURT ORDER  
AND REQUESTED BAIL.*

# EXHIBIT COVER PAGE:

Exhibit: 1-A

Description of this exhibit: MINUTE ORDER

Number of pages of this exhibit: 3 pages

JURISDICTION: (Check only one)

Municipal Court

Superior Court

Appellate Court

State Supreme Court

United States District Court

United States Circuit Court

United States Supreme Court

California Department of Corrections, 602 Exhibit.

Other: BRIEF SUPPLEMENTAL

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

**DEPT 100**

Date: APRIL 06, 2015  
Honorable: WILLIAM C. RYAN  
NONE

Judge M. SEALS  
Bailiff NONE

Deputy Clerk  
Reporter

(Parties and Counsel checked if present)

BH010057

In re,  
BRANDON FAVOR,  
Petitioner,  
On Habeas Corpus

Counsel for Petitioner:

Counsel for Respondent:

Nature of Proceedings: TRANSFER ORDER  
(Cal. Rules of Court, rule 4.552 (b)(2)(B))

**IN CHAMBERS**

The court is in receipt of petition for writ of habeas corpus filed by Brandon Favor ("Petitioner") on March 30, 2015. Petitioner appears to challenging his validation as a gang member by staff at Kern Valley State Prison, located in Delano, California. Specifically, he states his petition concerns "gang admission to membership falsely announced" and adds "[n]o gang issue(s) [sic] were raised until petitioner reached Kern Valley State Prison." The claims alleged in the petition constitute a challenge to the conditions of Petitioner's confinement, which may be transferred to the county of confinement. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 4.552(b)(2)(B).) Accordingly, the matter is hereby transferred to the Superior Court of California, County of Kern. (*Ibid.*)

The Clerk is directed to transmit, by mail, the petition, and a copy of this order, to the Honorable John S. Somers, Presiding Judge, Superior Court of California, County of Kern.

The Clerk is further directed to serve a copy of this order upon Petitioner, and upon the Office of the Attorney General, as counsel for Respondent, the Secretary of the CDCR.

MINUTE ORDER  
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DATE PRINTED: 05/25/12

-----  
CASE NO. BA285265

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
VS.  
DEFENDANT 01: BRANDON ALEXANDER FAVOR

-----  
INFORMATION FILED ON 12/27/05.

COUNT 01: 187(A) PC FEL  
COUNT 02: 664-187(A) PC FEL  
COUNT 03: 664-187(A) PC FEL  
COUNT 04: 211 PC FEL  
COUNT 05: 211 PC FEL

04/17/09 ARREST DISPOSITION REPORT SENT VIA FILE TRANSFER TO DEPARTMENT OF  
JUSTICE

ON 05/15/12 AT 200 PM IN CENTRAL DISTRICT DEPT 100

CASE CALLED FOR JUDICIAL ACTION

PARTIES: PATRICIA M. SCHNEGG (JUDGE) EDWIN HERNANDEZ (CLERK)  
NONE (REP) NONE (DDA)

DEFENDANT IS NOT PRESENT IN COURT, AND NOT REPRESENTED BY COUNSEL

THE COURT HAS READ AND CONSIDERED A VERY LONG HAND WRITTEN

MEMORANDUM EXPLAINING DEFENDANT'S INVOLVEMENT IN CRIMINAL  
PROCEEDINGS RESULTING IN HIS BEING SENTENCED TO LIFE WITHOUT  
POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE (LWOP) AMONG OTHER SENTENCES. DEFENDANT  
ATTEMPTS TO EXPLAIN THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF HIS INVOLVEMENT AS  
WELL AS HIS SENTENCING TO HIS ATTORNEY AND THE PROSECUTOR.

TO DATE THE MATTER REMAINS PENDING BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME  
COURT WHICH DEPRIVES THE COURT OF THE AUTHORITY TO DO ANYTHING  
OTHER THAN MAKE THIS MEMORANDUM A PART OF DEFENDANTS' LEGAL  
FILE.

THE COURT ORDER IS SIGNED AND FILED THIS DATE.

THE CLERK IS DIRECTED TO SEND NOTICE.

CASE NO. BA285265  
DEF NO. 01

DATE PRINTED 05/25/12

A TRUE COPY OF THIS MINUTE ORDER IS SENT VIA U.S. MAIL TO THE  
FOLLOWING PARTIES:

BRANDON ALEXANDER FAVOR  
G-60488  
NORTH KERN STATE PRISON  
P.O. BOX 5104  
DELANO, CA 93216

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY  
HABEAS CORPUS LITIGATION TEAM  
BRENTFORD J. FERREIRA, DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY  
320 WEST TEMPLE STREET, ROOM 540

LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

NEXT SCHEDULED EVENT:  
PROCEEDINGS TERMINATED

THE DOCUMENT TO WHICH THIS CERTIFICATE IS ATTACHED IS FULL, TRUE,  
AND CORRECT COPY OF THE ORIGINAL ON FILE AND OF RECORD IN MY OFFICE.  
JOHN A. CLARKE, EXECUTIVE OFFICER/CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF  
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES.

ATTEST: 5/25/12 BY: [Signature] DEPUT

V. TORRES



<b>SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES</b>	Reserved for Clerk's File Stamp
COURTHOUSE ADDRESS: Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center 210 West Temple Street Los Angeles, CA 90012	<b>CONFORMED COPY ORIGINAL FILED SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA</b>
PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER:  <b>BRANDON ALEXANDER FAVOR</b>	MAY 25 2012  John A. Clarke, Executive Officer/Clerk BY <u>Virginia Torres</u> , Deputy
<b>CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF MAILING</b> CCP, § 1013(a) Cal. Rules of Court, rule 2(a)(1)	CASE NUMBER:  BA285265

I, the below-named Executive Officer/Clerk of the above-entitled court, do hereby certify that I am not a party to the cause herein, and that this date I served:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Order Extending Time            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Order re: Memorandum  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Order to Show Cause             | <input type="checkbox"/> Order re: Writ Error Coram Nobis   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Order for Informal Response     | <input type="checkbox"/> Order re: Appointment of Counsel   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Order for Supplemental Pleading | <input type="checkbox"/> Copy of Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus/Suitability Hearing Transcript for the Attorney General |

I certify that the following is true and correct: I am the clerk of the above-named court and not a party to the cause. I served this document by placing true copies in envelopes addressed as shown below and then by sealing and placing them for collection; stamping or metering with first-class, prepaid postage; and mailing on the date stated below, in the United States mail at Los Angeles County, California, following standard court practices.

May 25, 2012  
DATED AND DEPOSITED

JOHN A. CLARKE, Executive Officer/Clerk

By: Virginia Torres, Clerk

Brandon Alexander Favor  
G-60488  
North Kern State Prison  
P.O. Box 5104  
Delano, CA 93216

Office of the District Attorney  
Habeas Corpus Litigation Team  
Brentford J. Ferreira, Deputy District Attorney  
320 West Temple Street, Room 540  
Los Angeles, CA 90012



7. Ground 2 or Ground 4 (if applicable):

PETITIONER'S REQUEST TO APPEAR BEFORE THE TRIAL COURT WITH ORIGINAL TRIAL JUDGE UNDER BOND/BAIL OWN RESPONSIBILITY OR STATUTORY REFUSE WHERE PROSECUTION AUTHORITY AWAITS ARREST, TRIAL OR HEARING REQUESTING PETITIONER AS LEGAL COUNSEL OR WITNESS FOR TESTIMONY

a. Supporting facts:

Petitioner BRANDON ALEXANDER FAVOR may correct all intolable errors with police companies amended complaint with criminal action, petitioner BRANDON FAVOR UP, identified "RAQUEL HARPER" with robbery crime where person fatally shot and killed under robbery equities accepted thru Raquel Harper while defendant remained in position safeguarding property store with city damages overruling inspection claim where harm one of dangerous effects not petitioner avoided before store arrival where one some warning struck petitioner while seeking relief otherwise avoiding contact irrespectively attaching under awareness where safeguard's protecting others in injurious damages harmed bodily harming such person where defendant is protecting each person from causing harm one or some damage among others as victims relatedly held under specified injurious nature's relates claim same as one possibly with BIANCA DEVINE for and to SHARON WITHFROY SHACORON W. in light with choice's decisions favoring ANY terms yet placed before the public where petitioner struggling to receive help and assistance thought to contact police located inside the Crenshaw Plaza receiving informable relief by thought alone contacting RAQUEL HARPER as "UNKNOWN" with NAFASA DANETTE GUZMAN seeking to return yet obstructed

b. Supporting cases, rules, or other authority:

Harper v. City of Los Angeles, 533 F.3d 1010, 1026 (9th Cir. 2008)  
 Prescherder III v. Clark County Sch. Bd. of Trs. 479 F.3d 1175, 1183 (9th Cir. 2007)  
 Chapman v. Houston Welfare Rights Org. 441 U.S. 600, 618 (1979)  
 Lora v. County of Los Angeles, 442 F.3d 1178, 1185 (9th Cir. 2006)  
 Crossley v. Nevada, 678 F.3d 730, 734 (9th Cir. 2012)

7. Ground 2 or Ground 4 (if applicable).

a. Supporting facts:

while exiting/entering THE LABOR BANK contacting penal institution conditions as exact subjective cause nature under force where such force exact prevents public safety or safety ones security under or with penal institution[s] conditioning inmates and/or parolees whom prisoners or assured (effectively) public safety without HIGH RISK PAROLE. Serving legislation where lawful effects efforts impossible escape upon subjection where its nature may not be identified for resolution or criminal review standard while seeking legal admittance performing penalty punishment administered before the courts otherwise elected legal punishment suitable with crime acted against such identified persons victimized (all included) with crime where prosecutors seek punishment with death relying upon life without parole, seeking punishment of death furtherly also where conveyed with guilt before the court establishing prosecutorial findings presenting claim with issue as before raised with trial counsel NANCY SVETICH POGUE with or without LEGAL CLERK FANNIE OWU where gang instruments became suits presenting allegations without the defendant priority conveyed to receive information with claim present affliction seeks relief before trial defense attorney where defendant did not hear could

b. Supporting cases, rules, or other authority:

Harper v. City of Los Angeles, 533 F.3d 1010, 1026 (9th Cir. 2008)

Long v. County of Los Angeles, 442 F.3d 1178, 1185 (9th Cir. 2006)

CRIMINAL SECTION - PHIS, MAY 08, 2015 (See Exhibit No.

Prescheider II, 479 F.3d at 1183

People v. Favor, BA285265, November 08, 2004 - no substantial records (State, PRELUDE w/wo)

6. GROUNDS FOR RELIEF

Ground 1: State briefly the ground on which you base your claim for relief. For example, "The trial court imposed an illegal enhancement." (If you have additional grounds for relief, use a separate page for each ground. State ground 2 on page 4. For additional grounds, make copies of page 4 and number the additional grounds in order.)

Four horizontal lines for writing the ground for relief.

a. Supporting facts:

Tell your story briefly without citing cases or law. If you are challenging the legality of your conviction, describe the facts on which your conviction is based. If necessary, attach additional pages. CAUTION: You must state facts, not conclusions. For example, if you are claiming incompetence of counsel, you must state facts specifically setting forth what your attorney did or failed to do and how that affected your trial. Failure to allege sufficient facts will result in the denial of your petition. (See *In re Swain* (1949) 34 Cal.2d 300, 304.) A rule of thumb to follow is, who did exactly what to violate your rights at what time (when) or place (where). (If available, attach declarations, relevant records, transcripts, or other documents supporting your claim.)

Multiple horizontal lines for writing supporting facts.

b. Supporting cases, rules, or other authority (optional):

(Briefly discuss, or list by name and citation, the cases or other authorities that you think are relevant to your claim. If necessary, attach an extra page.)

Four horizontal lines for writing supporting cases, rules, or other authority.

7. Ground 2 or Ground 4 (if applicable):

a. Supporting facts:

not exist factoring gang admissions or intent to promote active gang relations of any sort involving drive whereabouts in which Anthony Harper whom petitioner claims gang relations with the BLOODS, actively existing claim claimant under the city of Inglewood "TINY BOUTRIE OF THE INGLEWOOD FAMILY BLOODS" whose defendant appellant BRANDON ALEXANDER FAVOR did not immediately recognize as an ex-claimant sibling for parental rights, also with RAQUEL HARPER (also a claimant with ANTHONY HARPER for of with claim involving the BLOODS) defendant did not respectively assess immediate claim address identifying RAQUEL HARPER or ANTHONY HARPER as either attached person or concretely connect, involving parental relations consisting with the parent relations sought for to establish right of visitation and whereabouts RE. SAME IN SHARON WIMFLEY whom defendant physical/mental injury under ANTHONY HARPER People v. Butler (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 507 (8 Cal. Rptr. 2d 240), also Raquel Harper whom continues to presume parental relationship with petitioner BRANDON ALEXANDER FAVOR, also defendant appellant under Nancy Sneath Poque previous trial counsel whom sought required information identifying the case as a gang case, petitioner who is not a gang member or related otherwise possesses no criminal information other than juvenile information admitted as a minor, currently removed and removed to be destroyed under BRANDON FAVOR v. MICHELE BONE (United States Eastern District - Fresno) 1:15-cv-01864-LTC-EPG-PC where petitioner FAVOR no longer inquires criminal and/or traffic violation history discussing claims involving parent/mother with father amongst other issues raised existing relief herein as also same recognizing injury instant where applied for BIANCA DEVINE with included victims for SHARON WIMFLEY (names may include more than one (1) person) amongst others whom may also become same injuries or totally harmed with initial response graduating the murder and robbery of PABLO CASTENADA, JOSE HUERTA, PAUL E. EUGENIE for A&V Liquor Store on the date of NOVEMBER 08, 2004

b. Supporting cases, rules, or other authority:

Praschler II, 479 F.3d at 1183  
 Arnold v. Int'l Bus. Mach. Corp., 637 F.2d 1350, 1355 (9th Cir. 1981)  
 BRANDON ALEXANDER FAVOR vs BRANDON ALEXANDER FAVOR FOR AND WITH BA285265  
 Los Angeles County Superior Court (UNKNOWN)  
 Harper v. City of Los Angeles, 533 F.3d 1010, 1026 (9th Cir. 2008)  
 Praschler II, 479 F.3d at 1183  
 Johnson v. D.H.V., 586 F.2d 710, 713 (9th Cir. 1978)  
 Pen. Code § 190.2 subc. (d); (2)