

## Masters of Quibble

a concise opuscle

January 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2020

by: Ennis R. Patterson

Prosecutors of Cuyahoga County (Cleveland, OH) are masters of the art of quibble. No matter how exact one may be at presenting their written pleadings and using specific legal jargon, Cuyahoga Prosecutors (CP) are apt to pretend to not understand the gist of the important aspects of motions and other legal papers filed by pro se litigants.

I'll be the first to profess CP are far from being moribund in their intelligence based on the arid arguments they make at times and their seemingly inability to use plain logic. But at the same time it's hard to imagine standards for becoming a lawyer in the State of Ohio are so low (whether in studies or culture) that being able to comprehend text has become trivial or secondary. Are they dealing with too many cases? Could it be mnemonic guides of some kind are needed? Maybe it's a combination of both... or something else.

When reviewing responses from the state in regards to motions or petitions I've filed, at times it's inconceivable my filings were thoroughly refused as the state's responses flatly answer elements of my pleadings that don't exist. For example, I filed a motion (writ of mandamus) with the Eighth District Appellate Court requesting to be granted a new trial or to have my case dismissed since the state clearly was not fully in accord with particular rules, codes, and precedents aent specific judicial proceedings. In the state's response they claimed I was asking the appellate court to "compel the trial court to serve [me] with a copy of findings of fact and conclusions of law"<sup>1</sup> which is an absolute lie. There is not one segment of my writ of mandamus petition where I request such documents — NOT ONE! But the state

Knows in order for them to control the narrative and achieve a favorable ruling they absolutely must lie and fabricate. Skulduggery tactics as such are rife on the state-level. Even more alarming, appellate courts echo all purportations of the state in these such instances which indicates they either don't read pro se filings or they'd rather connive; after all, appellate court judges do have friends and family in the lower court judicial realm.

After reviewing several quasi cases in regards to the trickery of my own, it becomes clear all state-level courts are in cahoots to ambiguously, or blatantly depending on perception and understanding of law, hamper due-process if that's what it takes to satisfy a bottom-line.

It should be noted that the issue described in the penultimate paragraph is the most egregious of several lies/fabrications told by the state as it relates to the noted (Mandamus) motion.

The name of the game for the state is to 'do whatever it takes to win' even if it means constructing sensational prevarications or sophisticated jibberwocky.

### Endnotes

- 1 See: Petition for Writ of Mandamus. This is public info which can be looked up on internet (Patterson v. Cuyahoga Common Pleas Court - case no. 107755). See state's respond captioned: "Respondent's Motion for Summary Judgment to Petition for Writ of Mandamus". Mandamus also speak of how the state ignored claims of previous filed documents; gibbling is a constant for the state.