

To: Bad Jucist.Com.

In RE: Bad Judge, bias & Favoritism is Crystal Clear, In,  
US v Hueston, Case#<sup>(s)</sup> 1021-CR-37, Appeal# 23-1057  
(Holly A Brady, Fort Wayne Indiana, 7th Cir)

From: David Hueston  
43089-509  
FCE Gilmer  
P.O. Box 6000  
Clenville, WV. 26031

Bad Jucist,

I Need Help! I need people to become Aware of  
an Extreme In-justice. Please let me know if you  
can help me. Here is my story, About a Crooked &  
Dishonest Cop & Judge.

Detective Michael W. Ross of Marion Indiana, Compiled a  
Dis-Honest Affidavit for a warrant. A "FRANKS" Matter, to  
which I was Granted a Suppression Hearing. Now there are  
2-legal Standards, the "Impeachment Rules" of Federal Evidence.  
4e3, 607, etc. and, "Reckless Disregard", of the officers State of  
mind. If Ross Acted "Recklessly" they must suppress, or intentional.  
and Pursuant to Fed. R. Evidence 4e3, 607(a) a person who  
Contradicts or tells inconsistent stories is Not Reliable.

In Letters of testimony Here is a list of what  
this officer testified to, Admitted and told, inconsistently.

- 1) Admitted to Breaching His procedures.
- 2) Admitted to Back-dating Documents. (by 1 week)
- 3) Testified He Completely withheld knowledge of an informant  
from the Issuing Judge.
- 4) Testified later the CI was a "tipster" not a CI.
- 5) Contradicts #4, says CI's are paid, that he paid the CI  
In this case especially.
- 6) Contradicts #5, says, "He is not Classified as a CI in their Policy".

7) This Contradicts #<sup>s</sup> 4, 5, 6, yet, Ross testified that "He" gets to "Choose how to Classify Him." (exhibits lack of Candor)  
8) Ross testified He "Corroborated" the info he got from the CI.

9) Immediately Ross's next 10 questions, he Admits He did NOT Corroborate a single Fact Alleged by the CI.

10) Considering #9 Ross Asked for a warrant anyway, Full well knowing he had ~~no~~ Corroboration, meaning he knew he had to Lead a Judge to believe he in Fact did something, Corroborate, what he did not to get the warrant.  
(Ross did just that, misled the Judge purposefully)

11) Ross Admitted the CI told him my car was "Black", but Ross saw personally it was green, so, in the warrant He purposefully Changed what the "CI told Him" to "green". That is a Purposeful false statement.

12) Ross testified that there was a "congregation" of people outside my Home, His Partner proved that a False testimony and said He "does not Recall" there was only 1 person outside He said. (perjury)

13) Ross Admitted to making A False Statement, in the Affidavit About Crucial events, (seeing a Man Leave my Home & go to it) He further stated He could not even see the Front of the Home to know where the Man went.

14) Ross Admitted He misled the Judge stating in the Affidavit "we then returned, and while conducting surveillance, witnessed the green mini-cooper that Houston is believed to be Driving Accive." Ross testified He was not even present when the car Arrived, he Did not see it arrive.

These are just some of the highlights of the Dishonest Cops testimony. Detective Ross According to the Rules of Evidence Applying to witnesses is NOT Credible. He is Impeached by all the Case Law known to man. Holly A. Brady of

The 7<sup>th</sup> Cir Courts in Fort Wayne, Ruled a Bias and Prejudicial Ruling stating she finds "Ross" Credible" ? and I suffer a 20 year prison sentence because of Holly Bradys Deep seated Favoritism.

This is just the tip of how bad and dis-honest His testimony was. I AM going to Appeal on a \$2255 Due to this Bias's prejudice but I need the public to see this, to know, so that she cannot hide my case's Appeal and enforce an Honest Ruling.

I Am Receiving a settlement soon from my lawsuit against the Sheriff of Allen County. in 1:22-cv-00173  
Let me know if you can help me please and if so, I will donate and support the cause. I plan to Run an Ad. in the paper about it, publish on the internet and more if all goes right, then file my appeal.

I hope to hear from you soon.

Thank you for your time

Rob  
D. B.