

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
NINTH APPELLATE DISTRICT
LORAIN COUNTY, OHIO**

STATE OF OHIO,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

Case No. **14CA010555**

vs.

CLIFIDN JACKSON,

Trial Case No. **11CR083104**

Defendant-Appellant.

**AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT OF REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE
APPELLANT'S APPLICATION FOR REOPENING OF HIS DIRECT
APPEAL UNDER APP.R.26(B) DELAYED AND HIS
ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR I THOUGH VI**

Clifton Jackson #A652-163
Lake Erie Correctional Institution
501 Thompson Road
P.O. Box 8000
Conneaut, Ohio 44030

Mary Slanczka (0066350)
Assistant Prosecuting Attorney
The Justice Center, 3rd Floor
225 Court Street
Elyria, Ohio 44035

DEFENDANT-APPELLANT PRO SE

COUNSEL FOR APPELLEE

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
NINTH APPELLATE DISTRICT
LORAIN COUNTY, OHIO

STATE OF OHIO,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

Case No. 14CA010555

vs.

CLIFION JACKSON,

Trial Case No. 11CR083104

Defendant-Appellant.

AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT OF REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE
APPELLANT'S APPLICATION FOR REOPENING OF HIS DIRECT
APPEAL UNDER APP.R.26(B) DELAYED AND HIS
ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR I THROUGH VI

I, Clifton Jackson, being first duly sworn according to the laws of the State of Ohio, depose and assert a sworn statement pursuant to App. R. 26(B)(2)(b) & (d) of the basis for the claim in support of Request for Leave to File Appellant's Application for Reopening of his Direct Appeal Delayed.

1. My name is Clifton Jackson, I have first-hand knowledge of and am competent to make the following statements.
2. I was unable to file my application for reopening of my direct appeal under App. R. 26(B) within 90 days of the Court of Appeals Decision and Journal Entry and give the following reasons in support with both the delay and Civil and Constitutional Rights violations:
3. The following is a detailed break down of the actual alleged traffic stop occurring on June 14th, 2011 and the following events to date as I remember.
4. This break down is per the hour, minute and second of the morning of June 14th, 2011 , entirely supported by audio & video [See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), "A"], which is derived from Ohio State Trooper "Christopher Beyer's" (the pursuing and arresting officer) cruiser.
5. The audio & video starts at approx: **08:39:17**, which Trooper Christopher Beyer is narrating the alleged traffic infraction, Trooper Beyer was also communicating with LEADS.
6. At **08:40:04**, Trooper Beyer communicates to LEADS and initiate the alleged traffic stop.

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, III-IXIII] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

7. At **08:40:35**, Trooper Beyer approaches my vehicle and asked where I was coming from, and where was I going? Then Trooper Beyer asked me for my driver's license and the vehicle 's credentials.
8. At **08:42:08**, once Trooper Beyer discovered I had New York driver's license [this area of the audio & video, not limited too, primarily supports Trooper Beyer committed perjury regarding alleged attempts of checking my drivers license, alleged reviewing of a rental agreement, and alleged detailed response from LEADS regarding its operational status prior to the K-9 alleged open air sniff, finding drugs and subsequently Trooper Beyer falsified arrest report authored June 14th, 2011, See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibits "B & J", not limited too], Trooper Beyer immediately [with specific attention to Trooper Beyer's hands were clearly empty, **proof he never took my license or credentials**, not limited to the alleged rental agreement when] went back to his cruiser and called for K-9 Assistance at **08:42:20**, which Trooper Beyer received an immediate en route response.
9. At **08:42:30**, Trooper Beyer communicates to LEADS, unrelated to my vehicle, drivers license or alleged rental agreement (credentials).
10. At **08:45:30**, Trooper Beyer without any further request or attempts to obtain for the possibilities of review of my driver's license, the vehicle's credentials, or the alleged rental agreement, in addition without any further attempts to communicate to LEADS, and/or communications from LEADS, Trooper Beyer exit his cruiser, returns to my vehicle and at 08:45:40, immediately states: "everything checked out"(when no attempts were ever made at this point to check my driver's license etc., through leads), however, ordered me out my vehicle.
11. At **08:46:10**, I exit my vehicle and secured it (locked the my vehicle doors), which was confirmed by Trooper Beyer at my suppression hearing on June 4th, 2012, and trial testimony on February 11th, 2014.
12. At **08:46:45**, I was searched by Trooper Beyer, although unhand-cuffed, against my will I was striped of my liberty and placed and secured in the back of Trooper Beyer's cruiser.

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, III-IXIII] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

13. There are several points I feel are critical to be clearly understood at this point in the illegal process, which are:
 - A. I clearly had the car keys and the vehicle car/alarm remote, and cell phones etc..
 - B. LEADS has been clearly operable, and no such LEADS transmissions have been made or associated to its operable status of alleged going out of or coming back into service the life of the stop thus far, nor were the alleged mere attempts to check LEADS were ever in fact made.
14. At **08:46:50**, once I was striped of my liberty and secured in the back of Trooper Beyer's cruiser, Trooper Beyer clearly radios and states "Turned off mic conversation, Trooper Beyer".
15. At **08:47:00**, I start a cell phone conversation.
16. At **08:47:55**, Ohio State Trooper "**Michael Trader**" and "K-9 Argo" comes into Trooper Beyer's cruiser's camera's view, B-lining straight to my alleged vehicle.
17. What is extremely important to point out is:
 - A. Trooper K-9 Argo was extremely high strung the entire time before, during and after the search, extremely paying immediate attentions to Trooper Trader's right hand, which started at the trunk moving counterclockwise.
 - B. Trooper K-9 Argo at no point starting from the trunk of the alleged vehicle paid any attention to the lower or mid portion of the vehicle.
 - C. Trooper Trader clearly keeps his right hand above waist level.
18. At **08:48:05**, Trooper Trader clearly reaches the driver's side rear door area, changes his physical posture, get Trooper K-9 Argo's immediate attention, lowers his right hand while tapping the lower rear door 2 to 4 times (this act is extremely illegal and very important to remember regarding the instant case). After a brief pause, Trooper K-9 Argo complies with the prompt

command, and starts to vigorously scratch the immediate area Trooper Trader alerted Trooper K-9 Argo to, at which point trooper Trader reaches into his back pocket to give Trooper K-9 Argo an object, which Trooper K-9 Argo went crazy for, and leap up to Trooper Trader's right hand where the object was still in his hand, and bit down on the object in a playful manner [receiving his reward for following Trooper Trader's alert command].

19. At **08:48:46**, Trooper Beyer re-approached me illegally detained in the back of his cruiser, and placed me under arrest and began to read me my Miranda Rights, but after Trooper Beyer realized that his mic was still turned off, he immediately turned it back on. Trooper Beyer alleges that Trooper K-9 Argo indicated on my vehicle and immediately took my keys and remote from me against my legal right and wishes.
20. At **08:50:20**, Trooper Beyer clearly walks away from his cruiser with my keys and remote to my secured (locked) vehicle, turns his mic off while he used the remote to unlock my vehicle.
21. At **08:50:30**, Trooper Trader lingered around my vehicle without touching it, until Trooper Beyer hit the remote, then Trooper Trader opened my passenger door, and although both Trooper Beyer and Trooper Trader stood at the open passenger door without a thought, superficial nor thorough desire to search it's interior.
22. At **08:51:00**, Trooper Beyer while walking toward the rear of my vehicle, used the vehicle alarm remote once again to unlock the trunk, removed the contents from the trunk and thoroughly searched the contents and trunk without ever searching the interior [inside] of my vehicle, and more importantly without requesting or obtaining a legal search warrant, required to legally search or enter my vehicle without consent, and the drugs found inside luggage secured in the trunk, was obtained illegally. [Trooper Beyer's mic remained turned off at this time.]
23. At **08:54:00**, Trooper Beyer after illegally locating the drugs, re-approached me once again while I was still illegally detained in

the back of his cruiser, removes me from the cruiser, places handcuffs on me, and began searching me again, this time more thoroughly than the first time, while asking me if I would be willing to cooperate?

24. At **08:55:47**, Trooper Beyer realized his mic was still turned off, turns his mic back on, then asked if I would be willing to cooperate again? Even though I had already told him I had nothing to say.
25. At **08:56:00**, Once again I stated to Trooper Beyer I had nothing to say, meaning I did not wish to cooperate.
26. At **08:57:37**, Trooper Trader while on a cell phone, asked Trooper Beyer "what did you stop him for"?
27. At **08:57:39**, Trooper Beyer immediate response was "following to close".
28. At **08:59:20**, Trooper Trader (believed to be in violation of my Miranda Rights), again tried to get me to cooperate with them?
29. At **08:59:55**, Trooper Beyer completed his thorough search of my person.
30. At **09:00:07**, Once again, I stated to Trooper Trader I do not wish to cooperate.
31. At **09:00:45**, I was secured, handcuffed, arrested, and placed back into the back seat of Trooper Beyer's cruiser, yet Trooper Beyer left my cell phones in the back seat with me (purposely). So I resumed my cell phone conversation.
32. At **09:00:52**, Trooper Beyer started celebrating, stating in reference to me: "Got it, he went pass me and said, stop me, and I said OK".
33. At **09:01:03**, Trooper Beyer turned his mic back off, which from this point on, Trooper Beyer's mic officially remained off the life of the stop.
34. At **09:02:31**, Trooper Beyer and Trooper Trader are clearly and

visibly listening to my cell phone conversations.

35. At **09:32:39**, Troopers Beyer and Trader (again, believed to be in violation of my Miranda Rights), asked me where I got on the turnpike at?
36. At **09:34:26**, Trooper Trader (believed to be in violation of my Miranda Rights), asked me if I would be willing to deliver the cocaine?
37. At **09:34:31**, I refused to deliver the cocaine.
38. At **09:49:00**, Trooper Beyer returns too his cruiser.
39. At **09:49:10**, a tow-truck comes and towed my vehicle.
40. At **09:50:14**, Trooper Beyer pulls off, transporting me to the State of Ohio Trooper's Barracks, at which time I begun to question Trooper Beyer, but due to the fact his mic [body mic] was still off, you could hear me, but none of what Trooper Beyer responses.
41. At **09:51:00**, the audio & video was deliberately turned off by Trooper Beyer, well prior to reaching the State Trooper's Barracks.
42. After what appeared to be another 8 to 15 minute drive, we arrived at State of Ohio Trooper's Barracks, believed to be at the **Milan Post**, where Trooper Beyer pulls his cruiser inside a garage apart of the Barracks.
43. I was removed from the vehicle, searched again before entering the Barracks, then placed in a holding room adjacent to the primary desk locations for the Troopers and their Superiors. Also located in the corner of the barrack, was a wooden type stand, that housed various monitors. The walls were extremely thin, and the door where I was being detained had a window. So basically, I could hear and see everything going on without human or physical interference.

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, iii-ixiii] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

44. **At approximately 11:55 A.M., even though I had invoked my right to remain silence and right to counsel previously while illegally detained on the Ohio State Turnpike on multiple occasions (which was confirmed by Ohio State Trooper Christopher Beyer, See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), "J", Page 17, lines 11-17), while in this holding room, I was approached (again, believed to be in violation of my Miranda Rights), by two DEA TASK FORCE OFFICERS, officers "Geno Taliano" and "Caitlin SzczePinski" in hopes I would be willing to cooperate. I refused to cooperate and I also refused to sign the FORM DEA - 71. The DEA TASK FORCE OFFICERS immediately terminated there attempts to interview me. See Attached (Appendix In Support), Exhibit "D".**
45. The DEA TASK FORCE OFFICERS exit the holding room, and immediately informed the Troopers present at the Barracks [not limited too Trooper Beyer and Trooper Trader], that I refused to cooperate with their agency also. At which point Trooper Beyer immediate began pleading to with those DEA TASK FORCE OFFICERS to supersede Trooper Christopher Beyer arrest. The DEA TASK FORCE OFFICERS immediately went to the wooden type stand that housed various monitors, and immediately reviewed the live feed capabilities of both Trooper Beyer's and Trader's vehicles of the alleged traffic stop, and immediately declined to supersede Ohio State Trooper Christopher Beyer arrest and the desired charges. Now because of the amount of drugs, Trooper Beyer continued his plea for the DEA TASK FORCE OFFICERS to supersede his arrest and the desired charges, at which point [after reviewing the traffic stop via the live feed capabilities] the DEA TASK FORCE OFFICERS stated arrest would not last 15 seconds in a Federal Court. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), "D".
46. The DEA TASK FORCE OFFICERS [hereinafter "DTFO"] took possession of the illegally obtained evidence [the drugs, my cell phones, and my personal money etc.,]. Trooper Beyer, after falsifying the arrest report (See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "B"), eventually transported me to a Municipal Court in the City of Vermilion, County of Lorain, State of Ohio. Where I was arraigned based under the known fact(s) of fraudulent content, and given a \$500,000.00 bail and ordered transported to the Lorain County Jail. Trooper Beyer transported me to the Lorain County Jail. While in route Trooper Beyer [although to no avail]

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, *iii-lxiii*] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

attempted to initiate with endless attempts, to strike up conversations associated with drugs, again even though I had previously invoked my right to remain silence and right to counsel (which was confirmed by Ohio State Trooper Christopher Beyer, See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "J", Page 17, lines 11-17).

47. On or about June 15th, 16th, and possibly June 17th, 2011 the "DTFO" appeared at Lorain County Jail and re initiated interrogations [again to no avail] in attempts to get me to cooperate without counsel being present, which I declined to cooperate every time to date. This can be affirmed via the internal records at the Lorain County Jail.
48. On or about June 17th or 18th of 2011, attorney Jack Bradley of Lorain, Ohio was retained to represent me with the verbal agreement that no motion(s) etc., would be filed in my case/name without my participation or approval, nor should any hearings, motion(s) etc., be waived. Jack Bradley agreed to the verbal contract terms! *See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court*, Ohio Rules of Professional Conduct – Rule 1.1; Rule 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); Rule 1.3; Rule 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(B)&(C); Rule 2.1; and Supreme Court Rules for the Government of the Bar – Rule 1, Section 1 (d)(f); Section 3(B)(1)(2); **Rule 3**, Section 3(A)(C)(D); **Rule 4**, Section 1 & 2; and Gov. Jud. R. 1, Section 1 & 2.
49. On or about June 20th, 2011, I had to appear in the Municipal Court in the City of Vermilion. I thought it was out of the norm that every time I had to appear in a Court Room, "Trooper Beyer" was always the officer that transported me, and on every occasion, he would (although futile) make endless attempts to strike up conversations concerning drugs. My appearance was in relation to a Bond-Over Hearing and Bail Reduction Hearing. The bail remained the same, and counsel (J. Bradley) without communication, input, consent or warning waived the Bond-Over Hearing (which would have created a record) against my oral objections to the Court. **This can be affirmed via the internal records at the Lorain County Jail.**
50. On or about June 27th, 2011, I posted bail [**this can be affirmed via the internal records at the Lorain County Jail**], and via counsel, it was legally established that I would be residing in the Buffalo, New York area, pending the outcome of the case.

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, iii-ixiii] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

51. On or about July of 2011 or shortly thereafter, I traveled from Buffalo, New York, to attorney Jack Bradley's Law Office in the City of Lorain, Ohio for the initial office visit. At which point I verbally reiterated my desired instructions not to waive any hearings, motions, speedy trial etc., in addition not to submit anything in my case/name without first communicating with me, for my input and/or consent. It was well established, although a title of a lawyer was attorney Bradley's profession, however this case evolves around my life, therefore attorney Bradley did not have the authority to make any final decision(s) without my knowledge, input and most importantly my consent. Once again attorney Bradley agreed to terms of the oral contract previously entered. I immediately requested a copy of the actual traffic stop "CAD Reports" and the "LEADS LOGS" which attorney Bradley's position was my requests were evidence that would surface during (via) a Brady/Discovery Request filing. I also gave attorney Bradley specific instructions not to waive or stop the speedy trial clock for any reason. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court. Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B)&(C); 2.1; Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1(D)&(F), Section 3(B) (1) & (2); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(c)&(d); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Section 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.
52. On or about August of 2011 (See Attached Exhibit "C") , an indictment was issued by the Lorain County Grand Jury, and I was arraigned in Lorain County Court of Common Pleas, the Honorable Judge- Edward Zaleski residing, assigned Case No. 11CR083104. [Zaleski now retired]. The "DTFO" also submitted their formal (See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "D") report refusing to supersede the charges prepared by Trooper Christopher Beyer [even though both Trooper Beyer and Trader were involved in the illegal search of my vehicle, Trooper Trader's written report nor his body mic and audio & video of his cruiser (Brady Material) has yet to be disclosed to me to date].
53. On or about August 25th, 2011, without my knowledge, input or consent, attorney Bradley filed a motion for discovery. However, once I became aware of this motion by way of an email I received from attorney Bradley's Law Offices [a copy of said motion], I immediately paid specific attention to point 3. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "E"; See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B)&(C); 2.1; Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1(D)&(F); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(c)&(d); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.
54. On or about September 8th, 2011, by way of email, I received a copy of the motion of discovery reply authored by Assistant Prosecuting Attorney Laura Ann Dezort (0059460). Which I paid specific attention to Point 1 (defendant's/ co-defendant *s statement), which stated: "Please refer to Ohio State Highway Patrol Report No. 11-10115-1090 and discovery material" and Point 3 list of documents of which copies are being provided

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, iii-ixii] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

pursuant to Crim. R.. 16(B)(3)(4), which were 9 photos of the vehicle and drugs and cruisers video 1-DVD, with a specific detailed note which stated: **"the State intends to use all evidence referenced in the police report/discovery material. Attorney Bradley was advised to contact the Ohio State Highway Patrol, Milan Post to make an appointment to inspect any tangible evidence not otherwise provided."** Lastly **Point 4** (exculpatory evidence), which stated: **"None known to the State of Ohio at this time."** See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "F"

55. On or about September of 2011, I drove from Buffalo, NY to Lorain, Ohio again for another office visit with attorney Jack Bradley, at which point myself and Bradley agreed upon the following (not limited to):

A. To avoid the heavy expense of the constant long distance travel, alleged missed phone calls etc., unless absolutely necessary - emailing would be our primary vehicle of communication of correspondence, which shall include scanning and sharing of documents, notifications, authorizations, amendments etc., which attorney Bradley agreed to [as myself and attorney Bradley's office had already birth the vehicle of email communications.

B. Attorney Bradley birth the preparation of a suppression hearing motion, at which point I respectfully shared with attorney Bradley the dislike of the motion in its entirety. I then immediately informed attorney Bradley that his professional input would be welcome, however the initial paperwork (the foundation) would be prepared and presented to him from me, which the contents I present are not to be altered, deleted and/ or disturbed prior to submission. I respectfully shared with attorney Bradley, with all due respect for his person and profession, he works for me and its my life on line not his which I delegate the work, not limited to the preparation of motions etc., nor do I share this authority not even with you attorney Bradley, I and only I have the final say in all submissions, decisions regarding my case, you are only the face of an attorney needed to submit my specific issues as I deem before the court, if you do not agree attorney Bradley, I have no problem with finding an attorney that will! Attorney Bradley agreed.

56. On or about September of 2011, without my knowledge, input or consent, attorney Bradley waived the speedy trial clock for no defined reason to me. To date, I had no reason to disturb the speedy trial clock, besides the rules regarding the speedy trial clock associated to the rules of the Suppression Hearing, ever during the life of the proceedings associated with Docket No. 11CR083104. Without my knowledge, input or consent, attorney Bradley requested a continuance unto November of 2011, of which I was only made aware by way of email notification in September of 2011. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, iii-ixiii] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

the rules of the court. Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1(d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(a)(c)&(d); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Section 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.

57. On or about October 31st, 2011, by way of certified mail/return receipt (United States Postal Service certified No. 7008 0150 0000 2715 0424), I mailed attorney Bradley "the final draft of the motion to suppress prepared by me filed November 4th, 2011. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "G & H".
58. Attorney Jack Bradley filed the Motion to Suppress on November 4th, 2011 he received from me by way of certified mail. "Although counsel professional input was desired and requested, attorney Bradley's office did not participate in the final draft of my motion. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "H".
59. On or about December 15th, 2011, I received an email from attorney Bradley, which expressed legality concerns regarding Ohio State Trooper K-9 Argo's ability to perform independent drug alert-ion, and the fact that Ohio State Trooper K-9 Argo only alerts to drugs on command. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "I".
60. On and off between January and June of 2012, I traveled back and forth from Buffalo, NY to Elyria, OH for various Court dates, pretrial hearings were unknown to me, were made at the defense request by attorney Bradley. Again as previously stated, I have never requested pretrial hearing continuance personally, nor did I instruct or consent to attorney Bradley doing so! [The procedure was, "I would receive Court notification by way of attorney Bradley's office via email, I would then make the three (3) plus hour travel from Buffalo to Elyria, only to appear before a completely empty Court Room."] If attorney Bradley was not sharing a laugh with whom I now know to have been the Lorain County Assistant Prosecuting Attorney (whom changed various times), attorney Bradley was running behind closed doors, alleged to be in the Judge's Chambers alleged to be addressing my case, which I openly verbally objected to attorney Bradley numerous times. Because I was not present to know what was being discussed concerning my case, and the fact that there is no record concerning what was discussed in the Judge's Chambers. However, factually unbeknown to me, which eventually attorney Bradley would return on average within ten (10) to fifteen (15) minutes with rescheduled pretrial conference hearings alleged to have been requested by attorney Bradley (the defense), with a form to sign referencing the same with speedy trial implications. Attorney Bradley mislead me into believing as long as the Suppression Hearing Motion was pending "the suppression motion automatically suspends the speedy trial clock until a decision is rendered, at which point once a decision is rendered, the speedy trial clock would automatically resume against the State of Ohio." The speedy trial clock is automatically suspended, however after the Suppression Hearing states, as the record would reflect, I stopped signing those sham forms attorney Bradley and eventually

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, iii-ixiii] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

the Court would produce from behind closed door proceedings altogether the life of my case, which lasted approximately 2 years. *See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court.* Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1 (d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(a)(c)&(d); Gov. Bar. 4, Section 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Section 1 & 2.

61. On or about June 4th, 2012, the Suppression Hearing commenced . Attorney Bradley did not have any such prior discussion with me of any kind prior to the Suppression Hearing by way of email, phone calls, office visits, (the date of) pre-court appearances etc., regarding intentions, pretrial & trial strategies, waiving evidence (our strongest evidence), the viewing of the audio & video. I objected to attorney Bradley's waiving the viewing of the audio & video in open court for the record. I also objected to attorney Bradley for not objecting to the prosecution's use of selective portions of the audio & video, after attorney Bradley had already waived the viewing of the audio & video which was granted by the trial court. How could attorney Bradley impeach or rebut any of the State's witnesses testimony at the Suppression Hearing if the portions of the audio & video which contradicts such witness' testimony is not viewed by the Court, and most importantly placing on the record "those facts establishing a prima facie showing of the Fourth Amendment violation upon which the motion to suppress was claimed in the first place." Attorney Bradley refused to object on the record and stated "that the only reasons he was objecting was due to his being instructed to do so by me." The Suppression Hearing did not conclude that day. *See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "J". See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court.* Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 1.6(a); 2.1; 3.4(a)(b)(d)&(e); 4.1(a)(b); 5.1(c)(1)&(2); 8.3(a)(b); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1(d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(a)(c)&(d); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.

62. On or about August 14th, 2012, the Suppression Hearing decision had still not been rendered, however, there was another generic court date scheduled, only to be rescheduled again, with the same (attorney Bradley) running behind close doors as stated above at 60, however I was notified by attorney Bradley "that Judge Edward Zaleski, requested the vehicle's rental agreement." Which based on the fact that "no rental agreement arguments were preserved or reserved for the initial record." I deemed such a request moot and prejudicial to both parties, where such an argument could not be argued on the record of my case without both parties being afforded a copy of the vehicle's rental agreement, at which point once again without any prior communication, notification, intention, strategies etc., attorney Bradley submitted a motion in my case completely without my knowledge, input or consent. *See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "K". See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed*

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, iii-ixiii] IN ROMAN NUMERAL, EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

by the rules of the court. Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 1.6(a); 2.1; 4.1(a)(b); 5.1(c)(1)(2); 8.3; 8.4; Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1 (d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2; See also, Canon 1, 1.1, 1.2; and 1.3; Canon 2, 2.1; 2.2; 2.4(a)(b)&(c); 2.5(a); 2.6(a)&(b); 2.7; 2.9(A); 2.10(A)(B)&(C); 2.11(a)(1)(5)&(7)(b); 2.12(A); and Canon 3, 3.1(A)(C)&(D).

63. On or about August 15th, 2012 (05:04:41 P.M.), I sent an email to attorney Bradley [confirmed received], subject matter stated: "Points that I want included in the summation per the ongoing Suppression Hearing pending." The contents of the email was primarily based with instructions to address Troopers Beyer's and Trader's credibility concerns, with immediate instruction to challenge the same, and to support it by the record. Although there were informal previous verbal request dating back to 2011, I directly informally instructed attorney Bradley to obtain official copies of the LEADS SYSTEM LOGS, and CAD REPORTS, not limited too. Although attorney Bradley's office confirmed receipt of my email, attorney Bradley's actions were completely unprofessional as far as maintaining a good lawyer and client relationship by ignoring said emails. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "L". See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court. Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section (d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.
64. On or about September 11th, 2012, I sent an email to attorney Bradley [confirmed received], which mirrored the email sent/confirmed received of August 15th, 2012. In addition to the immediate request of copies of the LEADS LOGS, CAD REPORTS, not limited too. My concerns of attorney Bradley's actions in failing to communicate with me after being paid to represent me, in some way was depriving me of my Constitutional Right of counsel, in an attempt to let attorney Bradley know that I am aware of my constitutional rights. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "M". See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court. Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section (d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.
65. On or about October 1st, 2012, I received an email from attorney Bradley's office with an attachment, which was [now retired] Judge Edward Zaleski's Suppression Hearing Decision that consisted of 3 of 3 pages, signature d by Judge Edward Zaleski, what was stated specifically above his signature was the following:

"For the foregoing reasons, Defendants Motion to Suppress is granted".

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, iii-ixiii] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Top.

The document filed September 28th, 2012 is the same identical document altered, with the part stating my motion to suppress was granted removed and a prima facie showing of the document being altered. **See Attached (Appendix In Support), Exhibits "N"** (the altered document filed) & **"O"** (the original document now retired Judge Edward Zaleski authored and signature d)".

66. **On or about October 3rd, 2012**, I sent an email to attorney Bradley's office [confirmed received], once again re-assertion of my dissatisfaction of his unprofessional conduct due to his failure to communicate with me concerning my case and specific instructions, and his ignoring of this email. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits) Exhibit "P"**. *See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court.* **Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1 (A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section (d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.**
67. **On or about October 4th, 2012**, I sent an email to attorney Bradley's office [confirmed received], informing him that I was giving him one last chance to respond to my email(s) "this time I sent it **certified mail return receipt requested** (Certified #s 7007 0220 0001 3690 7239), expressing my same concerns. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "Q"**. *See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court.* **Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a) (c) (d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a) (1) (2) (3) (4) (5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section (d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.**
68. **On or about October 24th, 2012**, finally, I received a blank DVD s from attorney Bradley by way of U.S. Mail (a package), I was very glad to finally receive something from Bradley, it was two to three DVD s alleged to contain copies of the actual audio & video of the traffic stop only. Otherwise, attorney Bradley nor his office did not use the United States Postal Services to share notifications, documentations, consent forms etc.. Our primary and sole vehicle of communications were by way of phone calls and emails, which was well established and agreed upon as mentioned mid 2011. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits t), Exhibit "R"**.
69. **On or about November 13th, 2012**, I sent an email to attorney Bradley's office [confirmed received], expressing my concerns regarding drafts and the intent of a "Reconsideration Motion" prepared by attorney Bradley, shared by way of email, as to why he would submit a filing of reconsideration of our favorable ruling on our Motion to Suppress. When such a filing was not authorized by me number one, and secondly, such a filing is not authorized

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, iii-ixiii] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

by law with respect to reconsideration of a Suppression Hearing. And as an attorney license to practice law in the State of Ohio, attorney Bradley should have been aware of this fact. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "S".** *See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court.* **Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section (d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2;**

70. **On or about November 16th, 2012** around 8:22A.M., I sent an email to attorney Bradley [confirmed received], with my specific immediate instruction not to submit the reconsideration motion, until my amendments etc., were implemented. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "U".** Attorney Bradley ignored my specific instructions and filed the motion for reconsideration anyway. *See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court.* **Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3 (A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section (d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.**

71. **On or about November 16th, 2012** around 12:39 P.M., I received an email from attorney Bradley's office [confirmed received], informing me that attorney Bradley was proceeding with the filing of the motion for reconsideration anyway against my specific instructions and wishes, which was actually filed November 16th, 2012 around 3:03 P.M.. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "V".**

72. **On or about November 20th, 2012** around 5:41 P.M., I received an email from attorney Bradley, in his futile attempt to discourage me from making amendments to the motion for reconsideration filed against my specific instructions. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "T".** *See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court,* **Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4 (a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section (d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.**

73. **On or about November 21st, 2012** around 5:18A.M., I sent an email to attorney Bradley's office [confirmed received], solidifying my specific instructions regarding my amendments to be amended to the motion for reconsideration he previously filed, which all drafts (not limited to the final draft), were shared by way of email.

74. **On or about November 29th, 2012** around 5:32P.M., I sent an email to attorney Bradley's office [confirmed received], and forward to attorney Bradley November 30th, 2012 around 8:37 A.M., the supplement issues I wanted amended to the motion for reconsideration, which again the final draft were shared by way of email.

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, iii-ixiii] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

75. On or about December 7th, 2012 around 12:08 P.M., per my specific immediate instructions, attorney Bradley filed the supplement to the motion for reconsideration, which he received from me by way of email of Nov. 30th, 2012. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "X".

76. On or about December 11th, 2012, I received an email from attorney Bradley's office [confirmed received], which contained an alleged copy of Judge Zaleski's "Decision of the motion for reconsideration & supplements, which consist of a one page, one sentence denial", which stated:

"Defendant's motion to Reconsider decision to Suppress is denied."

I immediately expressed legality concerns over the reconsideration under the suppression hearing rules, Judge Zaleski's one page, one sentence denial, which did not have the file stamp, and clearly the Judge's signature on this decision was different then the previous signature of the altered Suppression Hearing Decision filed Sept.28th, 2012. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "Y".

77. On or about December 19th, 2012, I sent an email to attorney Bradley's office [confirmed received], and requested a copy of any existing transcript (as always at my expense) of all the alleged meetings between attorney Bradley, Judge Zaleski (and/or), the prosecutor in the Judge's chambers, held behind closed doors. This email also expressed my dissatisfaction with attorney Bradley's professional and unprofessional conduct with respect maintaining a good lawyer and client relationship by ignoring my email(s). See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "Z".

78. On or about December 19th, 2012, I sent a second email to attorney Bradley's office [confirmed received], in which there was another direct request to obtain copies of the LEADS LOGS to address some of the credibility concerns with respect to Troopers Christopher Beyer's and Michael Trader's testimony at the Suppression Hearing and at trial, being perjured testimony knowingly committed by both Troopers. In their futile attempts to cover up a Fourth Amendment violation occurring on June 14th, 2011, which renders all evidence illegally seized inadmissible under the "Fruits of the Poisonous Tree Doctrine". This email also was completely ignored. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AA". See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, III-IXIII] IN ROMAN NUMERAL, EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c) (d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section (d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A) (C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.

79. On or about December 27th, 2012, I sent an email to attorney Bradley's office [confirmed received], in which I informed him that. I know my case happen in Ohio, and I am familiar with the laws in New York, so with that being said, I also informed attorney Bradley that I know my Constitutional Rights, and I was not one of his average clients, and I knew that my Fourth Amendment has been violated, and that his actions has deprived me of counsel as guaranteed under the Sixth Amendment. I even went so far as to obtain copies of the "OHIO RULES OF THE COURT (STATE 2015)". Then I gave attorney Bradley specific instructions not to alter the contents of my Motion to Suppress, but in his professional opinion, if there was anything that he could add to strengthen the issues of my motion to suppress it would be welcome [with respect to my Fourth Amendment violation claim under fruit of the poisonous tree doctrine]. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AB". See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court**, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section (d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.
80. On or about February 8th, 2013, I was arrested and placed in Federal custody on unrelated charges.
81. On or about February 15th, 2013, I appeared in Federal Court on unrelated charges (pay specific attention to page 14, Lines 8-11 of the Federal Transcripts), however, Assistant U.S. attorney "Maura O'Donnell, Esq"., confirmed that the U.S. Attorney's Office in the Western District of New York had been in direct contact with the Court (Ohio) and/or Prosecuting Attorney's Office in Lorain County, Ohio. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AC".**
82. On or about March 5th, 2013, I sent an email to attorney Bradley's office [confirmed received], in which I expressed my concerns about violation of my speedy trial rights and ineffective assistance of counsel in violation of the Sixth Amendment, and also those portions of the Ohio Rules of Professional Conduct in relations to attorney Bradley's failure to communicate with me to maintain a good client and attorney relationship. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AD". See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court**, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, iii-ixiii] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section (d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.

83. On or about March 6th, 2013 at 10:36 A.M., I sent an email to attorney Bradley's office [confirmed received], in which I re-expressed my concerns about violations of my right to effective assistance of counsel, and once again stating my dissatisfaction with his handling of my case, and how his conduct violates the Ohio Rule of Professional Conduct and the Supreme Court Rules that Govern the Bar. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AE". See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section (d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.
84. On or about March 7th, 2013 at 11 :34 A.M., I re-sent the same email to attorney Bradley's office [confirmed received]. See Attached (Appendix In Support), Exhibit "AF".
85. On or about March 16th, 2013 at 8:49P.M., I sent an email to attorney Bradley's office [confirmed received], in which I addressed my concerns once again as to the issue of violation of my speedy trial rights and ineffective assistance of counsel, also asserting the Ohio Rules of Professional Conduct and the Supreme Court Rules that Govern the Bar, due to attorney Bradley's failure to properly investigate and argue issues and defenses that were in my best interest. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AG". See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section (d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.
86. On or about March 23rd, 2013 at 5:47 P.M., I sent an email I to attorney Bradley's office [confirmed received], in which once again I addressed my concerns as to the issue of ineffective assistance of counsel, also asserting the Ohio Rules of Professional Conduct and the Supreme Court Rules that Govern the Bar. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AH". See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar.

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, iii-ixiii] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

R. 1, Section (d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A) (C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.

87. On or about March 26th, 2013 at 1 :24 P.M., I sent an email to attorney Bradley's office [confirmed received], in which I addressed my concerns of his failure to properly investigate and address the Fourth Amendment violation of Troopers Christopher Beyer and Michael Trader and K-9 Argo illegal search of my vehicle, which violation was fully supported on the record by way of the "audio & Video" produced by the state. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AI".** See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1 (A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section (d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.
88. On or about April 11th, 2013 at 5:16 P.M., I sent an email to attorney Bradley's office [confirmed received], in which I addressed my concerns of **Brady Material being withheld** (to date), **not limited too 'exculpatory evidence': LEADS LOG'S, and CAD REPORTS** of both troopers. And his being ineffective due to his failure in having the State to produce/comply with our discovery request, in violation once again of Ohio Rules of Professional Conduct and the Supreme Court Rules that Governs the Bar. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AJ".** See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a) (c) (d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section (d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A) (C)&(D); Gov. Bar . R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.
89. On or about May 22nd, 2013 at 5:53 A.M., I sent an email to attorney Bradley's office [confirmed received], in which I addressed once again my dissatisfaction of his handling of my speedy trial violation, and his failure for what ever reason to make a **Brady** request per my specific instructions to obtain the **LEADS LOGS** and **CAD REPORTS** of both Trooper Beyer and Trader, etc.. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits t), Exhibit "AK".** See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a) (c) (d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C) (1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section (d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, iii-ixiii] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

90. On or about June 17th, 2013 at 11:16 A.M., I sent an email to attorney Bradley's office [confirmed received], in which I immediately re-addressed my specific instructions not to submit any documentation/motion in my name **without my knowledge, input or consent**. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AL".
91. On or about June 20th, 2013 at 7:41P.M., I sent an email to attorney Bradley's office [confirmed received], in which I addressed once again my concerns of his ineffectiveness as counsel, and the fact that he was not acting as counsel guaranteed by the Sixth Amendment, and his conduct with respect to my case violates the Ohio Rules of Professional Conduct and the Supreme Court Rules that Governs the Bar, which deprived me of the protection of the Sixth Amendment. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AM". See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a) (c) (d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section (d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A) (C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.**
92. On or about June 21st, 2013 at 7:46:45 P.M., I sent an email to attorney Bradley's office [confirmed received], in which I **addressed once again the violations of my Sixth Amendment protections**, and attorney Bradley's violations of the Ohio Rules of Professional Conduct and the Supreme Court Rules that Governs the Bar and his being ineffective as counsel. Also attached to this email, was the **Brady** request that I personally prepared (which was subsequently filed July 3rd, 2013), with immediate specific instructions to file it. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AM". See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3) (4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d) (e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section (d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.**
93. On or about July 3rd, 2013, attorney Bradley fully complied with my specific instructions as a result my **Brady** requests were as follows. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AN".**
94. On or about July 3rd, 2013 at 12:45 P.M., I received an email from attorney Bradley's office, which read: "Clifton, please be advised that you will incur additional fees of at least \$5,000.00, and it would be greatly appreciated if you would start making regular payments." **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AO".**
95. On or about October 7th, 2013, I sent an email to attorney Bradley's office [confirmed received], in which I requested that he compel the Lorain County Prosecutor's Office, to disclose any and

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, iii-ixiii] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

all Brady Material requested in the discovery motion filed July 3rd, 2013. Once again attorney Bradley went back to acting unbecoming of an attorney and unprofessional conduct, by ignoring my email and the specific instructions within the body of the emails. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AP"**. See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3) (4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section (d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.

96. On or about October 17th, 2013, Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, Peter J. Gauthier (#0055774), filed his partial response to "Clifton A. Jackson's Brady Request" filed July 3rd, 2013 [96 reference in this affidavit], that attorney Bradley's office provided me a copy of the same by way of email. Which was titled "Initial Response To Defendant's Demand For Discovery Prepared By And At The Discretion Of Clifton A. Jackson." **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AR"**. See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.3; 3.4(a)(b)(d)&(e); 3.8(a)(b)(c)&(d); 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1(d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.

97. On or about October 19th, 2013 at 9:18:16 A.M., I sent an email to attorney Bradley's office [confirmed received], in which I addressed my dissatisfaction for his unprofessional conduct by failing to compel the Lorain County Prosecutor's Office to hand over the requested Brady Material as requested July 3rd, 2013. And his actions violated the Ohio Rules of Professional Conduct, the Supreme Court Rules that Governs the Bar, the Sixth Amendment, and Section 10, of Article I of the Ohio Constitution. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AQ"**. See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1 (d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.

98. On or about October 28th, 2013 at 7:04 P.M., I sent an email to attorney Bradley's office [confirmed received], in which I once again addressed my dissatisfaction with his unprofessional handling of matters concerning my case, violating the Ohio Rules of Professional Conduct, the Supreme Court Rules that Governs the Bar, the Sixth Amendment, and Section 10, Article I of the Ohio Constitution. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AS"**. See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h);

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, III-IXIII] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1(d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2.

99. **On or about November 18th, 2013**, a pretrial hearing was held, at which this was the first time I appeared in front of this new judge (since Judge Edward Zaleski retired December of 2012), **John Miraldi**. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AT"**. See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, **Canon 1, Rules 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3; Canon 2, Rules 2.1, 2.2, 2.4(A)(B)&(C), 2.5(A), 2.6(A)&(B), 2.10(A)(B)&(C), 2.11(A)(1)(5)(7)& (b), 2.12(A), 2.15(A)&(B); Canon 3, Rule 3.1(A)(C)&(D).**
100. **On or about November 19th, 2013** at 3:49 P.M., once again by way of an attachment to this email, I received the transcript of the November 18th, 2013 pretrial hearing. It is my position, that not only did this hearing entertain the DNA of grave violations of Ohio Rules of Professional Conduct, the Supreme Court Rules that Governs the Bar, Government & Judiciary Rules, which violations graduated to direct violations of the canon Codes based on Judge John Miraldi exhibiting a bias disposition regarding his personal/professional opinion of Jack Bradley alleged to based on history, not the instant case. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AT"**. See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, **Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1(d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2; Canon 1, Rules 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3; Canon 2, Rules 2.1, 2.2, 2.4(A)(B)&(C), 2.5(A), 2.6(A)&(B), 2.10(A)(B)&(C), 2.11(A)(1)(5)(7)&(b), 2.12(A), 2.15(A)&(B); Canon 3, Rule 3.1(A)(C)&(D).**
101. **On or about November 25th, 2013**, a pretrial hearing commenced, at which Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, Peter Gauthier appeared for the Lorain County Prosecutor's Office, and attorney "Mark Aufdenkampe" appeared on my behalf (after being appointed on November 18th, 2013), which this was his first time newly appointed trial counsel Mark Aufdenkampe ever appeared with me in a Court proceeding. Judge John Miraldi, once again exhibited a bias disposition misleading the record regarding the State appointment of counsel after Aufdenkampe informed the court he was still waiting on the record, but he had been informed by the defendant verbally, substantial emails etc., and based on the mentioned, he would be requesting sometime to review to adequately prepare for trial. Trial Judge John Miraldi went on record to alleged past and/or present problems/issues exist(s)(ed) between the defendant and past counsel that never appeared before and/or existed on record. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibits "AU & AV"**. See Hearing Transcript Page 2, Lines 4-20.

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, III-IXIII] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

102. On or about December 23rd, 2013 at 7:54 A.M., I sent an email to attorney Aufdenkampe's office [confirmed received], in which I addressed my concerns with my Ohio legal representation, and informed him of the fact that we needed to up date our records of my case with copies of the courts docket sheet, and all of the court forms signed and unsigned that waived or did not waive my speedy trial clock, also, I informed him that my request was paramount because attorney Jack Bradley's office actions or the lack thereof, has been clearly inappropriate and negligent. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AW".** See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1(d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.
103. On or about December 23rd, 2013 at 8:04 A.M., I sent an email to attorney Aufdenkampe's office [confirmed received], in which I addressed my concerns of previous retained defense attorney "Jack Bradley's representation being unprofessional. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AX".** See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R.1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)& (e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5),(B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3 (A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1(d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar .R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.
104. In December of 2013, attorney Aufdenkampe obtained my file by way of Jack Bradley Although the reference date of December 15th, 2011 speaks volumes regarding Jack Bradley's immediate knowledge of legality issues existing with Ohio State Trooper K-9 Argo by way of email received from attorney Bradley's office. This information was critical to attorneys Bradley and Aufdenkampe having any chance of proper litigation of my Fourth Amendment violation claims fully supported by a prima facie showing made apart of the record at the June 4th, 2012 [See Suppression Hearing Transcripts P.43, Lines 3-16, See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "J"], previous attorney "Jack Bradley's" cross-examination of Trooper K-9 Argo's handler Michael Trader, which stated in part:

Question by Jack Bradley Answer of Trooper Trader:

Q: You understand that one of the judges in our Court has found that you and your dog are not credible means of detecting the odor of cocaine, you understand that, don't you?

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, III-IXIII] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

A: I believe I am familiar with that case.

Q: That's the State of Ohio versus Antwonne Duke?

A: I am very familiar with that case. End Quote

However, upon attorney Mark Aufdenkampe receipt of the defendant's case file, there was no reports of any kind regarding legality concerns of Trooper K-9 Argo, which I expressed grave concerns regarding the associated Brady request filed July 3rd, 2013.

105. On or about January 9th, 2014 at 10:23 A.M., I sent an email to trial attorney Aufdenkampe [confirmed received]. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AY". See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1 (A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1 (d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.
106. On or about January 11th, 2014 at 3:48A.M., I resent the Jan. 9th, 2014 email to attorney Aufdenkampe's office [confirmed received]. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibits "AZ & AAA". See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1 (d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.
107. On or about January 12th, 2014 at 2:42 A.M., in response to an on going dialog with attorney Aufdenkampe, I sent an email to attorney Aufdenkampe's office [confirmed received]. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAB". See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1(d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, iii-ixiii] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

108. **On or about January 13th, 2014** at 6:19 P.M., I sent an email to attorney Aufdenkampe' s office [confirmed received], in which I addressed my concerns of a speedy trial violation under R.C. 2945.71 and the Sixth Amendment. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAC". *See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court,* Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1(d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)& (D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.
109. **On or about January 27th, 2014** by way of an office visit, attorney Aufdenkampe received [confirmed by attorney Aufdenkampe' s signature] , a complete file consisting of 77 documents, to be submitted as documents of support with the motion to preclude that which was being prepared at that point in time. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAD". *See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court,* Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a) (1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1 (d) & (f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3 (A) (C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.
110. **On or about February 5th, 2014, I filed an "Internal Detailed Complaint" supported by Trooper Christopher Beyer's authored arrest report(s), Trooper Beyer's "Suppression Hearing Testimony" and reference to the audio & video,** after conferring with attorney Aufdenkampe, supporting the fact that Trooper Beyer falsified the arrest report(s), committed perjury. A copy of this Internal Complaint was served by way of certified mail return receipt requested, to the State of Ohio Highway Patrol Milan Post, the Lorain County Prosecutor's Office, attorney Aufdenkampe, and Internal Affairs (a Columbus Ohio office). See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAE".
111. **111. On or about February 7th, 2014,** due to attorney Aufdenkampe' s failure to comply with my specific instruction in the filing of a critical motion to dismiss and motion to preclude, I had no choice but to draft (as a layman with legal abilities) the motion to dismiss and preclude myself. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAD". *See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court,* Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B)

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, iii-ixiii] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

& (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1(d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Section 1 & 2.

112. On or about February 10th, 2014, trial judge John R. Miraldi (whom clearly exhibited a bias disposition), denied my motion to dismiss and motion to preclude referred to in 111 of this affidavit. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAF".** *See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court; Canon 1, Rules 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3; Canon 2, Rules 2.1, 2.2, 2.4(A)(B)&(C), 2.5(A), 2.6(A)&(B), 2.10(A)(B)&(C), 2.11(A)(1)(5)(7)&(b), 2.12(A), 2.15(A)&(B); Canon 3, Rule 3.1(A)(C)&(D).*
113. On or about February 11th, 2014 jury selection commenced for case No. 11CR0831 04. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAG & AAH".** *See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court.* Gov. Jud. R. 1. Sections 1 & 2; Canon 1. Rules 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3; Canon 2, Rules 2.1, 2.2, 2.4(A)(B)&(C), 2.5(A), 2.6(A)&(B), 2.10(A)(B)&(C), 2.11 (A)(1)(5)(7)&(b), 2.12(A), 2.15(A)&(B); Canon 3, Rule 3.1(A)(C)&(D).
114. On or about February 11th, 2014, before the trial commenced, although the State relied upon alleged professional testimony, the primary two witnesses against me were "Ohio's State Troopers 'Christopher Beyer' and 'Michael Trader [at the Suppression Hearing held on June 4th, 2012, these same two troopers were the State's only witnesses. Prior to the start of the Suppression Hearing, retained attorney then 'Jack Bradley' submitted an oral motion to **severance both troopers to avoid their hearing one another's** testimonies. Now retired Judge, **Edward Zaleski granted said motion**]. Prior to the start of trial, prosecutor 'Peter Gauthier' made an oral motion for Trooper Michael Trader to be able to set at the prosecution's table as a representative, even though he was a primary (one of two, which both primary witnesses for the State of Ohio were both Ohio State Trooper's Christopher Beyer and Micheal Trader), witness in the case. I immediately objected to attorney Aufdenkampe, and instructed him to object on the record, Aufdenkampe refused to make my objection known to the Court and placed on the record. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAG & AAH".** *See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court,* Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3) (4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1,

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED (first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, iii-ixiii) IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

section 1 (d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, sections 1 & 2.

115. Opening arguments commenced for case No. 11CR083104 on February 11th, 2014, the first day of trial. Immediately Assistant Prosecutor Gauthier informs the jurors, there is no DNA, Finger Prints amongst other references, but then goes on to state "their sole piece of evidence" was a phone conversation deriving from the audio & video. The same audio & video that's referred too in this affidavit [the cell phone conversation occurred well after violations of my Civil Right, 4th Amendment Rights, Due Process Rights & Equal Protection Rights under the 14th Amendment] Which the State of Ohio Highway Patrol Milan Post, Lorain County Prosecutor's Office, retired judge Edward Zaleski, residing judge John R. Miraldi, previous attorney Jack Bradley, and appointed attorney Mark Aufdenkampe were all individually and/or collectively made aware of after viewing the audio & video prior to trial. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAG & AAH" . See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court,** Canon 1, Rules 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3; Canon 2, Rules 2.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.4(A) (B)&(C), 2.5 (A), 2.6(A)&(B), 2.10(A)(B)&(C), 2.11(A)(1)(5)(7)&(b), 2.12(A), 2.15(A)&(B); Canon 3, Rules 3.1 (A)(C)&(D) [violated by both retired Judge 'Edward Zaleski ■ and 'John R. Miraldi']. See also, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4 (a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4 (a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f) (g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1(d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2 [violated by Asst. Prosecutor Peter Gauthier, previous retained attorney Jack Bradley and appointed counsel Mark Aufdenkampe].
116. After the opening arguments, the state showed the audio & video to the jurors, at which point, ..] must solidify the fact, that this was the first time ..] ever viewed the audio & video. I tried digesting the evidence presented through out the course of the first day of trial. Appalled at the manipulative disrespect exhibited toward my Civil Rights, Due Process and Equal Protection Rights, in placed under provisions of the blanket of protections guaranteed by the Constitution of Ohio and the United States afford to all American Citizens, these violations/actions committed by the Lorain County Judicial Community. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court,** Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4) (5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1(d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2; **Canon 1, Rules 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3; Canon 2, Rules 2.1, 2.2, 2.4(A) (B)&(C), 2.5(A), 2.6(A)&(B), 2.10(A)(B)&(C), 2.11(A)(1)(5)(7)&(b), 2.12(A), 2.15(A)&(B); Canon 3, Rules 3.1(A)(C)&(D)**
117. Both Troopers Christopher Beyer and Michael Trader testified, by their testimonies being inconsistent with the audio & video, the authored arrest report and their Suppression Hearing testimony, Trooper

Trader admitted to tapping (prompting) the area where Trooper K-9 Argo scratched (as commanded too), alleged to indicate on the presents of narcotics. On the cross examination closing of Trooper Trader by defense attorney Mark Aufdenkampe, he stated in part: "I had Trooper Beyer out there doing my thing". See attached Exhibit "AAG & AAH"?. The first day of trial closed, but after eating supper and mentally combing through the evidence presented earlier in the day, the evidence was clear that various violations Ohio State Highway Patrol Protocols and 4th Amendment existed and were supported by the audio & video. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "A".

118. On or about February 12th, 2014, the second day of trial commenced, due to vehicle troubles, I was a little more or less then 15 minutes late. I was in constant communication with attorney Aufdenkampe (new defense/trial counsel) relevant to my being minutes away due to traffic and weather conditions. Yet Judge John R. Miraldi commenced trial without my being present. Once I arrived late, Judge Miraldi directly question me as to why I was late? At which point I placed on record my reasoning for being late, was due to traffic and weather conditions beyond my control, of which attorney Aufdenkampe was made fully aware. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAG & AAH". See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Canon 1, Rules 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3; Canon 2, Rules 2.1, 2.2, 2.4(A) (B)&(C), 2.5(A), 2.6 (A)&(B), 2.10(A)(B)&(C), 2.11(A)(1)(5)(7)&(b), 2.12(A), 2.15(A)&(B); Canon 3, Rule 3.1(A)(C)&(D) [violated Judge - John R. Miraldi]; See also , Prof. Cond. R. 1,1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1 (d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1 , Sections 1 & 2 [violated by both atton1ey Aufdenkampe and assistant prosecutor Gauthier].
119. On or about February 12th, 2014, extreme winter advisory warnings were advised across this portion of the Country, not limited to extreme sub-zero temperatures. Due to this weather my vehicle would not start without a jump. Prior to the start of the second day of trial, attorney Aufdenkarnpe was notified of the situation, yet failed to notify or inform the court of my dilemma, and as a direct of his unprofessional conduct, the second day of trial commenced without my physical presence. I arrived physically in the courtroom around 20 minutes late believing that every thing was fine due to my giving attorney Aufdenkarnpe notification of my dilemma and his giving me assurance that he would inform the court. This was brought to my attention after the jurors were removed from the courtroom, and Judge - John R. Miraldi questioned me personally as to why I was late? At which point I informed him that I had informed attorney Aufdenkarnpe of my dilemma, at which point attorney Aufdenkarnpe assured me he would inform you. Attorney Aufdenkarnpe confirmed this fact on the record, in addition I notified the court "that I wanted to re-

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, iii-ixiii] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

cross examine both Trooper Christopher Beyer and Michael Trader? Subsequently attorney Aufdenkarnpe begun speaking. Judge Miraldi asked for the basis of the re-cross examination request? Attorney Aufdenkarnpe confirmed it was to address 4th Amendment infringement issues. Although Trooper Trader was present at the prosecutor's table, Judge Miraldi denied the re-cross request, stating in part:

Trooper Christopher Beyer was out of State on vacation".

I requested that attorney Aufdenkarnpe object for the record (because if I would have stood up and objected, I would have looked crazy to the court and jurors), because the trial should have been adjourned until Trooper Beyer returns from his alleged out of state vacation during a high profile trial which should have superseded this star witness' out of state vacation, attorney Aufdenkarnpe refused to object for the record. Judge Miraldi also asked if I objected to the start of trial without my presence? For the record I objected to the start of trial without my presence. Amongst other known and unknown trial concerns relating to violations of my Constitutional and Civil Rights resulting in a tainted conviction, the jury lost its way and found me guilty and I was sentenced to eleven (11) years mandatory (meaning day for day without the possibility of good days), and remanded me into custody, and housed in the Lorain County Jail as a high profile inmate, at the same time appointing appellate counsel Paul Griffin, Esq. Of Lorain, Ohio. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAG & AAH". See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & ; 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4 (a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R.1, Section 1(d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1& 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2; Canon 1, Rules 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3; Canon 2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.4(A)(B)&(C), 2.5(A), 2.6(A)&(B), 2.10(A)(B)&(C), 2.11(A)(1)(5)(7)&(b), 2.12(A), 2.15(A)&(B); Canon 3, Rules 3.1(A)(C)&(D).**

120. On or about February 13th 2014, being housed in the same Cell Block 3 East or West area, I met another inmate named Ira Lee, who was there under Case No. 12CRO84573. After several conversations, it became apparent to me that I was not the only one prey to Troopers Beyer's and Trader's racial profiling, where it was apparent that these other individuals were actually pulled over while driving on the Ohio Turnpike, in an identical area, while driving an identical vehicle model I drove. But what really got my attention, was when I found out that Trooper Trader gave Trooper K-9 Argo the same command to alert as he gave on my vehicle based on an alleged open air sniff. And in both cases the alleged indication (tapping prompting command) was in the identical area where Trooper K-9 Argo scratched, there were an identical alleged wind argument etc., to the extent it became very clear, the possibilities are extremely high, that these Troopers are racial profiling, patrolling Ohio's highways with predetermined illegal sets of circumstances, because just like the human body has a signature DNA, that cannot be shared, each case [alleged criminal or not] has it's own DNA, that cannot be shared,

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, iii-ixiii] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

so the exact sets of circumstances that exist in case No. 11CRO83104 and 12CRO84573 are next to impossible, unless the circumstances are predetermined. The Lorain County Prosecutor's Office and the Ohio State Highway Patrol Post Milan were well aware, or made aware of the circumstances surrounding both case numbers herein stated. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAI". See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & ©; 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, section 1(d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1& 2.**

121. On or about February 15th 2014, after financial arrangements between myself and Ira Lee, I received a copy of a report prepared by Steven D. Nicely, dated December 20th, 2013 of the K-9 Consultants of America, which was specifically about Ohio State Troopers Michael Trader and K-9 Argo, per their Ohio State Troopers Service Records, which concludes in part:

"Conclusion - Based on the records provided this team should not be in service because the dog has a high potential of being cued by the handler. Also, it is apparent in the video provided the more likely cause of K-9 Argo scratching at the driver's door, is the handler's actions and not the odor of contraband drugs."

The Lorain County Prosecutor's Office and the Ohio State Highway Patrol Post Milan were well aware of these facts surrounding Trooper K-9 Argo. Just as important, it became apparent to me, that the Ohio State Highway Patrol was instructed prior to my illegal arrest on June 14th, 2011 to correct known constitutionally invading behavior of K-9 Argo. The Ohio State Highway Patrol failed to make the required corrections, therefore the State of Ohio knew K-9 Argo was highly prompt dependent and could not independently locate narcotics as required to be a drug detecting K-9 as early as 2010, before my arrest on June 14th, 2011, and this was brought to attorney Aufdenkampe attention on or around December 20th, 2013, well after my arrest. Trooper K-9 Argo was deemed "not to fit the legal criteria to be a drug detecting K-9 on June 14th, 2011." **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAI". See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, section 1(d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R 4, Sections 1& 2; Gov. Jud. R 1, Sections 1& 2.**

122. Due to the Documented concerns, I had/have with the judicial community in Lorain County, prosecution and defense wise, I was not comfortable with appointed appellate counsel Paul Griffin of Lorain, Ohio for various reasons, not limited to:

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED (first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, iii-ixiii) IN ROMAN NUMERAL, EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

- A) Paul Griffin Law Office was located just bout next door to Jack Bradley's Law Office in Lorain, Ohio.
- B) Based on all the injustice documented, I did not trust anyone whom Judge - John R. Miraldi appointed.
- C) Prior to retaining Paul Mancino Jr., appointed appellate counsel Paul Griffin failed to communicate with me through visits, postage (mail) correspondence, etc.

See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d) & (e); 1.3 1.4(a) (1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1 4.1 (A) & (B); 5.1 (C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1(d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3 Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R 4, Sections 1&2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.

123. **On or about February 22nd, 2014**, at my home address in Buffalo, New York, I received a response from the State of Ohio Investigation Commander Lt. Firmi, dated February 19th, 2014, regarding my internal complaint filed against Troopers Christopher Beyer. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAJ".**
124. **On or about April 9th, 2014** while awaiting facility destination detained at Lorain Correction Institution (LorCI), 2075 S. Avon Beldon Road, Grafton, Ohio 44044, without any law material, I drafted a detailed letter (correspondence) to appointed appellate counsel Paul Griffin **See attached Exhibit "AAK"**, which was 17 of 17 pages. I mailed my draft to a family member to type (although many typos), my signature was authorized and this correspondence was mailed to the appellate counsel Paul Griffin certified mail return receipt (certified mailing # 7008 1140 0002 4824 8948), and a copy of this correspondence was also mailed to attorneys Fernando Mack, Rufus Simms, Paul Mancino (which was my initial correspondence to counsel [Mancino], although I am acutely aware counsel was not retained or legally binding at this point, counsel did not become retained and legally binding to on or around May 1, 2014, primarily the point counsel was aware of my position), Local News Investigators "Carl Monday" and "Tom Meyers", not limited to. This detailed correspondence addressed every concern of Civil and Constitutional Rights violated as attested to within this affidavit, I never received any response back from this correspondence by appellate attorney Paul Griffin (via any legal etc. forms and/or vehicles of communication's at this point), which was unprofessional and justified my hiring of (retained) Paul Mancino to perfect my appeal. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibits "AAK & AAL". See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3;**

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, iii-lxiii] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1(d)&(f); Gov. ar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.

125. **On or about May 1st, 2014**, per my instructions, my family retained Paul Mancino Jr., to prepare and submit my appeal brief per my legal concerns supported by the documented record after a thorough line of communication and understanding between myself and Paul Mancino Jr. [that thorough line of communication or any lines or vehicles of communications legal or personal eluded me to on or around July 15th, 2015]. Paul Mancino Agreed to the terms and accepted payment, and notified Paul Griffin his office was retained to perfect and file an effective appeal brief on my behalf. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibits "AAL & AAU". See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1(d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.
126. **On or about May 1st, 2014**, newly retained appellate attorney Paul Mancino Jr., by way of mail and phone communications, notified appointed appellate attorney Paul Griffin, that he (Paul Mancino Jr.'s Law Office) was retained to perfect my appeal brief, and requested that attorney Paul Griffin turn over the file and transcripts of my case. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAL".
127. **Between the time frame of May - July 2014**, I sent various detailed letters containing specific instructions by certified mail and emails through my family to appellate attorney Paul Mancino Jr., informing him of the specific issues and violations and all of the injustice done to me on this case. Appellate attorney Mancino Jr., never responded, in fact, he also did not respond to any of the lines of normal or formal communications that I used in an attempt to establish and/or maintain an open line of communication, being that he worked for me after my retaining him as counsel. In fact, the only communication from attorney Mancino to any of my contacts, were associated to the balance owed. Nothing else. See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B)& (C); 2.1; 4.1(A) & (B); 5.1(C) (1) &(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.
128. **On or about July 17th, 2014**, I received legal mail from attorney Paul Griffin (former appointed appellate counsel), dated July 15th, 2014 [See Attached (Appendix

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, iii-ixii] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

In Support), Exhibit "AAL"], which contained copies of letters mailed to appellate attorney Paul Mancino Jr., dated July 15th, 2014, which requested clarification of Paul Mancino Jr., which stated in part:

"I am writing requesting clarification on the above-style case. It was my understanding, based on a letter I received from you dated may 1st, 2014 (a copy of which is enclosed), that you had been retained by Mr. Jackson to represent him in his appeal. I checked the court docket today, and it appears you have not filed a Notice of Appearance with the court of appeals. It also appears that the record was filed on June 25th, 2014, and that Mr. Jackson's brief is therefore due today.

I have taken the liberty of filing a certification of extension of time to file a brief on Mr. Jackson's behalf, a filed copy of which is enclosed. As you can see, the due date for the filing of the brief is August 4th, 2014. I am assuming you will continue to represent Mr. Jackson. If you do, please file a Notice of Appearance with the Court of Appeals so that I may close my file. If you are not representing Mr. Jackson, please let me know."

It became apparent to me, not only was appellate attorney Mancino refusing to communicate with me, he had done absolutely nothing regarding a thorough research and review of the evidence and transcripts of the case to properly perfect any issue of merits in my brief on appeal. To file a thorough and/or effective appeal brief, nor did appellate attorney Mancino follow the fundamental procedures to authenticate legal representation as required for the possibilities of preparing and/or filing for appellate review. The body of work cannot resemble quality if it refused or refuses to incorporate the key ingredient for an effective appeal. Appellate attorney Mancino failed to comply with specific fundamental and procedural instructions, and his conduct was very unprofessional and detrimental to the appellant. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAL". See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B)&(C); 2.1 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1(d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, III-lxiii] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

129. **On or about July 22nd, 2014**, I mailed a 3-page letter to appellate attorney Mancino's office regarding the quality of his legal representation, and my instructions and concerns regarding the same with an immediate reference to his failure to keep open attorney and client line of communication, also his failure to communicate with the Court of Appeals and immediately reference to the letter he received from previous appointed counsel of record for appeal Paul Griffin, dated July 15th, 2014 confirming that (new appellate counsel) retained appellate attorney Paul Mancino failed to follow the fundamental procedures to authenticate legal representation as required in filing a Notice of Appearance to the Court of Appeals. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAM". See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B)&(C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C) (1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1(d) & (f); Gov Bar. R 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2.**
130. **On or about July 29th, 2014**, without the mere attempts of communications of any degree, not limited to emailing, U.S. Postage Correspondence, attorney visit(s) etc., to possibly gain the needed information to assist in the filing and effective appeal. Without notice appellate attorney Mancino filed my appellant's brief July 29th, 2014, without ever forwarding a copy to me so I may address any concerns about the issues raised for the appellate review, having merits. After endless phone calls, eventually appellate attorney Mancino Office Secretary (Per my families request) placed a copy of the filed brief in my families email, which once received by way of email, my family printed out and mailed me a copy of the filed brief. Although appellate attorney Mancino refused all lines and methods of communications with me, he contacted my family solely for his remaining balance, which was paid in full. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAN". See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B)&(C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R 1, Section 1(d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R.3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R 4, Sections 1 & 2, Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.**
131. **In August of 2014**, I prepare the "**Bombshell of an Active Story**" which is a true and accurate story consistent with this affidavit. This story continues to be active to date, however the initial phase was completed and dated September of 2014. Once completed, this 26 page story was mailed to my family, who scanned and emailed appellate attorney Mancino the same, and my family also mailed the

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, iii-ixiii] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

same certified to appellate attorney Mancino's law office with specific (supplemental brief) instructions to pay immediate attention to pages 8-14, which were specific instructions for Mancino. This story was also mailed and emailed globally, not limited to the formal U.S. Atty. Gen. Eric Holder Regime. Yet, appellate attorney Mancino failed to respond, and also failed to comply with my specific instructions. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAO".** *See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R 1.1; 1.2(a)(b)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1(d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Section 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.*

132. **On or about September 8th, 2014**, Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, Mary Slanczka (#0066350), filed the appellee Brief, requesting oral arguments. The State of Ohio, Lorain County Prosecutor's Office knowingly and willingly relied upon alleged evidence that was known to violate my Civil Rights, Due Process and both United States and Ohio Constitutional protections against "Racial Profiling, Perjured Testimony and Prompting" in violation of the 4th and 6th Amendments. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAP".**
133. **On September of 2014**, based on the fact that the appellate attorney Mancino refused to communicate with me, my family resent the "**Bombshell of an Active Story**" (that was previously emailed and mailed to Mancino by certified mail), by way of email and U.S. Postal Services, also certified mail again, with the identical supplemental brief instructions, **which were in specifics on page 8-14 of this story.** Once again, appellate attorney Mancino never responded, lack of communication and unprofessional conduct became alarming concerning my trust in appellate attorney Mancino's ability to defend and properly address my merits of my claimed violations. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAO".** *See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B)&(C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1(d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R 4, Sections 1&2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.*
134. **In September of 2014**, appellate attorney Mancino filed a "Reply Brief of Appellant". At this point, I had never had any level or line of direct communications with Mancino, even though any method or Line of communication on my part were always open and welcome. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAQ".** *See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1;*

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, III-IXIII] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B)&(C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1(d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1&2, Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.

135. On October of 2014, my family emailed another copy of the "Bombshell of an Active Story" to appellate attorney Mancino's office, my family also mailed the same by certified U.S. Mail again, with the same supplemental brief and specific instructions, attention on pages 8-14. Once again Mancino refused to respond, and at this point it seemed as if all lines of communication failed or were closed. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAO". See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1 (C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1(d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1&2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2.
136. On November of 2014, I was transported to Youngstown, Ohio CCA to resolve unrelated legal matters in Federal Court in Buffalo, New York. Appellate attorney Mancino was immediately notified of the same.
137. In December of 2014 through June of 2015, per my Federal Attorney, David Cotter of Williamsville, New York, although periodic, had a direct line of communication with my appellate attorney Mancino regarding my legal battles at both State and Federal levels. Per Federal Attorney Cotter's request in December of 2014, I gave him appellate attorney Paul Mancino's Office information. Federal attorney Cotter confirmed to me on multiple occasions a dialog exchange between him and appellate attorney Mancino, before and during my federal trial, when I was housed in Youngstown, Ohio in December of 2014. Appellate attorney Mancino by way of myself, knew about this transit process, in addition to Federal attorney Cotter notifying him of the same. Appellate attorney Mancino never responded to me directly or indirectly through any lines of attempted communications. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B)&(C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R. 1, Section 1(d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1&2; Gov. Jud. R. 1 & 2.
138. Throughout the time frame of December of 2014 through March of 2015, My sister "Angel Myles" [whom Paul Mancino contacted at his convenience to

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, iii-xviii] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

receive his fees\ and "Amber Pawlak" (my fiance) [whom Paul Mancino's office spoke with for fee updates, Amber also repeatedly called to ultimately obtain copies of the filed briefs in our home email, which she had to copy and send to me, Mancino never responded to any correspondence or sent any filed briefs etc., to me directly at my detaining facility in the State of Ohio at that point.], whom both were authorized by me to communicate with appellate attorney Mancino in May of 2014, attempted to contact appellate attorney Mancino various times, however became discouraged because Mancino would not/had not ever responded to me directly at this point, and once Mancino received his balance in full, he was no longer responding to either of my family members. *See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B)&(C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R 1, Section 1(d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1 & 2.*

139. **Between April and May of 2015**, while housed in Buffalo, New York on unrelated Federal Charges, I received an attorney visit from my New York, attorney David Cotter, who confirmed again that he had a dialog with my Ohio appellate attorney Paul Mancino regarding my Ohio trial and the pending sentence of my federal trial, and my current place of confinement in New York. But, counsel did not elaborate at length to the particulars of their dialog, no matter whether their dialog was appropriate or not, because the questions always exist within myself, why would my Ohio appellate attorney (Mancino), be speaking to anyone regardless the length or purpose of the conversations about me or my case, when Mancino has at that point "never spoken or conversed with me (his client) ever. *See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B)&(C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R 1, Section 1(d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1 & 2.*
140. **On or about June 29th, 2015**, on unrelated charges, I was scheduled to be sentenced in Federal Court in the Western District of New York, however prior to the scheduled sentencing hearing, without notification of any kind from anyone, a video conference was confirmed with my trial court in Lorain (Ohio) County Court of Common Pleas, and Judge - John Miraldi regarding an unknown Ninth Appellate District, Lorain County Court of Appeals Decision at the time regarding my pending appeal. The Court of Appeals' Decision was filed a week prior (June 22nd, 2015). However, appellate attorney Mancino who knew I was being confined in Buffalo, New York, did not notify me through any of the lines of open

communication available nor did he contact my family, Mancino's appropriate or inappropriate dialog with my Federal attorney Cotter. Needless to say, I was well beyond appalled. In fact, at that point, I'd had never had a direct line of communication of any degree with appellate attorney Mancino. I've never seen Mancino, spoken to him, nor received any correspondence of any kind from him. My federal attorney Cotter, provided me with the initial copy of the Court of Appeals Decision filed in Ohio. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibits "AAS, AAT & AAU".** See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d)&(e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B)&(C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A)&(B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)&(h); Gov. Bar. R 1, Section 1(d)&(f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C)&(D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1 & 2.

141. **During the life of my legal battle in the State of Ohio, I've requested copies scanned on hard drives in PDF format, of all court transcripts, emails sent/received to/from formal counsel (retained) Jack Bradley, replaced by Mark Aufdenkampe (court appointed trial counsel). In the first week of July 2015, I received hard copies of the above mentioned from my home (Buffalo, New York) files. After reviewing some of the hard copies, accompanied with what I already knew, I was left in an alarmed state of mind based on the abundance of documentation known or unknown that supported the injustice that has been done unto me, not limited to the "double jeopardy" issue with the Suppression Hearing Decision being granted, perjured testimony at both the Suppression Hearing & Trial by Troopers Beyer and Trader, prompting Civil Rights violations, Constitutional Rights violations, judicial misconduct, prosecutorial misconduct, and also, violations of Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibits "J & B", not limited too. See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court,** Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d) & (e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A) & (B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g) & (h); Gov. Bar. R 1, Section 1(d) & (f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C) & (D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1. Sections 1 & 2; Canon 1, Rules 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3; Canon 2, Rules 2.1, 2.2, 2.4(A)(B) & (C), 2.5(A), 2.6(A) & (B), 2.10(A)(B)&(C), 2.11(A)(1)(5)(7) & (b), 2.12(A), 2.15(A) & (B); Canon 3, Rule 3.1(A)(C) & (D). [The question remains present with me and my family, "How could such criminal behaviors of the Lorain County Judicial Community of this magnitude go unaddressed and/or unpunished?].
142. On or about July 6th, 2015, I sent an alarming detailed 2 of 2 page letter to appellate Attorney Mancino, certified mail [certified numbers 7013 2250 0000 1562 5014]. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAT".**

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED (first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, iii-ixiii) IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

143. Even after my actions of July 6th, 2015, I have never received any direct lines of communication from Mancino, nor have I ever spoken to him or received any attorney client correspondence by way of mail or attorney visits etc., *See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d) & (e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A) & (B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g) & (h); Gov. Bar. R 1, Section 1(d) & (f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C) & (D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1. Sections 1 & 2.*
144. I have made it clear throughout this affidavit, that not only has Mancino refused to communicate with me throughout the life of his retained representation at any level. It is also clear that his refusal to maintain a line of communication, and failure to notify me of my right to appeal to the Ninth Appellate Court's Decision to the Ohio Supreme Court, resulted in this untimely filing of my Application of Appellate Rule 26(B) [App. R. 26(B)], and clearly states meritorious grounds for the issues upon which my App. R. 26(B) application is founded, not limited to the tolling of appeal-able issues both State and Federal due to my being bounced back and forth between the State and the Fed's, and certified mail #7014 2120 0003 2166 7721 of July 6th, 2015. *See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAT". See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d) & (e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A) & (B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g) & (h); Gov. Bar. R 1, Section 1(d) & (f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C) & (D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1. Sections 1 & 2.*
145. On or about July 10th, 2015, while housed in New York, I received my first response ever from Appellate Attorney Mancino replying to my July 6th, 2015 letter. His primary notification was "I had 45 days to appeal to the Ohio Supreme Court, and to contact the State of Ohio Public Defenders office for help immediately after I was placed in transit back to Ohio." *See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAU".*
146. On or about July 13th, 2015, simultaneously and in addition to the letter sent to the Ohio Public Defenders Office in Columbus, Ohio - I drafted an additional 5 of 5 page correspondence on July 13th, 2015, which the cover page read "More Than An 4th Amendment Violation, The Face of Being Profiled." Collectively, all of this information mentioned, not limited to the Audio & Video, CD, etc, were combined packaged, and sent eventually to the following individuals and entities

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, III-IXII] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

by way of U.S. Mail as listed on the attached, **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAV"**.

147. **On or about July 14th, 2015**, I drafted a letter to the Ohio Public Defenders Office Notifying their office of some of my immediate issues, and the purpose of my contacting their office was based on the July 10th, 2015 letter received from Appellate Attorney Mancino instructing me to do so, and my immediate desire to appeal the Ninth Appellate District, Court of Appeals Decision, which primarily relied on perjured testimony, prompting and violating both my civil and Constitutional Rights under the 4th, 5th, 6th, 8th, and 14th amendments. In support of my factual position, I sent various documents, not limited to a copy of the Audio and Video [of the actual alleged traffic stop "June 14th, 2011" attached as well as a copy of the CD [containing the greater majority of the document ion in PDF format] referred to throughout this affidavit. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAW"**.
148. Prior to my family mailing this package, due to the fact a lot of copies were required of the CD & DVD s amongst others, and the process of being in transit, on or about July 20th, 2015, I drafted a multipurpose correspondents (1) to notify the above individuals and entities of my change of address (see attached exhibit "AAV"); (2) to provide all 8 of 8 pages acting as a supplement to the 5 of 5 pages provided within this paragraph. The primary issues targeted within the supplement were (1) Ineffective assistance of counsel [issue with Jack Bradley], not limited to (2) Brady Violations (3) Double Jeopardy [issue with Judge Zaleski's altered Suppression Hearing Decision] (4) The K-9 Consultants of America Report [which confirmed Ohio State Trooper K-9 Argo is patrolling the State of Ohio Highways illegally as a drug detecting K-9] and (5) Newly discovered evidence, regarding K-9, not limited too.
149. **On or about August 3rd, 2015**, all the mentioned parties were notified that my address changed again, now from Youngstown, Ohio to Conneaut, Ohio. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAX"**.
150. **On or about August 17th, 2015**, I received a response from the State of Ohio Public Defenders Office in Columbus, Ohio, whom denied to appoint representation and sent me a Pro Se Packet on how to file a delayed appeal to the Ohio Supreme Court. A day or so later, this office located and returned my entire package mailed to them, not limited to the DVD and CD to my detaining facility in Conneaut, Ohio, which I received by way of legal mail protocol. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAY"**.

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, iii-ixiii] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

151. **On or about August 21st, 2015**, I received a response from the Ohio State Bar Association, whom also returned my file, not limited to the DVD and CD, which I received by way of legal protocol. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAY"**.
152. **On or about September 3rd, 2015**, to the best of my ability as a layman of the law, I filed a delayed appeal in the Supreme Court of Ohio [per the instructions from the Public Defenders Office], Case No. 15-1458. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAAA"**.
153. **In September of 2015**, by way of my detaining facility's legal mail protocol, I received the third correspondence from appellate attorney Mancino's office, which simply was an unsigned computer generated document dated June 29th, 2015, alleging to notify me of the Appeal Court Decision. What struck me as extremely odd was, appellate attorney Mancino knew that I was in the State of New York from his periodic conversations with my Federal attorney David Cotter. The State of Ohio also knew well enough that I was detained in the State of new York, because unknown to me a video conference was scheduled in Federal Court in Buffalo, New York on June 29th, 2015, before my June 29th, 2015 Federal Sentencing. Which was known to every member in the judicial communities. State and Federal in Buffalo, New York and the State of Ohio regarding both State and Federal cases. Mancino's Integrity was clearly in question with me. Based on the known and unknown, also documented sequence of events, not only was Mancino's integrity in question, it was extremely clear that there was a conflict of interest between Mancino and my protections afforded to me under the 4th and 6th amendments. My Civil and Constitutional Rights have clearly been compromised, besides the three times mentioned in this affidavit, I have never heard from Mancino directly. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAAB"**. *See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d) & (e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A) & (B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g) & (h); Gov. Bar. R 1, Section 1(d) & (f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C) & (D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1. Sections 1 & 2.*
154. **In October of 2015**, for the first time by way of the facilities law library, I became aware of a vehicle known as Appellate Rule 26(B) [App. R. 26(B)] Application and purpose. To the best of my ability as a layman of the law, I have attempted to and prepared the Enclosed App. R. 26(B) application of which this affidavit and its supporting exhibits are a part.
155. **On or about October 28th, 2015**, the Supreme Court of Ohio filed an entry denying my motion for a delayed appeal as a felon. **See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit "AAAC"**.

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, iii-ixiii] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

156. In November of 2015, after a timely approval by way of the facilities staff, my Unit Team overseen and approved by Mr. Toth, for the second time ever, and the first time of quality viewing, I was able to review the audio and video of the alleged traffic stop of June 14th, 2011, per the hour, per the minutes and seconds as exactly what happened as documented in this affidavit.
157. The points made herein, not only supports blatant violations of the 4th amendment [under the "Fruit of the Poisonous Tree Doctrine"], not limited too with respect to the illegal actions of Ohio State Troopers Christopher Beyer, Michael Trader, and K-9 Argo individually and collectively. It also supports blatant violations of the 6th amendment [under effective assistance of counsel, and rights to a fair trial], with respect to the ineffective representation of counsel at all levels, not limited to (former retained attorney) Jack Bradley, (court appointed attorney) Mark Aufdenkampe, (court appointed appeals attorney) Paul Griffin, and (retained appeals attorney) Paul Mancino Jr., individually and collectively. It also supports blatant violation of a 6th, amendment [due process, right to a fair trial], with respect to the actions of judicial bias of suppression hearing Judge - Edward Zaleski (retired), and trail judge - John R. Miraldi, individually and collectively. It also supports blatant violations of the 6th amendment [under due process, right to a fair trial], with respect to the actions of prosecutorial misconduct by the Lorain County Prosecutor's Office, and the Assistant Prosecuting Attorney's whom represented the State of Ohio throughout the life of this case individually and collectively.. See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibit AAAD and "AAAE". See also exhibit "AAR" for the specific codes of violations, which is alleged to be strictly governed by the rules of the court, Prof. Cond. R. 1.1; 1.2(a)(c)(d) & (e); 1.3; 1.4(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (B) & (C); 2.1; 4.1(A)&(B); 5.1(C)(1)&(2); 8.3(A) & (B); 8.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g) & (h); Gov. Bar. R 1, Section 1(d) & (f); Gov. Bar. R. 3, Section 3(A)(C) & (D); Gov. Bar. R. 4, Sections 1 & 2; Gov. Jud. R. 1, Sections 1 & 2; Canon 1, Rules 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3; Canon 2, Rules 2.1, 2.2 2.4(A)(B)&(C), 2.5(A), 2.6(A)&(B), 2.10(A)(B)&(C), 2.11(a)(1)(5)(7)&(b), 2.12(A), 2.15(A)&(B); Canon 3, Rules 3.1(A)(C)&(D).
158. After this ordeal it is my personal opinion that in order for the adversarial process to function properly, all counsel appointed and or retained pretrial, during trial, and post trial, have their primary responsibility as an "adviser" (whom alleged responsibility is to provide me with an informed understanding of my legal rights and obligations, clearly explaining their practical implications), as an "advocate" (whom alleged responsibility are to assert my position under the rules of the adversary system), as a "negotiator" (whom alleged to seek a result advantageous to me consistent with requirements of honest dealings with

CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of affidavit unnumbered, iii-ixiii] IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX [Appendix Pages are numbered 1-655] PAGES. AFFIDAVIT AND EXHIBITS ARE IN SUPPORT OF 26B MOTION TO REOPEN STATE OF OHIO v. CLIFTON JACKSON, CASE NO. 11CR083104, NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. 14CA010555, Not Limited Too.

others), and as an "evaluator" (whom alleges to examine a client's legal affairs). In order for such a judicial system to properly function, there must be an "ethical" and "moral" balance between all parties to the judicial body of any Court system officers, in their personal and professional capacities, individually and collectively as documented throughout the record of events as attested to [See Attached (Appendix of Exhibits), Exhibits], and specifically highlighted in paragraphs 1 through 158 of this affidavit.

In the instant case, all the lawyers, prosecutors and judges failed in communicating to me individually and/or collectively that they were in fact all officers of the judicial system that were not loyal, diligent, prompt or competent regarding the specifics of this case through its life and their failure to adhere to the oath they took to uphold the Constitution. In addition to the mentioned immediate failure individually and collectively, to meet the standards of there responsibilities in order for the adversarial process to function properly, as an "adviser", "advocate", "negotiator" and "evaluator", these judicial officers' actions have fallen to such a level, that any hope of an adversary in today's court room is a farce, the defense attorney's, prosecutors and judges have become such good friends that they so value there friendships, self and or fraternity fulfillment's, that they have left the Constitution(al) [protections] setting on the sidelines, that the Constitution has become a stranger to them [**The Three Friends And A Stranger Doctrine**]. This Court can no longer let such type of actions influence the trust of the people in our judicial system being the pillar of justice as required to protect our liberty in the American way.

159. I swear that the above statements in Paragraphs 1 through 158 are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Further Affiant sayeth naught.

Clifton A. Jackson
Clifton Jackson A652-163

NOTARY PUBLIC

Sworn to and subscribed to in my presence on this 7 day of March, 2016.

Jennifer Maki
Notary Public



JENNIFER MAKI
Notary Public, State of Ohio
Recorded in Ashtabula County
My Commission Expires
April 25, 2017