

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.

EXHIBIT

AAT

EXHIBITS A-AAAE IN SUPPORT OF CLIFTON JACKSON ENCLOSED AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX PREPARED MARCH OF 2016 OF A DETAILED TIME LINE OF FACTUAL EVENTS BETWEEN JUNE 14th, 2011 AND OCTOBER OF 2015 TO THE BEST OF MY LAYMEN LEGAL ABILITIES.
THIS EXHIBIT "AAT" IS REFERENCED IN ¶ 142, 143 not limited too.

To: Paul Mancino Jr., Esq.
Mancino, Mancino & Mancino
75 Public Square, Suite 1016
Cleveland, Ohio 44113

Dated July 6th, 2015

From: Clifton Jackson
Niagara County Jail
P.O. BOX 496
Lockport, New York 14094

RE: State of Ohio v. Clifton Jackson
Case No. 14CA010555
APPEAL DECISION AND THE STATE OF OHIO SUPPORTING ALTERED DOCUMENT[S]

Dear Mr. Mancino:

Attached, please locate a copy of the alleged decision filed associated to Judge Zaleski Suppression Hearing Decision September of 2012.

The document is not the original decision. This is a altered document, that was attached in the supporting papers of the State of Ohio submitted Appeal Brief September of 2014, specifically speaking on the third (3rd) page, below the last paragraph to the right, right below trunk, you will see a speck of ink. If you will refer and compare to the original filed document[s] even you relied upon and documented in the Appellant Brief submitted July of 2014 on page 14, your first point of argument, it clearly states "in an puzzling entry filed by the court, the first paragraph reads that the motion to suppress has been "denied". In the last paragraph the court states that the motion to suppress has been "granted".", however on the State of Ohio's altered document where that mentioned speck of ink resides, is where the State of Ohio illegally altered and removed Judge Zaleski final hearing decision "granting" the suppression hearing September of 2012.

Although the answer is obvious, why would the State of Ohio go to such great lengths to illegally alter and remove Judge Zaleski final documented decision?

The points above are most important for several reasons;

1) page 3, of the Court of Appeals decision, the 6th point made reads "after a hearing on the motion to suppress, the trial court denied Jackson's motion to suppress by judgment entry dated September 28, 2012 (the altered document mentioned above). In November 2012, Jackson requested that the trial court reconsider its denial of the motion to suppress and he filed a supplemental brief in support on December 7, 2012 (the motion submitted to the court's February of 2014 and its supporting papers clearly presented ineffective assistance of counsel issues with prior counsel Jack Bradley, supported in email documentation also submitted as evidence supporting the defendant directly instructed counsel not to submit a reconsideration motion on behalf of the defendant, also in the supporting papers counsel reply was he was submitting the reconsideration motion any ways against the defendant's wishes, which counsel submitted the mentioned motion, only then did the defendant submit the supplemental brief. It is and was also the defendant's belief, the legal question resides, does a reconsiderations motions legally apply under the suppression hearing rules? Because why would the defendant want to reconsider a favorable decision to him?). Judge Schafer goes on an conclude his point, the trial court summarily denied the motion to reconsider on December 11, 2012.

correspondence continued to Mr. Mancino, dated July 6th, 2015.

2) Judge Schafer goes on and relied on this altered document in his ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR 1, of the Court of Appeals decision.

3) In addition with the arguments in your presentation and/or the Court of Appeals response, failed to mention the documented facts, per the Brady/Giglio request July 3rd, 2013 although there resides grave Brady/Giglio violation[s] relevant the grave denial of CAD Reports and LEADS Logs, the State of Ohio issued a partial response dated October 4th, 2013, confirming that vehicle was locked, nor were there ever any warrants requested, issued or obtained to legally gain entry to that locked vehicle, not limited too, in addition the State of Ohio acknowledge the same November 18th, 2013 supported by that hearing date transcripts, which you also have Mr. Mancino.

4) All the defendant document issues were presented to the court with all the supporting papers etc., February of 2014, in addition to the Internal Complaint filed against Trooper Beyers for falsifying the arrest report, supported by the Audio & Video, his suppression hearing testimony etc., which copies were sent to his trooper barracks, internal affairs amongst others. The only proof obtained after trial, was the proof the Ohio State Trooper K-9 Argo cannot independently sniff out drug, supported by his own patrol records, which the Audio & Video clearly supports Micheal Trader clearly prompts on command for K-9 Argo to illegally scratch that vehicle to illegally obtain probable cause amongst many other legal violations.

Also associated to the appeal decision, it is unfortunate that I was informed of the decision from anyone but you, as I was informed from my attorney in New York, unrelated to your retained representation. It is also unfortunate you never communicated with me regarding my appeal issues via a single visit, my telephone attempts or mailing correspondence relevant direct or supplemental issues, which the latter were mailed to you certified mail on multiple occasions September and October of 2014, titled a "Bombshell Of An Active Story", which directed your immediate attentions to pages 8-14 primarily, which those supplemental issues you ignored to this very day were extremely harmful. What are your intentions regarding the injustice with-in?

Please immediately inform me of my options based on my immediate status, and any possible remedies, not limited too (1) appealing the appeal decision (2) my next legal course of action in fighting for my innocence etc.!

Please, I respectfully request that you not ignore me any longer as you have since you were retained by my family to prepare my appeal brief.

Also respectfully at this point as I anticipate your prompt response, which I respectfully ask that you send to me via your correspondence, and please scan the same and send a copy to my email address jackson_clif@yahoo.com, to avoid any cross mailing issues that could possibly occur due to the fact I am still out on a Writ from Lake Erie in the State of Ohio.

Sincerely, thank you in advance for your immediate attentions, and for my personal files, this correspondence was mailed certified mail, the certified mail confirmation numbers are 7013 2252 0000 1562 5014,

Dated: July 5th, 2015
Lockport, New York.
DENISE L. ROBINSON
NOTARY PUBLIC - STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF NIAGARA
LIC. #01906017340
COMMISSION EXPIRES 12/14/2018

Denise L. Robinson

Respectfully,
Clifton Jackson 7/6/2015
Clifton Jackson
Appx. P. 579