CLIFTON JACKSON AFFIDAVIT AND APPENDIX OF EXHIBTS ARE NUMBERED [first two cover pages of alfidavit unnumbered, iii-ixiii) IN ROMAN NUMERAL. EXHIBIT PAGES ARE CROSS REFERENCED AS APPENDIX (Appendix Pages are numbered1-555] 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.



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 "AAY" IS REFERENCED IN ¶ 150, 151 not limited too.



Office of the Ohio Public Defender 250 East Broad Street - Suite 1400 Columbus, Ohio 43215

TIMOTHY YOUNG
State Public Defender

www.opd.ohio.gov

(614) 466-5394 Fax (614) 728-8091 TTY (800) 750-0750

August 17, 2015

Mr. Clifton Jackson # 652-163 Lake Erie Correctional Institution 501 Thompson Road P.O. Box 8000 Conneaut, Ohio 44030

Dear Mr. Jackson:

I am replying to your letter, which this office received on August 6, 2015. In your letter, you appear to ask this office to help you file an appeal to the Ohio Supreme Court. Your letter refers to a July 13 letter and a July 20 supplement. This office has no record of receiving those documents or any CDs or DVDs.

Unlike the court of appeals, the Supreme Court is not required to accept your case. Rather, the court selects the cases it will review. So you must convince the court that your case involves a legal question that is important enough for it to answer. The court usually does not take a case merely to fix mistakes that happened in the court of appeals or trial court. And the court usually does not review cases that primarily involve the application of settled law to the facts of the case.

Instead, the court prefers to review cases that involve unsettled legal issues, emerging trends in the law, and legal issues that will have a major impact on the practice of criminal law throughout Ohio. Except in capital cases, the court does not review claims regarding the manifest weight of the evidence. With limited exceptions, you can only raise issues that you raised in your appeal to the court of appeals. The court accepts relatively few criminal cases.

This office could help you only if your case involves a claim that has arguable merit. So we must decide whether one or more of the issues raised in your appeal are of the type that the supreme court is likely to want to review. Unfortunately, as the decision of the court of appeals demonstrates, your appeal does not involve such a claim. Rather, it would ask the court to apply settled law to the facts of your case.

Your notice of appeal and other necessary documents must be received by the Ohio Supreme Court Clerk's Office no later than 45 days after the court of appeals decision. The

The court's rules do allow an appellant to ask the court for a delayed appeal. Enclosed is a packet of forms and instructions that will help you file a motion on your own if you are unable to hire other counsel.

I regret that this office is unable to help you any further. Good luck with your case.

Sincerely,

Kenneth R. Spiert

Assistant State Public Defender

Encl.

#488762



Office of the Ohio Public Defender 250 East Broad Street - Suite 1400 Columbus, Ohio 43215

TIMOTHY YOUNG State Public Defender www.opd.ohio.gov (614) 466-5394 Fax (614) 728-8091

TTY (800) 750-0750

August 21, 2015

Mr. Clifton Jackson # 652-163 Lake Erie Correctional Institution 501 Thompson Road P.O. Box 8000 Conneaut, Ohio 44030

Dear Mr. Jackson:

I am writing to let you know that this office did receive the package of material you referred to in your prior letter, which this office received on August 6, 2015. We received the package on August 10, 2015.

I reviewed the material to determine whether there is anything in it that could be used to support a motion for a new trial based on newly discovered evidence. To be "newly discovered," the new evidence must be something that could not have been discovered at or before trial in the exercise of reasonable diligence.

The most promising potential claim is the one involving Argo. But, according to your notes, you obtained the report of Argo's deficiencies "mid Feb/2014." You were tried and convicted on February 13, 2014. So it would be very difficult to prove that this material could not have been found at or shortly after the time of your trial.

Therefore, this office is unable to help you any further. The materials included with your July 13 letter and July 20 supplement are enclosed.

Sincerely,

Kenneth R. Spiert

The Spirit

Assistant State Public Defender

Encl.

#488762