

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.

EXHIBIT

AG

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 "AG" IS REFERENCED IN ¶ 85 not limited too.

From: Maricella marijbradleylaw@centurytel.net
Subject: Re: Please confirm receipt
Date: March 18, 2013, 8:20 AM
To: jackson_clif@yahoo.com

Was unable to confirm was out of office for the weekend. RECEIVED

From: jackson_clif@yahoo.com
Sent: Saturday, March 16, 2013 8:49 PM
To: Maricella
Subject: Re: Please confirm receipt!

Maricella please confirm receipt of this email immediately as you always do!

Dear Mr. Bradley,

I appreciate your prompt response regarding Mondays court appearance, however, I beg to differ, based on my pasted, and personal experiences, being detained in federal custody with pending and or existing charges state or federal, regardless of the bail status, when the body had to be produced via a writ by the peoples on a desired court date(s), if and where the body (defendant) was knowingly detained,

Not only am I expecting you to argue the fact(s) that the time should remain chargeable to the people's case, because of there direct refusals to produce me (the body) at court March 18, 2013,

I'm also expecting you to birth a arguement(s) for dismissal of this case in a whole, because per the documented docket sheet, the people's case as it stands to date, are clearly violating my constitutional protections of speedy trail, however not limited to, all the other grave legal issue(s) that exist regarding.

I am still anticipating your prompt response of past emails that I requested your response of dating back to late December 2012.

Thank you in advance in anticipation of your prompt response to all correspondence requested again dating back to December 2012,

Sincerely,
Clifton A. Jackson

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 15, 2013, at 4:23 PM, "Marcellia" <mari.jbradleylaw@centurytel.net> wrote:

Dear Clifton,

Since you are not in Ohio, the only way the State of Ohio would be able to have you returned is to issue a warrant for your arrest and place a detainer on you. Once you were released from Federal Custody, Ohio would then extradite you back to Ohio to face your charges. Luckily, Ohio is not going to issue a warrant for your arrest for failure to appear at this point.

Very Truly Yours,
Jack W. Bradley

From: <jackson_clif@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, March 15, 2013 10:35 AM
To: "Marcellia" <mari.jbradleylaw@centurytel.net>
Subject: Please confirm receipt!

Marcellia please confirm receipt of this email immediately please as you always do.

Dear Mr. Bradley,

Due to the fact that I am presently detained in which the people's of the state of Ohio are aware of the same and declined to produce me at court in which they had ample time to do so, my question is simply the speedy trial clock should still be being charged to the people's due to the fact it's their responsibility to have me produced at court regarding based on my present state of detention, am I correct?

Thank you for your time and concern, and in anticipation of your prompt response.

Sincerely,
Clifton A. Jackson

Sent from my iPhone