

From: GARY NORTINGTON

Date: 6/18/2026 8:30:00 AM

To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: [▫]

92-184-GA, ADB v FREY #4 (17NOV1999 / rec: 08DEC1999): (R & E@end)

. . STATE OF MICHIGAN

. . ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE BOARD

GRIEVANCE ADMINISTRATOR,

Petitioner,

v

. . . . ADB Case No. 92-184-GA

vs

WILLIAM D. FREY, P-33806

Respondent.

-----/

. . ORDER OF SUSPENSION AND RESTITUTION

. . Issued by Attorney Discipline Board

. . Tri-County Hearing Panel #23

* This matter is before the panel upon the filing of Formal Complaint 92-184-GA charging that respondent, William D. Frey, has committed acts of professional misconduct warranting discipline. The panel has filed its report on misconduct and has conducted a further hearing on discipline in accordance with MCR 9.115(J)(2), the panel having filed its report on discipline, and the panel being otherwise advised;

* NOW, THEREFORE,

* IT IS ORDERED that the license to practice law in Michigan of respondent, William D. Frey,

is SUSPENDED FOR A PERIOD OF 18 MONTHS COMMENCING December 9, 1999, and until respondent's reinstatement by a hearing panel, the Attorney Discipline Board or the Supreme Court in accordance with the requirements of MCR 9.123/(B) and MCR 9124.

* IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the respondent shall, within 30 days of the date of this order, submit an accounting to the Attorney Discipline Board and the Grievance Administrator the precise amount of fees which b received in connection with the representation which is the subject of Count One. The Grievance Administrator may file an objection within 30 days after the filing of respondent's accounting. If an objection is filed, the matter shall be submitted to a master appointed to the Board.

* IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that respondent shall make restitution to his former client in the amount determined above, within 18 months of the date of this order. Full restitution is specifically made a condition of respondent's eligibility to file a petition for reinstatement.

* IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that from the effective date of this order and until reinstatement in accordance with the applicable provisions of MCR 9.123, respondent is forbidden from practicing law in any form; or holding himself out as an attorney by any means.

* IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that respondent shall be subjects to the provisions of MCR 9.119, to the extent that the provisions requiring notice to clients or tribunals are applicable.

* IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that respondent's conduct, after entry of this order but prior to its effective date, shall be subject to the restrictions set forth in MCR 9.119(D); and respondent's compensation for legal services shall be subject to the restrictions described in MCR 9.119(F).

* IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that respondent shall pay costs in accordance with MCR 9.128 in the total amount of \$2,896.57, as follows: \$950.00 to be paid within six months of the date of this order; \$950.00 to be paid within months of the date of this order; and \$996.57 to be paid within 18 months of the date of this order.. Check or money order shall be made payable to the State Bar of Michigan, but submitted to the Attorney Discipline Board [719 Griswold Street, Suite 1910, Detroit, MI 48226] for proper crediting.

... ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE BOARD
... Tri-County Hearing Panel #23

... By /s/ Russ E. Boltz
... -----
... Russ E. BOLTZ, Chairperson

F: WPData/Orderspanel/Discipline/FREY 92-184-GAwpd

Dear Rudy & Erin,

* On 17 JUNE 2026, I emailed my U.S. Court of Appeals MOTION FOR REHEARING regarding: (1) a false sentence remanded to the U.S. District Court for correction; and (2) requesting REMAND to the District Court on the issue of PROSECUTORIAL CORRUPTION and false trial evidence:

* An email sent on 31 AUGUST 2025, the case of GRIEVANCE ADMINISTRATOR v ROSTASH, 457 Mich 289 (1998), is EXHIBIT B, pages 9 & 10, mentioned in my MOTION FOR REHEARING, paragraph 4.

* The foregoing 2 pages are EXHIBIT B, pages 3 & 4, about Chief Prosecutor William D. Frey being PERMANENTLY DISBARRED BY the ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMPLAINT I FILED IN AUGUST 1988, mentioned in my MOTION FOR REHEARING, paragraphs 4 and 6.

* BOTH OF THESE 2 PARTS OF EXHIBIT B are stated as "the UNHOLY ALLIANCE OF ATTORNEYS" in my MOTION FOR REHEARING, paragraph 5.

* I'll have to snail mail the transcript of an attorney testifying about the corruption.

No King but King Jesus. Gary M

From: GARY NORTINGTON

Date: 6/17/2026 10:37:16 AM

To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: [▯]

26-1044, In re: NORTINGTON; MOTION 4 REH #1:

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

In re: Northington, Case No. 26-1044
Movant.

. MOVANT'S MOTION FOR REHEARING/RECONSIDERATION REGARDING ORDER
OF 05 JUNE 2026

. . (Order not yet received by Northington)

* Movant Gary M. Northington Pro Se requests this Honorable Court to grant rehearing and/or reconsideration of matters stated in this Court's 05 JUNE 2026 ORDER, deciding final outcome of this case, when he has NOT YET RECEIVED the ORDER from the Court (but found by a friend on line), as follows:

* 1. This Court, on 05 JUNE 2026, ruled on Northington's FIRST CLAIM that "the Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC) lists his conviction under the incorrect statute, which impacts his eligibility for parole," is remanded to the district court because it is evidence discovered in year 2022 after his year 1996 first habeas petition, and "does not require our authorization before bringing this claim." IN RE: BLACK, 148 F4th 375, 379 (6th Cir. 2025).

* 2. However, Northington's SECOND CLAIM on Prosecutorial Misconduct causing false trial evidence was not remanded because material records thereto have been confiscated and/or destroyed by the MDOC, and some material records are/were [1/2] isolated from Northington by the MDOC in a storage closet which he finally accessed, which is/are addressed, as follows:

* 3. The SECOND CLAIM of actual innocence is intertwined with gross misconduct of the prosecutor falsifying 97 percent of trial evidence as stated in Northington's 02 JUNE 2026 APPLICATION FOR PARDON (EXHIBIT A). Newspaper clippings of Northington's MOTION FOR SECOND HABEAS, EXHIBIT 6, subexhibit D, are about State actors, from before arrest to postconviction, having subjected Northington to five (5) attempts to murder him (EXHIBIT C is one), death threats, assaults and battery, and/or his legal documents confiscated by the MDOC when Northington files postconviction remedies about him being a RES GESTAE AND EYEWITNESS TO Michigan Judges and Prosecutors exchanging BRIBES/unlawful funds (everything Northington says in EXHIBIT A is recorded on audio and video tapes that should be in police or prosecutor files, and some hidden in places Northington cannot access without U.S. DOJ help). Pages 5 (Mother Nature) and 8 (eyewitness to Conspiracy) of EXHIBIT A attached hereto are proofs of Northington's innocence the State cannot manipulate..

* 4. Further, as to Northington's Second Claim on gross Prosecutorial falsifying of 97 percent of trial evidence, it is a Miscarriage of Justice that requires correction, ENGLE v ISAAC, 456 US 107, 135 (1982): Accompanying Exhibit B is certified State evidence to an illegal \$30,000 payment involving Chief Prosecutor William D. Frey (who took \$2,000 bribe from Prosecution Witness Walter E. Verdun/retired [2/3] Mafia Hit Man), Northington's First Special Prosecutor James Rostash (EXHIBIT B, pp. 9-10) (Frey's election campaign manager), Thomas Nordstrom (brother of Northington's trial attorney). This all was concurrent with Northington's trial in which Bruce Nordstrom (Tom's brother) ineffectively represented Northington; Bruce said he was ineffective because he was only a divorce attorney and would never do a criminal trial again. In AUGUST 1987, Sheriff Walter O. Trowbridge asked Northington, "I am not running for sheriff again because of all the corruption. Where do I find the evidence?" Northington told the Sheriff where to find the evidence that began Attorney Discipline Board Case No. 92-184-GA (EXHIBIT B, pp. 1-8, 11-12), GRIEVANCE ADMINISTRATOR v ROSTASH, 457 Mich 289 (1998) (EXHIBIT B, pp. 9-10), and GRIEVANCE ADMINISTRATOR v FRIED, 456 Mich 234 (1998) (judge shopping).

* 5. EXHIBIT B, pages 3-4, are the final NOVEMBER 1999 disposition of Chief Prosecutor William D. Frey's permanent disbarment of which Northington learned in DECEMBER 1999, when he received the transcript of Thomas Nordstrom (brother of Northington's trial attorney) testifying to the UNHOLY ALLIANCE OF ATTORNEYS surrounding Northington's trial

(EXHIBIT. B, p. 1). This new evidence was long after Northington's first habeas petition. PROSECUTORIAL BAD FAITH IS A RELEVANT ELEMENT IN REVIEW OF STATE CRIMINAL CONVICTIONS. BURGETT v TEXAS, 389 US 109, 117, n. 1 (1968). Northington believes this claim "does not require [Court of Appeals] authorization before bringing this claim," IN RE: BLACK, 148 F4th 375, 379 (6th Cir. 2025), and asks this Court to rule so for Claim 2.

* 6. Finally, regarding Claim 2: Northington raised this claim in a 25 JUNE 1999 MOTION TO GRANT EVIDENTIARY HEARING AS TO CORRUPTION OF THE COURT AND PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT. Judge Michael J. Talbot (who took bribes from the Mafia), after taking a \$4,000 bribe from Special Prosecutor Gregory Jones before a pretrial hearing, and subsequent judges, refused to rule on Northington's trial court motion. This claim was raised in the Michigan Court of Appeals twice, Northington v MDOC No. 372474, Michigan Supreme Court twice, No. 168427 was one, and previously in his first habeas petition without the later evidence of EXHIBIT B, so Northington believes he has exhausted his State remedies.

* 7. Northington believes his Claim 2 is based on new material evidence discovered since his first habeas petition and will make a difference in outcome as grounds for remand to the district court.

. RELIEF REQUESTED

* Wherefore, Movant Gary M. Northington Pro Se requests this Honorable Court to remand Claim 2 to the District Court as based on new evidence discovered after his first habeas petition, and where MDOC deliberately obstructed presentation of this evidence.

Dated: 17 JUNE 2025 /s/ Gary M. Northington

From: GARY NORTHINGTON

Date: 6/22/2026 5:44:23 PM

To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: º

92-184-GA, ADB v FREY #3 (18 APR 1995):

Page 9

1 Q. There was never an agreement he was to serve any time

2 because if he violated probation he could be jailed?

3 A. That's correct.

4 Q. How long have you practiced in Monroe County?

5 A. Since 1974.

6 Q. Have you ever had negligent homicide cases you

7 represented people on or aware of other cases?

8 A. Yes.
9 Q. That was a normal aspect offered to other Defendants if
10 there was no other aggravated circumstances such as
11 drinking?
12 A. Yes. Yeah, I would say that would be true.
13 MR. FREY: No further questions.
14 RE-EXAMINATION
15 BY MR. CUNNINGHAM
16 Q. Out of those cases that you dealt with that led you to
17 say this to be norm, how many did you negotiate
18 with Mr. Frey directly and how many with the assistant
19 prosecutor handling the case?
20 A. I don't know if I ever actually negotiated a negligent
21 homicide agreement with Mr. Frey before or after that
22 time. I've had other cases, but I don't know who I
23 would have negotiated with.
24 Q. Was it the norm to have your discussions with the
25 assistant prosecutor assigned to the case or was it

Page 10

1 your norm to see Mr. Frey personally during his tenure?
2 A. Either way.
3 Q. Do you remembering who the assistant prosecutor assigned
4 to this case was?
5 A. No, I really can't.
6 Q. Your negotiations were with Mr. Frey?
7 A. I think that's true.
8 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Nothing further.
9 MR. FREY: Just a few short questions.
10 RE-EXAMINATION
11 BY MR. FREY:
12 Q. How many criminal cases have you done since you
13 practiced?
14 A. Just a guesstimate over 20 years, maybe 50 to 100 a
15 year.
16 Q. So if I was in the Prosecutor's Office for eight years
17 that would be approximately 800 cases.
18 A. Yes, that would be fair to say.
19 Q. It wouldn't be unusual, would it not, if I had some
20 input in all those cases with you when you represented
21 those people? I'm not talking about a drunk driver,
22 I'm talking about a felony. It was a normal process for
23 all defense counsel in Monroe County to talk to me when
24 they had a case. I'm not saying they make an
25 appointment, I had an open office. You could walk in

Page 11

1 and discuss the case with me or see me in the hall?

2 A. That's all true.

3 MR. CUNNINGHAM: No further questions.

4 (Deposition concluded at 3:20 p.m.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 12

1 STATE OF MICHIGAN)

2) ss.

3 COUNTY OF WAYNE)

4

5 CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

6 I, PATRICIA J. HYLAND, a Notary Public in and for the above county and state, do hereby
7 certify that the deposition of said witness, was taken before me at the time and place herein
before

8 set forth; witness was by me first duly sworn to testify to the truth; that thereon the foregoing
9 questions were asked and the foregoing answers made stenographically and later reduced to
typewritten

10 form; and I certify that this is a true and correct transcript of my stenographic notes so taken.

11 I do further certify that I am not

12 connected by blood or marriage to any of the parties or their attorneys or agents; that I am
not an employee

13 of them, nor am I interested directly or indirectly in the matter in controversy either as

counsel, agent

14 attorney, or otherwise.

15

16

PATRICIA J. HYLAND, CSR-0453, RPR

17 Certified Shorthand Reporter

Registered Professional Reporter

18

Notary Public, Wayne County

19 Michigan

20

21 My Commission Expires:

2/23/99

22

23

24

25

Compliments of: NEW CENTURY COURT REPORTING

From: GARY NORTHINGTON

Date: 6/22/2026 5:44:23 PM

To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: ▯

92-184-GA, ADB v FREY #2 (18 APR 1995):

Page 5

1 Office. I don't remember if I contacted them or they

2 contacted me.

3 Q. But there was some contact?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. What county did the incident occur in?

6 A. Monroe County.

7 Q. And what were the charges brought against Mr. Bertram?

8 A. Negligent Homicide, two counts.

9 Q. And can you recall who the victims of that homicide

10 were, the deceased persons?

11 A. No, I could not.

12. Q. Now, did there come a time, sir, when you had contact

13 with Mr William Frey about this case?

14 A. I believe I did, yes.

15 Q. By Mr. Frey you mean who?

16 A. Mr. William Frey, the County Prosecutor.

17 Q. Is that the person who is present here in the room today?
18 A. Yes, it is.
19 Q. Respondent seated at table?
20 A. Yes, it is.
21 Q. What was the nature of your contact with Mr. Frey?
22 A. I believe he talked to me on the day of the Preliminary
23 Examination and it may have been before that. I
24 believe it was in front of Judge Taft and the hearing
25 was supposed to be in front of Judge Taft and we were

EXHIBIT B, p. 6

EXHIBIT B, p. 7

Page 6

1 and I don't have a real clear recollection of this, and
2 I don't have a file on it anymore.
3 Q. That's the file you turned over to the Attorney
4 Grievance Commission?
5 A. What I turned over to the Attorney Grievance Commission
6 was a complete copy of that file, so you have
7 everything that I had. But I can't locate that file
8 anymore. If you would like me to look at it or if you
9 have got it, I can perhaps be more precise because I
10 can tell from the billing sheet, I think, if there is
11 one in it, when things took place and what I did. But
12 I don't have a real clear recollection of those things.
13 Q. Can you recall, sir, if a Preliminary Examination was
14 actually held?
15 A. No, there wasn't one as far as I recall.
16 Q. Were there negotiations in regard to a plea?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. Who did you conduct negotiations with?
19 A. I think that was Mr. Frey.
20 Q. Can you recall if there was a plea in the case?
21 A. Yes, there was.
22 Q. And can you recall the nature of that plea?
23 A. I believe he plead as charged with the recommendation
24 of probation and no immediate jail time and that would
25 be on both counts. That is, it wouldn't guarantee

EXHIBIT B, p. 7

Page 7

1 that, but I think its was the situation.
2 Q. And the recollection was that you had was the agreement
3 called for him serving no time?

4 A. That's correct.
5 Q. Did you find anything unusual about the agreement?
6 A. No.
7 Q. It seemed under circumstances to be a reasonable
8 offer?
9 A. Yes, it was not a particularly good deal or bad deal
10 given the facts. I don't think Mr. Bertram would have
11 served any time regardless or not if there was an
12 agreement with regard to sentence.
13 Q. And in your experience as an attorney nothing stood out in
14 regard to this particular plea or it seemed within the
15 norm, if you will?
16 A. Yes.
17 Q. Now that plea offer was made directly with Mr. Frey?
18 A. I think it was. I kind of picture us, I think we
19 were talking outside the courtroom. Outside of Judge
20 Taft's courtroom.
21 Q. The exam was waived and it went to circuit court then?
22 A. Yes.
23 Q. And the plea was entered actually in circuit court?
24 A. Yes.
25 Q. But you had plea discussions even before the bindover?

Page 8

1 A. Yes.
2 Q. In fact, that's one of the reasons that led to the exam
3 being waived?
4 A. I believe so.
5 Q. The plea was accepted by your client, the offer was
6 accepted by your client; is that correct?
7 A. That's correct.
8 Q. And was he sentenced according to that recommendation?
9 A. As far as I can recall, yes.
10 Q. But do you recall having discussions with Mr. Frey
11 personally at some point in this process?
12 A. I don't mean to be evasive, but I think that's the
13 case. I just don't have a real clear recollection, so
14 whatever seven years ago or eight years ago, but I
15 believe I had conversations directly with him.
16 MR. CUNNINGHAM: That's all.
17 EXAMINATION
18 BY MR. FREY:
19 Q. Mr. Nordstrom, just a few short questions. You
20 testified the agreement on the waiver was plea to both
21 charges, no immediate jail time. Mr. Cunningham asked

22 you a question, he said he served no time. There is a
23 difference between the testimony. In other words, the
24 agreement was he was to serve no immediate jail time?
25 A. That's correct.

Compliments of: NEW CENTURY COURT REPORTING

EXHIBIT B, p. 7

From: GARY NORTINGTON

Date: 6/22/2026 5:44:24 PM

To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: ▯

92-184-GA, ADB v FREY #1 (18 APR 1995 / rec: 08 DEC 1999):

* Dear Rudy & Erin: It is better to send this transcript by 3-emails because the original is 4-pages on a single page. It goes with my last 2 emails of 17 & 18 JUNE 2026 of my U.S. COURT OF APPEALS MOTION FOR REHEARING. It is the brother of my trial attorney testifying to an unlawful \$30,000 payment that involved my trial prosecutors and judge. The "[EXHIBIT] pages are as cited in my MOTION, an "UNHOLY ALLIANCE OF ATTORNEYS" (MOTION, paragraph 5).

GRIEVANCE v WILLIAM D. FREY Multi-Page THOMAS NORDSTROM, 4/18/95
Page 1

.. STATE OF MICHIGAN
.. ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE BOARD

GRIEVANCE ADMINISTRATOR,
Attorney Grievance Commission,
State of Michigan,
Petitioner,

-vs-

... ADB Case No. 92-184-GA

vs

WILLIAM D. FREY,
Respondent.

-----/

* The Deposition of THOMAS NORDSTROM, taken before me, Patricia J. Hyland, CSR-0453, RPR, Notary Public in and for the County of Wayne, State of Michigan, at 602 South Monroe Street, Monroe, Michigan, on Tuesday, April 18, 1995 at 3:00 p.m.

APPEARANCES:

RICHARD L. CUNNINGHAM, ESQ.
Associate Counsel
Attorney Grievance Commission
243 West Congress, Suite 256
Detroit, Michigan 48226
Appearing on behalf of the Petitioner.

WILLIAM D. FREY, ESQ.
In Pro Per
9791 S. Dixie Hwy
P.O. Box 307
Erie, Michigan 48133
Appearing on behalf of the Respondent.

[EXHIBIT B, p. 5]

[EXHIBIT B, p. 6, startling]
Page 2

.. I N D E X

WITNESS PAGE
THOMAS NORDSTROM

Examination By Mr Cunningham 3
Examination By Mr Frey 8
Re-Examination by Mr Cunningham 9
Re-Examination by Mr Frey 10

.. E X H I B I T S

EXHIBIT NO. PAGE

.. N O N E

[EXHIBIT B, p. 6]

[EXHIBIT B, p. 6
Page 3

1 Monroe, Michigan
2 April 18, 1995
3 3:10 p.m.

4 - - - -

5 MR. CUNNINGHAM: This is Attorney Discipline
6 Board Case No. 92-184-GA, Attorney Grievance Commission
7 versus William D. Frey.

8 We are today conducting proceedings pursuant
9 to an order by Tri-County Hearing Panel No. 23. The
10 hearing panel has ordered that we may take testimony of
11 the witnesses by deposition in a manner as if the
12 hearing panel were present and that this testimony will
13 become part of the record in the trial.

14 My name is Richard L. Cunningham, I am
15 counsel for the Attorney Grievance Commission.
16 Also present during these proceedings is
17 Respondent William Frey. We are now examining witness
18 Thomas Nordstrom, attorney at law.

19 T H O M A S N O R D S T R O M
20 having been first duly sworn, was examined and
21 testified on his oath as follows:

22 EXAMINATION

23 BY MR. CUNNINGHAM:

24 Q. State your name for the record.

25 A. Thomas I. Nordstrom.

[EXHIBIT B, p. 6]

[EXHIBIT B, p. 6]

Page 4

1 Q. You are licensed to practice law in the State of
2 Michigan?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. I'm going to ask if, sir, in your duties as attorney
5 you had occasion to represent one Robert Bertram?

6 A. Yes, I did.

7 Q. Was that in regard to a vehicular homicide?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Can you tell me when that was?

10 A. It would be 1986 or 1987, I'm not sure.

11 Q. How did you become involved in that case?

12 A. I was appointed by the court to represent Mr. Bertram.

13 Q. And can you tell me approximately how long after the
14 A. incident were you were appointed?

15. Q. Probably three or four days or two days, as far as that
16 goes.

17 Q. Before the Preliminary Examination?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. But after the charges were, after there were charges,

20 after a warrant was issued?

21 A. That's correct.

22 Q. Now, can you tell me, sir, if prior to the Preliminary

23 Examination you had occasion to contact anyone from the

24 Prosecutor's Office?

25 A. I did have contact with somebody from the prosecutor's

Compliments of: NEW CENTURY COURT REPORTING

[EXHIBIT B, p. 6]

From: GARY NORTINGTON

Date: 7/27/2026 1:35:20 PM

To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: [□]

2:96-cv-73064 (#1), MEMORANDUM (email 1 of 4): Dear Rudy & Erin, The U.S. Court of Appeals reopened my case where Michigan courts ignored FACTS about MDOC putting a false conviction on my record. The following is my filing after reopening:

.. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
.. EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

Gary M. Northington,
Petitioner Pro Se,
.... No. 2:96-cv-73064

.... Honorable Brandy R. McMillion
vs

Russ Rurka, JCF Warden,
Respondent.

* MEMORANDUM OF LAW TO AMENDED PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS
CORPUS

.. PROCEDURAL RECORD

* In 1990 at State retrial, Petitioner was convicted of Conspiracy to Commit Murder (MCL 750.157a) (EXHIBIT, p. 1, JOS). Then, in the U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN, Petitioner's ORIGINAL HABEAS CORPUS PETITION, was: NORTHINGTON v ELO, U.S. District Court No. 96-cv-73064.

On 23 SEPTEMBER 1997, Judge JULIAN ABELE COOK DENIED the ORIGINAL PETITION as having not exhausted State remedies, which was based on the State trial court,

Michigan Court of Appeals, and Michigan Supreme Court refusing to decide and/or file Petitioner's In Pro Per pleadings on State court corruption of judges and prosecutors taking bribes to which Petitioner was a res gestae witness.

* In early 2023, Petitioner discovered the Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC) and its Parole Board falsely accused him of having a FIRST-DEGREE MURDER conviction (MCL 750.316) to unduly deny his release on parole (EXHIBIT, pp. 2-4), for which NO SIXTH AMENDMENT JURY TRIAL EXISTED. He later learned, this FALSE MDOC conviction RECORD was based on a PACC Code implemented under MCL 49.103-49.111 about 7-years after his sentencing. Petitioner then made three (3) State court attempts to correct this as follows:

* (1) In the trial court, PEOPLE v NORTHINGTON, Monroe County Circuit No. 87-21623-FC:

* On 01 JUNE 2023, days after reading, "The trial court should correct the judgment of sentence to add the code for conspiracy"; "MCL 750.316A-[C]," PEOPLE v HICKS, 2014 Mich App LEXIS 809, *46 (2014), Petitioner filed a trial court MOTION and AMENDED MOTION TO CORRECT Judgment of SENTENCE (JOS) to include the postconviction implemented PACC code. The trial court judge refused to change Petitioner's JOS (EXHIBIT, pp. 8-11). Petitioner asserted in a still not decided MOTION FOR REHEARING (29 AUG 2023): MDOC says this [false accusation] is because the PACC Code of "-[C]" is not suffixed to the MCL citation for Conspiracy to Commit Murder on the Judgment of Sentence. The U.S. Supreme Court says it should be on the Judgment of Sentence as "MCL 750.157a, 750.316-[C]", HALBERT v MICHIGAN, 545 US 605, 622 (2005); KOWALSKI v TESSMER, 543 US 125, 141 (2004) (Pending MOTION FOR REHEARING, 29 AUG 2023).

* (2) On 17 MAY 2024, in NORTHINGTON v CEKANDER (MDOC Records Administrator), et al, Michigan Court of Appeals, No. 372474:

* Petitioner filed PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS, MANDAMUS, AND/OR SUPERINTENDING CONTROL (as only viable remedy) on all parties who obstructed correcting his MDOC BASIC INFORMATION SHEET from the false First Degree Murder (MCL 750.316) conviction to the correct Conspiracy (MCL 750.157a) for which Petitioner was tried, and against the trial court for NOT ENTERING the PACC Code of "MCL 750.157a, 750.316-[C]" in his Judgment of Sentence. The Petition was denied on 07 FEBRUARY 2025, then MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION denied on 13 MARCH 2025. NORTHINGTON v CEKANDER, et al, Mich. COA No. 372474 EXHIBIT, pp. 12-13).

* (3) On 17 APRIL 2025, in NORTHINGTON v CEKANDER, et al, MICHIGAN SUPREME COURT No 168417, Petitioner filed Application for Leave to Appeal on the Court of Appeals denial of his State Habeas Petition on this issue:

* This was on Sixth Amendment violation of First Degree Murder (MCL 750.316) conviction without trial thereon, where MDOC STAFF refused to follow MDOC Policy on PACC Codes (EXHIBIT, p. 5) and records falsely say Petitioner is imprisoned under "MCL 750.316" (EXHIBIT, pp. 2-4), rather than using the PACC Code of "MCL 750.157a, 750.316-[C]" or "MCL 750.316-[C]." This PACC Code ALLEGEDLY became effective under MCL 49.103 about 7-years after Petitioner was sentenced, after his original habeas petition. This Claim is

cited in HALBERT v MICHIGAN, 545 US 605, 622 (2005), and KOWALSKI v TESSMER, 543 US 125, 141 (2004). On 01 AUGUST 2025, the Michigan Supreme Court denied the Application, "because we are not persuaded that the question presented should be reviewed by this Court," to deny reconsideration on 24 OCTOBER 2025 (EXHIBIT, pp. 14-15).

From: GARY NORTINGTON
Date: 7/27/2026 1:35:21 PM
To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: [▫]

2:96-cv-73064 (#3), MEMORANDUM, AMENDED HABEAS, 26-1044; 87-21623:

* MEMORANDUM TO PETITION, GROUND ONE (1)

* RESPONDENT, MDOC STAFF AND PAROLE BOARD MAKE FALSE ACCUSATION OF HOMICIDE CONVICTION (MCL 750.316) (EXH, pp. 2-4) FOR YEARS TO DENY PAROLE CONTRARY TO SIXTH AMENDMENT AND THEIR CLEAR LEGAL DUTY TO FOLLOW MDOC POLICY (EXH, p. 5) FOR WHICH THEY SHOULD FORTHWITH CORRECT THEIR RECORD, GIVE PAROLE HEARING DE NOVO WITHOUT THE FALSE INFORMATION OR THIS COURT SHOULD ORDER NORTINGTON'S IMMEDIATE RELEASE (Michigan COA Petition, pp. 8-12, 31-34).

* (1) This ISSUE RAISES SERIOUS QUESTION ABOUT LEGALITY OF Michigan Compiled Law 49.103 to 49.111 allowing the PROSECUTING ATTORNEY'S COORDINATING COUNCIL (PACC) to make an UNLEGISLATED PACC Code FOR CONSPIRACY, but ignored by RESPONDENT'S Records Administrator TO MAKE A FALSE Michigan Dept. of Corrections (MDOC) BASIC INFORMATION SHEET, falsely accusing Petitioner of being convicted of violating MCL 750.316 (First Degree Murder) (Exhibit, pp. 2, 4) by omitting the "-[C]" PACC Code of MDOC Policy (Exhibit, p. 5). Northington is IMPRISONED FOR ALLEGED CONSPIRACY under MCL 750.157a (Exhibit, p. 1). Parole Board Chairman Brian Shipman and Parole Board Member(s) abusively use RESPONDENT'S FALSE RECORD to unduly accuse Northington of being convicted of "assaultive crime: Resulted in loss of life" (EXHIBIT, pp. 2-3) which they use to deny Northington release on parole WITHOUT required Fifth, Sixth and Fourteenth Amendment JURY TRIAL on an alleged MCL 750.316 conviction (His early release date is 2007). USCA 5, 6, 14.

* (2) THE ISSUE RAISES A LEGAL PRINCIPLE VERY IMPORTANT TO ESTABLISHED LAW: No one may be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law under Michigan Constitution, Article I, Sections 16, 17, 19, and 20; and under U.S. Constitution, Amendments 5, 6, and 14. RESPONDENT is ACCOMPLICE TO a CRIMINAL CARTEL OF an unduly biased and MOB DOMINATED "TRIAL COURT" of MDOC's RECORDS ADMINISTRATOR, SUBORDINATE STAFF, AND PAROLE BOARD propagating

MDOC'S false record. Such State actions obtained "UNDER DOMINATION OF A MOB ARE VOID." *SHELLEY v KRAEMER*, 334 US 1, 17 (1948). The trial court refuses to put the PACC Code on the Judgment of Sentence to satisfy MDOC, and RESPONDENT refuses to follow its policy of putting the unlegislated PACC Code on Petitioner's MDOC Record as "MCL 750.157a, 750.316-[C]" to indicate Conspiracy to Commit Murder, contrary to the Courts. *HALBERT v MICHIGAN*, 545 US 605, 622 (2005); *KOWALSKI v TESSMER*, 543 US 125, 141 (2004) (*PEOPLE v NORTHINGTON*, No. 87-21623-FC, Motion for Rehearing (29 AUG 2023)).

* (3) THE STATE COURT DECISION(S) IS CLEARLY WRONG, CAUSED AND WILL FURTHER CAUSE MATERIAL AND MANIFEST INJUSTICE TO Northington. RESPONDENT falsely imprisons Northington for alleged violation of MCL 750.316 WITHOUT REQUIRED PUBLIC TRIAL thereon. RESPONDENT uses said falsely manufactured MURDER CONVICTION when there is no such conviction, which is compounded by RESPONDENT's Records Administrator not following MDOC Policy of entering PAAC Code "-[C]" for conspiracy (EXHIBIT, p. 5) on their BASIC INFORMATION SHEET to unduly influence the Parole Board with the fraud (Exhibit, pp. 2, 4).

* (4) The STATE DECISION and actions CONFLICT WITH A SUPREME COURT DECISION OR ANOTHER DECISION OF THE COURT OF APPEALS, such as: (a) *MARBURY v MADISON*, 5 US 137, 180 (1803) ("A law repugnant to the Constitution is void [ab initio]; the courts, as well as other departments, are bound by that instrument."); (b) Conspiracy has 10-year early parole date but not FIRST DEGREE MURDER. *PEOPLE v NORTHINGTON*, Michigan Court of Appeals No. 108315, p. 8 (APRIL 1990)

* C. Aforesaid CHOICES of RESPONDENT TO THIS ISSUE are because Northington eyewitnessed events to prosecutorial corruption, the Chief Prosecutor's attempts to silence him, and how a Monroe County Deputy Sheriff twisted Petitioner's totally innocent acts of year 1986 into a falsified alleged 1987 assault that never occurred. The 1986 events had nothing to do with a crime by Petitioner, but were hidden by the prosecutor's office not releasing, in discovery, videotape of the period wherein Michigan falsely accused Petitioner, which the Parole Board falsely said was "assaultive crime: Resulted in loss of life," an "MCL 750.316" conviction to unduly imprison. *BRADY v MARYLAND*, 373 US 83 (1963) (Suppression of exculpatory evidence violates due process). The State judges deliberately did not decide on relevant facts, to likely protect their bribe-taking buddies (Michigan COA ORDER, 07 FEB 2025).

* Appellant's very great grandfather, LORD Robert NORTHINGTON, exclaimed: "The ... question is, in effect, whether delay will purge a fraud? ... Every delay adds to its injustice and multiplies its oppression. In our own court, Mr. Justice Story has said: [I]t would seem that the length of time during which the fraud had been successfully concealed and practised, is rather an aggravation of the offense, and calls more loudly upon a court of equity to give ample and decisive relief." *BADGER v BADGER*, 69 US 87, 92 (1865). THERE IS A TIME WHEN ENOUGH IS TOO MUCH. This Honorable Court should forthwith grant Northington relief from aforesaid Parole Board fraud and rule the PACC Code is unconstitutional, as used here, to INVENT A CRIME NOT TRIED OR COMMITTED, likely by not following MDOC policy

(EXH, p. 5). USCA 5, 6, 14.

* Petitioner believes this Honorable Court should ORDER RESPONDENT to FORTHWITH end undue confusion that is exists between the sentencing court and MDOC by ruling the legislated PACC Code is unconstitutional; it violates the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments, and RESPONDENT should be ordered to correct Petitioner's MDOC Record to MDOC Record as "MCL 750.157a, 750.316-[C]" to indicate Conspiracy to Commit Murder. HALBERT v MICHIGAN, 545 US 605, 622 (2005); KOWALSKI v TESSMER, 543 US 125, 141 (2004).

From: GARY NORTHINGTON

Date: 7/27/2026 1:35:21 PM

To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: ▯

2:96-cv-73064 (#2), MEMORANDUM, AMENDED HABEAS, 26-1044; 87-21623:

* Petitioner's Claim One (1) was NEVER PRESENTED to federal courts until IN RE: GARY M. NORTHINGTON, U.S. Court of Appeals No. 26-1044 (6th Cir. 2026), where the Court ruled the issue is viable in this case (EXHIBIT 16). The Court of Appeals ruling is res judicata to this case.

* In early 2023, the PACC CODE Claim was first available when a family member of Petitioner, by FOIA request, discovered Respondent's MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS (MDOC) PAROLE BOARD FALSELY REFUSED TO RELEASE Petitioner BASED ON an administratively created FALSE FIRST-DEGREE MURDER CONVICTION (EXHIBIT, pp. 2-4) for which Petitioner has NEVER HAD a JURY TRIAL NOR been CHARGED. Such false ground(s) for refusal to release on parole is contrary to SIXTH AMENDMENT AND DUE PROCESS Rights. USCA 6, 14.

* The factual predicate for the claim(s) could not have been discovered previously through the exercise of due diligence because Respondent continually hid the State records from Petitioner. No INDICTMENT/INFORMATION, or jury trial EXISTED OR EXISTS for Respondent's false FIRST-DEGREE MURDER (MCL 750.316) MDOC conviction record used by Respondent's PAROLE BOARD (EXHIBIT, p. 2). Such ADMINISTRATIVELY CREATED, BUT NOT LEGISLATIVELY CREATED, PACC Code cannot be implemented ex post facto to create a new criminal offense not tried before a jury, as supported by his accompanying PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS, as follows:

* "The PROSECUTING ATTORNEY'S COORDINATING COUNCIL (PACC) does not have the right to exercise any portion of the sovereign power of the State. MCL 49.105. Its powers are limited to the statutes language: It may enter into agreements with other public or private agencies or organizations to implement the intent of the PACC'S authorizing act; cooperate with and assist other public or private agencies or organizations to implement the intent of the PACC'S authorizing act; and make recommendations to the legislature on matters pertaining to its responsibilities under PACC'S authorizing act, MCL 49.110. Nothing in this language,

however, supports an argument that PACC is a political subdivision or performs traditional local government functions." ZDEBSKI v SCHMUCKER, 972 F Supp 2d 972, 984 (ED Mich. 2013). An "MCL citation/PACC Code" of "MCL 750.157a, 750.316" or "MCL 750.157a, 750.316-[C]" is not a new criminal offense of "MCL 750.316" used by MDOC (EXHIBIT, pp. 2-3). ZDEBSKI, at 988, fn. 9.

Petitioner believes this involves a new rule of Constitutional law, made retroactive to cases on collateral review by the Supreme Court of the United States, that was previously unavailable, as noted where the Supreme Court says the PACC Code should be on the Judgment of Sentence as "MCL 750.157a, 750.316-[C]", HALBERT v MICHIGAN, 545 US 605, 622 (2005); KOWALSKI v TESSMER, 543 US 125, 141 (2004) (PEOPLE v NORTHINGTON, No. 87-21623-FC, Motion for Rehearing (29 AUG 2023)).

* Finally, Petitioner has had great difficulty presenting this CLAIM because he is disabled since 2008 by four (4) Major Strokes and a plethora of minor strokes, which cause him TRANSIENT memory loss and almost daily vasovagal syncope (EXHIBIT, pp. 6-7). Petitioner's Habeas petition to the Eastern District of Michigan is, for the most part, his Michigan Supreme Court Application for Leave to Appeal converted to a Habeas Corpus Petition.

* Petitioner exhausted State remedies in attempts to end a miscarriage of justice. ENGLE v ISAAC, 456 US 107, 135 (1982); SHELLEY, 334 US at 17 (p.1, (2) herein).

From: GARY NORTHINGTON

Date: 7/27/2026 1:35:21 PM

To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: ▯

2:96-cv-73064 (#4), MEMORANDUM, AMENDED HABEAS, 26-1044; 87-21623:

* A "plain-error standard is unnecessary to correct miscarriages of justice." "In appropriate cases those principles must yield to the imperative of correcting a fundamentally unfair incarceration." ENGLE v ISAAC, 456 US 107, 135 (1982). Here, RESPONDENT'S SUBORDINATES formed a DE FACTO STATE COURT of their own, by usurping legislative and judicial functions not allowed in their executive branch offices, to act as a MOB-DOMINATED COURT that denies Due Process. USCA 5, 6, 14; SHELLEY, 334 US at 17.

* Respondent knowingly and intelligently waived right to dispute this claim in the Court of Appeals. Therefore, such waiver (Petition, p. 7b) is binding in this Court and cannot be changed. JOHNSON v ZERBST, 304 US 458, 464 (1938). A failure to deny is an admission. FED. R. CIV. P. 8(b)(6); MCR 2.111(E).

* Therefore, since Petitioner's early release date of 2007 has not been honored due to Respondent's false record, he believes this Honorable Court may ORDER Petitioner

FORTHWITH be discharged.

* DECLARATION

* I, Gary M. Northington, declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

. . . Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 27 JUL 2026 _____

.. Gary M. Northington #193035

* RELIEF REQUESTED

* 9. FOR ABOVE REASONS I REQUEST THAT THIS HONORABLE COURT:
GRANT THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS TO RELEASE PETITIONER
FROM THE WRONGFUL MCL 750.316 CONVICTION WHICH RESPONDENT CLAIMS
EXISTS, THAT WAS DONE WITHOUT A TRIAL THEREON, AND HAS BEEN USED TO
HOLD PETITIONER PAST HIS YEAR 2007 EARLY RELEASE DATE;
ORDER THAT THE PACC CODE CREATED BY A NONLEGISLATIVE ENTITY OF
PROSECUTORS IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL;
ORDER THAT PETITIONER GARY M. NORTINGTON BE FORTHWITH
DISCHARGED FROM IMPRISONMENT BY THE MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS AS A PUNITIVE MEASURE FOR RESPONDENT'S WRONGFUL
ACTIONS;
ORDER THAT THE RESPONDENT CANNOT ACCUSE PETITIONER OF HAVING A
FIRST DEGREE MURDER HOMICIDE CONVICTION BECAUSE IT VIOLATES SIXTH
AMENDMENT TO U.S. CONSTITUTION; AND
ORDER ANY OTHER RELIEF THAT IT DECIDES PETITIONER IS ENTITLED TO
RECEIVE.

. . . Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 27 JUL 2026 _____

.. Gary M. Northington #193035

.. 3510 N. Elm

.. Jackson, MI 49201

.. (517) 780-5000

.. Plaintiff In Pro Per

* PROOF OF SERVICE

* I, Gary M. Northington, certify that on this day, I served one copy of foregoing PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS with MEMORANDUM, and EXHIBITS upon ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL ANDREA CHRISTENSEN-BROWN, P.O. Box 30217, Lansing, MI 48909, by first-class U.S. Mail with postage fully prepaid thereon, and upon Warden Russ RURKA.

Dated: 27 JUL 2026 _____

.. _____
.. Gary M. Northington