

From: GARY NORTHINGTON

Date: 12/17/2025 8:39:34 PM

To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: [Xms_49_MryChr.jpg](#)

DEAR RUDY & ERIN,
THE LAST FEW MONTHS HAVE BEEN A LITTLE TURMOIL BUT I'M DOING FINE.

!!! I HOPE YOU ALL HAVE A BLESSED BIRTH OF CHRIST CELEBRATION !!!

>NO KING BUT KING JESUS<



From: GARY NORTHINGTON

Date: 11/21/2025 6:14:36 AM

To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: ["](#)

ARCHAMBEAU, Lt. #1, MISCONDUCT (07 OCT 2025): (I'll explain by snail)

From: Gary M. Northington 193035 JCF (07 OCT 2025)
TO: HEARINGS ADMINISTRATOR

* CLASS I MISCONDUCT (07 OCT 2025), ALLEGED "THREATENING BEHAVIOR"

* At hearing for alleged THREATENING BEHAVIOR, in a written footnote of 26 SEPTEMBER 2025 letter to ADW McCALLUM, after being in Temporary Segregation for 11

days, where the ALJ cut me off every time I spoke:

* 1. I told the Administrative Law Judge (hereinafter "ALJ"), " You are past the 7-day limit. You cannot hear this." The ALJ only said, "Do you have your hearing aids on?" I answered, "No. My hearing aid batteries were dead during the ticket review," then I indicated they were still dead. The ALJ, in a sarcastic and demeaning tone, with what seemed a facial sneer, said, "Oh, that's unfortunate." MDOC had held my hearing aids since the Ticket Review. At this point, the ALJ denied my request to dismiss this matter for flawed ticket review (#3 herein) by his silence (silence is admission), which denied me due process by violation of Policy PD 03.03.105, Sections O and P, 2 (lack of HID accommodation). ALJ bias against me in violation of PD 03.03.105, Section XXX, 5, and multiple violations of Policy as stated herein, requiring that under MCL 791.254 "a REHEARING SHALL BE ORDERED" for gross violation of Due Process. USCA 14; PD 03.03.105, Sec. XXX, 3.

* 2. At this point, C/O Bertoglio took me to get hearing aid batteries, and the ALJ held other hearings.

* 3. During the 26 SEPTEMBER 2025 Ticket Review, I had a Heart Attack with elevated TROPONIN (HEART DAMAGE indicator), stroke level [1/2] SEVERE HYPERTENSION of 246/108 mmHg (EXHIBIT D, pp. 5-6), and I passed-out and fell. At the Ticket Review, I recall nothing but not understanding Sgt. Brooks, my hearing aids being dead, and flailing my arms during severe head and heart pain spikes (check L-Unit camera). I tried to speak but could not. I had been having Heart Pain and Hypertensive Headaches since in AUGUST 2025 that I thought caused by a THROMBUS blocking 65% of my Right Carotid Artery (Exhibit E, JCF-25-09-1813-12D1). From 26 SEPTEMBER 2025 TICKET REVIEW to 02 OCTOBER 2025, I vomited everything I ate because MDOC gave me Clonidine blood pressure medication, until Henry Ford Hospital said, "AVOID CLONIDINE" (Exhibit F, 06 OCT 2025). The flawed Ticket Review, where I was at sufficiently diminished capacity to NOT UNDERSTAND, and with dead hearing aids, violates Policy PD 03.03.105, Sections O, P and XXX, 3. HI AUSTIN not getting requested medical records for which I mailed request to AUSTIN on 26 SEPTEMBER 2025 (EXHIBIT B, p. 1, nos. 8 & 9), and which I was unable to get until after 07 OCTOBER 2025 HEARING (EXHIBITS C & D) because I was hospitalized (EXHIBIT F), denied Due Process at Hearing and regarding Ticket Review issues. USCA 14; PD 03.03.105, Sec. V.

* In the Hearing, the ALJ said of my MATERIAL DEFENSE of flawed Ticket Review, "I don't believe you," because the ALJ was unduly biased against me, and HI AUSTIN did not get Medical and Mental Health records needed to support this defense, violating Policy PD 03.03.105, Sections O, V and XXX, 5. This was a SUBSTANTIAL DENIAL OF DUE PROCESS that, under MCL 791.254, requires "a REHEARING BE ORDERED" for failure to follow statute, policy and/or rule. USCA 14; PD 03.03.105, Sec. XXX.

[2/3]

* 4. Upon restarting the hearing (after #1 herein), the ALJ said he did not believe me, which was due to HI AUSTIN not timely getting MATERIAL EVIDENCE I requested (#5 to #7 herein): (a) my written statement of preventing violence and illegal drug trades for decades (EXHIBIT A, p. 1); (b) that I have cognitive dysfunction of a 2016 BRAIN INJURY and

"SENIOR MOMENTS" of old age (EXHIBIT C); (c) that I have ERRATIC BLOOD PRESSURE (EXHIBIT D); and (d) that aforesaid conditions of subsections (b) and (c) cause me to write INCOHERENT SENTENCES like the one in question. HI AUSTIN not getting MATERIAL EVIDENCE: (e) STAFF STATEMENTS in response to questions of EXHIBIT B; and (f) my Medical and Mental Health Records (EXHIBITS C & D) to prove my defense on lack of culpability for the INCOHERENT SENTENCE IN QUESTION. Denying such evidence to prove my defense, by HI AUSTIN, denied Due Process, USCA 14; PD 03.03.105, Sections P, V and XXX. The ALJ had a duty to know, AFTER ACKNOWLEDGING HE READ MY REQUESTS, but the ALJ further denied said Rights that AUSTIN had denied. USCA 14; PD 03.03.105, Sec. CC.

* The ALJ's age/elderly discrimination against me violates the ADA. 42 USC, Secs. 12101, et seq. This is a proof that the ALJ is biased by inferring an age 76 man like me cannot have SENIOR MOMENTS of cognitive dysfunction where he gets confused. This was a MOB DOMINATED COURT (#11 herein) with intent to harm, harass and intimidate me regardless of facts, in violation of MCL 19.142, because I has such SENIOR MOMENTS. In accordance with MCL 791.254, "a REHEARING SHALL BE ORDERED" for gross departure from statute, policy and/or rule which violated Due Process. USCA 14; PD 03.03.105, Sec. XXX.

[3/4]

From: GARY NORTHINGTON
Date: 11/21/2025 6:14:35 AM
To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: 

ARCHAMBEAU, Lt. #2, MISCONDUCT (07 OCT 2025): (I'll explain by snail)

[3/4]

* 5. The ALJ deliberately did not consider MATERIAL EVIDENCE of my MENTAL HEALTH RECORD (EXHIBIT C) and should have rescheduled the hearing, AFTER STATING HE READ MY REQUEST for EXHIBIT C (#4, 1st pgh.) said in EXHIBIT B, page 1, nos. 8 and 9, but HI AUSTIN did not provide the record. My request (Ex. B) was mailed to AUSTIN on 26 SEPTEMBER 2025 and given to AUSTIN on 06 OCTOBER 2025. EXHIBIT C proves my lack of culpability for the INCOHERENT SENTENCE IN QUESTION written during a spell of a SENIOR MOMENT WHICH I DO NOT CONTROL, similar to INVOLUNTARY INTOXICATION, and misinterpreted by Lt. ARCHAMBEAU. This MOMENT is, in part, caused by MDOC denial of Neurosurgery, of which Dr. WANG said I must accept the cognitive dysfunction spells of a 2016 BRAIN INJURY and OLD AGE (EXHIBIT C). AUSTIN not providing the requested Record (Ex. C), and the ALJ allowing this to go unchecked when he said reading my request (Ex. B, p. 1), violated Policy PD 03.03.105, Sections V and CC, and denied Due Process. USCA 14. In accordance with MCL 791.254, "a REHEARING SHALL Be ORDERED" for failure to follow statute, policy and/or rule. USCA

14; PD 03.03.105, Sec. XXX.

* 6. The ALJ deliberately did not consider MATERIAL EVIDENCE of my MEDICAL RECORD (EXHIBIT D), and should have rescheduled the hearing AFTER HE READ MY REQUEST for EXHIBIT D (#4, 1st pgh.) said in EXHIBIT B, p. 1, nos. 8 & 9 but AUSTIN did not provide the record. This request (Ex B) was mailed to, then given to, HI AUSTIN as aforesaid in paragraph 5. EXHIBIT D proves an aggravating CAUSE for my lack of culpability for the INCOHERENT SENTENCE IN QUESTION written during a SENIOR MOMENT WHICH I DO NOT CONTROL, similar to INVOLUNTARY INTOXICATION, and misinterpreted by Lt. ARCHAMBEAU. These SENIOR MOMENTS are DAILY minor events of Postprandial [4/5] Hypotension Triggered Atrial Fibrillation (herein "PHTAF," a.k.a. Acute Heart Failure) that are a dim, semiconscious, dreamlike state of presyncope (Exhibit D, pp. 1-4) caused by life-threatening Hypotension after eating. During major events of PHTAF syncope (loss of brain blood flow), I become cyanotic and unconscious, then vomit and defecate all over myself (EXHIBIT D, pp. 1-3). The INCOHERENT SENTENCE was an INVOLUNTARY product of transient cognitive dysfunction and confusion for which I AM NOT CULPABLE. PD 03.03.105, Sec. EEE. AUSTIN not getting requested MATERIAL MEDICAL RECORD violated Policy, which the ALJ further violated by not ensuring all relevant evidence was considered (#4 herein). PD 03.03.105, Secs. V and CC. In accordance with MCL 791.254, "a REHEARING SHALL BE ORDERED" for failure to follow statute, policy and/or rule. USCA 14; PD 03.03.105, Sec. XXX.

* 7. I requested HI AUSTIN to get MATERIAL STATEMENTS: (a) of MDOC STAFF to prove my defense of acting to prevent violence which is what my INCOHERENT SENTENCE IN QUESTION was intended to do; and (b) of Dr. WANG, Psychologist, to prove my defense of cognitive dysfunction/a SENIOR MOMENT caused by 2016 BRAIN INJURY and old age (Ex. B) which Dr. Wang said I must accept (Ex. C). HI AUSTIN not providing witness statements requested in EXHIBIT B, and the ALJ knowingly allowing this to go unchecked, violated Policy and denied Due Process. USCA 14; PD 03.03.105, Secs. V and CC (#4 herein). In accordance with MCL 791.254, "a REHEARING SHALL BE ORDERED" for failure to follow statute, policy and/or rule. USCA 14; PD 03.03.105, Sec. XXX.

* 8. I told the ALJ, "The note was to ADW McCallum, not HUDSON, so Hudson would not worry," upon which the ALJ angrily snapped before I could [5/6] finish with, "to investigate the hostility." The ALJ's angry snap was, "That's ridiculous - so she would not worry," with a sarcastic tone, demeaning manner, and likely facial sneer. This and the ALJ falsely saying I sent the note to HUDSON (#9 herein) proves his undue bias which violates Policy PD 03.03.105, Secs. CC & XXX, 5. I said, "I used the word reprobates to show my disdain for persons trying to involve me in a crime," when they tried to get my fingerprints on a picture (like Exhibit A, p. 1, #4). To sum what I said, my INCOHERENT WRITTEN SENTENCE of a SENIOR MOMENT, caused by MDOC's LACK of MEDICAL and NEUROSURGEON CARE, is not my fault (#12 herein). PD 03.03.105, Sec. EEE. It is MISPRISON OF FELONY to not report the danger I heard. The ALJ punishing me for following the law is abuse of power, and the ALJ also EXCLUDING EXCULPATORY MATERIAL DEFENSE EVIDENCE denies Due Process. In accordance with MCL 791.254, "a REHEARING SHALL BE ORDERED" for failure to follow statute, policy and/or rule. USCA 14; PD 03.03.105, Sec. XXX.

* 9. The ALJ falsely said that I sent the note in question to HUDSON. The forwarding address of the note said, "TO: ADW Martin McCALLUM," the Misconduct Report (26 SEP 2025) said it is "addressed to ADW McCALLUM," and I twice said, "It was to McCALLUM." Both the ALJ's undue bias (due to bribe and contact with JCF STAFF), and the ALJ deliberately MANUFACTURING FALSE EVIDENCE FOR MDOC denied fair hearing and Due Process. USCA 14; PD 03.03.105, Sec. CC (must ensure all relevant evidence). I also was NOT GIVEN A COPY OF THE NOTE AT TICKET REVIEW to verify who wrote it. In accordance with MCL 791.254, "a REHEARING SHALL BE ORDERED" for failure to follow statute, policy and/or rule. USCA 14; PD 03.03.105, Sec. XXX.

[6/7]

C

From: GARY NORTHINGTON
Date: 11/21/2025 6:14:35 AM
To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: 

ARCHAMBEAU, Lt. #3, MISCONDUCT (07 OCT 2025): (I'll explain by snail)

[6/7]

* 10. MCL 19.142, Work Rule 1, and Policy PD O3.03.130 provide that MDOC STAFF shall not harass and/or intimidate a prisoner. Lt. ARCHAMBEAU violated said Rules of Law when he sent out two (2) prisoners to involve me in or to manufacture a crime or the Misconduct matter in question, then writing a false misconduct report for me exposing his operatives. MCL 19.142; WR 1; PD 03.03.130. ARCHAMBEAU told MDOC STAFF, or otherwise had them contacted, to tell them to not make statements in my defense. This is entrapment prohibited by PEOPLE v TURNER, 390 Mich 1, 7 (1973), and retaliatory creating of an offense by the biased ARCHAMBEAU that denied Due Process. USCA 14. In accordance with MCL 791.254, "a REHEARING SHALL BE ORDERED" for failure to follow statute, policy and/or rule. USCA 14; PD 03.03.105, Sec. XXX.

* 11. The aforesaid incorporated by reference and fully restated herein. This whole event is retaliation for my First Amendment exercise in Letters of Complaint, Grievances, and pursuing NORTHINGTON v CEKANDER about STAFF CORRUPTION AT JCF. Aforesaid actions of JCF STAFF and the ALJ refusing to follow statute, policy and/or rule, and thinking they can do what they want, is a "MOB DOMINATED COURT," that denied me Due Process. SHELLY v KRAEMER, 334 US 1, 17 (1948). The ALJ was told to give a predetermined result, PERRY v McGINNIS, 209 F3d 597, 604 (6th Cir. 2001), and took a bribe to do so; all of which denied a fair hearing and Due Process. USCA 14; IN RE MURCHISON, 75 S Ct 623, ____ (1955). Policy PD 03.03.105, Sections O and P (ticket review), U (HI investigation), V (witness statements & documents), W (Misconduct Sanction Screening), CC (ALJ to ensure evidence presented), KK (no staff contact with ALJ), EEE (not responsible for chronic BRAIN

INJURY), and XXX (MCL 791.254) were all violated. [7/8] I was unduly prejudiced thereby. Such retaliation is prohibited. CRAWFORD-EL v BRITTON, 523 US 574, hn. 5 (1998). In accordance with MCL 791.254, "a REHEARING SHALL BE ORDERED" for failure to follow statute, policy and/or rule. USCA 14; PD 03.03.105, Sec. XXX.

* 12. As said, the INCOHERENT SENTENCE in question, falsely alleged as "Threatening Behavior," occurred during a "SENIOR MOMENT"/cognitive dysfunction of a 2016 "CHRONIC BRAIN INJURY" and OLD AGE (EXHIBIT C) (nos. 5-7 herein). This is a Mental DISABILITY for which I am "NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR MISCONDUCT." Policy PD 03.03.105, Sec. EEE, 2. The INCOHERENT SENTENCE in question was caused by MDOC refusing to give me: (a) According to Dr. WANG, NEUROSURGEON CARE for BRAIN INJURY of a 2016 STROKE and OLD AGE (EXHIBIT C); (b) Cardiologist care for ongoing 69% LOSS OF BLOOD FLOW TO MY RIGHT BRAIN (EXHIBIT D, p. 4; EXHIBIT E); and (c) Blood Pressure that goes from a NEAR DEATH unconsciousness of no blood flow to my brain (syncope) to IMMINENT DEATH OF STROKE near 246/108 mmHg (EXHIBIT D) for which I filed Grievance JCF-25-09-1813-12D1 (EXHIBIT E). Dr. WANG said I must accept the COGNITIVE DYSFUNCTION SPELLS of the BRAIN INJURY and OLD AGE because MDOC does not provide NEUROSURGEON CARE (EXHIBIT C). Work Rule 1 and PD 03.03.105 require Humane Treatment which writing such Misconduct Ticket violated. Policy PD 03.03.105, Section EEE, 2, therefore, absolves me of responsibility for the alleged THREATENING BEHAVIOR.

* Regarding this Issue #12, HI AUSTIN did not timely provide my requested: (a) Mental Health Record (EXHIBIT C), (b) Medical Record (Exhibit D), nor (c) STATEMENTS from MDOC STAFF and Dr. Wang (EXHIBIT B). This unduly prejudiced me at hearing. Under MCL 791.254, "a REHEARING SHALL BE ORDERED" for failure to follow statute, policy and/or rule. USCA 14; PD 03.03.105, Sec. XXX.

[8/9]

* 13. The INCOHERENT SENTENCE in question was merely intended to alert JCF STAFF that two (2) prisoners had angry or hostile feelings. It was NOT A "TRUE THREAT." VIRGINIA v BLACK, 538 US 343, 359-360 (2003) (Words only a "true threat" where said directly to the person focused on). It may also be junk another person pulled out of the trash can that was erroneous and not intended to be sent, a denial of Due Process. I was going through periods of blackouts with my head dropping then bobbing-up, in the PHTAF situation of paragraph 6 herein. I never was given the note at Ticket Review, so I do NOT KNOW if I sent it. In accordance with MCL 791.254, "a REHEARING SHALL BE ORDERED" for failure to follow statute, policy and/or rule. USCA 14; PD 03.03.105, Section XXX.

* 14. Lt. ARCHAMBEAU never had the common courtesy to speak to me to find-out what my note was about. He applied HIS own VICIOUS MINDSET and falsely claimed it was mine.

.. RELIEF REQUESTED

* THEREFORE, you should forthwith dismiss the misconduct and/or Grant a REHEARING for the Misconduct Ticket (26 SEP 2025) and Hearing Report (07 OCT 2025) alleging Threatening Behavior.

..
Dated: 13 OCT 2025 /s/ Gary M. Northington

From: GARY NORTHINGTON
Date: 11/21/2025 6:14:34 AM
To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: □

POSTPRANDIAL HYPOTENSION #2; 01 JUL 2019 - 25 SEP 2025: (R @ end)

* From: Gary M. Northington 193035 JCF H/U H44 28 OCT 2025
* TO: Lt. ARCHAMBEAU, CRR Troy COBB, Lt. HUDSON, DW Jimmy JARRETT, ADW Martin McCALLUM, Brian MORRISON (517) 780-5000 or 5111, Kim NAPIER (517) 780-5121, Richard D. RUSSELL, FM Tim SCHUBRING, Heidi WASHINGTON, ADW David WENDT

* POSTPRANDIAL HYPOTENSION TRIGGERED ATRIAL FIBRILLATION

* I have had life-threatening POSTPRANDIAL HYPOTENSION 5 times since 01 JULY 2019:

* On 01 JULY 2019, I ate a Peanut Butter sandwich at 0430 hours. At 0500 hours, C/O Buendia took me to Health-Service in a wheelchair because I could not stand and had syncope, vomiting and defecating of Postprandial Hypotension Triggered Atrial Fibrillation. I vomited again halfway to Health-Service. At Health-Service, I watched the Vital Signs machine as my pulse went lower than 35, Oxygen went below 85%, and blood pressure dropped below 70/40 mmHg. On the way to the ambulance, I again vomited and defecated, then went to McLAREN Hospital for 4-days. This was diagnosed as Atrial Fibrillation caused PRESYNCOPE (McLAREN Record, 04 JUL 2019).

* On 29 OCTOBER 2024 as I walked out of the F-Unit bathroom, a young guy sprayed me in the face with a perfume atomizer as I left for Henry Ford Hospital (HFAH). I ate breakfast. At HFAH within 30 minutes of breakfast, my legs went numb and I passed-out from syncope while cyanotic and diaphoretic. Transport Officer Drum took 2-minutes in bringing me back. I then vomited and defecated 5 pounds within 7-minutes, and was hospitalized 2 days. It was diagnosed as severe POSTPRANDIAL HYPOTENSION TRIGGERED ATRIAL FIBRILLATION.

* In JULY 2025, a young guy sprayed me in the face with a perfume atomizer as I went in and out of the bathroom. Minutes later, I nodded out of and into consciousness, then became unconscious on my bed in ACUTE HEART FAILURE with a pulse near 40 bpm.

* On 10 SEPTEMBER 2025, a guy sprayed a perfume atomizer at my face in the H-Unit

bathroom. Minutes later, I went into ACUTE HEART FAILURE and passed-out while vomiting and defecating on the toilet. A misconduct ticket for Out of Place was written for me missing KOP lines during this Heart Failure.

- * On 25 SEPTEMBER 2025, a guy sprayed an atomizer in my face as I left the H-Unit bathroom. Minutes later, I was incoherent while writing a note of 2 prisoners, days earlier, venting hostilities about Lt. HUDSON. I nodded out of and into consciousness, then fell unconscious on my bed, during Acute Heart Failure. Lt. ARCHAMBEAU falsely twisted the note into a retaliatory Threatening Behavior misconduct report for which I am not culpable.
- * This is abovenamed's fault of subjecting a medically frail man, me, to nonconsensual abuse of your drug addicts in the same housing with a disabled person. 42 USC, Sec. 12101 et seq.

Dated: 28 OCT 2025 /s/ Gary M. Northington

* Dear Rudy,

* The MDOC NAZIS, as named herein, used my POSTPRANDIAL HYPOTENSION TRIGGERED ATRIAL FIBRILLATION to abusively create MISCONDUCT REPORTS against me in retaliation for my First Amendment exercise in letters of complaint, Grievances, and court actions exposing their corruption. My appeal of the misconduct is the other 3 emails sent with this. They threw me into "The Hole" for 21 days where I had time to reread The Pentateuch+.

* I cannot recall if I told you, but my year 2020 Americans with Disabilities Act Complaint to the U.S. DOJ, ADA Division, made them spend \$8-million for a new sidewalk in 2024, and put new tables in the Chow Hall.

No King but King Jesus. God Bless, Gary M.

From: GARY NORTHINGTON

Date: 5/1/2025 7:45:47 PM

To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: □

25-168417, MI S CT, ISSUES 2 & 4 [email 3]:

* ISSUES II & IV (combined):

*A. [II] MDOC DEFENDANTS CEKANDER, ET AL, VIOLATED CLEAR LEGAL DUTY WHEN PUTTING FALSE CONVICTION IN PLAINTIFF'S RECORD ALLEGING VIOLATION OF MCL "750.316" WITHOUT JUDGMENT OF SENTENCE THEREON AND BY NOT FOLLOWING MDOC'S OWN POLICY OF PUTTING PACC CODE "-[C]" INDICATING CONSPIRACY AND SHOULD CORRECT FALSE RECORD (COA Petition, pp. 10-12, 34-35), and [IV], CEKANDER VIOLATED HIS CLEAR LEGAL DUTY WHEN REFUSING TO CORRECT FALSE INFORMATION IN PLAINTIFF'S MDOC RECORD WHICH FALSELY SAY PLAINTIFF IS CONVICTED OF HOMICIDE UNDER MCL "750.316" (pp. 17-18, 37-38).

* B. THE COURT SHOULD REVIEW THE COURT OF APPEALS DECISION ON THIS ISSUE BECAUSE:

* (1) THE ISSUE RAISES A SERIOUS QUESTION ABOUT THE LEGALITY OF A LAW PASSED BY THE LEGISLATURE. This ISSUE RAISES SERIOUS QUESTION ABOUT LEGALITY OF Michigan Compiled Law 49.103 to 49.111 under which unlegislated PACC Codes are made that affect legislated convictions in the MDOC. These Statutes are unconstitutionally vague because "PERSONS of common intelligence MUST GUESS AT [THEIR] MEANING AND DIFFER AS TO [their] APPLICATION, PEOPLE v POSNER, 79 Mich App 63, 71 (1977), when enforcing its UNLEGISLATED PACC CODES on trial courts and the MDOC thereby CHANGING LEGISLATED CRIMINAL CODES. In making PACC Codes, the Prosecutor's Council unduly USURPED FUNCTION OF the MICHIGAN LEGISLATURE, and defined its own jurisdiction CONTRARY TO constitutional SEPARATION OF POWERS. Mich. Const., Art. III, Sec. 2. Defendant CEKANDER (MDOC Records Administrator) unduly USED CONFUSION caused by this unduly vague statute TO MISUSE the PACC CODE and falsely enter a First Degree Murder (MCL 750.316) conviction in Northington's MDOC Records WITHOUT TRIAL thereon (Issue II), THEN REFUSED TO CORRECT IT to Conspiracy to Commit Murder (MCL 750.157a-[C] or MCL 750.157a, 750.316-[C]) (Issue IV). Defendant CEKANDER has thereby illegally CHANGED Northington's PAROLABLE OFFENSE of Conspiracy TO a NONPAROLABLE Murder WITHOUT TRIAL thereon.

* (2) THE ISSUE RAISES A LEGAL PRINCIPLE THAT IS VERY IMPORTANT TO MICHIGAN LAW. The statutory code of Conspiracy is "MCL 750.157a" as stated in MDOC's BASIC INFORMATION REPORT issued on 28 MARCH 1988 and the trial court judgment of sentence issued on 28 JANUARY 1991 when no PACC Code then existed (Exhibit A, pp. 1-2). Law available to Northington says the Supreme Court used "MCL 750.157a, 750.316" and "MCL 750.316-[C]" on later sentencing documents (COA Petition, p. 11), around 2014. The PACC made an unlegislated rule to put PACC Codes on such documents which MDOC enforced by policy (Exhibit A, p. 4). Defendant CEKANDER's subordinate said, "MDOC enters the PACC Code [on the BASIC INFORMATION SHEET] when only the PACC enhancement code is on the JOS" (Judgment of Sentence) (Exhibit C, p. 2). Neither "MCL

750.316," "-[C]," nor any combination thereof are on Northington's Judgement of Sentence. However, Defendant CEKANDER saw fit to enter a statutory MCL 750.316 (First Degree Murder) on Northington's MDOC BASIC INFORMATION SHEET (Exhibit B, p. 3) but not a "-[C]" of MDOC Policy (Exhibit A, p. 4) for Conspiracy which changed Northington's conviction to MCL 750.316 (First Degree Murder) without Sixth Amendment jury trial thereon contrary to U.S. Constitution.

* (3) THE COURT OF APPEALS DECISION IS CLEARLY WRONG AND WILL CAUSE MATERIAL AND MANIFEST INJUSTICE TO ME when it refused to provide an OPINION that elucidates facts and law but only said "DENIED", contrary to law and Michigan Court Rules which say: "In an action tried without a jury," MCR 2.504(B)(2), and judgment on merits "the court shall make findings as provided in MCR 2.517." MCR 2.504(B)(2). On summary judgment, if the court "does not dispose the entire action or grant all relief demanded, the action must proceed to final judgment." MCR 2.116(J)(1). Under MCR 2.517, "in all actions tried without a jury" on "equity actions and claims for extraordinary writs, which are normally tried without a jury ..., the court must make findings of fact and conclusions of law without regard to whether they had been requested by the parties." MCR 2.517.3, p. 920, fn. 3 (citing Nicpan v Nicpan, 9 Mich App 373 (1968); Zawisa v Zawisa 61 Mich App 1 (1975)) (Rehearing Brief, 19 FEB 2025). Supreme law on such DENIAL says: Due process requires "findings, in such detail and exactness as the nature of the case permits, of subsidiary facts on which the ultimate conclusion of fairness can rationally be predicated." KELLEY v EVERGLADES DRAINAGE DIST., 319 US 415, 418-419 (1943). Such failure to elucidate facts and law for a final judgment on issues of the Complaint for extraordinary relief requires reversal of the denial of Complaint. MCRP, p. 920 at footnote 3.

* (4) THE DECISION CONFLICTS WITH A SUPREME COURT DECISION OR ANOTHER DECISION OF THE COURT OF APPEALS. The COURT OF APPEALS decision conflicts with the following: "Petition for Habeas Corpus, though not available because Petitioner had not served maximum sentence, would under circumstances be treated as petition for mandamus, and under facts would be issued against parole board requiring acceptance of jurisdiction over Petitioner for possible parole in accordance with law." PETITION OF CAREY, 372 Mich 380, 381-382 (1964); MORALES v MDOC PAROLE BOARD, 260 Mich App 29 (2003).

* C. EXPLAIN WHY YOU THINK THE CHOICES CHECKED IN "B" APPLY TO THIS ISSUE. LIST ANY CASES AND STATE ANY FACTS YOU WANT THE SUPREME COURT TO CONSIDER, EVEN IF THEY WERE NOT INCLUDED IN YOUR COURT OF APPEALS BRIEF. Paragraph C of Issue I incorporated by reference and fully restated herein. Plaintiff previous 3 State Mandamus and a Superintending Control Petition always gave facts and law for Judgment. The Court of Appeals judgment was a POLITICAL ACT to hide corruption described in Exhibit H, by an associate(s) thereof (Facebook, X, YouTube). See NEW ISSUE I.

From: GARY NORTHINGTON

Date: 9/15/2025 1:24:13 PM

To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: 

MISCONDUCT; C/O KRUITSCHNITT (10 SEP 2025): Dear Rudy & Erin, MDOC does all they can in retaliation for my court access. The following is the most recent.

* Charlie Kirk's assassination shows THE LEFT HATES the TRUTH. Snail mail to come soon. May God Bless All!!! Gary M.

* From: Gary M. Northington 193035 H44 11 SEP 2025

* TO: JCF HEARING OFFICER

* CC: CRR Troy COBB, DW Jimmy JARRETT, ADW Martin McCALLUM, Warden Brian MORRISON/Russ RURKA, Admin. Asst. Kim NAPIER (780-5121), Richard D. RUSSELL, Tim SCHUBRING, Heidi WASHINGTON, ADW David WENDT (517) 780-5000

* Housing Unit H, Lower Right Level, is so noisy in the P.M., with Superradios blasting and prisoners yelling (Grievance JCF-24-03-0420-03F) (#471) (06 MAR 2025), that we cannot hold voice-level conversations. I cannot wear my Hearing Aids in such noise levels; they distort and cause pain.

* On 10 SEPTEMBER 2025, from 1420 to 1530 hours, I sat in H-Unit waiting for KOP Lines to be called. I asked one of 4 officers, "Have KOP Lines been called?" I heard, "No." I was going into Atrial Fibrillation, which JCF Medical has refused to treat (Grievance JCF-24-02-0411-28I) (#437) (13 FEB 2024) (Grievance JCF-25-09-1813-12D1) (#487) (29 AUG 2025), caused by eating Lunch. I kept trying to get up from my seat to tell someone, but I could not see to relate to anything around me; sounds were distant. I never heard a call for KOP Lines, and no officer brought the KOP SIGN around. NO KOP NOTICE CAME OVER MY PAGER (Check your System). You are punishing me for disabilities JCF Medical refuses to treat, and JCF STAFF not doing their jobs; a denial of Due Process (#487 above).

* I have daily POSTPRANDIAL HYPOTENSION TRIGGERED ATRIAL FIBRILLATION causing SYNCOPE (no blood flow to brain) (#s 437 & 487 above). McLAREN HOSPITAL said I NEED A PACEMAKER but MDOC said, "No" (04 JUL 2019).

* It is abusive to sanction me for disabilities MDOC caused and refused to treat; an abusive denial of Due Process. I will not go to Chow during days of sanctions; I can go 30-days.

* I told Sgt. Payne, "I cannot understand a word you are saying. You have to speak louder." I believe he did not read the ticket to me but I'm not sure. Denying ADA RIGHTS violates Due Process. 42 USC, Sec. 12101, et seq. I had to take a Nitroglycerin on the way to Bldg. 300.

Dated: 11 SEP 2025 /s/ Gary M. Northington

From: GARY NORTHINGTON

Date: 8/31/2025 7:36:43 AM

To: Rudy Davis

Attachments:

ROSTASH, 457 MICH 289:

* Dear Rudy & Erin: Following court case is about prosecutorial corruption I exposed in 1987; a \$30,000 bribe of ROSTASH & FREY. Gary M

* **"PROCEDURAL POSTURE**

* Petitioners, the attorney grievance commission (commission) and administrator, filed charges against respondent attorney for a violation of Mich. Rules of Prof'l Conduct R. 1.16(a)(1) and former Mich. Code of Prof'l Responsibility DR 1-102(A)(4)-(6), 7-102(A)(8). The Attorney Discipline Board/Attorney Grievance Commission (Michigan) issued a 90-day suspension from the practice of law to the attorney. The parties appealed.

* **OVERVIEW**

* The chief law enforcement official (officials) (PROS. FREY) was responsible for the prosecution of a defendant, who killed a decedent in a car accident. The official and the attorney made an agreement for the attorney to represent to the probate court that the attorney represented the decedent's estate against defendant. In reality, the official represented the estate against and split the fee with the attorney. The court increased the suspension to 180 days. The suspension increase required the attorney to prove by clear and convincing evidence that he was to be allowed to be reinstated to the practice of law. Even though the attorney had an essentially unblemished disciplinary record for 36 years, and he was a former elected official, his actions violated Mich. Rules of Prof'l Conduct R. 1.16(a)(1) and former Mich. Code of Prof'l Responsibility DR 1-102(A)(4)-(6), 7-102(A)(8). The court reasoned that there was a **VIOLATION OF PUBLIC TRUST WHERE THE ATTORNEY IMPROPERLY ASSISTED THE OFFICIAL TO PRIVATELY GAIN (\$30,000 bribe)** in an action where the official had a conflict of interest and the public's trust as an elected official to safeguard the law.

* **OUTCOME**

* The court increased the amount of the attorney's suspension from the practice of law to 180 days." GRIEVANCE ADM'R v ROSTASH, 457 Mich 289 (1998).

* "Former Mich. Code of Prof'l Responsibility DR 9-101(B), which was in effect until OCTOBER 1, 1988, precludes a lawyer from accepting private employment in a matter in which he had substantial responsibility while he was a public employee. That provision is now found in Mich. Rules of Prof'l Conduct R. 1.11(a)." ROSTASH, 457 Mich 289, 290, fn. 1 (1998).

* "In JULY 1993, the Attorney Grievance Commission authorized the filing of a three-count formal complaint against the respondent. The complaint stemmed from his involvement with William D. FREY, then Monroe County prosecutor, in the representation of the relatives of two

men who were killed in a JANUARY 1987 automobile accident.

* "The Grievance Administrator alleged in count 1 that the respondent aided and abetted Mr. FREY in accepting and pursuing private employment in a matter in which Mr. FREY had a conflict of interest because of his substantial employment as a public official. As chief law enforcement officer for the county, Mr. FREY was responsible for prosecuting the driver of the vehicle that had struck the decedents. While charges of negligent homicide were pending, Mr. FREY allegedly agreed to represent the decedent's relatives in civil claims arising out of the matter. The respondent was accused of assisting Mr. FREY in this [291] regard and of agreeing to split the eventual attorney fee, despite knowledge of Mr. FREY'S conflict of interest.

* In count II, the respondent was charged with failing to disclose to the Monroe County Probate Court that Mr. FREY had handled civil claims for the decedent's relatives, and had received a substantial portion of the attorney fee that was paid to settle those claims.

* It was alleged in count III that the respondent had misrepresented important and material facts in his answer to the request for investigation that was filed against him. He was accused of falsely stating that he alone had handled the wrongful-death claims, and that Mr. FREY alone had handled the probate matters related to the estates.

* The case was tried before switching hearing panel over several dates in 1995 and 1996. At the conclusion of the adjudication stage, the panel determined that the Grievance Administrator had proven the misconduct alleged in counts I and III. The panel dismissed count II.

* In its written report, the panel set forth its findings and conclusions. It found that the respondent had agreed to assist Mr. FREY in pursuing the civil claims of the decedent's relatives, and in handling the related probate matters. The panel further found that the respondent had agreed to split the attorney fee. Because of Mr. FREY'S substantial involvement in the criminal case arising from the same underlying facts, this was misconduct under Rule 1.16(a)(1) of the Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct, and also [292] violated former disciplinary rules 1-102(A)(4)-(6) and 7-102 (A)(8)." ROSTASH, 457 Mich 289, 290-292 (1998).

* "A goal of discipline is to weed out practitioners who are not trustworthy." ROSTASH, 457 Mich 289, 294 (1998).

* "When an attorney ASSISTS a public OFFICIAL in IMPROPERLY GAINING ADVANTAGE from public office, that attorney is acting contrary to accepted standards.". ROSTASH, 457 Mich 289, 294 (1998).

* "The respondent was the chief assistant prosecutor in Monroe County for three years, and subsequently was twice elected prosecutor. His only previous discipline, an admonishment to which he consented, stemmed from a closing argument that he made in a criminal case while acting as special prosecutor." ROSTASH, 457 Mich 289, 298, fn. 8 <<(Northington) (1998).

* In the instant case, where the proven misconduct was connected to a violation of the public trust by an official who was elected (Chief Prosecutor William D. FREY), in part, specifically to safeguard that trust, we believe that the respondent should be required to prove ... his entitlement to resume practicing law." ROSTASH, 457 Mich 289, 294 (1998).

From: GARY NORTHINGTON

Date: 8/22/2025 6:37:14 AM

To: Rudy Davis

Attachments:

25-168417; REHEARING MEMORANDUM (17 AUG 2025): (Rudy & Erin: This is a follow-up on my 11 AUG 2025 Rehearing Motion that is not yet decided. The Persistent Gary!)

.. STATE OF MICHIGAN
.. IN THE SUPREME COURT

Gary M. Northington,
Plaintiff In Pro Per,
.... Supreme Court No. 168417
.... COA No. 372474
.... Lower Court No. 87-21623

vs

* (1) MDOC Records Administrator Christina CEKANDER/Michigan Dept. of Corrections (MDOC),
* (2) JCF Grievance Coordinator Troy COBB/MDOC,
* (3) UNKNOWN PAROLE BOARD MEMBER/MDOC (who said Northington has "homicide" case),
* (4) MDOC FOIA Administrator Andrew PHELPS/MDOC,
* (5) MDOC Parole Board Chairman Brian SHIPMAN/
* (6) JCF Prison Guard James SIMS-NEELEY/MDOC,
* (7) MDOC Director Heidi WASHINGTON/MDOC,
* (8) David S. WHITE, Monroe Circuit Judge,
Defendants, sued in Individual and Official Capacity.

/

Gary M. Northington #193035
Cotton Correctional Facility
3510 N. Elm
Jackson, MI 49201
(517) 780-5000
email @ JPay.com
Plaintiff In Pro Per

H. Steven LANGSCHWAGER (P52380)
Assistant Attorney-General
P.O. Box 30217
Lansing, MI 48909
(517) 335-3055
Attorney for Defendants

-----/

.. PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT'S
MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION FOR REHEARING/RECONSIDERATION

- * Plaintiff-Appellant Gary M. Northington In Pro Per filed a MOTION FOR REHEARING/RECONSIDERATION with the Court on 11 AUGUST 2025, by giving it to MDOC STAFF and paying for postage thereon, regarding matters of the 01 AUGUST 2025 ORDER denying Northington's Application for Leave to Appeals.
- * In this Memorandum, Northington requests leave of the Court to file it, if needed, and addresses federal law related to his Rehearing Motion that is relevant to the MCR 2.111(E) issue therein. Northington could not previously address this because of limited library access, then said library access was canceled by a hospital visit.
- * A complaint "requires only a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief ... and grounds upon which it rests. In addition, ... a judge must accept as true all of the factual allegations contained in the complaint." ERICKSON v PARDUS, 551 US 89, 93-94 (2007); accord, TROWELL v PROVIDENCE HOSPITAL, 502 Mich 509, 519 (2018).
- * Further, "A document filed pro se is to be LIBERALLY construed, and a pro se complaint, however inartfully pleaded, must be held to a less stringent standard than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers." ERICKSON, 551 US at 94.
- * It is obvious that many of the judiciary have an inherent hatred of prisoners and those accused of a crime while ignoring the statistic that 25% of State prisoners are falsely detained (U.S. DOJ).

[1/2]

As stated in Exhibits I and J attached hereto, which are EXHIBITS I and J of the Application, the entire prosecution was/is a fraud. It is clear that three (3) levels of State judiciary have IGNORED the TRUTH for 38-years, in part by ignoring aforesaid law and MCR 2.111(E).

- * "If the Government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for law; ... it should invites every man to become a law unto himself; it INVITES ANARCHY." OLMSTEAD v UNITED STATES, 277 US 433, 485 (1928). Are CORRUPT Michigan COURTS INVITING ANARCHY by supporting POLITICAL PERSECUTION of Northington because he

eyewitnessed the JUDICIARY TAKE BRIBES TO RENDER JUDGMENTS TO THE HIGHEST BIDDER?

* The convictions holding Northington should be vacated/reversed for FRAUD ON THE COURT.

... Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: _____

.. 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 accompanying MEMORANDUM and EXHIBITS upon Counsel of Record and Defendants without counsel, at their respective addresses as shown by the Record, by first-class U.S. Mail with postage fully prepaid thereon.

Dated: 17 AUG 2025 _____

..
.. Gary M. Northington

From: GARY NORTHINGTON
Date: 8/19/2025 8:09:08 AM
To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: 

25-168417; OPINION/ORDER, Northington v CEKANDER, 2025 Mich. LEXIS 1403 (01 AUG 2025)

* Dear Rudy and Erin,
* The following is a hand typed copy of the ORDER of the Michigan Supreme Court about MDOC Records Administrator entering a false MCL 750.316 (First-Degree Murder) conviction in my MDOC record, without a 6th Amendment trial, after the prosecutor visited the prison and paid a bribe to falsify their record on me. My motion for rehearing of this abusive decision is the 2 following emails (which do not have exhibits cited because my email tablet cannot do that). The Michigan Supreme Court and Court of Appeals are deliberately HIDING the BRIBERY OF lower court JUDGES because they are part OF the MOB-DOMINATED Michigan COURT SYSTEM THAT IS complicit and integrated with the DETROIT MAFIA.

* Gary M.

.. STATE OF MICHIGAN
.. IN THE SUPREME COURT

Gary M. Northington,
Plaintiff/Petitioner In Pro Per,
.... S CT No. 168417
.... COA No. 372474
.... Lower Court No. 87-21623-FC
vs

CHRISTINA CEKANDER, ANDREW PHELPS, BRIAN SHIPMAN, HEIDI WASHINGTON, TROY COBB, UNKNOWN MDOC PAROLE BOARD MEMBER, JAMES SIMS-NEELY, and MONROE CIRCUIT JUDGE, Defendants-Appellees.
Defendants.

JUDGES: Megan Cavanaugh, Chief Justice, Brian K. Zahra, Richard Bernstein, Elizabeth M. Welch, Kyra H. Holden, Kimberly A. Thomas, Noah P. Hood, Justices

* On order of the Court, the application for leave to appeal the February 7, 2025 order of the Court of Appeals is considered, and it is DENIED, because we are not persuaded that the questions presented should be reviewed by this Court.

* I, Larry S. Royster, Clerk of the Michigan Supreme Court, certify that the foregoing is a true and complete copy of the order entered at the direction of the Court.

* August 1, 2025 /s/ Larry S. Royster

Clerk

* MI SUPREME COURT, 925 W. Ottawa, Lansing, MI 48915; P.O. Box 30052, Lansing, MI 48909, (517) 373-0120; Chief Justice (517) 373-2582

From: GARY NORTHINGTON

Date: 8/19/2025 8:09:07 AM

To: Rudy Davis

Attachments:

25-168417; MOT 4 REH #2 (11 AUG 2025):

* 8. This Court should promote civilized conduct by granting Northington relief as requested herein and in accompanying Brief.

***C. QUESTION ABOUT COA JUDGE RIORDAN**

* 9. In 1999, Vicki Riordan stated she and Court of Appeals Judge Michael Riordan were biased neighbors when Northington was arrested (Exhibit D is result of the meeting).

CONCLUSION

* 10. For aforesaid reasons, palpable error was committed because Northington's claims were admitted as TRUE, under MCR 2.111(E)(1), by Defendants failure to respond, in both the Court of Appeals and Supreme Court. This makes a substantial difference in outcome here but was ignored by the Court. THE COURT HAS THEREBY FALSELY DECIDED that THE STATE MAY CLAIM NORTHINGTON IS CONVICTED OF VIOLATING MCL 750.316 WITHOUT SIXTH AMENDMENT TRIAL thereon, which the Court should correct.

[4/5]

*** DECLARATION**

* I, Gary M. Northington, declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

Dated: _____

.. Gary M. Northington

RELIEF REQUESTED

* WHEREFORE, Plaintiff-Appellant Gary M. Northington In Pro Per requests this Honorable Court to rehear his Application with accompanying brief, applying also law and facts of this motion, to grant him relief requested therein which were previously ignored.

... Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: _____

.. 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 accompanying Motion, Brief and EXHIBITS upon Counsel of Record and Defendants without counsel, at their respective addresses as shown by the Record, by first-class U.S. Mail with postage fully prepaid thereon.

Dated: 11 AUG 2025 _____

..

.. Gary M. Northington

From: GARY NORTHINGTON

Date: 8/19/2025 8:09:07 AM

To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: 

25-168417; MOT 4 REH #1 (11 AUG 2025):

.. STATE OF MICHIGAN
.. IN THE SUPREME COURT

Gary M. Northington,
Plaintiff In Pro Per,
.... Supreme Court No. 168417
.... COA No. 372474
.... Lower Court No. 87-21623-FC
vs

CEKANDER, et al,
Defendants.

-----/
Gary M. Northington #193035
Cotton Correctional Facility
3510 N. Elm
Jackson, MI 49201
(517) 780-5000
email @ JPay.com
Plaintiff In Pro Per

-----/
H. Steven LANGSCHWAGER (P52380)
Assistant Attorney-General
P.O. Box 30217
Lansing, MI 48909
(517) 335-3055
Attorney for Defendants

. APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR REHEARING/RECONSIDERATION
. REGARDING 01 AUGUST 2025 DENIAL OF
. PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT'S APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL

* Plaintiff-Appellant Gary M. Northington In Pro Per, pursuant to MCR 2.119(F), requests this Honorable Court to rehear and/or reconsider its 01 AUGUST 2025 DECISION (RECEIVED by Northington ON 06 AUGUST 2025) that DENIED Northington's APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL.

* A. DEFENDANTS ADMITTED PLAINTIFF'S CLAIMS AS TRUE

* 1. Michigan Court Rule 2.111(E) mandates: "Allegations in a pleading that require a responsive pleading ... are admitted if not denied in a responsive pleading." MCR 2.111(E)(1). Such "failure to deny an allegation is an admission thereof." ZDERO v BRIGGS, 338 Mich 549, 553 (1953).

* 2. Northington is cognitively challenged by a MASSIVE STROKE of 2016. On 23 JUNE 2016, he lost 6 decades of memory of: (a) his sister, (b) music he wrote (20 songs), and (c) meanings of many words. Cognitive gaps exist due to a 69% stenosis in his right Carotid Artery (attached Exhibit A), so it takes days to write a page. He does understand his Application and COA Petition required a response from Defendants under MCR 2.111(E)(1), or Michigan courts are a meaningless ritual intended to hide State abuses.

* 3. Defendant-Appellees' failure to deny allegations of Northington's Application and COA Petition are admitted ALL of Northington's CLAIMS as being TRUE.

[1/2]

* 4. Therefore, this Court should treat Northington's claims as TRUE and grant him requested relief as supported by this motion and accompanying BRIEF.

* B. "DENIED" IS CONCLUSORY WHEN WITHOUT FACTS

* 5. "The right to sue and defend in the courts is the alternative of force" and attribute of civilized and orderly persons. CHAMBERS v B&O RR, 207 US 142, 146 (1908).

* 6. A plausible ruling must hold more than "labels and CONCLUSIONS" or "a formulaic recitation," BELL ATL CORP v TWOMBLY, 550 US 554, 555 (2007); LIFE IS A TWO-WAY STREET (quoting EEOC motto). "DENIED," without facts thereon by the Court is

unduly CONCLUSORY where "there must be findings, in such detail and exactness as the nature of the case permits, of subsidiary facts on ... the ultimate conclusion." KELLEY v EVERGLADES DRAINAGE, 319 US 415, 418-419 (1943). A detailed ruling on real facts is the only civilized way here, rather than the State's MOB-DOMINATED courts and violence (Exhibits B & C). CHAMBERS at 146

* 7. Convictions here were falsely manufactured by: (a) Bribe-Taking Prosecutor, William D. Frey; and (b) KKK/retired Detroit mafia enforcer, Walter E. Verdun, who Northington witnessed commit a murder. Res gestae witnesses: (a) Mike Otto testified Northington was not at an alleged conspiracy site; and (b) Jack Carter testified Northington [2/3] was not at an alleged Ohio "conspiracy" site but at a Lansing job (in a Court of Appeals Judge's home). Ninety-five percent (95%) of prosecution testimony was patently false; the rest was exculpatory.

(continues on email #2)

From: GARY NORTHINGTON
Date: 8/19/2025 8:09:07 AM
To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: 

25-168417; MOT 4 REH #1 (11 AUG 2025):

.. STATE OF MICHIGAN
.. IN THE SUPREME COURT

Gary M. Northington,
Plaintiff In Pro Per,
.... Supreme Court No. 168417
.... COA No. 372474
.... Lower Court No. 87-21623-FC
vs

CEKANDER, et al,
Defendants.

Gary M. Northington #193035
Cotton Correctional Facility
3510 N. Elm
Jackson, MI 49201
(517) 780-5000
email @ JPay.com
Plaintiff In Pro Per

H. Steven LANGSCHWAGER (P52380)
Assistant Attorney-General
P.O. Box 30217
Lansing, MI 48909
(517) 335-3055
Attorney for Defendants

. APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR REHEARING/RECONSIDERATION
. REGARDING 01 AUGUST 2025 DENIAL OF
. PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT'S APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL

* Plaintiff-Appellant Gary M. Northington In Pro Per, pursuant to MCR 2.119(F), requests this Honorable Court to rehear and/or reconsider its 01 AUGUST 2025 DECISION (RECEIVED by Northington ON 06 AUGUST 2025) that DENIED Northington's APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL.

* A. DEFENDANTS ADMITTED PLAINTIFF'S CLAIMS AS TRUE

* 1. Michigan Court Rule 2.111(E) mandates: "Allegations in a pleading that require a responsive pleading ... are admitted if not denied in a responsive pleading." MCR 2.111(E)(1). Such "failure to deny an allegation is an admission thereof." ZDERO v BRIGGS, 338 Mich 549, 553 (1953).

* 2. Northington is cognitively challenged by a MASSIVE STROKE of 2016. On 23 JUNE 2016, he lost 6 decades of memory of: (a) his sister, (b) music he wrote (20 songs), and (c) meanings of many words. Cognitive gaps exist due to a 69% stenosis in his right Carotid Artery (attached Exhibit A), so it takes days to write a page. He does understand his Application and COA Petition required a response from Defendants under MCR 2.111(E)(1), or Michigan courts are a meaningless ritual intended to hide State abuses.

* 3. Defendant-Appellees' failure to deny allegations of Northington's Application and COA Petition are admitted ALL of Northington's CLAIMS as being TRUE.
[1/2]

* 4. Therefore, this Court should treat Northington's claims as TRUE and grant him requested relief as supported by this motion and accompanying BRIEF.

* B. "DENIED" IS CONCLUSORY WHEN WITHOUT FACTS

- * 5. "The right to sue and defend in the courts is the alternative of force" and attribute of civilized and orderly persons. CHAMBERS v B&O RR, 207 US 142, 146 (1908).
- * 6. A plausible ruling must hold more than "labels and CONCLUSIONS" or "a formulaic recitation," BELL ATL CORP v TWOMBLY, 550 US 554, 555 (2007); LIFE IS A TWO-WAY STREET (quoting EEOC motto). "DENIED," without facts thereon by the Court is unduly CONCLUSORY where "there must be findings, in such detail and exactness as the nature of the case permits, of subsidiary facts on ... the ultimate conclusion." KELLEY v EVERGLADES DRAINAGE, 319 US 415, 418-419 (1943). A detailed ruling on real facts is the only civilized way here, rather than the State's MOB-DOMINATED courts and violence (Exhibits B & C). CHAMBERS at 146
- * 7. Convictions here were falsely manufactured by: (a) Bribe-Taking Prosecutor, William D. Frey; and (b) KKK/retired Detroit mafia enforcer, Walter E. Verdun, who Northington witnessed commit a murder. Res gestae witnesses: (a) Mike Otto testified Northington was not at an alleged conspiracy site; and (b) Jack Carter testified Northington [2/3] was not at an alleged Ohio "conspiracy" site but at a Lansing job (in a Court of Appeals Judge's home). Ninety-five percent (95%) of prosecution testimony was patently false; the rest was exculpatory.

(continues on email #2)

From: GARY NORTHINGTON
 Date: 5/1/2025 7:45:47 PM
 To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: 

25-168417, MI S CT, ISSUES 2 & 4 [email 3]:

* ISSUES II & IV (combined):

*A. [II] MDOC DEFENDANTS CEKANDER, ET AL, VIOLATED CLEAR LEGAL DUTY WHEN PUTTING FALSE CONVICTION IN PLAINTIFF'S RECORD ALLEGING VIOLATION OF MCL "750.316" WITHOUT JUDGMENT OF SENTENCE THEREON AND BY NOT FOLLOWING MDOC'S OWN POLICY OF PUTTING PACC CODE "-[C]" INDICATING CONSPIRACY AND SHOULD CORRECT FALSE RECORD (COA Petition, pp. 10-12, 34-35), and [IV], CEKANDER VIOLATED HIS CLEAR LEGAL DUTY WHEN REFUSING TO CORRECT FALSE INFORMATION IN PLAINTIFF'S MDOC RECORD WHICH FALSELY SAY PLAINTIFF IS CONVICTED OF HOMICIDE UNDER MCL "750.316" (pp. 17-18, 37-38).

* B. THE COURT SHOULD REVIEW THE COURT OF APPEALS DECISION ON THIS ISSUE BECAUSE:

* (1) THE ISSUE RAISES A SERIOUS QUESTION ABOUT THE LEGALITY OF A LAW PASSED BY THE LEGISLATURE. This ISSUE RAISES SERIOUS QUESTION ABOUT LEGALITY OF Michigan Compiled Law 49.103 to 49.111 under which unlegislated PACC Codes are made that affect legislated convictions in the MDOC. These Statutes are unconstitutionally vague because "PERSONS of common intelligence MUST GUESS AT [THEIR] MEANING AND DIFFER AS TO [their] APPLICATION, PEOPLE v POSNER, 79 Mich App 63, 71 (1977), when enforcing its UNLEGISLATED PACC CODES on trial courts and the MDOC thereby CHANGING LEGISLATED CRIMINAL CODES. In making PACC Codes, the Prosecutor's Council unduly USURPED FUNCTION OF the MICHIGAN LEGISLATURE, and defined its own jurisdiction CONTRARY TO constitutional SEPARATION OF POWERS. Mich. Const., Art. III, Sec. 2. Defendant CEKANDER (MDOC Records Administrator) unduly USED CONFUSION caused by this unduly vague statute TO MISUSE the PACC CODE and falsely enter a First Degree Murder (MCL 750.316) conviction in Northington's MDOC Records WITHOUT TRIAL thereon (Issue II), THEN REFUSED TO CORRECT IT to Conspiracy to Commit Murder (MCL 750.157a-[C] or MCL 750.157a, 750.316-[C]) (Issue IV). Defendant CEKANDER has thereby illegally CHANGED Northington's PAROLABLE OFFENSE of Conspiracy TO a NONPAROLABLE Murder WITHOUT TRIAL thereon.

* (2) THE ISSUE RAISES A LEGAL PRINCIPLE THAT IS VERY IMPORTANT TO MICHIGAN LAW. The statutory code of Conspiracy is "MCL 750.157a" as stated in MDOC's BASIC INFORMATION REPORT issued on 28 MARCH 1988 and the trial court judgment of sentence issued on 28 JANUARY 1991 when no PACC Code then existed (Exhibit A, pp. 1-2). Law available to Northington says the Supreme Court used "MCL 750.157a, 750.316" and "MCL 750.316-[C]" on later sentencing documents (COA Petition, p. 11), around 2014. The PACC made an unlegislated rule to put PACC Codes on such documents which MDOC enforced by policy (Exhibit A, p. 4). Defendant CEKANDER's subordinate said, "MDOC enters the PACC Code [on the BASIC INFORMATION SHEET] when only the PACC enhancement code is on the JOS" (Judgment of Sentence) (Exhibit C, p. 2). Neither "MCL 750.316," "-[C]," nor any combination thereof are on Northington's Judgement of Sentence. However, Defendant CEKANDER saw fit to enter a statutory MCL 750.316 (First Degree Murder) on Northington's MDOC BASIC INFORMATION SHEET (Exhibit B, p. 3) but not a "-[C]" of MDOC Policy (Exhibit A, p. 4) for Conspiracy which changed Northington's conviction to MCL 750.316 (First Degree Murder) without Sixth Amendment jury trial thereon contrary to U.S. Constitution.

* (3) THE COURT OF APPEALS DECISION IS CLEARLY WRONG AND WILL CAUSE MATERIAL AND MANIFEST INJUSTICE TO ME when it refused to provide an OPINION that elucidates facts and law but only said "DENIED", contrary to law and Michigan Court Rules which say: "In an action tried without a jury," MCR 2.504(B)(2), and judgment on merits "the court shall make findings as provided in MCR 2.517." MCR 2.504(B)(2). On summary judgment, if the court "does not dispose the entire action or grant all relief demanded, the action must proceed to final judgment." MCR 2.116(J)(1). Under MCR 2.517, "in all actions tried without a jury" on "equity actions and claims for extraordinary writs, which are normally tried without a jury ..., the court must make findings of fact and conclusions of law without regard to

whether they had been requested by the parties." MCRP 2.517.3, p. 920, fn. 3 (citing Nicpan v Nicpan, 9 Mich App 373 (1968); Zawisa v Zawisa 61 Mich App 1 (1975)) (Rehearing Brief, 19 FEB 2025). Supreme law on such DENIAL says: Due process requires "findings, in such detail and exactness as the nature of the case permits, of subsidiary facts on which the ultimate conclusion of fairness can rationally be predicated." KELLEY v EVERGLADES DRAINAGE DIST., 319 US 415, 418-419 (1943). Such failure to elucidate facts and law for a final judgment on issues of the Complaint for extraordinary relief requires reversal of the denial of Complaint. MCRP, p. 920 at footnote 3.

* (4) THE DECISION CONFLICTS WITH A SUPREME COURT DECISION OR ANOTHER DECISION OF THE COURT OF APPEALS. The COURT OF APPEALS decision conflicts with the following: "Petition for Habeas Corpus, though not available because Petitioner had not served maximum sentence, would under circumstances be treated as petition for mandamus, and under facts would be issued against parole board requiring acceptance of jurisdiction over Petitioner for possible parole in accordance with law." PETITION OF CAREY, 372 Mich 380, 381-382 (1964); MORALES v MDOC PAROLE BOARD, 260 Mich App 29 (2003).

* C. EXPLAIN WHY YOU THINK THE CHOICES CHECKED IN "B" APPLY TO THIS ISSUE. LIST ANY CASES AND STATE ANY FACTS YOU WANT THE SUPREME COURT TO CONSIDER, EVEN IF THEY WERE NOT INCLUDED IN YOUR COURT OF APPEALS BRIEF. Paragraph C of Issue I incorporated by reference and fully restated herein. Plaintiff previous 3 State Mandamus and a Superintending Control Petition always gave facts and law for Judgment. The Court of Appeals judgment was a POLITICAL ACT to hide corruption described in Exhibit H, by an associate(s) thereof (Facebook, X, YouTube). See NEW ISSUE I.

From: GARY NORTHINGTON

Date: 5/1/2025 7:45:47 PM

To: Rudy Davis

Attachments:

25-168417, MI S CT, ISSUE 1 [email 2]:

* CIVIL PRO PER APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL

* ISSUE I:

* A. THE MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS (MDOC) PAROLE BOARD MADE FRAUDULENT ACCUSATION OF HOMICIDE CONVICTION (MCL 750.316) FOR YEARS TO DENY PAROLE CONTRARY TO BOARD'S CLEAR LEGAL DUTY AND SHOULD FORTHWITH GIVE HEARING DE NOVO WITHOUT THE FALSE

INFORMATION OR THE COURT SHOULD ORDER NORTHINGTON'S IMMEDIATE RELEASE (COA Petition, pp. 8-12, 31-34).

* B. THE COURT SHOULD REVIEW THE COURT OF APPEALS DECISION ON THIS ISSUE BECAUSE:

* (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 Defendant CEKANDER (MDOC Records Administrator) (Exhibit A, pp. 3-4) TO MAKE A FALSE MDOC BASIC INFORMATION SHEET accusing Northington of being convicted of violating MCL 750.316 (First Degree Murder) (Exhibit B, p. 3) (Exhibit C, pp. 3-5) by omitting the "-[C]" PACC Code of MDOC Policy (Exhibit A, p. 4). Northington is IMPRISONED FOR ALLEGED CONSPIRACY under MCL 750.157a (Exhibit A, pp. 1-2) (INITIATED BY BRIBE-TAKING Chief County PROSECUTOR William D. Frey AFTER DISQUALIFICATION ORDER). Defendants Parole Board Chairman Brian Shipman and Unknown Parole Board Member abusively use CEKANDER'S FALSE RECORD to unduly accuse Northington of being convicted of "assaultive crime: Resulted in loss of life," which they used to deny Northington release on parole WITHOUT required Fifth, Sixth and Fourteenth Amendment JURY TRIAL on an alleged MCL 750.316 conviction (Exhibit B, pp. 1-2).

* (2) THE ISSUE RAISES A LEGAL PRINCIPLE THAT IS VERY IMPORTANT TO MICHIGAN 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. All MDOC DEFENDANTS ARE ACCOMPLICES TO a CRIMINAL JUDICIAL CARTEL OF A BRIBE-TAKING MOB DOMINATED TRIAL COURT, and are unduly biased by MDOC'S twisted record (Exhibits H, I, and J) thereof, as said in following subsection (B)(3). Such State actions obtained "UNDER DOMINATION OF A MOB ARE VOID." SHELLEY v KRAEMER, 334 US 1, 17 (1948).

* (3) THE COURT OF APPEALS DECISION IS CLEARLY WRONG, IS CAUSING, AND WILL FURTHER CAUSE MATERIAL AND MANIFEST INJUSTICE TO Northington. MDOC Defendants falsely imprison him for alleged violation of MCL 750.316 WITHOUT REQUIRED PUBLIC TRIAL thereon BECAUSE HE IS A RES GESTAE WITNESS, privy TO conversations of, and eyewitness to CHIEF COUNTY PROSECUTOR William D. Frey, Special Prosecutor Gregory Jones, SPECIAL PROSECUTOR James ROSTASH, AND Circuit Court JUDGE MICHAEL J. TALBOT TAKING BRIBES and holding discussions, in violation of Federal and State law, to unduly imprison innocent persons and unduly conceal murders for bribe money paid to them (Exhibit H). Aforesaid MDOC Defendants use said falsely manufactured Conspiracy and Solicitation convictions, of the MOB DOMINATED Southeast Michigan Judicial Cartel that pays and accepts bribes to determine judicial outcomes (Exhibits H, I, and J), as premise for FALSELY accusing Northington of having a MURDER CONVICTION when there is no such conviction, which is compounded by MDOC Defendants not following MDOC Policy of entering PAAC Code "-[C]" for conspiracy (Exhibit A, p. 4), on their BASIC INFORMATION SHEET (Exhibit B, p. 3) to unduly influence the Parole Board

with a fraud.

* (4) THE DECISION CONFLICTS 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; the courts, as well as other departments, are bound by that instrument."); (b) PEOPLE v NORTHINGTON, Michigan Court of Appeals No. 108315 (1990) (Conspiracy has possible 10-year parole date but not MURDER).

* C. EXPLAIN WHY YOU THINK CHOICES CHECKED IN "B" APPLY TO THIS ISSUE. LIST ANY CASES AND STATE ANY FACTS YOU WANT THE SUPREME COURT TO CONSIDER, EVEN IF NOT INCLUDED IN YOUR COURT OF APPEALS BRIEF. IF YOU THINK COURT OF APPEALS MIXED UP ANY FACTS ABOUT THIS ISSUE, EXPLAIN BELOW. Accompanying Exhibits H, I, and J. Exhibit H are a summary of Northington's eyewitnessed events to prosecutorial corruption and the Chief Prosecutor's attempts to silence him. Exhibit I describes how a Monroe County Deputy Sheriff twisted Northington's totally innocent acts of year 1986 into a falsified alleged 1987 assault inferring death that never occurred (to help the Deputy's brother gain leniency for raping a minor). Exhibit J lists actual totally innocent 09 JANUARY 1987 events that had nothing to do with a crime by Northington, but were hidden by the prosecutor's office not releasing, in discovery, videotape of the period wherein Michigan falsely accused Northington of of "assaultive crime: Resulted in loss of life," which Parole Board Defendants falsely said was "MCL 750.316" conviction to unduly imprison. BRADY v MARYLAND, 373 US 83 (1963) (Suppression of exculpatory evidence violates due process). The Court of Appeals judges deliberately did not issue OPINION on facts, to likely protect their bribe-taking buddies (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). This Honorable Court should forthwith grant Appellant relief from aforesaid Parole Board fraud and rule the PACC Code is unconstitutional.

From: GARY NORTHINGTON
Date: 5/1/2025 7:45:47 PM
To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: 

25-168417; S CT COVER (17 APR 2025) [email 1]: Dear Rudy: Thanks for your email about "134." etc. I have a document that is 8 pages on paper but 5 emails. If you would rather have this via snail mail, please let me know. Can you put the emails into one document? /s/ Gary M.

.. STATE OF MICHIGAN
.. IN THE SUPREME COURT

Gary M. Northington,
Plaintiff In Pro Per,
.... Supreme Court No. 168417
.... COA No. 372474
.... Lower Court No. 87-21623
vs

* (1) MDOC Records Administrator Christina CEKANDER/Michigan Dept. of Corrections (MDOC),
* (2) JCF Grievance Coordinator Troy COBB/MDOC,
* (3) UNKNOWN PAROLE BOARD MEMBER/MDOC (who said Northington has "homicide" case),
* (4) MDOC FOIA Administrator Andrew PHELPS/MDOC,
* (5) MDOC Parole Board Chairman Brian SHIPMAN/
* (6) JCF Prison Guard James SIMS-NEELEY/MDOC,
* (7) MDOC Director Heidi WASHINGTON/MDOC,
* (8) David S. WHITE, Monroe Circuit Judge,
Defendants, sued in Individual and Official Capacity.

/

Gary M. Northington #193035
Cotton Correctional Facility
3510 N. Elm
Jackson, MI 49201
(517) 780-5000
email @ JPay.com
Plaintiff In Pro Per

H. Steven LANGSCHWAGER (P52380)
Assistant Attorney-General
P.O. Box 30217
Lansing, MI 48909
(517) 335-3055
Attorney for Defendants

From: GARY NORTHINGTON
Date: 5/1/2025 7:45:46 PM
To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: 

25-168417, MI S CT, ISSUES 3, 5 to 7, NEW ISSUE I [email 4]:

* ISSUE III:

* A. DEFENDANT MDOC GRIEVANCE COORDINATOR COBB VIOLATED HIS CLEAR LEGAL DUTY WHEN HE FALSELY REJECTED GRIEVANCES BY SAYING THERE WAS/IS LACK OF JURISDICTION OVER FALSE HOMICIDE CONVICTION OF MCL "750.316" IN PLAINTIFFS MDOC RECORD WHEN THERE IS NO COURT JUDGMENT OF SENTENCE AGAINST PLAINTIFF FOR ALLEGED VIOLATION OF MCL "750.316" AND THE COURT SHOULD RULE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE IS DYSFUNCTIONAL UNDER GRIEVANCE COORDINATOR COBB.

* Northington cannot timely address this issue because his cognitive and physical disability prevents him from doing so.

* ISSUE V:

* A. MDOC DEFENDANT RECORDS ADMINISTRATOR CEKANDER AND OTHER MDOC STAFF VIOLATED THEIR CLEAR LEGAL DUTY WHEN THEY REFUSED TO PROVIDE THE DOCUMENT REQUIRED BY MCL 600.4379 THAT STATES PLAINTIFF IS IMPRISONED FOR VIOLATION OF MCL "750.316" WHEN DEFENDANTS SAY SAID DOCUMENT EXISTS AND DEFENDANTS SHOULD PAY PLAINTIFF \$200.00 PER EACH EVENT AND PERSON WHO REFUSED TO PROVIDE SUCH DOCUMENT.

* Northington cannot timely address this issue because his cognitive and physical disability prevents him from doing so.

* ISSUE VI:

* A. DEFENDANT MDOC AND WASHINGTON'S POLICY ON SEXUAL MISCONDUCT CONFLICTS WITH FIRST AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS TO U.S. CONSTITUTION, AND ARTICLE I, SECTIONS 3 AND 17 OF MICHIGAN CONSTITUTION WHERE IT IS CONTRARY TO MDOC AND WASHINGTON'S POLICY ON GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE WHICH REQUIRES AN ATTEMPT TO RESOLVE AN ISSUE DURING WHICH A PRISONER MUST DESCRIBE THE WRONGFUL SEXUAL ACT DONE TO HIM.

* Northington cannot timely address this issue because his cognitive and physical disability prevents him from doing so.

* ISSUE VII:

* A. DEFENDANT CIRCUIT JUDGE DANIEL S. WHITE REFUSED TO CHANGE PLAINTIFF'S JUDGMENT OF SENTENCE TO INCLUDE PACC CODE AND/OR MDOC

STAFF WRONGFULLY REFUSED TO CORRECT PLAINTIFF'S MDOC RECORD TO INCLUDE PACC CODE FOR CONSPIRACY CONVICTION.

* B. THE COURT SHOULD REVIEW THE COURT OF APPEALS DECISION ON THIS ISSUE BECAUSE:

* (1) THE ISSUE RAISES A SERIOUS QUESTION ABOUT THE LEGALITY OF A LAW PASSED BY THE LEGISLATURE. Sections B(1) of Issues I, II and IV incorporated by reference and fully restated herein.

* (2) THE ISSUE RAISES A LEGAL PRINCIPLE THAT IS VERY IMPORTANT TO MICHIGAN LAW: No citizen can lawfully be convicted and imprisoned without a jury trial thereon. U.S. Const., Amends. 5, 6, 14; Mich. Const., Art. I, Secs. 14, 16, 17, 19 and 20. The MCL citation for Conspiracy, "MCL 750.157a", is on Northington's JUDGMENT OF SENTENCE. The MDOC's false Record says "MCL 750.316" with no jury trial thereon, and is without a PACC Code; State fraud. MCL 750.248.

* (3) THE COURT OF APPEALS DECISION IS CLEARLY WRONG, AND IS CAUSING MATERIAL AND MANIFEST INJUSTICE TO ME where the court both refused to exercise Superintending Control over Defendant Judge Smith to correct the JUDGMENT OF SENTENCE (Exhibit A), if needed, or ORDER Defendant CEKANDER to correct MDOC's BASIC INFORMATION SHEET (Exhibit B), if needed. It is typical behavior of bribe-taking judges to GO SILENT when confronted with the corruption of EXHIBIT H. Both Defendant Judge SMITH and the Court of Appeals Judges became silent when confronted with Exhibit H; abusively refusing to elucidate reasons for DENIAL of Petition. Issues II and IV (combined), Sec. (B)(3) incorporated and restated herein.

* (4) THE DECISION CONFLICTS WITH SUPREME COURT AND COURT OF APPEALS DECISIONS. Cases infer MDOC Records must be "MCL Citation/PACC Code." PEOPLE v KUCHCIAK, 467 Mich 873 (2002); PEOPLE v WARNER, 2014 Mich App LEXIS 1017, *12-*13 (03 JUN 2014). Please cite proper format for a Conspiracy to Commit Murder conviction. [5/6]

* C. THE CHOICES CHECKED IN "B" APPLY TO THIS ISSUE, because Northington eyewitnessed Chief Monroe County PROSECUTOR William D. FREY solicit and take a bribe to conceal a homicide prosecution after the later Prosecution Witness Walter E. Verdun shot a bullet into a man's head (Exhibit H, paragraphs 1-2). Even after the honest Chief Monroe County Judge disqualified Prosecutor Frey and the entire County Judiciary, Frey continued covert involvement in Northington's case. Then, Judge Michael J. Talbot from Detroit was given the case and took a \$4,000.00 bribe from Special Prosecutor Gregory Jones (Exhibit H, paragraph 13). Northington personally spoke to Judge Daniel Sullivan before Sullivan attempted suicide (Exhibit H). Northington requests this Honorable Court to ORDER: (a) Defendant CEKANDER to correct the false MDOC Record; and/or (b) Defendant Judge White to correct Northington's Judgment of Sentence, to end and prevent further Manifest Injustice of the false MURDER conviction, and the falsely manufactured Conspiracy/Solicitation convictions (Exhibits I and J). U.S. Const., Amends. 5, 6, 14; Mich. Const., Art. I, Secs. 14, 16,

17, 19, 20.

* NEW ISSUE I:

* A. THE COURT OF APPEALS JUDGES REFUSED TO ELUCIDATE FACTS, LAW BECAUSE THEY ARE UNDULY BIASED. Judge Michael J. TALBOT, whom Northington saw take a \$4000 [6/7] bribe in Northington's criminal case, was Chief Court of Appeals Judge for years; the deciding judges of this case worked for TALBOT. The judges of this case should have certified their disqualification. MCR 2.003.

* Northington spoke to Vicki RIORDAN about his criminal case and they discussed Vicki's husband and family. Northington recalls Vicki saying they were neighbors during the time of Northington's arrest. That may cause bias.

* Further, Northington says not (accompanying Exhibit H-J).

From: GARY NORTHINGTON

Date: 5/1/2025 7:45:45 PM

To: Rudy Davis

Attachments:

25-168417, MI S CT, END [email 5]:

* DECLARATION

* I, Gary M. Northington, declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing, and accompanying Exhibits H, I and J, are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

. . . Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: _____

. . . Gary M. Northington #193035

* RELIEF REQUESTED

* FOR ABOVE REASONS I REQUEST THAT THE SUPREME COURT GRANT MY APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL OR ORDER ANY OTHER RELIEF THAT IT DECIDES I AM ENTITLED TO RECEIVE.

. . . Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: _____

.. 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 APPLICATION with EXHIBITS upon Counsel of Record, Defendants, and the Michigan Court of Appeals, at their respective addresses, as shown by the Record, by first-class U.S. Mail with postage fully prepaid thereon.

Dated: 17 APR 2025 _____

..
.. Gary M. Northington

From: GARY NORTHINGTON
Date: 9/2/2022 6:27:20 AM
To: Rudy Davis

Attachments: □

BIDEN #8: (note @ end)
07 JUNE 2022
..... Gary M. Northington #193035
..... Cotton Correctional Facility
..... 3510 N. Elm
..... Jackson, MI 49201

"President" Joe BIDEN
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20513

RE: THE ECONOMY

Dear Uncle Joe (as Soviets called Stalin):

A. BASIC MATH:

*** Running the Federal government is a matter of basic MATH. Regarding fossil fuel prices:

** (1) OPEC and other foreign suppliers (OPEC) are the CONSTANT that create the Worldwide Fossil Fuel MEAN PRICE.

** (2) The UNITED STATES (US) is the VARIABLE in the Worldwide Fossil Fuel PRICE (WFFP).

** (3)(a) When the United States is a net fossil fuel EXPORTER, then Worldwide Fossil Fuel PRICE is low ($OPEC + (US) = WFFP < MEAN PRICE$).

** (3)(b) When the United States is a net fossil fuel IMPORTER, then Worldwide Fossil Fuel PRICE is high ($OPEC - (US) = WFFP > MEAN PRICE$).

We the People know such grade school MATH.

B. GREEN ENERGY COSTS:

*** GREEN ENERGY PRODUCTION AND CONSTRUCTION COSTS (GE) ARE DEPENDENT UPON FOSSIL FUEL COSTS (FFC) and other costs affected by Fossil Fuels (X). IF THE COSTS OF FOSSIL FUELS INCREASE by 2, THEN COSTS OF GREEN ENERGY INCREASE by about 3 times ($2(FFC) + X = 3(GREEN\ ENERGY)$). In JANUARY 2021, the GREEN ENERGY cost was about \$1 per watt. On 07 JUNE 2022, about a 120% increase in fossil fuel costs, since JANUARY 2021, caused GREEN ENERGY COSTS TO RISE to around \$3 to \$4 per watt. This means the middle class and poor cannot afford GREEN ENERGY, electric vehicles, etcetera, but only the rich like SENATOR MARIE ANTOINETTE STABENOW can.

C. ELECTRIC VEHICLES

*** The GREEN RELIGIOUS MANTRA of decreased Carbon pollution with electric vehicles (EVs) IS A LIE. Charging electric vehicles on the power grid HAS A 30% ENERGY LOSS BETWEEN the POWER PLANT AND CHARGING AN ELECTRIC VEHICLE. THIS IS A 15% dielectric hysteresis LOSS THROUGH A STEPUP TRANSFORMER AT THE POWER PLANT PLUS A 15% dielectric hysteresis LOSS THROUGH THE STEPDOWN TRANSFORMER AT THE ELECTRICAL USER. Other minor transmission LINE LOSSES add to this DIELECTRIC HYSTERESIS LOSS. Therefore, ELECTRIC VEHICLES CAUSE at least 30% MORE CARBON DIOXIDE POLLUTION in the air WHEN CHARGED from the Power Grid.

*** Such charging of EVs will grossly OVERLOAD the POWER GRID, make the GRID unreliable for charging EVs and, thereby, the EVs will become unreliable or useless. The only EFFICIENT CHARGING of electric vehicles is DIRECTLY FROM individual SUNLIGHT-POWERED PHOTOVOLTAIC CHARGING STATIONS, or by hybrid vehicles such as presently sold.

*** The best implementation of GREEN ENERGY would a 50% TAX CREDIT for each GREEN ENERGY system installed or vehicle used by We the People; NOT by DECREASING FOSSIL FUEL AVAILABILITY which DRIVES UP Green Energy COSTS. Present fossil fuel caused INFLATION has turned 70% of We the People against GREEN ENERGY in any form.

D. CONCLUSION:

*** EXECUTIVE ORDER 13990 (20 JAN 2021) SHUTTING DOWN the KEYSTONE Pipeline causes 2,500 trucks per month TO EMIT CARBON into the air. EXECUTIVE ORDER 14008 (27 JAN 2021) SHUTTING DOWN 40-percent of U.S. FOSSIL FUEL production causes each foreign OIL tanker SHIP to the U.S. TO EMIT 8 TONS OF CARBON PER HOUR INTO THE AIR. Jennifer GRANHOLM and many in your Administration have their heads stuck in a warm, smelly place rather than reality.

. . . Sincerely,

. . . /s/ Gary M. Northington