

Supreme Court, U.S.  
FILED

06-60 JUL 11 2006

No. OFFICE OF THE CLERK

In The  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF COLORADO,

*Petitioner,*

v.

ANDREA HUMPHREY

**On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari  
To The Colorado Supreme Court**

**PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

CAROL CHAMBERS  
District Attorney for the  
18th Judicial District

PAUL R. WOLFF\*  
Chief Deputy District Attorney

DANIEL D. PLATTNER  
Deputy District Attorney  
7305 S. Potomac St., Suite 300  
Centennial, CO 80112  
Tele: 720-874-8500  
*\*Counsel of Record*

Dated: July 11, 2006

68

i

### QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Whether the Colorado Supreme Court erred by failing to follow U.S. Supreme Court precedent that voluntariness is a mixed question of fact and law requiring an independent or plenary review rather than deferring to the trial court's findings.
2. Whether Humphrey's statements after being informed of the victim's death violated due process or were voluntary.

Supreme Court, U.S.  
FILED

No. 06-61 JUL 11 2006

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
In The  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

HECLA MINING COMPANY,

*Petitioner,*

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
AND THE STATE OF IDAHO,

*Respondents.*

**On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari  
To The United States Court Of Appeals  
For The Ninth Circuit**

**PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

ELIZABETH H. TEMKIN  
(*Counsel of Record*)  
TEMKIN WIELGA HARDT  
& LONGENECKER LLP  
1900 Wazee Street  
Suite 303  
Denver, CO 80202  
Tel: (303) 292-4922  
Fax: (303) 292-4921

MICHAEL R. THORP  
HELLER EHRMAN LLP  
701 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 6100  
Seattle, WA 98104  
Tel: (206) 447-0900  
Fax: (206) 447-0898

July 11, 2006

61

i

### QUESTION PRESENTED

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(5) authorizes a district court to grant relief from a judgment on grounds that it is no longer equitable for the judgment to have prospective application. Did the Ninth Circuit impermissibly limit the district court's authority to administer its consent decrees in concluding, based on *Rufo v. Inmates of Suffolk County Jail*, 502 U.S. 367 (1992), that this Court intends for such relief to be governed by a limited checklist of factors to the exclusion of other considerations, with the admissible evidence defined by the "four corners" of the decree, like a contract?

Supreme Court, U.S.  
FILED

06-62 JUL 10 2006

No. \_\_\_\_\_ OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

---

ARTHUR GAVLOCK; ADAM WALTZ; JAMES P.  
PLETCHER; ROBERT FLOYD; JEAN FLOYD,

Petitioners

v.

CLINT DENIKER WCO; WCO WASSERMAN; DOTY  
MCDOWELL WCO; RONALD STOUT, Supervisor;  
VERNON ROSS

Respondents

---

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

---

Don Bailey Esquire  
Bailey & Ostrowski  
4311 N. 6<sup>th</sup> Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17110  
717.221.9500

62

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether American citizens have the right to protect their real property from destruction by a non-native, unendangered species introduced by their state government to roam uninhibited over private lands?

2. May a state government subject American citizens to prosecution for defending their lives and property from destruction by wildlife that is non-native to the state in question, and in which the state has no interest?

3. In conducting a *de novo* review does an appellate US Court of Appeals have as a standard of review issue the responsibility to visit the matters presented to it?

06-65 JUL 12 2006

No. OFFICE OF THE CLERK

---

---

**In the  
Supreme Court of the United States**

---

NATHANIEL RICHMOND  
and  
STEPHANIE RICHMOND,  
*Petitioners,*

v.

NICHOLAS G. HIGGINS, d/b/a  
NICHOLAS G. HIGGINS & ASSOCIATES,  
*Respondents.*

**On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United  
States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit**

---

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

---

JOHN M. ALBRIGHT  
*Counsel of Record*  
MOORE, WALSH & ALBRIGHT, L.L.P.  
433 N. MAIN STREET  
P.O. Box 610  
POPLAR BLUFF, MO 63902  
(573) 785-6200

*Counsel for Petitioners*

65

**QUESTION PRESENTED**

Whether a consumer covered by Medicaid, who could sue a hospital using a declaratory judgment action, can maintain an FDCPA action against the hospital's debt collector, who is engaged in a felony — collecting more for a hospital bill than Medicaid would pay — when the facts are otherwise indistinguishable from *Heintz v. Jenkins*, 514 U.S. 291 (1995).



Supreme Court, U.S.  
FILED

06-66 JUL 12 2006

No. OFFICE OF THE CLERK

---

---

In the  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

MARIO ALBERTO RICHARDS-DIAZ,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney General,  
*Respondent.*

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United  
States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

---

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

---

MURRAY D. HILTS  
*Counsel of Record*

LAW OFFICES OF MURRAY D. HILTS  
3020 MEADE AVENUE  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92116  
(619) 688-1174

*Counsel for Petitioner*

66

**QUESTION PRESENTED**

1. Does the refusal to allow Petitioner to apply for simultaneous relief from removal proceedings under Immigration and Nationality Act section 240A(a) (Title 8 United States Code section 1229b(a)) and former Immigration and Nationality Act section 212(c) (Title 8 United States Code section 1182(c)), an issue that has the potential to affect thousands of immigrants in the United States, constitute an impermissible deprivation of due process?

06-68 JUL 13 2006

No. OFFICE OF THE CLERK

---

---

In the  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

KENNETH A. MAUDER,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

METROPOLITAN TRANSIT AUTHORITY  
OF HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS  
*Respondent.*

**On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United  
States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit**

---

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

---

JOSEPH Y. AHMAD  
*Counsel of Record*  
AHMAD, ZAVITSANOS  
& ANAIPAKOS, P.C.  
3460 ONE HOUSTON CENTER  
1221 MCKINNEY STREET  
HOUSTON, TX 77010-2009  
(713) 655-1101  
(713) 655-0062 FAX

*Counsel for Petitioner*

---

---

Becker Gallagher Legal Publishing, Inc. 800.890.5001

68

### Questions Presented

Whether an employee must be physically unable to travel to his place of employment in order to be considered “incapacitated” pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 825.114(a)(2)(iii) when he is unable to perform one or more essential functions of his job due to a chronic serious health condition.

Whether an employer must allow an employee fifteen days to return the FMLA certification packet upon formal request for intermittent FMLA leave in accordance with 29 C.F.R. § 305.