

RECEIVED

JUN 04 2010

CLERK OF COURT
SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

ORIGINAL

STATE OF OHIO

v.

TORRANCE C. PILGRIM

FILED

JUN 04 2010

CLERK OF COURT
SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

Case No. 2009-2218

MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION, S. Ct. Prac. R. 11.2


Comes now Appellant, Torrance C. Pilgrim, without counsel, pursuant to Supreme Court Practice Rule 11.2, and move this Honorable Court to reconsider its dismissal of his leave to appeal and his motion to strike memorandum in response, entered on May 26, 2010, in the above captioned case, for reason(s) that:

- (1) the decisions of the trial and appellate court(s) are contrary to Ohio "**established law**" and presents a constitutional question of equal protection and denial of due process,
- (2) appellant received ineffective assistance of counsel at both trial and appellate level as alleged in his memorandum in support of jurisdiction, in violation of the 5th, 6th, and 14th Amendments to the United States Constitution, and Article I, Sections 10 and 16, of the Ohio Constitution,
- (3) the numerous statutory, constitutional, criminal Rules, and "**Procedural Rules violations**", which would include the failure of appellee to serve a copy of his memorandum in response to appellant's memorandum in support, pursuant to rule, presents constitutional questions of equal protection and a denial of due process,
- (4) appellant has been denied equal protection and due process of law in regards his rights under R.C. 2925.01(K), R.C. 2945.71 et seq., Criminal Rules 12, 16, and 48, the Code of Judicial Conduct, Code of Professional Responsibility, which presents constitutional issues of great public interest.
- (5) appellant did not receive a fair trial as guaranteed by the 5th and 14th Amendments to the United States Constitution, and Article I, Sections 10

- and 16, Ohio Constitution, because of judicial errors, abuse of discretion and prosecutorial misconduct. presenting constitutional questions and issues,
- (6) Constitutional violations, State and Federal are reflected throughout the proceedings in this cause and should be heard on the merits of the errors and issues presented on appeal,
 - (7) the adjudication of the court of appeals, trial court and jury resulted in decisions based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented during the proceedings, and a violation of the doctrine of stare decisis,
 - (8) the decisions of the court of appeals is contrary to clearly established federal law as determined by the United States Supreme Court, and presents a constitutional question of equal protection, due process, and fundamental fairness.

For the foregoing reasons this Honorable Court should reconsider its decision of May 26, 2010, and allow appellant to proceed on appeal of the decision of the Tenth District Court of Appeals, on October 8, 2009. For the relief sought, appellant prays.


Respectfully submitted,



Torrance C. Pilgrim, pro se
A589102 – B076
16759 Snake Hollow Road
Nelsonville, Ohio 45764

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing motion has been sent, via regular prepaid U.S. Mail, to Ron O'Brien and John H. Cousins, Franklin County Prosecuting attorney, 373 South High Street, 13th Floor, Columbus, Ohio 43215, th is 1st day of June, 2010,


Torrance C. Pilgrim