

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>Page(s)</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii - v
THE PETITION SATISFIES ALL OF THE CRITERIA FOR EN BANC REVIEW .....	1
Rehearing en banc is warranted, because the panel’s decision conflicts with decisions from the United States Supreme Court and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit .....	1
Rehearing en banc is warranted, because the panel’s opinion directly conflicts with <i>Tennessee v. Lane, supra</i> .....	2
I. INTRODUCTION .....	7
II. THE PANEL’S MEMORANDUM RESTS ON SUPPRESSION AND MISCHARACTERIZATION OF THE FACTS AND CONTROLLING LAW .....	12
III. CONCLUSION .....	22
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE .....	24
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE .....	25
ADDENDUM	
“ <i>The REAL Issues of Judicial Ethics</i> ,” Judge Alex Kozinski, <u>Hofstra Law Review</u> , V. 32, No. 4 Summer, 2004 .....	1-12
Brief of Theodore Olson to the U.S. S. Ct, <i>Popovich v. Court of     Common Pleas of Ohio</i> , No-01-1503, 2002, .....	13-25
Unpublished Judicial Opinions Hearing, Committee of the House Judiciary Committee, June 27, 2002 .....	26-41

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Page(s)

“Should the Ninth Circuit Be Split?” Appellate Counselor Memos,  
12/20/98 ..... 42-43

Media Release: “Ninth Circuit Federal Courts Issue Final Report  
on Study of Racial, Religious and Ethnic Fairness.” ..... 44-47