

"SEAN RIKER: PASCHINI"

(1 of 2) ①

OHNO! Say it isn't so! But I ALWAYS knew. Back in the day when I was in the Federal system at USP Florence I was very close to this guy, Paschini. I called him "bro" which doesn't happen too often and then as the months turned into a year I started to notice that he was pointing out "snitches" and "rat's" and "informants" in an inordinate amount of times.

Unfortunately I have done a lot of time and during that time I have learned that when a guy points out rat's or snitches or cops or anything against the now-dead "convict code" he ALWAYS is what he points out the most. So when Paschini pointed out his go-to moniker I NEVER looked funny at the guy he pointed out. No, I looked at him funny.

And then I went to the hole and I got word he was calling me names, his go-to names, and it hurt my one feeling, but I always knew what he was. My "bro" was campaigning against me and TRYING to cause me problems, but he was ineffective in his endeavors to soil my name.

So the other day I was cruising thru the law library computer looking up past associates and WTF? There was Paschini. Apparently he got released from the Feds and got caught up in another few crime's in San Deiego and he cooperated in a murder case. He cooperated so that he could get a sweet plea bargain in HIS case. It was the classic snitches trade-mark, glean information on an inmates case in the county jail and use that info against the poor guy so that he could get less time in his case.

As far as I could "glean" myself, paschini is not incarcerated, so his info must have paid off.

I am happy my intuition is still as keen as ever. Ya can't fool ol' Seanie Boy.

I have redacted the first names of everyone invloved b'c its not allowed on this here outlet, but I am attaching the case so you can see that I was right, I am always right in this respect.

(2 of 2)  
②

2019 WL 6840410 [REDACTED] Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

United States District Court, S.D. California.

[REDACTED] MCCREARY, Petitioner,

v.

[REDACTED] DIAZ, Secretary, Respondent.

Case No.: 18cv0789-CAB (BGS)

Signed 12/16/2019

Petitioner claims he did not know the victim was going to be shot, that he had met Withers a few days earlier and did not know Withers had shot several other people including one in the same manner as the victim here, and relies primarily on his allegations of trial error identified in his federal Petition and discussed above. (ECF No. 19 at 19-20.) His new evidence includes photographs he contends show he is not tall enough to have been the shooter as described by Withers at trial, and the proffered testimony of four witnesses who did not testify at trial: (1) [REDACTED] Chavez who could testify Withers called her asking where Petitioner kept his gun in his car, (2) [REDACTED] Paschini who could testify that Withers confessed to shooting the victim while Petitioner was driving and that he did it because he was jealous she had sex with one of his friends, and (3) [REDACTED] Baldino and [REDACTED] Flores to whom Withers made "incriminating statements that placed the murder on himself and would have proved my innocence." (Id.) Petitioner presents a transcript of an interview with [REDACTED] Paschini conducted by a District Attorney with Paschini's counsel present dated October 21, 2013, in which Paschini, seeking consideration in a pending criminal case against him, says Withers admitting killing the victim. (Id. at 112-61, 96 S.Ct. 2392.) He contends [REDACTED] Flores could testify that Withers told him while they were both in jail that he was not driving the car when the victim was shot, and that Baldino witnessed Withers kill someone and attempt to blame Baldino. (Id. at 172-73, 131 S.Ct. 1388.)