

ORIGINAL

18-8705

No. _____

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

MAR 15 2019

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

Action Involves
The Challenge of
The Constitutionality
of A Federal Statute
Pursuant, To Title
28 USC § 2403, and Under
Fed. R. Civ. Pro R. 5.1(a)

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

KEITH BRYAN WEBB-EL — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

VS.

L.J. ODDO, WRADEN USP ALLENWOOD — RESPONDENT(S)

ON A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS
PURSUANT, TO TITLE 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(3)

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

KEITH BRYAN WEBB-EL

(Your Name)

UNITED STATES PENITENTIARY FLORENCE-High

(Address)

FLORENCE, CO 81226

(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

I. Whether, the Petitioner Webb-EL, a mentally ill Moorish-American Citizen, or any other State, or Federal Prisoner's, Title 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(3) Writ of Habeas Corpus Petition, Present to the Supreme Court, actual innocence, and illegally confinement claims of exceptional circumstance, that warrants the Supreme Court, to exercise its discretionar powers in granting the petitioner, writ of habeas corpus relief.

Whereas, the petitioner, declares herein that he can not obtain adquaet relief in the lower United States Court of Appeals For the Third Circuit, nor, in the United States District Court For the Middle District of Pennsylvania.

Where, both federal court's, unlawfully refused to Address, and Dispose of the petitioner, actual innocence, and illegally confinement claims, and issue's, that was raise in the lower federal court's, pursuant, well establish federal law that has been determine by the Supreme Court decision's Mcquiggin v. Perkins, 133 S. Ct 1924, 185 L. Ed 2d 1019 (2013); Also, under Schulp v. Delo, 513 S. Ct. 851, 130 L. Ed 808 (1995)

Which mandated both federal court's, to have addressed, and Disposed of the petitioner, actual innocene, and illegally confinement claims, and issues for 2241(c)(3) writ of habeas corpus statute for relief.

II. Whether, the petitioner Webb-EL, a Moorish-American Federal Prisoner, or any other State, or Federal American Prisoners, that are incarcerated under similar circumstances;

Writ of Habeas Corpus Petition, raise paramount public important
deprivation Human Rights violation pursuant to the Universal
Declaration Human Rights Treaty, Adopted and proclaim by the
General Assembly resolution 217 A III of December 10, 1948
Articles 3 thru Article 9.

And deprivation of the petitioner, 5th, 8th, and 13th Amendments
Substantially, and Procedural Due Process of Law Const. Right's
to resort to the Title 28 USC § 2241(c)(3) Writ of habeas corpus
to raise a claim of actual innocence, and illegal confinement
claim for relief. Should be settled by the Supreme Court.

The petitioner Webb-EL, ask the Supreme Court the Federal Question .

Whether, Congress in the case at bar has suspended the Writ of
Habeas Corpus pursuant to the Constitutional Suspension Clause
pursuant, to Article 1, § 9, cl.2 of the Constitution, which
clearly state to wit:" The Privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus
shall not be suspended, unless when in Cases of Rebellion or
Invasion the public Safety may require it. Or under Title 28 USC
§ 2241(c)(3) Writ of Habeas Corpus Statute.

And if the answer is no.

Whether, the petitioner, a Moorish-American Citizen Federal Prisoner,
or any other State, and Federal American Federal Prisoner's
that are incarcerated under similar circumstances;

Who, is being confin in the territorial jurisdiction of the United
States of America. In voluntary servitude against his will unlawfully
in federal custody in violation of the Constitution, and the Laws
of the United States, for an non-existing capital offense charge
for second degree murder, that the petitioner, was not charged by
an Federal Grand Jury, in Count One of the U.S. Government July 16,
1985 superseding indictment.

The petitioner, ask the Supreme Court, the Second Federal Constitutional Question, Is the Federal Statute under Title 28 USC § 2255 motion, and § 2255(e) Saving Clause, unconstitutional in the manner the lower U.S. Third Circuit Appellate Court, and the U.S. District Court For the Middle District of Pennsylvania, application, and construing the above mention described federal statutes in such a manner against the petitioner.

As a procedural bar rule, to precluded the petitioner Webb-EL federal § 2241(c)(3) writ of habeas corpus review of his claims of actual innocence, and illegal confinement claims for habeas relief.

The petitioner, ask the Supreme Court the third Federal Constitutional Question. Was the petitioner, Human Rights, and 5th, 8th, and 13th Amendment's Due process and Equal Protection of the Law Const. Right's were violated?

To have been afforded a full, and fair meaningful plenary habeas corpus adjudication process of his actual innocence, and illegally confinement Claims, before, a neutral Article III Judge decision maker.

Also, the petitioner, Human Rights, and Constitutional Right's were violated; to have been afforded the opportunity to challenge the constitutionality, authority of the petitioner, present physical immediate confinement custodian Respondent L. J. Oddo, Warden USP Allenwood, PA . Whom is acting unlawfully in clear absence of Congressional authority, and jurisdiction under Title 18 USC § 4042 Bureau of Prisons Duties Statute, and under Title 18 USC § 1111 Federal Second Degree Murder Statute, confining the petitioner, indefinitely in voluntary servitude in federal custody against his will in violation of the Constitution, and the Laws of the United States, unconstitutionally holding the petitioner, to answer for a non-existing capital offense of second degree murder that the petitioner, was not charged by a Federal Grand Jury. In violations of his Human Rights, and Constitutional Right's.

LIST OF PARTIES

All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
<u>Fay v. Noia</u> , 372 US 391 (1963).....	13.
<u>Harris v. Nelson</u> , 394 US 286 (1968).....	11.
<u>Marbury v. Madison</u> , 1 Cranch 137, 175, 2 Led 2ed 60 (1803)...	13.
<u>McQuiggin v. Perkins</u> , 133 S. Ct. 1924 (2013).....	i,4,7,8.
<u>Schulp v. Delo</u> , 513 US 298 (1995).....	i,4,7,8.

STATUTES AND RULES

Title 28 USC § 2241(c)(3) Writ of Habeas Corpus Statute.....	i,iii,4,5,7,8,9,10,11,12, 13.
Title 28 USC § 2255 motion, and § 2255(e)Saving Clause Statute;.....	ii,7,9,10,
Title 18 USC § 4042 Bureau of Prisons Duties Statute....	ii,5,10.
Title 18 USC § 1111 Federal Second Degree murder Statute....	ii,5,10.

OTHER

Universal Human Rights Treaty, Adopted, and proclaimed by the General Assembly resolution 217-A (III), Dec. 10,1948...	ii,ii,8,11,12.
---	----------------

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4 thru 7
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	8 thru 14
CONCLUSION.....	14

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	United States Third Circuit Court of Appeals. August 21, 2018 Judgment Attached hereto marked as Appendix (A).
APPENDIX B	United States District Court For the Middle District of Pennsylvania Judgment April 26, 2018, attached hereto marked as Appendix (B)
APPENDIX C	U.S. Government Count One superseding Indictment, where the Federal Grand Jury did not charge the petitioner Webb-EL, with committing the alleged capital offense of second degree murder. attached hereto marked as Appendix (C)
APPENDIX D	The Universal Human Rights Treaty, Adopted and proclaimed by the General Assembly resolution 217-A (III) Dec. 10, 1948 attached and marked hereto as Appendix (D)
APPENDIX E	
APPENDIX F	

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Petitioner, respectfully prays that a writ of habeas, be issued
to review the judgment below

OPINIONS BELOW

For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

reported at _____; or,
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix B to the petition and is

reported at _____; or,
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished.

For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

reported at _____; or,
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished.

The opinion of the _____ court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

reported at _____; or,
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was August 21, 2018.

No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. A _____.

The petitioner, Webb-EL, hereby invokes this Supreme Court jurisdiction to adjudicate his Petition For A Writ of Habeas Corpus, actual innocence, and illegally confinement claims for relief under the First Judiciary Act of September 24, 1789, ch. 20, § 14, 1 Stat. 82, also, under Title 28 USC § 2106, and pursuant, to Title 28 USC § 2241(c)(3) Writ of Habeas Corpus Statute.

For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was _____. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix _____.

A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. A _____.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.....	iii,4,8,10,13
Eight Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.....	iii,4,8,13.
13th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.....	iii,4,8,13.
Constitution Suspension Clause, Art. 1, § 9, cl. 2, of the Const.....	ii,
Art. III, § 2, of the U.S. Const.....	iii,10,
Frist Judiciary Act of September 24, ch 20 § 14, 1 Stat. 82.....	2

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On or about Feb 17, 2017, the petitioner Keith B. Webb-EL, Title 28 USC § 2241(c)(3) actual innocence writ of habeas corpus petition, into the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania.

Therein pursuant, to the Constitutional mandates of the 5th Amendment which states that No person shall be held to answer for a capital offence, or otherwise infamous crime unless on a presentment or indictment. .."No person shall be deprived life, liberty or property without due process of the law!"

Also, pursuant, to the Supreme Court decisions McQuiggin v. Perkins, 133 . Ct. 1924, 185 L. Ed 2d 1019 (2013); also under Schulp v. Delo 513 US 298, 115. S. Ct. 851, 130 L. Ed 2d 808 (1995).

Where, the petitioner Keith B. Webb-EL, declaraed that he is actual innocence of commtting the U.S. Government purported non-existing capital offense charged of second degree murder that he was not charged by a federal grand jury of committing the unlawful criminal act of second degree murder in Count One of the Government July 16, 1985 superseding indictment in violation of the petitioner, 5th, 8th, and 13th Amend's. Due Process, and Equal Protection of the Law Constitutional Rights.

As a result the petitioner, stated that his present physical immediate Custodian Respondent L. J. Oddo, Warden USP Allenwood is in violation of the Constituition, and the Laws of the United Statues is unlawfully acting in an ultra vires manner in clear absence of any Congressional authorities, and jurisdiction under Title 18 USC § 4042 Bureau of Prisons Duties Statute, and under Title 18 USC § 1111 Federal Second Degree Murder Statute, is unconstitutionally holding the petitioner, answer for, and inflicting cruel, and unusual punishment upon the petitioner, for a alleged capital offense of second degree murder that he was not charged by the federal grand jury in Count One of the Government July 16, 1985 superseding indictment.

In March 20, 2017, the United States District Court Chief Judge Conner, in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, enter a Order into the habeas corpus court record directing the Respondent L. J. Oddo, Warden USP Allenwood to Show Cause, why the petitioner, § 2241(c)(3) writ of habeas corpus petition should not be granted.

On May 26, 2018 the Assistant Attorney Anthony Judge filed into the District Court, in response to petitioner, writ of habeas corpus petition, therein the AUSA Judge failed to file answer to the petitioner actual innocence or illegally confinement claims, and issue's for habeas corpus relief.

On March 13th 2018, the petitioner, filed an Expedited Motion into the district court challenging the constitutionality of the 2255 motion, and § 2255(e) Saving Clause Statute as being interpert, and the Atiterrorism And Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996, as being applied by the Respondent L.J. Oddo, Warden USP Allenwood to have the court dismissed his § 2241(c)(3) actual innocence, and illegally confinement writ of habeas corpus petitioner for relief.

On April 26, the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of pennsylvania enter a Order into the record summary dismissing the petitioner, actaul innocence, and illegally confinement claims, and issue's for habeas corpus relief, without addressing and disposing the petitioner, actual innocence claims, and issue's for relief.

On May 1, 2018, the petitioner Webb-EL, filed into the District Court a Notice of Appeal, that informed the lower court, that he was appealing the District Court Judgment, that dismissed his § 2241 writ of habeas corpus petition to the U.S. Third Circuit Appellate Court.

On May 21, 2018 petitioner, filed into the U.S. Third Circuit Appellate Court a Pro Se Brief that challenge the lower court constitutionalty authorities to dismiss his § 2241 writ of habeas petition withou addressing, and disposing of his actual innocence and illegally confinement claims, and issue's for relief under

the Supreme Court actual innocence and illegally confinement case law authorities that are set forth in the Courts decisions McQuiigin v. Perkins, 133 S. Ct. 1924, 185 L. Ed 2d 1019 (2013); and under Schulp v. Delo, 513 US 298, 115. S. Ct. 851, 130 L. Ed 2d 808 (1995).

And the petititon, befor the U.S. Third Circuit Appellate Court challenge the constitutionality of the lower district court on appeal interpertation and application of the § 2255 motion, and § 2255(e) Saving Clause Statute to dismissing the petitioner, actual innocence, and illegally confinement claims, and issue's for relief under 2241 writ of habeas corpus statute.

On August 21, 2018, the U.S. Third Circuit Court of Appeals dismissed his 2241 actual innocent appeals brief without addressing and disposing of the petitioner, actual innocenec and illegally claims, and issue's for relief.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

The Petitioner Webb-EL, a Moorish-American Citizen Federal prisoner, state herein that his Title 28 USC § 2241(c)(3) Writ of Habeas Corpus paramount public important deprivations of Human Rights, violation pursuant, to Universal Declaration Human Right's Treaty Adopted, and proclaim by the General Assembly resolution 217 A (III) of December 10, 1948 Articles 3 thru 9.

And deprivations of the petitioner, 5th, 8th, and 13th Amendment's Due Process, and Equal Protection of the Law Const. Right's

To have resort to the Title 28 USC § 2241(c)(3) Writ of Habeas Corpus to raise claims of actual innocence, and illegally confinement Federal Constitutional Questions of federal law that should be decided by this Supreme Court.

Also, the petitioner, state herein that his Writ of Habeas Corpus Petition raise exceptional circumstance actual innocence, and illegally confinement claims for habeas relief, that warrants the exercise of this Court discretionary, powers in granting his habeas corpus petition.

Whereas, the petitioner Webb-EL, declares herein that adequate habeas corpus relief cannot be obtain in the lower United States Third Circuit Appellate Court, nor in the lower United States District Court For the Middle District of Pennsylvania.

Where both federal court's, refused/failed to Address, and Dispose of the petitioner, actual innocence, and illegally confinement issue's, and claims for Title 28 USC § 2241(c)(3) writ of habeas corpus .

Where, the petitioner, raised his actual innocence, and illegally claims for relief under the Supreme Court decision McQuiggin v. Perkins, 133 S. Ct. 1924, 185 L. Ed 2d 1019 (2013)

Also, See: Schulp v. Delo, 513 US 298 S. Ct. 851, 130 L. Ed 2d 808 (1995) Which mandated the United States Third Circuit Appellate Court, and the United States District Court For the Middle District of Pennsylvania, to have Addressed, and Dispose of the petitioner, actual innocence, and illegally confinement issue's, and claims for § 2241(c)(3) for habeas relief.

The petitioner, Webb-EL, a mentally ill Moorish-American Citizen federal prisoner, and any other State or federal prisoner, American Citizen that are incarcerated under similar circumstance.

Argues, and contends herein before, this U.S. Supreme Court, that Federal Statute under Title 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion, and under § 2255(e) Saving Clause.

Is unconstitutional in the manner the United States Appellate Court For the Thrid Circuit, and the United States District Court For the Middle District of Pennsylvania, applied, and construed the above mention described § 2255 motion federal statute.

As an procedural bar rule to arbitrary deprived the petitioner, of his Human Right's, and Constitutional Right's to obtain § 2241(c)(3) federal habeas corpus review of his actual innocence and illegally confinement claims for habeas relief.

Whereas, the petitioner Webb-El, declares herein that neither the U.S. Constitution, nor the Laws of the United States confered no judicial authority on the U.S. Third Circuit Appellate Court, or the U.S. District Court For the Middle District of Pennsylvain to recharacterized the petitioner, 28 USC § 2241(c)(3) writ of habeas corpus, to be an 28 USC § 2255 motion, and § 2255(e) Saving Clause Statute to leave in place the petitioner,

indefinite confinement in voluntary servitude against his will in federal custody in the territorial jurisdiction of the United States, where the petitioner, is being held in violation of the Constitution, and the Laws of the United States, to answer for, and being subjected to cruel, and unusual punishment for an alleged capital offense of second degree murder, that he was not charged by a Federal Grand Jury In Count One of the U.S. Government July 16, 1985 superseding indictment.

Which has resulted in the petitioner, being unconstitutionally deprived of his Human Right's, and Constitutional Right's to have been afforded a full, and fair meaningful plenary habeas corpus adjudication process of his actual innocence, and illegally confinement claims for relief before a neutral Article III Judge decision maker.

Also, the petitioner Webb-El, argues, and contends herein the United States Third Circuit Court of Appeals, and the United States District Court For the Middle District of Pennsylvania recharacterized of the petitioner § 2241(c)(3) Writ of Habeas Corpus to be a § 2255 motion, and under the § 2255(e) Saving Clause.

Deprived the petitioner of his Human Rights, and 5th Amendment Due Process, and Equal Protection of the Law Cons. Right's to have afforded the opportunity to challenge the constitutionality of the petitioner, immediate confinement custodian Respondent L.J. Oddo, Warden, USP Allenwood, PA

authority to unlawfully act in clear absence of Congressional authority, and jurisdiction under Title 18 USC § 4042 Bureau of Prison Duties Statute, and under Title 18 USC § 1111 Federal Second Degree Murder Statute. To confine the petitioner Webb-EL indefinite in voluntary servitude against his will in violation of the Constitution, and the Laws of the United States,

Unconstitutionally holding the petitioner Webb-EL, to answer for, and inflicting cruel, and unusual punishment upon the petitioner, for an non-existing capital offense of second degree murder, that the petitioner, was not charged by an Federal Grand Jury in the U.S. Government July 16 1985, superseding indictment.

Which violated the petitioner, Human Right's, and 5th Amend. Due process, and Equal Protection of the Law Const. Right's to resort to the § 2241(c)(3) Writ of Habeas Corpus Statute to raise claims, and issue's of actual innocence, and illegally confinement.

The petitioner, respectfully moves this Honorable Supreme Court, to pursuant, to Fed. R. Civ. Pro. Rule 201 To Take Judicial Notice of the Fact. That in the well establish federal law that has been determine by this Court decision in Harris v. Nelson, 394 US 286 (1968). The Supreme Court held..."There being no higher duty of a court, under our constitutional system, than the careful processing and adjudication of petitions for writ of habeas corpus, the powers of inquiry on federal habeas corpus is plenary, and petitioners in habeas corpus proceeding are entitle to full opportunity for presentation of relevant's."

Moreover, the petitioner, argue, and contends before this Supreme Court, that U.S. Third Circuit Appellate Court, and the U.S. District Court For the Middle District of Pennsylvania unlawful recharacterization of his § 2241(c)(3) Writ of Habeas Corpus Petition, to be an § 2255 motion, and under the § 2255(e) Saving Clause. Thereby afterwards leaving the petitioner, confinement in place upon a capital offense of second degree murder, he was not charged by a Federal Grand Jury, violated his Human Right's pursuant to, the Universal Declaration Human Right's Treaty Adopted, and proclaimed by the General Assembly resolution 217 A (III) of Dec. 1948.

Violated the petitioner, Human Rights under Art. 3. Whcih clearly states to wit: "Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person."

Violated the petitioner Webb-EL, Human Rights, under Article 4. Which states to wit: ..."No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all forms.

Violated the petitioner, Human Rights, under Article 5. Which state to wit:..."No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment."

Violated the petitioner, Human Rights under Article 6. Which state to wit:...."Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law."

Violated the petitioner, Human Rights, under Article 7. Which state to wit:...."All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination."

Violated the petitioner, Human Rights, under Article 8. Which states to wit:..."Everyone has the right to an effective remedy by the competent national tribunals for acts violating the fundamental rights granted him by the constitution or by law."

Violated the petitioner, Human Rights under Article 9. Which states to wit: ..."No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile."

Also, the petitioner Webb-EL, argues, and contends herein; that his actual innocence, and illegally confinement claims for habeas corpus relief under § 2241(c)(3). Raised *prima facie showing/evidence* that demonstrated before both lower federal courts. That it is more likely than not, that no reasonable trial jury would have found the petitioner, guilty of second degree murder. If the trial jury would have known of the petitioner, Newly Discovered Evidence, that the Petitioner Keith B. Webb-EL, was not charged by the Federal Grand Jury, of committing the alleged unlawful criminal conduct capital offense of second degree murder.

That there is a reasonable doubt that no trial jury would have not founded the petitioner Webb-EL, guilty of of committe of committing the non-existing capital offense charge of second degreee murder.

See: Fay v. Noia, 372 US 391 (1963) Where the Supreme Court, held..
.."When a man is brought by Habeas Corpus to the Court, and upon return of it, it appears to the Court, that he was against Law imrison'd and detain'd...he shall never be by the Act of the Court remanded to his unlawful imprisonment, for then the Court should do an act of injustice in imprisoning him, de novo, against Law whereas the great Charter is, Qudo nulls libet homo imprisoneture nisi per legem terrae; This the present case, and this was the case, and this was the case upon all the Presidents (precedents) produc'd and many more that might be produc'd, where upon Habeas Corpus, many have been discarg'd."

The petitioner Webb-EL, declare herein before, this Supreme Court, that his present immediate confinement custodian Respondent L.J. Oddo, Warden USP Allenwood, PA continue confinement of the petitioner, for a non-existing capital offense of second degree, of which he was not charge by a Federal Grand Jury. In violation of his Human Right's, and 5th, 8th, and 13th Amendment's Const. Right's.

With no avaiable resource to the petitioner, under § 2241(c)(3) i Writ of Habeas Corpus Statute would result in an denial of the petitioner's due process, and equal protection of the Law Right's resulting in a competent miscarriage of justice, that is contaray to the Constitution and Laws of the United States of America.

Hence, the petitioner, states herein that pursuant, to the Supreme Court decision in Marbury v. Madison, 1 Cranch 137, 175, 2 L Ed 60 Where the Supreme Court held.."It is emphatically the judicial duties and the province of the Court to say what is the law."

See: Stone v. Powell, 428 US 465, 49 L Ed 2d 1067, 96 S Ct 3037 (1976. Where the Supreme Court held.."State courts, like federal courts, have a constitutional obligation to safeguard personal liberties and to uphold federal law."

Verification:

I, Keith B. Webb-EL hereby verify that every statements and allegations I, have made herein is true, and correct to the best of my knowledge, and being made under the penalty of perjury under Title § 1746, on this day 18th month March Year 2019. Keith B. Webb-EL

CONCLUSION

The petitioner WebbEL, so, prays that this most Honorable Supreme Court, shall grant his Writ of Habeas Corpus Petition. And to enter an ORDER directing the petitioner Webb-EL, present physical Confinement Custodian L.J. Oddo, Warden USP Allenwood,PA to release the petitioner, k forwith from its unconstitutionally imposed confinememnt.

Respectfully submitted,

Keith Bryan Webb-EL
Keith Bryan Webb-EL,
Pro se
Reg No. # 19665-080
USP Florence-High
P.O. Box 7000
Florence, CO 81226
Dated March 18th 2019