NO 20-719

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

DON A WEBSTER, PETITIONER

V

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. RESPONDENT

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI FROM
THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

DON A. WEBSTER. PRO SE
FCI SHERIDAN
PO BOX 5000 UNIT 1A
SHERIDAN OREGON 97378

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

(1) DOES RACIAL BIAS DISPORPORTIONALLY AFFECT THE FEDERAL COURTS TREATMENT OF MARGINALIZED PEOPLE OF COLOR, WHEN ADDRESSING THE INTERNATIONAL TREATY ASPECT OF 18 U.S.C. § 1591 IN RELATION TO THE PURELY LOCAL CRIMINAL CONDUCT OF PROSTITUTION?

(2) IS IT A MATTER OF NATIONAL IMPORTANCE AND CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATION WHEN THE NINTH CIRCUIT PROCEDURALLY REFUSES TO ADDRESS ALL ISSUES RAISED CONCERNING 18 U.S.C. § 1591, BECAUSE OF ITS INHERENT NATURE TO DISPORPORTIONATELY AFFECT AND RACIALLY DISCRIMINATE AGAINST BLACK AMERICANS?

(3) IS IT AN ISSUE OF NATIONAL IMPORTANCE WHERE ALL CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FAIL TO APPLY THE RELEVANT LAW CHANGE TO ALL CASES INVOLVING THE FEDERAL CRIMINAL STATUTE THAT IS PART OF A TREATY, 18 U.S.C. § 1591? DOES THOSE DECISIONS DEPART FROM THE EXPECTED AND USUAL COURSE OF JUDICIAL PROCEEDING WHERE A LAW WAS UNSETTLED AT TRIAL BUT BECAME SETTLED ON DIRECT REVIEW?

(4) CAN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH'S POWER TO MAKE TREATIES AND THE 106th CONGRESS'S POWER UNDER ART. I. (U.S. CONST.), REGULATE PURELY LOCAL CRIMINAL CONDUCT? DOES THAT LACK OF RESTRAINT ON THE TREATY POWER CONFLICK WITH THE 58th THRU 98th CONGRESS'S LIMITED REACH OF THE EXCUTIVE'S TREATY POWER?

LIST OF PARTIES.

ALL PARTIES APPEAR IN THE CAPTION OF THE CASE ON THE COVER PAGE.

RELATED CASES.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INDEX TO APPENDICES

TABLE OF AUTHORITES CITED

SUPREME COURT CASES:

CIRCUIT COURT CASES:

US v MARCUS 538 F3d 97 (CA2 2009)
US v TODD 627 F3d 329 (CA9 2010)
US v YUNIS 681 FED. SUPP. 896 (1988)

STATUTES AND RULES:

18 U.S.C. § 31
18 U.S.C. § 32
18 U.S.C. § 229
18 U.S.C. § 1591
22 U.S.C. § 7101 (a) AND (b)(24)
22 U.S.C. § 7107 (b)(22)
28 U.S.C. § 453
49 U.S.C. § 1301
FED. R. CRIM. P. 52 (b)

OTHER:

BLOOMBERG CRIMINAL LAW REPORTER (VOL 95, No 10)(6/4/14)
58th CONGRESS
98th CONGRESS
105th CONGRESS
106th CONGRESS

AIRCRAFT PIRACY ACT OF 1984

CHEMICAL WEAPON IMPLEMENTATION ACT OF 1998

DESTRUCTION OF AIRCRAFT ACT OF 1984

FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

HOSTAGE TAKING ACT OF 1984

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

PETITIONER RESPECTFULLY PRAYS THAT A WRIT OF CERTIORARI ISSUE TO REVIEW THE JUDGEMENT BELOW.

OPINIONS BELOW

ALL CASES ARE FROM FEDERAL COURTS:

US V. WEBSTER 2011 US APP LEXIS 26438 (9th CIR JULY 27 2011) UNPUB.

WEBSTER V US 566 US 1016, 132 S.Ct. 2475, 182 L.Ed.2d 1073. (CERT DENIED 2012)

WEBSTER V US 574 US 918, 135 S.Ct. 307, 190 L.Ed.2d 223 (CERT DENIED 2014)

WEBSTER V FLOWERS 2016 US DIST LEXIS 153486 (9th CIR AUG 16, 2016)

WEBSTER V FLOWERS 2016 US DIST LEXIS 153096 (9th CIR NOV 4, 2016)

WEBSTER V FLOWERS 2017 US APP LEXIS 27195 (CA9 APRIL 14, 2017)

WEBSTER V US 2019 US APP LEXIS 11550 (CA9 APRIL 19, 2019)

JURISDICTION

THE DATE ON WHICH THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS DECIDED MY CASE WAS.

BECAUSE OF THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC PETITIONER BEGS LEAVE TO FILE HIS WRIT BEYOND THE PERMITTED 90 DAY FILING PERIOD IN RULE 13.1; 13.3. AS PETITIONER IS IN PRISON, AND THE PRISON HAS BEEN ON LOCKDOWN DUE TO THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC, RESTRICTING HIS ACCESS TO THE LAW LIBRARY, TYPE WRITER, AND PHOTO COPIERS.

THE JURISDICTION OF THIS COURT IS INVOKED UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1)

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

US CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT ONE
US CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT EIGHT
US CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT TEN
US CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT FOURTEEN

STATEMENT OF THE FACTS

IN OCTOBER 2006 PETITIONER WAS INDICTED ON MONEY LAUNDRYING, PUBLIC CORRUPTION, WIRE FRAUD AND POSSESSION WITH INTENT TO DISTRIBUTE.

ON DECEMBER 22, 2006 THE GOVERNMENT BROUGHT A SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT CONTAINING 11 COUNTS OF 18 U.S.C. § 1591 (SEX TRAFFICKING) AND 16 COUNTS OF DRUG RELATED OFFENSES.

ON JULY 26, 2007, THE GOVERNMENT AGAIN BROUGHT A SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT WITH 9 ADDITIONAL COUNTS.

IN FEBRUARY 2008 PETITIONER WAS CONVICTED BY JURY TRIAL ON 11 COUNTS OF 18 U.S.C. § 1591 AND 16 COUNTS OF DRUG RELATED OFFENSES.

IN 2009 PETITIONERS DIRECT APPEAL WAS STAYED PENDING THE OUTCOME OF TWO OTHER § 1591 CASES.

ON JULY 27, 2011 PETITIONER APPEALED HIS CONVICTION TO THE NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

ON NOVEMBER 28, 2011 PETITIONERS SENTENCE WAS AFFIRMED

ON JANUARY 17, 2012 AN EN BANC HEARING WAS DECIDED.

ON APRIL 7, 2012 WRIT OF CERTIORARI WAS DENIED.

ON JUNE 19, 2012 PETITIONER FILED A PRO SE 28 U.S.C. § 2255

ON NOVEMBER 27, 2013 THE NINTH CIRCUIT COURT AFFIRMED HIS CONVICTION AND DENIED PETITIONERS REQUEST FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY (C.O.A.)

ON APRIL 28, 2014 MR WEBSTER'S APPEAL WAS DENIED.

ON JUNE 6, 2014 PETITIONER FILED HIS SECOND WRIT OF CERTIORARI

ON OCTOBER 13 2014 WRIT OF CERTIORARI WAS DENIED.

ON JUNE 4, 2015 PETITIONER FILED A 28 U.S.C. § 2241 IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF OREGON.

NOVEMBER 2016 APPEAL WAS DENIED.

ON OCTOBER 24, 2017 PETITIONER HAD RESTITUTIONAL ISSUE WITH THE U.S. ATTORNEY IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF ANCHORAGE ALASKA.

DECEMBER OF 2018 PETITIONER FILED A SECOND AND SUCCESSIVE PETITION TO THE NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

ON MAY 6, 2019 PETITIONER FILED A MOTION TO RECONSIDER

ON MAY 14, 2019 THE COURT DENIED HIS SECOND AND SUCCESSIVE PETITION.

IN APRIL OF 2020 PETITIONER FILED A WRIT OF MANDAMUS IN THE NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS.

ON MAY 20, 2020 THE COURT DENIED PETITIONERS MOTION TO RECALL OR AMEND.

ON MAY 21, 2021 THE COURT DENIED PETITIONERS WRIT OF MANDAMUS.

REASON FOR GRANTING THE PETITION.

1) DOES RACIAL BIAS DISPROPORTIONALLY AFFECT THE FEDERAL COURTS TREATMENT OF MARGINALIZED PEOPLE OF COLOR, WHEN ADDRESSING THE INTERNATIONAL TREATY ASPECT OF 18 U.S.C. § 1591 IN RELATION TO THE PURELY LOCAL CRIMINAL CONDUCT OF PROSTITUTION?

THIS QUESTION SHOULD BE HEARD BECAUSE IT NOT ONLY IMPLICATES THE CONSTITUTION RIGHTS OF AFRICAN AMERICAN MEN, BUT ALSO THE PRESIDENTS INTERNATIONAL TREATY POWER.

THE FAILURE OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE GOVERNMENTS COMPLETE FAILURE TO ADDRESS MR WEBSTERS CLAIM THAT..." THE DOMESTIC AND LOCAL ENFORCEMENT OF THE TRAFFICKING VICTIMS PROTECTION ACT OF 2000 (TVPA) CRIMINAL STATUTE 18 U.S.C. § 1591 AGAINST PURELY LOCAL INTRASTATE CRIMINAL CONDUCT, (ie. PROSTITUTION) IS AN ABUSE OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH'S POWER TO MAKE TREATIES, AND IT SEVERELY DEPARTS FROM THE ACCEPTED

JURISDICTIONAL LIMITATION PLACED ON OTHER TREATY ENACTED CRIMINAL STATUTES LEGISLATED BY PAST CONGRESS'" CLEARLY MAKING IT CONTRARY TO, OR CONSTITUTING AN UNREASONABLE APPLICATION OF CLEARLY ESTABLISHED FEDERAL LAW, AS WELL AS DENYING THE PETITIONER HIS FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO PETITION THE GOVERNMENT FOR REDRESS OF HIS GRIEVANCES, THE TENTH AMENDMENT BALANCE OF POWER BETWEEN LOCAL AND NATIONAL GOVERNMENTS, AND HIS FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS, WHICH GUARANTEES MORE THAN A FAIR PROCESS AND EXTENDS TO A SUBSTANTIVE SPHERE AS WELL, BARRING CERTAIN GOVERNMENT ACTIONS REGARDLESS OF THE FAIRNESS OF THE PROCEDURES USED TO IMPLEMENT THEM. SEE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO V LEWIS 523 US 833, 844, 118 S.Ct. 1708, 140 L.Ed.2d 1043 (1998)

THE TOUCHSTONE OF DUE PROCESS IS PROTECTION OF THE INDIVIDUAL AGAINST ARBITRARY ACTIONS OF GOVERNMENT. WOLF V MCDONNELL 418 US 539, 558, 94 S.Ct. 2963, 41 L.Ed.2d 935 (1974)

ON THE OTHER HAND, HAD THE NINTH CIRCUIT SIMPLY REVIEWED MR WEBSTER'S CLAIM --- IN THE CONTEXT OF "WHETHER THE 'TREATY ASPECT' OF SECTION 1591, ON ITS OWN MERITS, COULD REGULATE THE PURELY LOCAL AND DOMESTIC INTRASTATE CRIMINAL CONDUCT

OF AN 'AMERICAN CITIZEN ON AMERICAN SOIL'" IT WOULD HAVE REALIZED THAT PETITIONER HAD PRESENTED AN -AS APPLIED- CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGE TO THE APLICATION OF THE PRESIDENTS INTERNATIONAL TREATY POWER IN SECTION 1591 TO THE LOCAL DOMESTIC AND INTRASTATE CRIME OF PROSTITUTION - INVOLVING ONLY LOCAL AMERICAN CITIZENS, ie NO FOREIGN ALLEGED VICTIMS OR PARTICIPANTS. SEE US V WEBSTER §2255 CASE No 3:06-cr-0096-HRH. (6/19/12); US V WEBSTER §2241 CASE No. 3:15-cv-00953-CL (6/4/15); BOND V US 134 S.Ct. 2077, 189 L.Ed.2d 1,3, 2014 U.S. LEXIS 3988 (2014); US V WEBSTER WRIT OF MANDAMUS CASE No 08-30311. IN WHICH THE COURT OF APPEALS DENIED THE WRIT, FAILED TO ANSWER MR WEBSTERS REQUEST FOR REDRESS ON THIS VERY IMPORTANT CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUE, AND ERRED WHEN IT FAIL TO ORDER THE DISTRICT COURT OF ALASKA TO FULLY ADDRESS THIS ISSUE. AND IT ERR WHEN IT DENIED THE MOTION TO RECALL OR AMEND IS MANDATE.

SO THE QUESTION AT ISSUE HERE IS:

HOW DOES THE PURELY LOCAL INTRASTATE AND DOMESTIC PETTY CRIME OF PANDERING AND PROSTITUTION RISE TO THE LEVEL OF AN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZED CRIME OF WHITE SLAVERY SIMPLY BECAUSE "DATES" ARE ARRANGED USING

A CELL PHONE?

THE GOVERNMENTS INTERPRETATION OF § 1591 WOULD MAKE ALL SMALL TIME PIMPS WITH 2 OR 3 PROSTITUTES INTO INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL ORGANIZATIONS EVEN THOUGH ALL PARTICIPANTS WERE LOCAL AMERICAN CITIZENS.

CONGRESS SURELY NEVER INTENDED THAT THIS ONE STATUTE, ENACTED IN A CHAPTER OF INTERNATIONAL TREATY LAW PROHIBITING THE TRAFFICKING IN KIDNAPPED GIRLS AND WOMEN USE AS SEX SLAVES, TO ALSO ENCOMPASS AND PROHIBIT PURELY DOMESTIC PANDERING, PIMPING, AND PROSTITUTION BETWEEN AMERICAN CITIZENS ON AN INTRASTATE AND LOCAL LEVEL.

SO HOW IS IT THAT ALL THESE BLACK AMERICAN CITIZENS WHO ARE COMMITTING THE LOCAL PETTY CRIME OF PANDERING ON AN INTRASTATE LEVEL ARE FILLING FEDERAL PRISONS CHARGED WITH AN INTERNATIONAL TREATY LAW? THE PERCENTAGE OF BLACK AMERICANS CHARGED WITH § 1591 IS INAPROPORTIONATE TO WHITE AMERICAN MEN.

MOREOVER, THE GOVERNMENTS INTERPRETATION OBLITERATES THE CAREFUL LINES CONGRESS HAS DRAWN THROUGHOUT CHAPTER 44 AND PROVIDED FOR ALL OF THE STATUTES CONCERNING PEONAGE AND SLAVERY IN CHAPTER 44, INSTEAD THE GOVERNMENT ASKS THE COURTS NATIONWIDE TO OVERLOOK THE OBVIOUS READING

OF THE STATUTES OF CHAPTER 44 IN FAVOR OF ITS STRAINED READING IN WHICH THEY ATTEMPT TO INSERT THEIR SKEWED INTERPRETATION OF THE TEXT TO CAUSE IT TO REACH THE INTRASTATE, DOMESTIC ACTIONS AND CONDUCT OF BLACK AMERICAN CITIZENS PANDERING TO OTHER LOCAL AMERICAN CITIZENS, WHICH IS NOT CLEARLY PROHIBITED ON THE FACE OF THE STATUTE.

THE GOVERNMENT CLAIMS THAT IF CELL PHONES ARE USED TO ARRANGE THE DATES OF LOCAL PROSTITUTES THAT MAKES PROSTITUTION A FEDERAL GOVERNMENT INTEREST OF AN INTERNATIONAL LEVEL.

THE PLAIN LANGUAGE OF CHAPTER 44 DIRECTLY CONTRADICTS THIS OVER BROAD INTERPRETATION OF CONGRESS' INTENTION OF PROHIBITING THE KIDNAPPING AND OWNING OF WOMEN AND GIRLS TO BE FORCEFULLY COERCED INTO COMMERCIAL SEX ACTS. IT SAYS NOTHING ABOUT LOCAL AND DOMESTIC PETTY CRIMINALS WHO KNOWINGLY AND FREELY CHOOSING TO PROSTITUTE THEMSELVES AND WHO HIRE A PIMP TO PANDER FOR THEM.

THIS USE OF THE PRESIDENTS INTERNATIONAL TREATY POWER TO PROSECUTE LOCAL PETTY CRIMINALS IS OVER-REACH AND A VIOLATION OF THE TENTH AMENDMENT AND DISPROPORTIONATELY PURSUING BLACK AMERICAN MEN WITH THIS STATUTE IS DISCRIMINARY, RACIST,

AND VIOLATES THE EQUAL PROTECTION CLAUSE OF THE EIGHT AMENDMENT - PETITIONER IS 14 YEARS INTO A 30 YEAR SENTENCE FOR VIOLATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL TREATY LAW FOR THE CRIME OF PANDERING TO AMERICAN CITIZENS WHO WERE FREE TO COME AND GO, BUT CHOSE TO BE PROSTITUTES AND HIRED PETITIONER TO PANDER FOR THEM. - A LOCAL, INTRASTATE, DOMESTIC CRIME. - BUT NO COURT IN THE NINTH CIRCUIT WILL TAKE THE TIME TO CONSIDER PETITIONERS QUESTION, IS THE PRESIDENTS INTERNATIONAL TREATY POWER APPLICABLE TO DOMESTIC PETTY CRIME ABSENT A FOREIGN NEXUS?

IN 2012, PETITIONER PRESENTED AN "ACTUAL INNOCENCE" CLAIM TO THE DISTRICT COURT OF ALASKA, THE ISSUE RAISED WAS THE CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION REGARDING THE DOMESTIC ENFORCEMENT OF CHAPTER 44, SECTION 1591, AS AN ISSUE OF NATIONAL IMPORTANCE.

THE CLAIM STATED THAT THE "AS APPLIED" SECTION OF 1591 COULD NOT BE CONSTITUTIONALLY APPLIED TO "PURELY LOCAL CRIMINAL CONDUCT, ABSENT AN OBVIOUS FOREIGN NEXUS." RELYING UPON THE FACT OF LAW, THAT THE TVPA AND SECTION 1591 WERE BOTH FOREIGN POLICY LEGISLATION ENACTED BY CONGRESS, AND THAT MY CONDUCT WAS COMPLETELY VOID OF ANY LEGITIMATE NEXUS TO INTERNATIONAL OR FOREIGN CONCERNS.

THE COURT COMPLETELY FAILED TO ADDRESS THIS ISSUE ON ITS MERITS AND FOCUSED ENTIRELY UPON OTHER UNRELATED ISSUES.

PETITIONERS CLAIM WAS DENIED BY THE COURT ON THE BASIS THAT PETITIONER HAD NOT PROPERLY PRESENTED AN "ACTUAL INNOCENCE" CLAIM. SEE US V WEBSTER § 2255 CASE NO 3:06-CR-00096 HRH (9/19/13)

THIS PROCESS PLAYED OUT AND WAS REPEATED THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE APPEAL PROCESS, WITH THE QUESTION NEVER BEING ADDRESSED OR WEIGHED ON ITS MERITS DENYING ME MY FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO REDRESS OF MY GREIVANCES AND RECENTLY CONCLUDED WITH THE DENIAL OF MY WRIT OR MANDAMUS, AND MOTION TO RECALL OR AMEND THE MANDATE. CASE NO. 20-71342

THEREFORE, THIS COURT HOPEFULLY WILL ADDRESS THIS ISSUE, AS THE CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION CONCERNING THE FULL EXTENT AND LIMITS OF THE PRESIDENTS TREATY POWER MUST BE ADDRESSED AS IT IS AN ISSUE OF INTERNATIONAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL IMPORTANCE, AND BECAUSE IT LEAVES UNSETTLED THE CONSTITUTIONAL DISTINCTION BETWEEN LOCAL, NATIONAL AND FOREIGN POWER AND THE DOMESTIC APPLICATION OF ITS ENFORCEMENT ON PURELY LOCAL, INTRASTATE CONDUCT.

AS THE SUPREME COURT STATED IN THE BOND

CASE:

"THE PRESERVATION OF LIMITS ON THE TREATY POWER IS NEVERTHELESS A MATTER OF FUNDAMENTAL CONSTITUTIONAL IMPORTANCE, AND THE COURT OUGHT TO ADDRESS THE SCOPE OF THE TREATY POWER WHEN THE ISSUE IS PRESENTED."

THIS CASE IS A MATTER OF FUNDAMENTAL CONSTITUTIONAL IMPORTANCE AND A MATTER OF FIRST IMPRESSION BECAUSE OF THE NEWNESS OF 18 U.S.C. § 1591, NO COURT HAS BEEN CALLED UPON TO ADDRESS AND ANALIZE THE "UNLIMITED SCOPE, AND RACIAL IMPACT" OF ITS "TREATY ASPECT" WHEN ENFORCED ON DOMESTIC SOIL AGAINST PREDOMINATELY BLACK AMERICANS, WHICH CONFLICTS WITH PRIOR CONGRESSIONAL LEGISLATION "LIMITING THE SCOPE AND REACH OF TREATY ENACTED CRIMINAL STATUTES."

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS WEAPONIZED SECTON 1591, TO A ONE SIZE FITS ALL JURISDICTIONAL FEDERAL CRIMINAL STATUTE TO THE CONSTITUTIONS FIFTH, EIGHTH, AND TENTH AMENDMENTS AND FOCUSED THE NEW POWERFUL WEAPON PRIMARILY ON BLACK AMERICAN CITIZENS.

IS IT A MATTER OF NATIONAL IMPORTANCE AND CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATION WHEN THE NINTH CIRCUIT PROCEDURELY REFUSES TO ADDRESS ALL ISSUES RAISED CONCERNING 18 U.S.C. § 1591, BECAUSE OF ITS INHERENT NATURE TO DISPROPORTIONATELY AFFECT AND RACIALLY DISCRIMINATE AGAINST BLACK AMERICANS?

PETITIONER CONTENDS THAT HE IS A BLACK AMERICAN CITIZEN BEING UNCONSTITUTIONALLY HELD TO ANSWER FOR "A VIOLATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL TREATY" UNDER "THE LAW OF NATIONS AND/OR INTERNATIONAL LAW" FOR HIS "PURELY INTRASTATE DOMESTIC CONDUCT," SIMPLY BECAUSE OF THE DISCRIMINARY BIAS THAT EXISTS IN THE ENTIRE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM AGAINST BLACK AMERICAN MEN. THIS RACIAL PREJUDICE PERMEATES THE ENTIRE SYSTEM TO SOME DEGREE TO INCLUDE PETITIONERS DEFENSE COUNSEL, THE GOVERNMENT ATTORNEYS OFFICE, THE CIRCUIT COURTS, ALL THE WAY TO SOME MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.

ALL OF WHICH HAVE FAILED TO ADDRESS THE FULL CONSTITUTIONAL EXTENT TO WHICH SECTION 1591 IS BEING APPLIED BEYOND CONGRESS' INTENTIONS WHEN THEY DRAFTED AND ENACTED CHAPTER 44 TO PROHIBIT WHITE SLAVERY.

THE ASSUMED REASON FOR THIS DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE IS PRIMARILY BECAUSE THE TARGETED GROUP FOR PROSECUTION UNDER THE SEX TRAFFICKING STATUTE ARE NOT WEALTHY WHITE AMERICANS BUT RATHER POOR BLACK AMERICAN MEN, AND UNFORTUNATELY IN THIS CONTEXT, THE TERM "PIMP" IS SYNONOMUS WITH THE TERM "BLACK MAN." SEE REASON MAGIZINE (VOL. 47, NO 6 - NOV 2015 PUB.) ARTICAL "THE WAR ON SEX TRAFFICKING IS THE NEW WAR ON DRUGS" by ELIZABEATH NOLAN BROWN, STAFF EDITOR.

MS BROWN REFERRENCED THE TERM "PIMP" FOUR TIMES IN THE ARTICLE'S SUBSECTION TITLED "WILLFUL HYPERBOLE." HER USAGES OF THE STEREOTYPICAL LANGUAGE THAT IS CATEGORICALLY RESERVED FOR DESCRIBING TYPICAL DIALOG WITHIN AFRICAN AMERICAN CULTURE AND COMMUNITIES, HIGHLIGHTS HER OBJECTIVE - TO MAKE OBVIOUS THE FACT - THAT BLACK MEN ARE EFFECTED DISPROPORTIONALLY MORE THAN ANY OTHER RACE BY THE WAR ON SEX TRAFFICKING.

MS BROWN REFERS TO THE DOG WHISTLE LANGUAGE OF THE "WAR ON CRACK" WHEN SHE REPORTS THAT " WE PASS LAWS MANDATING MORE PRISON TIME FOR PIMPS." WHICH IN THE GENERAL SCHEME OF THINGS COULD SIMPLY BE TRANSLATED AS " MORE TIME FOR BLACKS." SEE APPENDIX A

CAN THE EXECUTIVE'S BRANCH POWER TO MAKE TREATIES AND THE 106th CONGRESS'S POWER UNDER ART. I. (U.S. CONST.), REGULATE PURELY LOCAL CRIMINAL CONDUCT? DOES THAT LACK OF RESTRAINT ON THE TREATY POWER CONFLICT WITH THE 58th THRU 98th CONGRESS'S LIMITED REACH OF THE EX-EXECUTIVE'S TREATY POWER?

ABSENT A NEXUS TO FOREIGN AFFAIRS THE "TREATY ASPECT OF §1591" IS INSUFFICIENT AS A SOURCE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENTS POWER TO REGULATE PETITIONERS "PURELY INTRASTATE DOMESTIC CONDUCT."

MR. WEBSTER HAS CONTINUALLY ASSERTED WITHIN NUMEROUS HABEAS CORPUS PETITIONS THAT "ABSENT A LEGITIMATE NEXUS" TO A FOREIGN ELEMENT THAT COULD BRING HIS OTHERWISE DOMESTIC CONDUCT WITHIN THE DOMAIN OF THE PRESIDENT'S INTERNATIONAL TREATY POWER TO REGULATE, ENFORCING §1591 AGAINST HIM FOR SIMPLE PANDERING TO PROSTITUTES WHO ARE AMERICAN CITIZENS AND WILLING PARTICIPANCE, IS AN ABUSE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENTS POWER TO MAKE TREATIES.

IN SUPPORT OF HIS POSITION MR WEBSTER HAS POINTED TO RECENT SUPREME COURT PRECEDENT THAT SPECIFICALLY ADDRESSES THE CONSTITUTIONAL DISTINTION BETWEEN DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN POWER:

> "... TO INTERPRET THE TREATY POWER AS EXTENDING TO EVERY CONCEIVABLE DOMESTIC MATTER - EVEN MATTERS WITHOUT ANY NEXUS TO FOREIGN RELATIONS - WOULD DESTROY THE BASIC CONSTITUTIONAL DISTINCTION BETWEEN DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN POWERS."

SEE BOND V US 134 S.Ct. 2077, 2103, 189 L.Ed.2d. 1: 2014 U.S. LEXIS 3988; AMENDMENT 10

SIMULARY, IN THE BLOOMBERG CRIMINAL LAW REPORTER (BNA), PUB. VOL. 95, NO 10 (JUNE 4, 2014) UNDER SUBTITLE "CONCURRENCE URGED BROADER RULING." MR JUSTIC SCALIA STATES:

> "THE TREATY POWER DOES NOT GIVE CONGRESS THE AUTHORITY TO ENACT IMPLEMENTING STATUTE(S) THAT GO FAR BEYOND THE SCOPE OF CONGRESS' OTHER ENUMERATED

POWERS UNDER ARTICAL 1. IF THAT WERE THE CASE, THE POSSIBILITY FOR EXPANTION OF FEDERAL POWER WOULD BE ENDLESS... JUST AS LONG AS THERE WAS A TREATY ON POINT."

MR JUSTICE THOMAS, Co, ARGUED IN HIS CONCURRENCE THAT:

"THE TREATY POWER EXTENDS ONLY TO 'MATTERS OF INTERNATIONAL INTERCOURSE' AND NOT TO MATTERS THAT ARE PURELY DOMESTIC."

MR JUSTICE ALITO, S, ECHOED THIS POINT IN HIM CONCURRENCE STATING:

"THE TREATY POWER IS LIMITED TO --- MATTERS OR LEGITIMATE INTERNATIONAL CONCERN."

THE SUPREME COURT STATED IN US V CURTISS-WRIGHT EXP CORP. 299 US 304, 319, 57 S.Ct. 216, 81 L.Ed. 255 (1936)

"THE COURT DEFINES THAT 'THE FEDERAL POWER OVER EXTERNAL AFFAIRS IN ORIGIN AND ESSENTIAL CHARACTOR DIFFERENT FROM THAT OVER INTERNAL AFFAIRS ..."
BOND SUPRA AT 2103.

THERE IS NO CLEAR CUT RULING BY ANY UNITED STATES COURT THAT DISPUTES THE FACTS THAT THERE ARE STRICT JURISDICTIONAL LIMITATIONS ON THE PRESIDENTS TREATY POWER.

HOWEVER AS LONG AS THE COURTS CONTINUE TO AVOID ADDRESSING PETITIONERS QUESTION REGARDING THE "TREATY ASPECT" OF SECTION 1591 OF CHAPTER 44, THE LONGER MARGINALIZED PEOPLE OF COLOR WILL SUFFER UNDER, AND BE SUBJECTED TO THIS WEAPONIZED VERSION OF 18 U.S.C. § 1591, WIELDED BY THE RACIALLY BIASED FEDERAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM, PROSECUTING BLACK AMERICANS UNDER INTERNATIONAL ANTI SLAVERY LAWS FOR THE SIMPLY DOMESTIC CRIME OF PANDERING.

- IN THE INSTANT MATTER, PETITIONER IS ASKING THIS COURT TO PONDER THE "CONFLICT" THAT EXISTS BETWEEN "THE DECISION TO LIMIT THE JURISDICTIONAL REACH OF THE TREATY POWER BY THE 78th THRU 98th CONGRESSIONAL LEGISLATION OF TREATY ENACTED CRIMINAL STATUTES," AND

"THE ABANDONMENT OF THOSE RESTRAINTS BY THE MORE RECENT TREATY ENACTMENTS OF THE 105TH AND 106TH CONGRESS."

THE 105TH CONGRESSIONAL ENACTMENT OF THE "CHEMICAL WEAPON IMPLEMENTATION ACT OF 1998. (C.W.A.)

NOWHERE IN THE TEXT OF THE LEGISLATION OF THE 105TH CONGRESSIONAL ENACTMENT, OF THE CHEMICAL WEAPON IMPLEMENTATION ACT OF 1998, OR IN THE TEXT OF ITS PENAL PROVISION 18 U.S.C. § 229. IS THERE SAFE GUARDS TO PROTECT AMERICAN CITIZENS ON AMERICAN SOIL, FROM CRIMINAL LIABILITY FOR THEIR PURELY DOMESTIC CONDUCT.

THE PLAIN LANGUAGE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL ENACTMENT OF THE CWA CLOSELY TRACKS THE TEXT OF THE STATUTE, WHICH STATES IN RELEVENT PART:

"... EACH STATE PARTY SHALL, IN ACCORDANCE WITH ITS CONSTITUTIONAL PROCESS, ADOPT THE NECESSARY MEASURE TO IMPLEMENT ITS OBLIGATION UNDER THE CONVENTION, IN PARTICULAR; EACH STATE PARTY

SHALL [P]ROHIBIT NATURAL AND LEGAL PERSON ANYWHERE --- UNDER ITS JURISDICTION --- FROM UNDERTAKING ANY ACTIVITY PROHIBITED TO A STATE PARTY UNDER THIS CONVENTION, INCLUDING ENACTING PENAL LEGISLATION WITH RESPECT TO SUCH ACTIVITY."

IN A POORLY VEILED ATTEMPT TO "UNLIMIT" FEDERAL CRIMINAL JURISDICTION, THE 105TH CONGRESS' RESTRAINT ON SECTION 229 TREATY POWER IS NON-EXISTENT, ACCORDING TO THE PLAIN LANGUAGE OF THE TEXT, AND CLEARLY DEPARTS FROM TEXT OF PRIOR CONGRESSIONAL ENACTMENTS THAT DEAL WITH THE CRIMINAL ENFORCEMENT OF TREATYS.

THE 106TH CONGRESSIONAL ENACTMENT OF THE "TRAFFICKING VICTIM PROTECTION ACT" OF 2000. (TVPA).

THE TOTAL DISREGARD FOR AMERICAN CITIZENS BEING HELD LIABLE UNDER THE PENAL PROVISION OF AN INTERNATIONAL TREATY AGREEMENT WAS NOT LOST ON THE 106TH CONGRESSIONAL ENACTMENT OF THE "TVPA".

THE LANGUAGE OF THE ACT IS AMBIGUOUS AND IT FAILS TO CONTAIN ANY SAFEGUARDS WHATSOEVER TO

PROTECT AMERICAN CITIZENS PURELY DOMESTIC CONDUCT FROM BEING PROSECUTED UNDER SECTION 1591'S INTERNATIONAL TREATY POWER.

THE TEXT OF THE TVPA IN RELEVENT PART STATES:

"THE PURPOSE OF THIS DIVISION ARE TO COMBAT TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS), A CONTEMPORARY MANIFESTATION OF SLAVERY. SEE 22 U.S.C. § 7107 (a). ALSO IN THE UNITED STATES, THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDANCE, RECONIZED THE INHERENT DIGNITY AND WORTH OF ALL PEOPLE.

ACKNOWLEDGING THIS FACT THE UNITED STATES OUTLAWED SLAVERY IN 1865 AS AN EVIL INSTITUTION THAT MUST BE ABOLISHED. CURRENT PRACTICES OF SEXUAL SLAVERY AND TRAFFICKING OF WOMAN AND CHILDREN ARE SIMULARILY ABHORENT." id (b)(24)

THE RELEVENT TEXT OF STATUTE 18 U.S.C. § 1591 STATES:

"(a) WHOMEVER KNOWINGLY --

(1) IN OR AFFECTING INTERSTATE OR FOREIGN COMMERCE, OR WITHIN THE SPECIAL MARITIME AND TERRITORIAL JURISDICTION OF THE UNITED STATES..."

NEITHER THE TEXT OF THE ACT OR THE FACE OF THE STATUTE CLEARLY DEFINE THE JURISDICTIONAL REACH OF THE TREATY POWER.

IN CONTRAST, THE 78TH THRU 98TH CONGRESS' ADHERED TO THE CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE II SECTION II TREATY POWER ALOCATION OF AUTHORITY, WHICH RESTRICTS THE TREATY POWER JURISDICTION TO INTERCOURSE WITH FOREIGN NATIONS. AND IN SO DOING SHIELDED AMERICAN CITIZENS PROFORMING DOMESTIC CONDUCT ON AMERICAN SOIL, FROM CRIMINAL LIABILITY WITH UNAMBIGUOUS LANGUAGE IN BOTH THE TEXT AND STATUTE OF THE ACTS.

• LIMITS ON THE TREATY POWER •

THE 98TH CONGRESSIONAL ENACTMENT OF THE "HOSTAGE TAKING ACT OF 1984 (HTA); THE DESTRUCTION OF AIRCRAFT ACT OF 1984; AIRCRAFT PIRACY ACT OF 1984; AND THE FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

PRIOR TO THE ENACTMENT OF THE ABOVE ACTS

THE 98TH CONGRESS ENACTED THE HOSTAGE TAKING ACT OF 1984 (HTA)

IN THAT PARTICULAR ACT CONGRESS PLACED SAFE GUARDS IN ITS LEGISLATION SPECIFICALLY TO SHIELD THE PURELY DOMESTIC CONDUCT OF AMERICAN CITIZENS ON AMERICAN SOIL FROM PROSECUTION UNDER THE PENAL PROVISION 18 U.S.C. § 1203. WHICH STATES IN RELEVENT PART:

> "IF EITHER THE ALLEGED OFFENDER OR VICTIM IS A NON-NATIONAL, THE HOSTAGE TAKING ACT APPLIES; HOWEVER, IF BOTH THE ALLEGED OFFENDER AND THE VICTIM(S) ARE NATIONALS OF THE UNITED STATES (AND THE OFFENSE OCCURED IN THE UNITED STATES AND EACH ALLEGED OFFENDER IS FOUND IN THE UNITED STATES) THEN THE ACT IS INAPPLIABLE..."

SEE MR. WEBSTERS MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF ORDER DENYING C.O.A. (CASE No. 13-36123)(QUOTING US V LUE 134 F3d 79); US V LOPEZ-FLORES 63 F.3d 1468, 1471-72 (CA9 1995)

PETITIONER HAS REPEATEDLY ASKED THE COURTS OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT TO ADDRESS THE ISSUE OF JUST

HOW DOES THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT JUSTIFY THE USE OF THE PRESIDENTS INTERNATIONAL TREATY POWER IN PROSECUTING PREDOMINATELY BLACK AMERICAN CITIZENS FOR CONDUCT OF A DOMESTIC NATURE INVOLVING ONLY WILLING PARTICIPANTS, WHO ARE ALL AMERICAN CITIZENS ACTING ON AMERICAN SOIL?

EVERY NINTH CIRCUIT COURT ASKED THAT SIMPLE QUESTION, SIMPLY SIDESTEPPED THE ISSUE OR COMPLETELY IGNORED IT THEREBY DENYING MR WEBSTER HIS FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO BE HEARD AND RECEIVE REDRESS OF HIS GRIEVANCES.

WHILE BEING FUNDAMENTALLY UNFAIR, THE NINTH CIRCUITS RELUCTENCE TO ADDRESS THIS ISSUE IS COMPLETELY UNDERSTANDABLE...

BECAUSE TO ADDRESS THE RACIAL INEQUALITY, CONGRESSIONAL OVERREACH, CONSTITUTIONAL REACH AND SCOPE OF THE PRESIDENTS INTERNATIONAL TREATY POWER AS APPLIED TO DOMESTIC, INTRASTATE CONDUCT OF BLACK AMERICANS, THE COURT WOULD HAVE HAD TO RECONIZE IT RAN A HIGH RISK OF TOTALLY FORFEITING THE PURELY DOMESTIC ENFORCEMENT OF 18 U.S.C. § 1591 AND WOULD HAVE SUFFERED A DELUGE OF HABEAS CORPUS'S FROM ALL THE OTHER BLACK MEN BEING HELD UNDER THIS INTERNATIONAL STATUTE FOR DOMESTIC CONDUCT

AND THAT WOULD HAVE LIKELY BEEN A GREAT INCONVENIENCE BUT JUST BECAUSE IT MIGHT BE INCONVENIENT, IS THAT REALLY A JUST REASON TO DENY A BLACK MAN JUSTICE AND/OR HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS?

IS IT AN ISSUE OF NATIONAL IMPORTANCE WHERE ALL CIRCUITS COURTS OF APPEALS FAIL TO APPLY THE RELEVANT LAW CHANGE TO ALL CASES INVOLVING THE FEDERAL CRIMINAL STATUTE THAT IS PART OF A TREATY, 18 U.S.C. § 1591? DOES THOSE DECISIONS DEPART FROM THE EXPECTED AND USUAL COURSE OF JUDICAL PROCEEDINGS, WHERE A NEW LAW WAS UNSETTLED AT TRIAL BUT BECAME SETTLED ON DIRECT APPEAL?

MR. WEBSTER ASSERTED TO THE 9TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS THAT HIS INTENT WAS TO ONLY, SEEK A "RECALL" OF THE COURTS MANDATE IN REGARDS TO HIS DIRECT APPEAL IN 2011, CASE NO.: 08-30311. THE BASIS OF RECALLING THE MANDATE WAS BASED ON THE FACT, THE COURT ERR WHEN IT FAILED TO EXERCISE ITS DISCRETIONARY DUTY TO REVIEW HIS CASE UNDER THE FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURES RULE 52(b). THE NINTH CIRCUIT HELD THAT

WHERE A PETITIONER ASSERTS THAT AN ERROR OCCURRED IN THE IN THE COURT OF APPEALS ON DIRECT REVIEW, THE PROPER METHOD TO SEEK REVIEW OF THOSE ERROS IS THROUGH A MOTION TO RECALL OR AMEND THE MANDATE." SEE GHOTRA V. NAPOLITANO, 336 FED. APPX. 603 (9TH CIR. 09)(QUOTING, FELDMAN V. HENMAN, 815 F. 2D. 1318, 1322-23 (9TH CIR. 1987). AS IT RELATED TO WHETHER THE ERROR THAT WAS CREATED BY THE CHANGE IN THE LAW FROM THE TIME OF HIS TRIAL WAS PLAIN ERROR AT TIME OF APPELLATE REVIEW. SEE. HENDERSON V. UNITED STATES, 133 S.CT. 1121, 1130-31 (2013)" AN APPELLATE COURT DETERMINE WHETHER A ERROR IS "PLAIN" AT THE TIME OF APPEAL, REGARDLESS OF WHETHER A LEGAL QUESTION WAS UNSETTLED AT TIME OF TRIAL."

MOREOVER, THE COURT ERR WHEN IT FAILED TO CONSIDER THE FORFEITED ERROR COMMITTED BY MR. WEBSTER'S TRIAL COUNSEL. WHERE COUNSEL'S FAILURE TO OBJECT TO THE "TREATY ASPECT" OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S USUAGE OF ITS CRIMINAL STATUTE 18 U.S.C. § 1591. EVENTHOUGH THE LAW WAS PLAINLY SUPPORTED BY EXISTING PRECEDENT THAT PLACED JURISDICTIONAL RESTRAINTS ON THE EXTENT OF THE TREATY POWER. SEE. UNITED STATES V. PINK, 315 U.S. 203, 230, 62 S.CT. 552, 86 L.ED 797 (1942)("ITS IS OF COURSE TRUE THAT EVEN TREATIES WITH FOREIGN NATION WILL BE CAREFULL CONSTRUDED SO AS NOT TO DEROGATE FROM THE AUTHORITY AND JURISDICTION OF THE STATES OF THIS NATION...");
(THE POWER TO MAKE TREATIES... WAS DESIGNED TO [BE] ...

CONSISTENT WITH... THE DISTRIBUTION OF POWER BETWEEN THE GENERAL AND STATE GOVERNMENT.") HOLMES V. JENNISON, 39 U.S. 504 at 569 (1940).

NEVERTHELESS, THE ISSUE OF WHETHER THE TREATY POWER COULD REGULATE PURELY DOMESTIC CONDUCT REMAINED UNSETTLED UNTIL 42 DAY, PRIOR TO MR. WEBSTER FILING HIS DIRECT APPEAL, ON JULY 27, 2011. IN THAT INSTANCE THE HIGH COURT STATED "AN ACCUSED CONVICTED UNDER A FEDERAL CRIMINAL STATUTE THAT WAS PART OF A TREATY HAVE STANDING TO CHALLENGE HIS STATUTE OF CONVICTION ON TENTH AMENDMENT FEDERALISM GROUNDS." SEE BOND V. UNITED STATES, 564 U.S. 211 (2011)(EMPHASIS ADDED).

THE LAW CHANGE THAT THE COURT FAILED TO APPLY TO MR. WEBSTER'S CASE PROVIDED HIM STANDING TO CHALLENGE HIS STATUTE OF CONVICTION 18 U.S.C. § 1591, BASED ON ITS TREATY NATURE. MOREOVER, THE 9TH CIR. WAS FULLY AWARE THAT "AN APPELLATE COURT MUST APPLY THE LAW IN EFFECT AT THE TIME IT RENDERED ITS DECISION." SEE, THORPE V. HOUSING AUTHORITY OF DURHAM, 393 U.S. 268, 281, 89 S.CT. 581, 21 L.ED. 2d 474 (1969). ALSO SEE UNITED STATES V. SCHOONER PEGGY, 5 U.S. 103, 1 CRANCH 103, 110, 102 L.ed 49 (1801)(QUOTING, HENDERSON V. UNITED STATES, 568 U.S. 266 at 271 (2013). INDEED, CHIEF JUSTICE MARSHALL WROTE LONG AGO:

"... IF SUBSEQUENT TO THE JUDGEMENT AND BEFORE THE DECISION OF THE APPELLATE COURT, A LAW INTERVENES AND POSITIVELY CHANGES THE RULE WHICH GOVERNS, THE LAW MUST BE OBEYED, OR ITS OBLIGATION DENIED... IN SUCH A CASE THE COURT MUST DECIDE ACCORDING TO EXISTING LAW, AND IF IT BE NECESSARY TO SET ASIDE A JUDGEMENT, RIGHTFUL WHEN RENDERED, BUT WHICH CANNOT BE AFFIRMED BUT IN VIOLATION OF THE LAW, THE JUDGEMENT MUST BE SET ASIDE."

" A NEW RULE FOR CONDUCT FOR CRIMINAL PROSECTION IS TO BE APPLIED RETROACTIVELY TO ALL CASES... PENDING DIRECT APPEAL... WITH NO EXCEPTIONS FOR CASES IN WHICH THE NEW RULE CONSTITUTES A 'CLEAR BREAK' WITH THE PAST." SEE GRIFFITH V. KENTUCKY, 479 U.S. 329, 93 L. ed. 2d. 649, 107 S. Ct. 708 (1987). THE RELEVANCE OF THE ABOVE MMENTIONED LAW IS IN RELATIONS TO MR. WEBSTER'S ASSERTIONS IN HIS "MOTION TO RECALL OR AMEND THE MANDATE. WHERE HE ASSERTED THAT THE LAW DID NOT FUNCTION IN THE MANNER IN WHICH IT WAS INTENDED IN VIOLATION OF HIS DUE PROCESS PROTECTION OF EQUAL TREATMENT UNDER THE LAW. WHICH SUBSEQUENTLY RESULTED IN A REFLECTION OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS "DEPARTING FROM THE EXPECTED AND USUAL COURSE OF JUDICIAL PROCEEDING". BY FAILING TO ADJUDICATE

MR. WEBSTER'S SECTION 1591 CONVICTIONS UNDER ITS OWN NEW NINTH CIRCUIT RULE, WHICH STATES:

> " THE NINTH CIRCUIT HAS LONG HELD, PRIOR TO BOND DECISION, THAT [O]NLY STATES HAVE STANDING TO PURSUE CLAIMS ALLEDGING VIOLATION OF THE TENTH AMENDMENT BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT." SEE OREGON V. LEGAL SERVICE CORP., 552 F.3d 965, 972 (9th. CIR. 2009)(QUOTING, 2012 U.S. DIST. LEXIS 138769:: MORGAN V. BABCOCK. (10.26.12).

IT WAS OBVIOUS TO THE 9th. CIRCUIT COURT THAT MR. WEBSTER HAD "STANDING" TO CHALLENGE HIS SECOND 1591 CONVICTIONS ON TENTH AMENDMENT FEDERALISM GROUNDS, BASED ON THE RELEVANT LAW CHANGE. AND GIVEN THE FACT THAT MR. WEBSTER'S CRIMINAL CONDUCT WAS PURELY LOCALIZED PLUS HIS STATUTE OF CONVICTION WAS PART OF AN INTERNATIONAL TREATY AGREEMENT OF THE UNITED STATES. THE LIKELYHOOD OF A POSITIVE OUTCOME TO AN - AS APPLIED - CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGE AGAINST DOMESTIC ENFORCEMENT OF SECTION 1591 WOULD BE MORE THEN LIKELY.

THE QUESTION IS WHETHER MR. WEBSTER WAS PREJUDICED BY THE NINTH CIRCUIT COURTS FAILURE TO REVIEW HIS CASE UNDER THE RULE 52(b) PLAIN ERROR STANDARD? AND DID THAT

LACK OF ACTION TO ACT WITHIN THE RULE OF LAW, SERIOUSLY AFFECT THE FAIRNESS, INTEGRITY OR PUBLIC REPUTATION OF THE JUDICIAL PROCEEDING? ("THE SUPREME COURT STATES THAT PLAIN ERROR RULE ONLY ALLOWS REVIEWING COURTS TO CORRECT PARTICULARLY EGREGIOUS ERROR THAT SERIOUSLY AFFECT THE FAIRNESS, INTEGRITY, OR PUBLIC REPUTATION OF THE JUDICAL PROCEEDINGS AND (2), THAT A CLAIM OF PLAIN ERROR MUST BE EVALUATED AGAINST THE ENTIRE RECORD OF THE PARTICULAR CASE RATHER THAN ON ANY PER SE BASIS") SEE. JOHNSON V. UNITED STATES, 520 U.S. 461 at 469, 137 LED2D 178 (1997)

CONCLUSION

THERE HAS NOT BEEN "ONE DAY" OF RELIEF GRANTED BY ANY COURT, TO ANY, ACCUSED CONVICTED UNDER SECTION 1591. A CRIMINAL STATUTE THAT IS PART OF A TREATY, THAT PRIMARILY FOCUSES ON MARGINALIZED PEOPLE OF COLOR. FOR THIS REASON THERE WILL NEVER BE CONFLICT BETWEEN THE CIRCUITS ON THE TREATY ASPECT OF SECTION 1591. THE NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS ACCOMPANIED BY THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM HAS REFUSED TO DISPENSE EQUAL PROTECTION UNDER THE LAW. THIS IS THE DEFINITION OF SYSTEMIC RACISM.

MR. WEBSTER PRAYS THAT THIS HONORABLE COURT REMAND THIS CASE BACK TO THE NINTH CIRCUIT WITH INSTRUCTION TO ADDRESS (1) THE LOCAL ENFORCEMENT OF THE TREATY ASPECT OF SECTION 1591 AND (2) ADDRESS THE RULE 52(b) PLAIN ERROR IN WHICH THE NINTH CIRCUIT FAILED TO ADDRESS.

THIS PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI SHOULD BE GRANTED.

RESPECTFULL SUBMITTED THIS

9th DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2020

Don Webster

DON A. WEBSTER
FCI SHERIDAN UNIT 1A
P.O. BOX 5000
SHERIDAN, OREGON
97378

APPENDIX'S

~~EXHIBIT "A" & "B"~~

A-THRU-H