

FILED: April 21, 2021

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 20-4432
(5:18-cr-00318-FL-1)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

BRANDON MARQUIS JENNINGS, a/k/a Smilez, a/k/a Smilez Finesse, a/k/a Beezy, Mustafa Bey

Defendant - Appellant

O R D E R

The court denies the pro se motion to relieve counsel from further representation on appeal.

For the Court--By Direction

/s/ Patricia S. Connor, Clerk

10/12

THE SWORD OF JUSTICE
Salvation, wisdom, origin, Redemption, Divinity

To: Who it may concern.

This letter is written on behalf of ex rel Brandon Marquis Jennings, who was wrongfully convicted in a United States district court for sex trafficking and sex trafficking related offenses on the 13th day of June, 2019 (Case No. 5:18-cr-318-FL-1).

The case is currently pending appeal in the fourth circuit (Case No. 20-4432). The party comes to you seeking your assistance with several issues involved in the matter. Issues ranging from double jeopardy, abuse of discretion, prosecutorial misconduct, ineffective assistance of counsel, professional misconduct, ineffective assistance of appeal counsel, deprived the right to witnesses in ~~■~~ ones own defense. The party was arrested on the 27th day of June, 2017, for an offense that occurred on the 9th day of December, 2016, but reported on the 15th day of December, 2016, to the Raleigh Police Department by Tawnya Strait (T.S., T.C., Tawnya Chacon) inquiring an assault and requesting that it be reviewed for human trafficking connections, which shows the relevant connection between the assault and human trafficking. As shown in the Suppiement report by Raleigh Police Department the incident started and ended on the 9th day of December, 2016, but was reported on the 12th day of December, 2016 and the 15th day of December, 2016. The report shows that the human trafficking derives its conduct from the assault, and it presents a clear showing that nothing actually happen on the 15th day of December, 2016, neither the assault or the human trafficking, but a report inquiring its conduct was made on the 15th day of December, 2016. Courtney R. Fauntieroy, the attorney for the party in the state proceeding spoke to the party about the contents leading to the charge for assault, and the reason why the bond was higher than normal for assault.

2012

Average bond for assault in Wake County is \$ 1,000.00, but the party bond was set at \$20,000.00. The attorney informed the party of the reason for the outrageous bond was that human trafficking was attached to the assault, the party then inquired to the attorney that he would be willing to accept a plea of simple assault and time served in exchange to void the human trafficking. The attorney informed the party that the district attorney had agreed to the plea under the conditions that the party no longer engage in anymore criminal acts, as it was stated by the district attorney "There's nothing we can do for you if the federal government comes for you, so if you not done be done", and on the 3rd day of August, 2017, the district attorney for Wake County agreed to the party stipulations and released the party time served. The party received a number of phone calls from different women indicating that detective Robert Pereira was constantly contacting them harassing about the party whereabouts and questioning the women about their involvement with the party. One woman by the name Chances Abson mentioned to the party that detective Robert Pereira stated to her "He thinks that Muslim shit is going to save him" referring to the party and showing an extreme hate towards muslims. The party after having several disturbing phone calls then contacted detective Pereira and questioned him as to why he was harassing women, provoking the women to say things that never happened, the party then informed detective Pereira that he would sue him if he [redacted] continued to harass. The party after communicating with detective Robert Pereira sent a copy of his legal status identifying him as Mustafa Bey of the Asian race and a member of the Moorish American community,

which is of berber ancestry through the sa'adian dynasty of Ahmed Bil'qasim and queen charlotte mecyanburg of europe. Days later an arrest was made on the party in retaliation to the phone call that was made by the party and documents indicating the party's legal status that was sent to detective robert pereira. An arrest concerning the report made on the 15th day of december, 2016, was now in progress on the 4th day of may, 2018, during the arrest the party questioned officers for a warrant signed by a article 3 sec 2 judge, when the officers could not make a showing of the warrant the party contacted 911. While the party was speaking with dispatch the officers made threats to do harm by force with their K-9 if the party did not cooperate with their commands, the party through threat and coercion cooperated with officers. The party asked officers if his sister could get numbers out of his phone which was in the home, the officer stated that he would write numbers down from the phone and agreed not to confiscate the party's phone, but immediately after writing the numbers the officer then seized the party's phone without a warrant, the party was then released to officer sent by dispatch and booked on the 4th day of may, 2018, for a human trafficking offense that was inquired in the same report as the assault that the party pled to so that he could avoid human trafficking charges. on the 8th day of August, 2018, the human trafficking charge was dismissed by the state and the party was then federally indicted for its conduct which involved a 13 count indictment. The party was tried on all 13 counts on the 10th day of June, 2019, following a 4 day trial the party was convicted of all 13 counts which involved the same facts the party pled to on the 3rd day of august, 2017, which indicates that the party was tried twice in a state

Court for the same offense, and being that the federal indictment derives it's conduct from the arrest made on the 4th day of May, 2013, of which was barred due to double jeopardy, it is now to be deemed unconstitutional and facially void. Let it be noted that all evidence obtained in this matter is considered fruits of the poisonous tree and is to be discharged in it's entirety. The party would also like to bring to your attention of the party's non-cooperative participation in consulting with neither attorney William Woodward Webb Sr and William Woodward Webb Jr. As it is lawfully explained uncooperative behavior may constitute a valid waiver of right to counsel. Although the party has not once consulted with either attorney they've entered pleas on the behalf of the party without first consulting with the party to insure that the party understood the severity of the plea. When asked of by the party for the attorneys to identify themselves by way of bar membership card and oath of office, but the party was disregarded. The party inquired to William Woodward Webb Jr's of his obligation to the court, in response he agreed to be obligated to the court, which is shown in his closing and opening argument during trial when he told the jury he wasn't there to represent the defendant. This now turns me to a hearing on March 7th, 2019, to proceed pro se. During the reading of a superseding indictment by magistrate Judge James E. Gates the party interrupted and questioned the Judge "is that what you're saying I did?" Magistrate Judge Gates response was "Yes," which indicates that the party was found guilty before being arraigned. On the 23rd day of April, 2019, a hearing was held for a second superseding indictment, again as magistrate Judge Gates was reading the indictment the party interrupted

and questioned the Judge is that what your saying I did; Judge Gates responded "No, it's what you've alledgedly did," the party then responds "Good answer, because when I asked you this question during the first superseding indictment you said yes, finding me guilty before I was arraigned," attorney William Woodward Webb Jr then shouts "No he didn't," which proves William Woodward Webb Jr conspired with magistrate Judge Gates to deprive the party of the right to a fair trial while showing complete ineffectiveness and his obligation to the court. It is deemed accurate when considering an attorney's obligation is to be to his client and raises serious concerns of prejudice when simply performing for the courts and not the client. They've made such a great effort to work with the court in depriving the party of rights. As it has been stated the party was not allowed the discovery nor brady material without speaking with attorney's William Woodward Webb Sr and William Woodward Webb Jr in the courts attempt to gain jurisdiction. The party notes that he has never consulted with neither attorney, but it was later said by the attorney's that the Judge Louise W. Flanagan issued an order removing the party from discovery, an order that was never revealed to the party, which also led to William Woodward Webb Jr and William Woodward Webb Sr withholding brady material which proved the party innocence, whereas it was later discovered that J.C. whom did not testify at court told officers that she did not have sex with any of her clients, but this information was withheld and the party was convicted of 4 counts sex trafficking J.C. when such counts should not have made it to the indictment. It was said by attorney's William Woodward Webb Sr and William Woodward Webb Jr on the day of trial

that counts involving J.C. will be dropped because J.C. is not testifying, but instead Erin C Biondel allowed Taushia Strait to give a corroborating testimony that did not corroborate with J.C. statement that was given to officers. Evidence proved Taushia strait to be the one who sex trafficked J.C. Joycelyn campbell, which is more than enough reason to give a perjured testimony and withholding brady material caused by the attorney's helped in the conviction and the prevailing of the perjured testimony corroborated by taushia strait. As it is lawfully explained the sixth amendment constitutionally entities one charged with a crime to the assistance of counsel, and compliance with this constitutional mandate is an essential jurisdictional prerequisite to a federal courts authority to deprive an accused of his life or liberty. Not only is it a due process violation when depriving the party of brady material, but it is absolutely impossible to deprive a party of life or liberty without compliance. The party now turns to the unlawful arraignment of which proceeded to trial on the 10th day of June, 2014, for which attorney's William Woodward Webb sr and William Woodward Webb Jr entered a plea of not guilty which led to a Jury selection of which the party was not allowed to participate. The attorney William Woodward Webb sr then stated to the Judge Louise W. Flanagan that it would cause prejudice to allow the party to select the Jury. Let it be noted that the entire Jury besides two jurors were of european descent, and each of the victims were also european descent. The party never waived any rights, but was deprived of many. The law explains the purpose of the sixth amendment is to protect the unaided layman at critical confrontations with his expert adversary, the government,

after the adverse positions of government and defendant have solidified with respect to a particular alleged crime and to act without first speaking with the party would be in complete violation of the sixth amendment and deemed unconstitutional. The party brings to your attention of the sixth amendments right to counsel, which implies that one shall have the right to represent himself, and if he chooses, the right to the assistance of counsel. The party was denied this right whereas he moved for self representation, but was denied and instead was forced the option to assist himself in his own defence, which is not granted in the constitution and strips the party of his rights while transferring them to the courts. Assist himself in his own defence is to not be confused with assistance of counsel. One is to assist the attorney as to the other consisting of the attorney assisting. Unless one is incompetent it is in dire violation of the constitution for one to assist himself in his own defence. I will like to also address an oral motion to sequester witnesses which was filed on the 10th day of June, 2019, the day of trial, by attorney's William Woodward Webb Sr and William Woodward Webb Jr. The motion was granted by Judge Louise W. Flanagan. On the 11th day of June, 2019, during trial a partial testimony was given by Christina Albino before the court moved ordering lunch which she was questioned by attorney William Woodward Webb Sr if she had testified to the grand jury intoxicated on drugs and alcohol, her response was yes "Molly and liquor." At the return from lunch it was mentioned to the party by both attorney's William Woodward Webb Sr and William Woodward Webb Jr of witnessing the government's witnesses having lunch together. Upon cross examination of Christina Albino, by attorney's for the party it was inquired as to how many of the women she knew,

She responded "two of them", it was further questioned if she knew any of the other government witnesses that she had lunch with, she then responds "oh I just met them today"; not only does this prove criminal contempt for not complying with court order to sequester witnesses, but it also proves the government's involvement and conspiracy in violating the court order to sequester witnesses, on the grounds that Christina Aibino only knew two of the witnesses prior to violating the court order, and the record will reflect that neither of the other witnesses knew of one another's identity, and the fact that she "met them today" as she puts it clears any suggestion that she could have met the ~~two~~ witnesses prior to trial and a clear showing that someone of lawful authority, such as the prosecutor erin c. Biondel introduced them after the commencement of trial. It now raises concerns as to it's true purpose for violating such court order, which could have strongly been used for fabricated testimonial purposes. It also raises questions of abuse of discretion being practiced by Judge Louise W. Flanagan for failure to hold conformors in contempt for violations done in her presence. As the law explains criminal contempt sanctions are appropriate for witnesses violations of court's sequester order, and it is further explained that this specific order of the courts is an essential element of criminal contempt, and to ignore such contemptuous behavior would be abuse of discretion on the Judges behalf. Violation of such court order cannot be cured by harmless error and due to it's taintedness it's clearly grounds for an acquittal, vacate, and reversal of judgement. Neither of the witnesses, prosecutors, or judges in the matter can be used without being preJudece.

A detention hearing was held on the 15th day of August, 2013, during the hearing the party hand delivered a copy of documents containing the party's legal status, Erin C. Blondel of the U.S. government shouts "Those are probably documents stating he's sovereign, but he's not, he's an U.S. citizen." Let it be noted that the record reflects that the party has also provided domestic medical records that identify the party as Mustafa Bey of the asian race, and let it be noted that these records were provided by lab corps and the North Carolina laboratory of public health, which are both reliable sources regarding identity in the United States. As it is lawfully explained per the Asiatic barred zone of 1924 Act, U.S. residents that are ineligible for immigration are not allowed U.S. citizenship, and to make such argument "He's a U.S. citizen" without factual proof is grounds for prejudice which places the burden of proof on the U.S. government and before proceeding that burden must be met.

During a Faretta hearing on the 7th day of March, 2013, the party orally moved for status hearing, and again by written motion on the 18th day of March, 2013, which was disregarded along with a motion for lack of jurisdiction. It is lawfully explained that before the allegations of any crime can be legally arraigned, prosecuted, or adjudicated the accused must first be properly identified, and the lawful jurisdiction over that person must be met, which again the burden of proof is on the government for which has never been proven and in dire violation of the party's substantive right and deemed unconstitutional. It's also been said by the government's Erin C. Blondel on several occasions that a order was issued by the courts inquiring that the party be denied discovery,

10 OF 12

a order that was never received by the party. As it is lawfully explained, depriving the party of exculpatory evidence that is favorable in one's defense and or what is known as brady material is a due process violation and is in clear violation of the constitution. It is absolutely impossible to properly bring an adequate defense to stand trial without a discovery.

During trial on the 12th day of June, 2019, it was admitted and also proven by preponderance of the evidence that the government's witness Jamie Bosnford (J.B., R.W.) recanted, but the government by way of misconduct stated that the witness did not know what recant mean, which is grounds to question if the government's witness understood any of the questions or proceedings that had been presented due to the incompetency of understanding it's own plea to recant. As it is lawfully explained the prosecutor may not vouch for the credibility of government witnesses especially when the suggestion to recant was advised by the witness counsel, which also provides a clear showing of the prosecutors invasion on attorney client relationship and prosecutorial misconduct to persuade a jury for a conviction. Evidence used to prosecute the party was intrinsic in nature and gained it's relevancy from perjured testimonies. The government's witness Taushia Strait (T.C., T.S., Taushia Chacon) gave a corroborating testimony that was to corroborate with statement's given by Joycelyn Campbell. Brady Material that was withheld by the party's attorney's, which was later discovered, provided evidence that Joycelyn Campbell did not have sex for money whereas she stated that she didn't have sex with any of her client's.

Let it be noted that evidence provided at trial determined Taushia Strait to be guilty of sex trafficking Joycelyn Campbell whereas Taushia strait told the party that Joycelyn Campbell "needed to earn her own keeps" which suggest that Joycelyn Campbell was not a victim to sex trafficking prior to statements made by taushia strait and provides a clear showing as to taushia strait's extreme need to provide a purjured testimony. Joycelyn Campbell stated that she did not have sex with any of her clients, but taushia strait corroborating statement suggest that she did, which is perjury. Erin C. Biondel's argument to evidence suggesting that Taushia strait was guilty of sex trafficking Joycelyn Campbell was that "she got tired of doing all the work herself," being tired of doing all the work yourself is not grounds to suggest that an innocent person should be convicted of a crime that one did not commit. During trial while Taushia strait was giving the testimony, courtroom cameras will provide that taushia strait was coached by the government. It was said by Erin C. Biondel during trial that the party showed reckless disregard in his dealings with Joycelyn Campbell, but to the contrary evidence will provide that to be false. Let it be noted that the party was also falsely accused of engaging in prostitution with Joycelyn Campbell. The party would like to note that the case was reassigned to Judge Louise W. Flanagan at the discretion of the court on the 11th day of September, 2013 for the means to change the courts venue without request to or permission from the defense. A Faretta motion was filed by the party which was considered a motion to withdraw by the attorney William Woodward Webb Sr. A hearing was held on the 26th day of October, 2013; regarding the motion to withdraw, during the hearing it was stated by Louise W. Flanagan "I'm tired of this moronish crap"

referring to the party's national origin. As the hearing continued Louise W. Flanagan then states that "the party is a victim and he's been lied to regarding his information, and he's probably spent a lot of money for false information." The party has requested Louise W. Flanagan to provide the delegation of authority showing that she has authority over the matter and that the matter was in the proper court, and to provide the oath of office showing that she has to uphold the constitution as a Judge, each request was raised on several occasions and was disregarded each time. It was said that a order was issued by Louise W. Flanagan depriving the party from discovery which led to the attorney's of which the party never spoke with to withhold evidence that was favorable in his own defense. Upon receipt of acknowledging mitchell G. Styers as the attorney for the appeal, the party has made a great effort in contacting the attorney whereas mitchell G. Styers refuses to have any contact with the party nor does he find it relevant to argue any of the appeal issues found in this letter. By motion the party has moved to relieve mitchell G. Styers as counsel and twice it has been denied, which turned the party to filing a cease and desist order to the U.S. district court for the eastern district (5:21-cv-3094-D) of North Carolina for the [redacted] violation of the Sixth Amendment's right to counsel clause for ineffectiveness. It is also to be noted that the party has filed civil actions against William Woodward Webb Sr, William Woodward Webb Jr, magistrate Judge James E. Gates, and Louise W. Flanagan for several of their violations as shown in this letter, actions were filed in the eastern district of North Carolina (5:21-cv-3094-B).

BANZET, THOMPSON, STYERS & MAY, P.L.L.C.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

PO Box 535 • 101 NORTH FRONT STREET • WARRENTON, NC 27589

MITCHELL G. STYERS
ROBERT T. MAY, JR.
JILL NEVILLE

TELEPHONE 252-257-3166
FACSIMILE 252-257-2053

January 26, 2021

Mr. Brandon M. Jennings Reg. No: 65213-056
USP Hazelton
U.S. Penitentiary
P.O. Box 2000
Bruceton Mills, WV 26525

Re: Fourth Circuit Appeal No. 20-4432

Dear Brandon,

I hope you are doing well. I am enclosing a copy of the appeal brief and joint appendix which I filed on your behalf. The BOP does not allow me to send the sealed volume of the joint appendix because it contains the Presentence Report. I have raised as your issue on appeal, the fact that the district court erred in allowing the expert testimony of Dr. Sharon Cooper, the Government failed to introduce sufficient evidence to convict on Counts 3 and 4, and the district court did not give adequate reasons why it gave you the lifetime sentence.

The Government will file its response brief in 60-90 days. I will send you a copy of their brief when I receive it.

Please let me know if you have any questions and let me know that you received this letter. Contact me if you have further questions.

Sincerely,



Mitchell G. Styers

Appendix D

BANZET, THOMPSON, STYERS & MAY, P.L.L.C.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
PO Box 535 • 101 NORTH FRONT STREET • WARRENTON, NC 27589

MITCHELL G. STYERS
ROBERT T. MAY, JR.
JILL A. NEVILLE

TELEPHONE 252-257-3166
FACSIMILE 252-257-2053

August 27, 2020

Piedmont Regional Jail
Mr. Brandon M. Jennings Reg. No: 65213-056
801 Industrial Park Rd.
Farmville, VA 23901

Re: Appeal to 4th Circuit

Dear Brandon,

Hope you are well. I am enclosing a copy of the Appearance of Counsel form for your records.

Please let me know you have received this letter and if you have further questions.

Sincerely,



Mitchell G. Styers

Let Mr. Jennings call his attorney

extreme

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT
APPEARANCE OF COUNSEL FORM Appendix D

BAR ADMISSION & ECF REGISTRATION: If you have not been admitted to practice before the Fourth Circuit, you must complete and return an Application for Admission before filing this form. If you were admitted to practice under a different name than you are now using, you must include your former name when completing this form so that we can locate you on the attorney roll. Electronic filing by counsel is required in all Fourth Circuit cases. If you have not registered as a Fourth Circuit ECF Filer, please complete the required steps at Register for eFiling.

THE CLERK WILL ENTER MY APPEARANCE IN APPEAL NO. 20-4432 as

Retained Court-appointed(CJA) CJA associate Court-assigned(non-CJA) Federal Defender
 Pro Bono Government

COUNSEL FOR: Brandon Marquis Jennings

as the

(party name)

appellant(s) appellee(s) petitioner(s) respondent(s) amicus curiae intervenor(s) movant(s)

/s/ Mitchell G. Styers

(signature)

Please compare your information below with your information on PACER. Any updates or changes must be made through PACER's Manage My Account.

Mitchell G. Styers

Name (printed or typed)

252-257-3166

Voice Phone

Banzet, Thompson, Styers & May, PLLC

Firm Name (if applicable)

252-257-2053

Fax Number

PO Box 535

Warrenton, NC 27589

Address

mitchstyers@banzettlaw.com

E-mail address (print or type)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE (*required for parties served outside CM/ECF*): I certify that this document was served on 8/27/2020 by personal delivery; mail; third-party commercial carrier; or email (with written consent) on the following persons at the addresses or email addresses shown:

Brandon M. Jennings Reg. No. 65213-056
Piedmont Regional Jail
801 Industrial Park Rd
Farmville, VA 23901

/s/ Mitchell G. Styers

Signature

8/27/2020

Date

BANZET, THOMPSON, STYERS & MAY, P.L.L.C.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

PO Box 535 • 101 NORTH FRONT STREET • WARRENTON, NC 27589

MITCHELL G. STYERS
ROBERT T. MAY, JR.
JILL NEVILLE

TELEPHONE 252-257-3166
FACSIMILE 252-257-2053

January 26, 2021

Mr. Brandon M. Jennings Reg. No: 65213-056
USP Hazelton
U.S. Penitentiary
P.O. Box 2000
Bruceton Mills, WV 26525

Re: Fourth Circuit Appeal No. 20-4432

Dear Brandon,

I am enclosing a copy of my response to your motion to reconsider, as required by the Court's notice for a response.

Sincerely,



Mitchell G. Styers

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT
No. 20-4432

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
)	
vs.)	<u>COUNSEL'S RESPONSE TO</u>
)	<u>APPELLANT'S PRO SE MOTION</u>
BRANDON MARQUIS JENNINGS,)	<u>FOR RECONSIDERATION</u>
Appellant.)	<u>OF ORDER DENYING MOTION</u>
)	<u>TO RELIEVE COUNSEL</u>

NOW COMES the undersigned counsel, and hereby responding to the Appellant's pro se motion for reconsideration of this Court's order denying Appellant's motion to relieve counsel. [DE: 33].

On or about December 8, 2020, this Court entered an order denying Appellant's previous Motion to Relieve Counsel. The Appellant now moving this Court to reconsider its previous order. The undersigned counsel has communicated with the Appellant and has filed an appeal brief on his behalf, raising several issues on appeal, as of January 19, 2021. Counsel contends there are no grounds for substitution of counsel, but ultimately leaves the decision to the Court's discretion.

Respectfully submitted this the 26th day of January, 2021.

/s/ Mitchell G. Styers
Mitchell G. Styers
Counsel for Appellant
BANZET, THOMPSON, STYERS & MAY, PLLC
P. O. Box 535
Warrenton, NC 27589
Telephone: (252) 257-3166
Facsimile: (252) 257-2053
North Carolina Bar No. 24553

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that the foregoing Response was served on the following person(s) by electronic filing and by mailing a copy thereof, post prepaid (respectively), to:

Jennifer P. May-Parker
Assistant U. S. Attorney
usance.ecfappeals@usdoj.gov

Mr. Brandon M. Jennings
P.O. Box 2000
Bruceton Mills, WV 26525

Respectfully submitted this the 26th day of January, 2021.

/s/ Mitchell G. Styers
Mitchell G. Styers
Counsel for Appellant
BANZET, THOMPSON, STYERS & MAY, PLLC
P. O. Box 535
Warrenton, NC 27589
Telephone: (252) 257-3166
Facsimile: (252) 257-2053
North Carolina Bar No. 24553

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT
1100 East Main Street, Suite 501, Richmond, Virginia 23219

December 8, 2020

PARTY-ATTORNEY NOTICE
UNDER CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACT

No. 20-4432, US v. Brandon Jennings

5:18-cr-00318-FL-1

Counsel and the parties are advised as follows:

- Counsel is obliged to keep the defendant informed of the progress of the appeal and the issues to be pursued, and it is the defendant's duty to cooperate with counsel. The determination of which issues the appeal record will support is within counsel's professional judgment.
- Counsel shall provide the defendant with a copy of the appeal brief and appendix (or the Anders brief and record). Counsel is also authorized to make additional copies of necessary record documents and claim reimbursement of expenses under the CJA up to \$300 (\$.15 per page) without moving for prior approval.
- Motions and other requests in the case must be filed with the court by counsel rather than by the defendant, though the defendant may file a pro se motion to relieve counsel or for substitution of counsel and may also file a pro se motion for leave to file a pro se supplemental brief, accompanied by the brief.
- The defendant's dissatisfaction with the issues raised on appeal is not sufficient grounds for a motion to relieve counsel.
- The defendant's dissatisfaction with the issues raised by counsel is generally not sufficient grounds for filing of a pro se supplemental brief. The defendant has a right to file a pro se supplemental brief only in cases proceeding under Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). In other cases, the defendant may file a motion to file pro se supplemental brief, accompanied by the brief. The court will consider and rule upon any motion to file pro se supplemental brief when the appeal is reviewed on the merits.

Appendix F

Joy Hargett Moore, Deputy Clerk
804-916-2702

FILED: December 8, 2020

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 20-4432
(5:18-cr-00318-FL-1)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

BRANDON MARQUIS JENNINGS, a/k/a Smilez, a/k/a Smilez Finesse, a/k/a Beezy, Mustafa Bey

Defendant - Appellant

O R D E R

The court denies the motion for substitution of counsel on appeal.

For the Court--By Direction

/s/ Patricia S. Connor, Clerk



United States District Court
Eastern District of North Carolina
Office of the Clerk
PO Box 25670
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

Phone (919) 645-1700
Fax (919) 645-1750

Peter A. Moore Jr.
Clerk of Court

April 5, 2021

Brandon Marquis Jennings #65213-056
Hazelton - U.S.P.
P.O. Box 2000
Bruceton Mills, WV 26525

Re: Jennings v. Styers
5:21-CT-3094-D

Dear Mr. Jennings,

Our office has received and filed your complaint. Your case has been given the above-indicated docket number. **Please use this number when submitting documents for filing in this case.**

If your address changes, a notice of your change of address should be sent to the Clerk's office.

If you want a copy of a filing returned to you, a stamped, self-addressed envelope and an extra copy of the document must be provided.

Upon receipt, your documents are scanned and the scanned copy becomes the official record of the court. To assist with the best possible scan, please adhere to the following.

- Use 8 1/2" by 11" white, paper.
- All documents must include an original signature. The "/s/ typed name" is for electronic filers only.
- **Do not highlight your documents.** When scanned, highlights look like black lines and you cannot read the text below the highlight.
- **Leave a margin.** If you write at the very top and very bottom of your paper, most likely, some of your handwriting will be cut off when scanned.
- **Number your pages.** This helps us keep your papers organized and in the correct order.
- **Do not tape your papers.** Tape clogs up the scanner and causes pages to rip.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

/s/ Peter A. Moore, Jr.

Clerk of Court

PAM/ai

FILED: March 25, 2021

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 20-4432
(5:18-cr-00318-FL-1)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Plaintiff - Appellee

v.

BRANDON MARQUIS JENNINGS, a/k/a Smilez, a/k/a Smilez Finesse, a/k/a Beezy, Mustafa Bey

Defendant - Appellant

ORDER

Appellant has filed a motion to relieve counsel and for leave to file a pro se supplemental brief.

The court denies the motion to relieve counsel from further representation on appeal. The motion for leave to file a pro se supplemental brief is denied without prejudice to refiling, accompanied by the pro se supplemental brief.

For the Court--By Direction

/s/ Patricia S. Connor, Clerk