

①

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OFFICE OF THE CLERK, WASHINGTON DC

GEMAR MORGAN (PRO SE)

v

UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS

IN PURSUANT WITH SUPREME COURT RULE 10

(a) & (c) 28 U.S.C. §§ 2101 (c); 1254 (1)

GEMAR MORGAN (PRO SE)

F.C.T. ELKTON # 40722-03

P.O. BOX 10

LISBON, OH 44432

SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE U.S.
DEPT. OF JUSTICE, Room 5616
950 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20530-0001

RECEIVED

SEP 29 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

RECEIVED

OCT 12 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

2

(a)

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OFFICE OF THE CLERK, WASHINGTON DC

(PROSE)
GEMAR MORGAN

v.

UNITED STATES

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

DO U.S.S.G. § 4B1.4 CMT., N.(1) VIOLATES THE DICTATES OF § 4A1.2 (c)(3) & (c)(4) - APPLICABLE TIME PERIODS; § 4A1.2 CMT., N.(7) - OFFENSES COMMITTED PRIOR TO AGE EIGHTEEN; § 4A1.2 (a)(2) & AMENDMENT 709 - SINGLE SENTENCE RULE AND § 2K2.1 CMT., N.(10)?

DO U.S.S.G. § 4B1.4; § 4A1.2 (a)(2) & AMENDMENT 709; § 4A1.2 CMT., N.(7); § 4A1.2 (d)(2); § 4A1.2 (e)(3) & (4) BEAR THE CONSTRUCTION OF § 4B1.4 CMT., N.(1)?

DOES THE THREE PRIOR CONVICTIONS FOR "VIOLENT FELONY OFFENSES," COMMITTED ON OCCASIONS DIFFERENT FROM ONE ANOTHER, FROM § 4B1.4 CMT., N.(1) CONFLICTS § 4A1.2 (a)(2) AND AMENDMENT 709?

DO U.S.S.G. § 4B1.4 CMT., N.(1) SERVES AS AN INDEPENDENT LEGAL FORCE STANDING ALONE THAT ADDS AN ADDITION TO § 4A1.2 (e) - APPLICABLE TIME PERIOD?

(3)

(a)

DOES STINSON V. UNITED STATES :: 508 U.S. 36, AT 43 ::
113 S. CT. 1913 :: 123 L. ED. 2d 598 (1993)] ASSERTING:] THE
SENTENCE REFORM ACT ITSELF COMMANDS COMPLIANCE
WITH THE GUIDELINES; IF COMMENTARY AND THE GUIDELINE
IT INTERPRETS ARE INCONSISTENT THAT FOLLOWING ^{ONE} WILL
RESULT TO VIOLATING THE DICTATE OF THE OTHER] APPLY WITH
§ 4B1.4 CMT. N. (1) VIOLATING § 4A1.2 (e) APPLICABLE TIME
PERIOD?

IS IT UNCONSTITUTIONAL FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT TO
ADD FIREARM RIGHTS TO MICHIGAN DETERMINE " A PERSON"
CIVIL RIGHTS RESTORED - AS " VOTE, HOLD PUBLIC OFFICE
AND SERVE ON JURIES " ?

DOES THE SENTENCING COMMISSION HAS THE POWER
TO ALLOW AN APPLICATION ^{NOTE} TO SERVE AS ADDITION TO
A GUIDELINE AND OR INDEPENDENT LEGAL FORCE
STANDING ALONE?

IF THE JUDGEMENT OF OPINION DOES NOT ACKNOWLEDGE
THE CLAIM IN THE APPELLANT'S BRIEF - DOES THIS
REASON CONSTITUTE THE REVIEW OF THE SUPREME
COURT?

COULD THIS COURT PLEASE CLARIFY THE CORRECT
ENFORCEMENT AND TRANSLATION OF " CIVIL RIGHTS "
UNDER 18 USC § 921 (a) (20) FOR THE LOWER COURTS?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGES</u>
COVER PAGE	1
QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW	2, 3
TABLE OF CONTENTS	4
TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES	5, 6, 7
LIST OF PARTIES	8
CITATION OF THE ^{OPINION} OF ORDERS	9
JURISDICTION STATEMENT	10, 11
STATUTES, REGULATIONS WITH CITATION	12, 13
CONCISE STATEMENT & ARGUMENT	14, 15, 16
CONCLUSION	17
AFFIDAVIT TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS	18-22
EXHIBITS - JUDGEMENT & ORDERS	23-32
" EXHIBIT A - REFERENCE FOR PGS. 10-17 OF THIS PETITION	33
" EXHIBIT B - REFERENCE FOR PGS. 10-17 OF THIS PETITION	34-43

TABLE OF CITATION

<u>CASES</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
BALINT v. U.S.: 258 U.S. 250 (1992)	34
BASS v. U.S.: 404 U.S. 336 (1971)	35
MISTRETTA v. U.S.: 488 U.S. 361 (1989)	10-17, 36-39
MOLINA-MARTINEZ v. U.S.: 136 S.Ct. 1338 (2016)	10-17, 36-39
OLD CHIEF v. U.S.: 519 U.S. 172 (1997)	35
REHAFF v. U.S.: 139 S.Ct. 2191 (2019)	10-17, 34, 35
BOWLES v. RUSSELL: 551 U.S. 205, AT 212 (2007)	10, 11, 12
STAPLES v. US: 511 U.S. 600 (1994)	34
X-CITEMENT VIDEO v. U.S.: 513 U.S. 72 (1995)	34
STINSON v. U.S.: 508 U.S. 36 (1993)	3, 10
WILLIAMS v. US: 503 U.S. 193 (1992)	10-17, 36-40
HAMPTON v. U.S.: 191 F.3d 695, 701-703 (6 TH CIR, 1999)	10-17
GILTAM v. US: 2000 U.S. APP. LEXIS 8781 (6 TH CIR 2000)	10-17
WALKER v. US: 800 F.3d 720 (6 TH CIR, 2015)	10-17
U.S. v. BELL: 661 FED. APPX 918 (2016) 6 TH CIR.	10-17 36-40
U.S. v. BELL: 572 FED. APPX. 417 (2014) 6 TH CIR	10-17 36-40
U.S. v. BERRY: 2020 U.S. APP. LEXIS 18929 (2020 6 TH CIR)	10-17
U.S. v. BOWERS: 615 F.3d 715 (2010 6 TH CIR)	10-17
U.S. v. CHATMON: 565 FED. APPX. 345 (2014 6 TH CIR)	10-17, 39
U.S. v. FLEMING: 894 F.3d 764 (2018 6 TH CIR)	10-17, 39
U.S. v. GOWARD: 315 FED. APPX 345 (2014 6 TH CIR)	10-17, 39
U.S. v. HAVIS: 927 F.3d 382 (2019 6 TH)	10-17, 38
U.S. v. RICCARDI: 989 F.3d 476 (2021 6 TH CIR)	10-17
U.S. v. ROLLINS: 836 F.3d 737, 742 (2016 6 TH CIR.)	10-17, 36-38
U.S. v. SHALASH: 759 FED. APPX. 578 (2019 6 TH CIR)	10-17, 39
U.S. v WINSTEAD: 890 F.3d 1082 (2018)	36

6

STATUTES

18 U.S.C. § 921(a)(20)	3, 10-17, 34, 35
18 U.S.C. § 922(g) AMENDED VERSION	10-17, 34, 35
18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1)	10-17, 34, 35
18 U.S.C. § 924(a)(2)	34, 35
18 U.S.C. § 924(e)	38, 39
18 U.S.C. § 3742(a)(1)(e)(i), (f)(i)	10-17, 37-39
28 U.S.C. § 994	10-17, 36-39
28 U.S.C. § 1291	
28 U.S.C. § 2101(c)	1, 10
18 U.S.C. § APPX. FED. SENTENCING GUIDELINES	10-17
MCL 750.224F	10-17, 34, 35
MCL 750.529 (1994 DEFINITION)	34, 35

RULES

FED. R. APP. P. RULE 35 & 40	10-17, 24
FED. R. APP. P. RULE 27(b)	23
FED. R. C. P. RULE 7	34, 35
FED. R. C. P. RULE 52(b)	34, 38
SUPREME COURT RULE 10(a) & (c)	1, 10, 11
SUPREME COURT RULE 12(2)	

U.S.S.G.

2K2.1(a)(a) & 2K2.1, cmt., N. (10)	2, 10-17, 36-40
4A1.1(a)(b)(c)	36, 37
4A1.2(a)(2) & AMENDMENT 709	2, 10-17, 36-40
4A1.2(d)(2) & 4A1.2, cmt., N. (7)	2, 10-17, 36-40

7

4A1.2(e)(3) & (4) & 4A1.2 CMT., N.(8)

2, 10-17, 36-40

4B1.2

36, 37

4B1.4 CMT., N.(1)

2, 10-17, 36-39

(b)

LIST OF ALL THE PARTIES

(i) GEMAR MORGAN (PRO SE) PETITIONER

v.
UNITED STATES (RESPONDENT)

(iii) GEMAR MORGAN (PRO SE)

v.
UNITED STATES
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

} CASE # 2:19-cv-20259
DATE OF JUDGEMENT: 6/11/21
JUDGE: DAVID M. LAWSON

GEMAR MORGAN (PRO SE)

v.
UNITED STATES

} #
CASE 21-2628
DATE OF JUDGEMENT:
DATE OF EN BAC ORDER:

JUDGES: CLAY, ROGERS, AND STRANCH

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE 6TH CIR.

9

(d)

CITATIONS OF THE OPINION & ORDERS

GEMAR MORGAN V. UNITED STATES ; CASE #
2:19-cr-20259 ; AS OF TODAY 9/19/2022 - THERE'S
NO OFFICIAL OR UNOFFICIAL REPORTS OF THE OPINIONS
CASELAW CITING FOR THIS JUDGEMENT. THE ONLY
REFERENCE FOR THIS CASE IS "TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS
DOCKET # 118 & 119" , "SENTENCING TRANSCRIPTS" - AND
"JUDGEMENT" IN A CRIMINAL CASE

GEMAR MORGAN V. UNITED STATES ; CASE #
21-2678
THE OPINION WAS "AN UNPUBLISHED OPINION" ; DOCKET
59 IN THE 6TH CIRCUIT APPEALS COURT ; AS OF 9/19/22
THERE'S NO CASELAW CITINGS FOR THE CASE

(e)

JURISDICTION STATEMENT

ACCORDING WITH 28 U.S.C. § 2101(C)^{1254 (1)} A PARTY SEEKING TO BRING ANY JUDGMENT BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT FOR REVIEW - SHALL FILE A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI WITHIN 90 DAYS FROM THE DATE OF JUDGMENT WHICH WAS 08/01/2022 FOR CASE # 21-2628 ; OR ORDER FROM ENBANC / REHEARING WHICH WAS 09/02/2022 FOR CASE # 21-2628 IN THE 6TH CIRCUIT OF APPEALS COURT. MORGAN SEEKS THIS COURT REVIEW OF THE 6TH CIRCUIT JUDGMENT FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS: THE 6TH CIRCUIT DID NOT CONSIDER THE APPELLANTS BRIEF [SENTENCING PORTION] PAGES 13-20 OF DOCKET # 36 IN THE OPINION FOR THE JUDGMENT WHICH IS ILLUSTRATED IN DOCKET # 59 UNPUBLISHED OPINION BY THE 6TH CIR. THE SENTENCING PORTION OF THE APPELLATE BRIEF CONSISTED OF STINSON V. UNITED STATES :: 508 U.S. 36-46 (1993); WILLIAMS V. UNITED STATES :: 503 U.S. 193, 203 (1992); UNITED STATES V. HAVIS :: 927 F.3d 382 AT 386 (6TH CIR. 2019); UNITED STATES V. MILLER :: 34 F.4TH 500, AT 2022 U.S. APP. LEXTS 3 & 4 (6TH CIR. 2019); 18 U.S.C. § 3742(a)(1) & (F)(1); U.S.S.G. § 4A1.2(d)(2); § 4A1.2 cmt., n.(7); § 4A1.2(a)(2) & § AMENDMENT 709; § 4A1.2(e)(3); § 2K2.1 cmt., n.(10); § 4B1.4 cmt., n.1] - SEE SUPREME COURT RULE 10(a) & (c). ALSO MORGAN FILED A REHEARING EN BANC PER FED. R. APP. P. RULE (35) & (40) DUE TO THE 6TH CIR. NOT ADDRESSING THE ISSUES IN THE APPELLATE BRIEF DETAILED IN THE ABOVE TEXT. ALSO THIS COURT SUPERVISORY POWER IS NEEDED FOR THE CLARIFICATION OF THE 6TH CIRCUIT ADDING "FIBER OPTIC RIGHTS TO CIVIL RIGHT DETERMINED UNDER MICHIGAN

11

(e)

"LAW WHICH IS VOTE, HOLD PUBLIC OFFICE, AND SERVE ON JURIES". SEE [800 F.3d 720, 732 & 733: UNITED STATES V. WALKER (6TH CIR. 2015) AND 191 F.3d 695, 701-703 :: HAMPTON V. UNITED STATES: (10/12/99) (6TH CIR.)]. THE 6TH SIXTH CIRCUIT WRONGLY DECIDED MORGAN ASSERTION OF 18 U.S.C. § 921(a)(20) "WHAT CONSTITUTES A CONVICTION OF SUCH CRIME SHALL BE DETERMINED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LAW OF THE JURISDICTION IN WHICH THE PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD. ALSO MORGAN FILED A MOTION TO VACATE THE ENBANC ORDER, ON 9/9/2022 WHICH WAS ENTERED BY THE CLERK ON 9/02/22 PER FED. R. APP. P. R. 27(b). ON 9/12/2022 THE CLERK SENT ME THE MOTION BACK "UNFILED"! THE 6TH CIR. NEVER ACKNOWLEDGES THE ITEMS IN THE ENBANC PETITION PER RULE (35) & (40) OF THE "FED. R. OF APP. P"! FOR THESE COMPELLING REASONS THE SUPREME COURT HAS THE JURISDICTION TO REVIEW THE ERRORS IMPOSED BY 6TH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS. ALSO MR. MORGAN SUBMITTED THE "LEXIS NEXIS" LAW LIBRARY - SUBSTITUTED VERSION OF 18 U.S.C. § 922(g) - WHICH WAS ESTABLISHED IN JUNE 2019 THAT DESERVES THIS COURT REVIEWING POWER! I ASK THAT THE PETITION OF WRIT OF CERTIORARI BE GRANTED PER - SUPREME COURT RULE 10(a) & (c)!

(F)

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS, STATUTES
REGULATIONS WITH APPROPRIATE CITATION

18 U.S.C. § 921(a)(20) | 800 F.3d 720, 732 & 733;; UNITED STATES V. WALKER (6TH CIR. 2015); 191 F.3d 695, 701-703;; HAMPTON V. UNITED STATES (6TH CIR. 1999); 2000 U.S. APP. LEXIS 8781, AT LEXIS 2-8;; GILLIAM V. UNITED STATES;; 6TH CIR. 2000; LOGAN V. U.S.;; 552 U.S. 23 (2007)

18 U.S.C. § 922(g) | I.D. AT LEXIS 2; GILLIAM V. UNITED STATES (6TH CIR. 2000); I.D. AT 191 F.3d 703;; HAMPTON V. UNITED STATES (6TH CIR. 1999); REHAIF V. UNITED STATES;; 139 S.Ct. 2191 (2019)

18 U.S.C. § 3742 | 615 F.3d 715, AT 718-719;; UNITED STATES V. BOWERS;; (2010 6TH CIR.); WILLIAMS V. UNITED STATES;; 503 U.S. 193, 203;; 117 L.Ed.2d 341;; 112 S.Ct. 1112 (1992)

28 U.S.C. § 994 | UNITED STATES V. RICCARDI;; 989 F.3d 476, 483 (6TH CIR. 2021); STINSON V. UNITED STATES;; 508 U.S. 36, 43;; 113 S.Ct. 1913 (1993)

28 U.S.C. § 2101(c) | BOWLES V. RUSSELL;; 551 U.S. 205, AT 212;; 127 S.Ct. 2360;; 168 L.Ed.2d 96 (2007)

18 U.S.C. § 924(a)(2) | REHAIF V. UNITED STATES;; 139 S.Ct. 2191 (2019)

18 U.S.C. § 924(c) | SHEPARD V. UNITED STATES;; 544 U.S. 13 (2007)

MCL 750.224(f) | WALKER V. UNITED STATES; 800 F.3d 720 (6TH 2015)

RULES

FED. R. APP. P. RULE (35) & (40) | UNITED STATES V. HAVIS;; 927 F.3d 382, 386;; (6TH CIR. 2019) (EN BANC); 2022 U.S. APP. LEXIS 2477;; HOPSON V. HUNT (6TH CIR. 2022)

FED. R. CRIM. P. (7) | REHAIF V. UNITED STATES;; 139 S.Ct. 2191 (2019)

FED. R. APP. P. (52)(b)

13

(F)

SUPREME COURT RULE 10(a) & (c)

SUPREME COURT RULE 12(2)

U.S.S.G

§ 2K2.1(1)(a) & 2K2.1 CMT.3, N. (10) | UNITED STATES V. BERRY :: 2020
U.S. APP. LEXIS 18929 (6TH CIR. 2020); UNITED STATES V. GOWARD :: 315 FED.
APPX. 544 (6TH CIR. 2009)

§ 4A1.2(a)(2) & AMENDMENT 709 | 136 S. CT. 1338 :: MOLINA-MARTINEZ
V. UNITED STATES (2016); 894 F. 3d 764 :: UNITED STATES V. FLEMING ::
(6TH CIR. 2018); 759 FED. APPX. 387 :: U.S. V. SHALASH :: (2018 6TH CIR.)

§ 4A1.7(d)(2) & § 4A1.2 CMT. N. (7) | 572 FED. APPX. 417, 418 :: U.S. V. BELL
6TH CIR. 2014 & 661 FED. APPX. 318, 323-325 :: U.S. V. BELL (6TH CIR 2016);
MISTRETTO V. U.S. :: 488 U.S. 361, 413 (1989); STINSON V. U.S. :: 508 U.S. 36,
40-46 (1993)

§ 4A1.2(e)(3) & § 4B1.4 APPLICATION N. (1) | U.S. V. EVE :: 984 F.2d 701, 705 (6TH
CIR 1993); U.S. V. CHATMON :: 565 FED. APPX. 345 (6TH CIR 2014); STINSON
U.S. V. 508 U.S. 36, AT 43 (1993); MISTRETTO V. U.S. :: 488 U.S. 361, 413 (1989);
HAVIS V. U.S. :: 927 F.3d 382, 386 (6TH CIR. 2019)

(g)(h)(i)

CONCISE STATEMENT & ARGUMENT

ON 11/06/2019 MORGAN WAS FOUND GUILTY AT TRIAL FOR 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1). DURING THE PRE SENTENCE INVESTIGATION PROCEEDING, THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT APPLIED FOR A "CHAPTER 4 ENHANCEMENT - SEE EXHIBIT A", MORGAN FILED OBJECTIONS AND MOTIONS: [ECF NUMBERS 130, 131, AND 134 FOR DISTRICT COURT CASE # 2:19-cr-20259 - INFORMING THE COURT OF THE PROBATION OFFICERS' INCORRECT APPLICATION OF THE SENTENCING GUIDE LINES - UNDER 18 U.S.C. § 3742(a)(1), (e)(1), AND (f)(1): SEE WILLIAMS V. U.S.: 503 U.S. 193, 203 (1992)]. ALSO, MORGAN ASSERTED THE STINSON V. U.S.: 508 U.S. 36, 43 (1993); HAVIS V. U.S.: 927 F.3d 382, 386 (6TH CIR. 2019); MINSTRETTA V. U.S.: 488 US 361, 413 (1989) - SHOWING THAT "4B1.4 cmt. n. (1) VIOLATES THE DICTATES OF § 4A1.2(a)(2), AMENDMENT 709, § 2K2.1 cmt. n. (10), § 4A1.2(d)(2), § 4A1.2 cmt. n. (7), § 4A1.2(e)(3) & (4). THE DISTRICT COURT IMPOSED A SENTENCE OF 180 MONTHS FOR 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1). ON JUNE 11TH 2021, MORGAN FILED A TIMELY APPEAL ENTERED IN THE 6TH CIRCUIT ON 6/22/2021, CASE # 21-2628. MORGAN APPEALED HIS CONVICTION AND SENTENCE FOR 18 U.S.C. § 922(g) - SEE EXHIBIT B - APPELLANT'S BRIEF DOCKETED IN THE 6TH CIRCUIT ILLUSTRATING THE ARGUMENTS, CITATIONS, STATUTES, AND CASE LAWS APPEALING CONVICTION AND SENTENCE. MORGAN BRIEF FOCUSED PRIMARILY ON "CIVIL RIGHTS BEING RESTORED UNDER 18 U.S.C. § 921(a)(20) - SEE [WALKER V. U.S.: 800 F.3d 720, 732 & 733 (6TH CIR. 2015); 191 F.3d 695, 701-703; HAMPTON V. U.S. (6TH CIR 1999)], THE SUBSTITUTED AND REPLACED 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)

(g)(b)(i)

PRINTED FROM THE LEXISNEXIS LAW LIBRARY CAUTIONS
 SEE AMENDMENT NOTES SECTION OF 18 U.S.C. § 922(S). SEE
 "EXHIBIT B" WHICH IS DOCKET # 36, CASE # 21-2628, 6TH CIR. - APPELLANTS
 "BRIEF, FOR THE CONVICTION PORTION OF THE BRIEF; MORGAN
 PRIMARILY FOCUS ON THE SENTENCE PORTION OF THE BRIEF WAS
 BASE UPON - THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT INCORPORATING THE
 "CHAPTER 4 ENHANCEMENT FROM THE CRIMINAL HISTORY SECTION
 OF THE UNITED STATES SENTENCING GUIDELINES MANUAL"; WHICH
 ASSERTEA 18 U.S.C. § 3742(a)(1), (e)(1), & (f)(1). SEE WILLIAMS,
 503 U.S. 193, AT 203 (1992); THE BRIEF DETAILED HOW § 4B1.4
 CMT, N.(1) - VIOLATES THE DICTATE OF § 4A1.2(a)(2) & AMENDMENT
 709: SINGLE SENTENCE RULE; § 4A1.2(d)(2) & 4A1.2 CMT, N.(7) OFF-
 ENSES COMMITTED PRIOR TO AGE EIGHTEEN; § 4A1.2(e)(3) & 4A1.2
 CMT, N.(8) - APPLICABLE TIME PERIODS; § 2K2.1 CMT, N.(10) AND
 18 U.S.C. § 921(a)(20) - ANY CONVICTION WHICH A PERSON HAS CIVIL
 RIGHTS RESTORED SHALL NOT BE ^A CONVICTION FOR THE PURPOSES OF THIS
 CHAPTER & 18 U.S.C. APPENDIX FEDERAL SENTENCING GUIDELINES
 AND SERVES AS AN INDEPENDENT LEGAL FORCE, ADDITION
 TO THE GUIDELINES AND NONE OF THE GUIDELINES PROVISIONS
 LISTED IN THE ABOVE TEXT BEAR THE CONSTRUCTION OF § 4B1.4
 CMT, N.(1) - SEE [STINSON V. U.S.: 503 U.S. 36, 40-46 (1993);
 MINISTRETTA V. U.S.: 488 U.S. 361, 413 (1989); HAVIS V. U.S.: 927
 F.3d 382, 386 (6TH CIR. 2019); 136 S.Ct. 1338; MOLINA-MARTINEZ V. U.S.
 (2016); U.S. V. BERRY: 2020 U.S. APP. LEXIS 18929 (6TH CIR. 2020); U.S. V. FLEMING
 : 894 F.3d 764 (6TH CIR. 2018); U.S. V. SHALASH: 759 FED. APPX. 387 (2018 6TH CIR.);
 U.S. V. CHATMON: 565 FED. APPX. 345 (6TH CIR. 2014); 542 FED. APP. 417
 418: U.S. V. BELL (6TH CIR. 2014); 661 FED. APPX. 318, 323-325: U.S. V. BELL

(g), (h), (i)

(6TH CIR 2016); U.S. v. GOWARD; 315 FED. APPX. 544 (6TH CIR 2009);
 U.S. v. EVE; 984 F.2d 701, 705 (6TH CIR 1993).

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

MORGAN FILED MOTIONS BEFORE AND AFTER TRIAL ASSERTING
 REHAB V. U.S.; 139 S. CT. 2191 (2019); 18 U.S.C. § 921(a)(20); U.S.
 LEXISNEXTS SUBSTITUTED VERSION OF 922(G) OF 18 U.S.C. &
 CLAIMING HE WAS CLEAR OF THE STATUS FELON AND
 NEVER SHOULD'VE BEEN CHARGED FOR 18 U.S.C. § 922(G)(1)
 PER § 921(a)(20). SEE [WALKER V. U.S.; 800 F.3d 720, 732 & 733 (6TH CIR.
 2015) & 191 F.3d 695, 701-703; HAMPTON V. U.S. (6TH CIR 2019)], WHICH
 THE DISTRICT OVERLOOKED AND FOUND MORGAN GUILTY AND
 THE 6TH CIR AFFIRMED CONVICTION ON 8/01/22. MORGAN APPEALED
 SENTENCE WHICH IS DETAILED IN THE PREVIOUS TEXT. THE
 6TH CIR NEVER ACKNOWLEDGED THE MATTERS IN MORGAN'S
 APPELLANT BRIEF ABOUT THE SENTENCING CLAIMS AND AFFIRMED
 THE SENTENCE. MORGAN FILED A TIMELY (REHEARING) & (ENBANC)
 PER "FED. R. APP. P. (35) & (40)" BUT THE CLERK ENTERED A DENIAL
 ORDER ON 9/2/22. ON 9/9/22 MORGAN FILE A "FED. R. APP. P. (27)(b)
 MOTION TO VACATE THE ORDER ON 9/2/22 - BECAUSE THE ORDER CLAIM
 IT PROPERLY CONSIDERED THE PETITION FOR ENBANC AS OPPOSED
 TO THE ORIGINAL DECISIONS - BUT - THE "UN PUBLISH ORDER
 DOCKET # 59 FOR CASE # 21-2628 - NEVER ACKNOWLEDGED THE
 SENTENCING CLAIM IN THE APPELLANT BRIEF¹ FOR THE
 REASONS THE 6TH CIRCUIT CONTINUE TO REFUSE TO ACKNOWLEDGE
 MORGAN'S SENTENCING CLAIMS & MIS APPREHENDING THE
 PROPER ENFORCEMENT OF 18 U.S.C. § 921(a)(20) - MORGAN
 PRESENTS WELL ARTICULATE AND COMPELLING MATTERS

FOR THE GRANTING OF A "WRIT OF CERTIORARI" IN
 PURSUANT WITH SUPREME COURT RULE 10(a) & (c).^{"1"}

CONCLUSION

UPON THE REVIEWING COURT SUPERVISORY POWER
 THE COURT SHALL PROPERLY CLASSIFY 18 U.S.C. § 921 (a)
 (20) RESTORATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS TO BE "VOTE, SIT ON
 JURY AND HOLD PUBLIC OFFICE" AS DETAILED IN [HAMPTON V.
 U.S.; 191 F.3d 695, 701-703 (1999)] WHEREAS THE 6TH CIRCUIT
 IS ADDING "FIREARM RIGHTS" TO THE CIVIL RIGHTS LIST IN
 18 U.S.C. § 921(a)(20). BASED ON THE PROPER ENFORCEMENT OF
 18 U.S.C. § 921(a)(20) - MORGAN CONVICTION AFFIRMED BY THE 6TH CIR.
 SHALL BE VACATED ACCORDING TO THE SENTENCING ASPECT
 THIS COURT SHALL ENFORCE "STINSON, AT 508 U.S. 36, 43 (1993)" -
 OUR HOLDING IN WILLIAMS DEALING WITH COMMENTARY AND THE
 GUIDELINE IT INTERPRETS ARE INCONSISTENT IN THAT FOLLOWING
 ONE WILL RESULT IN VIOLATING THE DICTATES OF THE OTHER - THE SENTENCE
 REFORM ACT COMMAND COMPLIANCE WITH THE GUIDELINES. IN THIS
 CASE § 4B1.4 CMT., N.(1) VIOLATES THE COMMANDS OF [§ 4A1.2 (a)(2) & AMEND
 MENT 709; 2K2.1 CMT., N.(10); 4A1.2 (a)(2) & 4A1.2 CMT., N.(7); § 4A1.2
 (c)(3) & (4) - AND 18 U.S.C. § APPX - FEDERAL SENTENCING GUIDELINES] WHICH
 THE DISTRICT COURT & 6TH CIRCUIT - DID NOT COMPLY BY THE SENTENCE
 REFORM ACT COMPLIANCE WITH THE GUIDELINES - WHICH AFFECTED
 MORGAN'S LIBERTY AND SENTENCE THAT WAS THE RESULT OF THE
 INCORRECT APPLICATION OF THE GUIDELINE - 18 U.S.C. § 3742 (a)(1),
 (e)(1) & (f)(1). FOR THESE REASON MORGAN SENTENCE SHALL REFLECT
 THE 18 mo. - 24 mo. IN EXHIBIT A - AND THE 6TH CIRCUIT JUDGE
 SENTENCE SHALL BE REVERSED.