


22-6864

ORIGINAL

No. _____



IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

In Re Abdush S. DuBose — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

V.S.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

V.S. Attorney General

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Abdush S. DuBose (Inmate Number)
(Your Name) 286-02-509

F D C Philadelphia
(Address) P.O. Box 562

Philadelphia PA 19105
(City, State, Zip Code)

N.A.
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- (1). Whether the U.S. District Court has personal or subject-matter jurisdiction over an indictment that was not filed in open court or voted on by 12 or more Grand Jurors or the Grand Jury and its members?
- (2). Whether an indictment that was not voted on by 12 or more Grand Jurors, and not returned or filed in open court by the Grand Jury or its members violates the defendants 5th and 6th due process rights of the U. S. Constitution?
- (3). Whether the U.S. District Court has personal or Subject-matter Jurisdiction over an indictment that was not signed by any attorney at all, or a representative for the Government?
- (4). Whether an indictment that was not signed by any attorney at all or representative for Government violates the 5th and 6th Amendment rights of the accused U.S. Constitutional rights?

- (5). Whether the U.S. District Court has personal or subject-matter jurisdiction over an indictment that fails to state an offense?
- (6). Whether an indictment that fails to state an offense violates the accused 5th and 6th Amendment U.S. Constitutional rights?
- (7). Whether the U.S. District Court has jurisdiction, personal or subject-matter; over an indictment that was presented with and obtained by perjured testimony in the Grand Jury Proceedings by the Government?
- (8). Whether an indictment that was presented with and obtained by Perjured testimony in the Grand Jury proceedings violates the accused 5th and 6th and 8th Amendment Constitutional rights?
- (9). Whether a Pretrial detained defendant is detained Unconstitutionally if the indictment is invalid on its face or obtained by perjured testimony presented to the Grand Jury by the Government?

(10). Whether a Customer or Shipper who files and submits a fraudulent indemnity claim for lost, missing, or damaged contents in transit to the United States Postal Service constitutes mail fraud, wire fraud, and Bank fraud violations?

(11). Whether a Customer or Shipper who files and submits a fraudulent notice of claim for lost, missing, or damaged contents while in transit to a Federal Motor Carrier constitutes a Mail fraud, wire fraud, or bank fraud violations?

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:

Abdush S DuBose
In Re: ~~James H. DuBose~~
v
Attorney General of the United States of America:

RELATED CASES

1. United States District Court
for The Eastern District of Pennsylvania

United States of America: Criminal Action

v.

Zumar Hamid DuBose : Indictment 20-453-WB
Abdush Shukur DuBose
Kariem Baseer DuBose

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1.
JURISDICTION.....	2.
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3.
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4.
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	5.
CONCLUSION.....	6.

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - 7.

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

See Next page

11

STATUTES AND RULES

11

OTHER

11

Table of Authorities Cited

Cases:

1. "Costello v. United States, 350 U.S. 359"
2. "Bank of Nova Scotia v. United States, 487 U.S. 250"
3. "Neder v. United States, 527 U.S. 1"
4. "United States v. Panarella, 277 F.3d 678 (3-d Cir App 2001)"
5. "Missouri P. R. Co. v. Elmore & Stahl, 377 U.S. 134"
6. "United States v. Hasting, 461 U.S. 499"
7. "McNabb v. United States, 318 U.S. 332"
8. "United States v. Salerno, 481 U.S. 739"
9. "Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668"
10. "Frisbie v. United States, 157 U.S. 160"
11. "United States v. Cox, 342 F.2d 167"
12. "United States v. Mills, 995 F.2d 480"
13. "United States v. Calandra, 414 U.S. 338"

- (14) "Giglio v. United States, 405 U.S. 150"
- (15) "United States v. Mandujano, 425 U.S. 564"
- (16) "United States v. Williams, 504 U.S. 36"
- (17) "United States v. Fisher, 692 F. Supp. 495, 501"
- (18) "Gaither v. United States, 134 U.S. App D.C. 154"
- (19) "Napue v. Illinois, 360 U.S. 264"
- (20) "Hamling v. United States, 418 U.S. 87"
- (21) "United States v. Ranking, 870 F.2d 109, 112"
- (22) "United States v. Peter, 310 F.3d 709"
- (23) "United States v. Brown, 752 F.3d 1344"

Statutes;

- (1) 18 U.S.C. 1341 Mail Fraud
- (2) 18 U.S.C. 1343 Wire Fraud
- (3) 18 U.S.C. 1344 Bank Fraud
- (4) 18 U.S.C. 2 ~~aiding~~ / abetting
- (5) 18 U.S.C. 1956 / 1957 conspiracy Money laundering
- (6) 18 U.S.C. 288 False Postal Losses
- (7) 49 U.S.C. 14706 Carmack Amendment
- (8) 49 C.F.R. 1005-1005.5 Interstate Commerce Act
- (9) 28 U.S.C. 2241 (a), (c) (1) (3)

Rules:

- (1) Fed. R. Crim. P. 6 (b)(2), (c), (d)(1), (f), (e)
- (2) Fed. R. Crim. P. 7(c)(1)
- (3) Fed. R. Crim. P. 12 (b)(2)
- (4) Fed. R. Crim. P. 12 (b)(3)(A)(v)
- (5) Fed. R. Crim. P. 12 (b)(3)(B)(v)
- (6) Fed. R. Crim. P. 52(a)

Other:

- (1) United States of America Federal Constitution
5th Amendment Right.
- (2) United States of America Federal Constitutional
6th Amendment Right.
- (3) United States of America Federal
Constitutional 8th Amendment right.

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

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of habeas corpus issue.

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 A 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 N.A.

☒ 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 jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1),

28 U.S.C. 2241 (a) (1) (3). "Unlawful detention"

☐ 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

- (1). U. S. Constitution 5th, 6th, and 8th
Amendment rights,
- (2). 28 U.S.C. 2241 (a), (c) (1) (3)
- (3). 18 U.S.C. 1341
- (4). 18 U.S.C. 1343
- (5). 18 U.S.C. 1344
- (6). 18 U.S.C. ~~2~~ 2
- (7). 18 U.S.C. 1956 / 1957

STATEMENT OF THE CASE
& RULE 20.4(A) STATEMENT

Abdush S. DuBose

I, ~~Zachary H. DuBose~~; a born United States of America Citizen; wish for this Petition of Habeas Corpus 2241(a), (c)(1)(3), to issue. I did not submit the application to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania because the U.S. District Court lacks Personal and Subject-matter Jurisdiction per 18 U.S.C. 3231.

On 8-1-22 and 11-8-22 the U.S. District Court denied pretrial motions that I have filed within the pretrial time limits. The U.S. District Court for the E. D. Pa. Order document numbers 192 and 153 are denials for the Pretrial Motions document numbers 116, 182, 184 for Pretrial dismissal of the insufficient and invalid indictment, prosecutorial misconduct in the grand jury proceeding 12-3-20 and 8-26-21, and lack of Jurisdiction.

I invoke my 5th and 6th Amendment Federal Constitutional right against the 20-453-WB (E.D.Pa.) invalid indictment. I am detained Pretrial Unconstitutionally. 5th, 6th, and 8th Amendment Violation.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Ground 1:

Superceding Indictment 20-453-WB (E.D.Pa.)
Was not filed in open court by the 8-26-21
Grand Jury, Foreperson, or Deputy Foreperson; and
12 or more Grand Jurors did not vote to indict at all.
The indictment is invalid by way of form, jurisdiction does not exist.

Ground 1 objections:

1. Superceding Indictment 20-453-WB document
79 filed 8-26-21 page 30 of 30 does not
include, purport, or possess any information in the
"filed in open court" section of the indictment.
The section is left blank by the Grand Jury
and not voted by the Grand Jury as a True Bill.
2. Superceding Indictment 20-453-WB is in violation
of Fed. R. Crim. P. 6(f) "12 or more Grand Jurors
must vote" and "The Grand Jury - or its foreperson or
deputy foreperson - must return the indictment to a
magistrate judge in open court". The indictment was not.
3. All defendants 5th and 6th Amendment rights of the
U.S. Constitution are violated and the district court
lacks jurisdiction, Personal and Subject matter per
18 U.S.C. 3231 and a Fed. R. Crim. P. 12(b)(2) violation.

Ground 2:

Superseding Indictment 20-453-WB (E.D.Pa.) was not signed by any attorney at all. No attorney for the Government signed the indictment. The signer is an unauthorized person to sign indictments and is unauthorized to be present in the Grand Jury Proceeding. The indictment is invalid, and no jurisdiction exist.

Ground 2 Objections:

1. Superseding Indictment 20-453-WB document 79 filed 8-26-21 page 29 of 30 does not include, possess, or purport the U.S. Attorney Jennifer A. Williams signature, any AUSA signature, or any representative signature for the United States at all. "United States v. Cox, 342 F.2d 167"
2. The signer is not an American Bar Association member, and is not authorized to sign indictments for the ~~for~~ United States government at all per Fed. R. Crim. P. 7(c)(1). The signer lacks a license to practice law or be an attorney. A 5th and 6th Amendment Constitution violation and Fed. R. Crim. P. 12(b)(2) violation, and Fed. R. Crim. P. 6(d)(4) violation, and Fed. R. Crim. P. 6(e) secrecy violation.
3. Superseding Indictment 20-453-WB document 79 filed 8-26-21 (E.D.Pa.) Counts 1-17 is "invalid by way of form." see "Frisbie v. United States, 157 U.S. 160" 5.

Ground 3:

The Grand Jury Foreperson nor the Deputy Foreperson signed or indorsed the Superseding Indictment 20-453-WB (E.D.Pa.) on 8-26-21. 12 or more Grand Jurors did not concur to indict any of the defendants. The indictment is invalid by way of form and the U.S. District Court lacks jurisdiction. Procedure defect of Fed. R. Crim. P. 6.

Ground 3 objections:

1. Superseding Indictment 20-453-WB document 79 filed 8-26-21 page 29 and 30 of 30 does not include, possess, or purport the Foreperson or deputy Foreperson of the 8-26-21 Grand Jury signature or indorsement. The signature was forged by an unauthorized individual who may not indorse a True Bill. The signature was redacted to hide the fraudulent signature that was fraudulently signed in the True Bill section of the indictment. ~~4th~~ Fed. R. Crim. P. 6 (C) violation.
2. Superseding Indictment 20-453-WB (E.D.Pa.) lacks the indorsement of a true bill. see *Friskie v. United States*, 157 U.S. 160. It is not a legal accusation. Violation of Fed. R. Crim. P. 6 (b)(2), (c)(f), 12(b)(2), and 5th and 6th Amendment Constitutional right of accused violations.

Ground 4:

Superceding Indictment 20-453-WB does not inform the defendants of the nature and cause of the accusation, fails to state an offense, and lacks jurisdiction.

Ground 4 objections:

1. I invoke my 5th and 6th Federal U.S. Constitution Amendment rights to dismiss Superceding Indictment 20-453-WB, at all times,
2. I re-allege Ground 1-5 and incorporate here,
3. Superceding Indictment 20-453-WB document 79 filed 8-26-21 page 5 of 30 paragraph 19 reads " From at least in or about October 2018 through in or about April 2020, in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and elsewhere, defendants Zumar Hamid DuBose, Abdush Shakur DuBose, and Kariem Baseer DuBose knowingly devised and intended to devise a scheme and artifice to defraud, and to obtain money and property by means of false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, and promises."

4. Superseding Indictment 20-453-WB document 79 filed 8-26-21 page 5 of 30 paragraph 19 does not: (1) allege what the scheme to defraud is, (2) how the defendants intended to defraud, (3) allege materiality, (4) does not allege what was the property or amount of money obtained by the scheme to defraud, (5) does not allege who was defrauded by the scheme to defraud. I am not apprised at all to form a defense or plead double jeopardy. "Fed. R. Crim. P. 7(c)(1)" violation; 5th Amendment due process right violation and 6th, "Hamling v. United States, 418 U.S. 87." Fed. R. Crim. P. 12 (b)(3)(B)(V) violation.

5. "Materiality is an element of the mail fraud, wire fraud, and bank fraud statutes" quoting "Neder v. United States, 527 U.S. 1."

6. Superseding Indictment 20-453-WB document 79 filed 8-26-21 page 5 of 30 paragraph 19 fails to charge an offense because it only recites the 18 U.S.C. 1341 statutory language, but it does not allege any conduct or "factual orientation" of any specific "essential facts" at all "constituting the offense charged" see "Fed. R. Crim. P. 7(c)(1)", "United States v. Panarella, 277 F.3d 678". Paragraph 19 is incomplete of any specific facts, and lack jurisdiction.

20-453-WB

7. Superseding Indictment[↓] document 79 filed
8-26-21 page 15 of 30 paragraph 49
does not allege: (1) how the defendants
used the mails to execute a scheme to defraud,
(2) what the scheme to defraud is, (3) it does not
allege any conduct or specific facts at all of
how any of the defendants intended to defraud. Counts 1-17
are incomplete and insufficient to charge an offense.

8. Superseding Indictment 20-453-WB document 79
filed 8-26-21 page 17 of 30 paragraph 3
Counts 11-15 reads

"From at least October 2018 through
in or about April 2020, in Philadelphia, in the
Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and elsewhere
defendants

Zumar Hamid DuBose,
Abdush Shakur DuBose, and
Kariem Baseer DuBose

knowingly devised and intended to devise a scheme
and artifice to defraud, and to obtain money and
property by means of false and fraudulent pretenses,
representations, and promises."

9. Superseding Indictment 20-453-WB document 79
filed 8-26-21 page 17 of 30 paragraph 3
Counts 11-15 fails to allege: (1) what the scheme
to defraud is, (2) materiality, (3) how the defendants
intended to defraud, (4) what was the money amount
and what was the property obtained by false fraudulent
pretenses, representations, and promises. Counts 11-15
violates Fed. R. Crim. P. 7(c)(1) because it does not
allege any plain, concise, and definite written statement
of facts at all. The paragraph only recites
the wire fraud statutory language, but does not inform
the defendants of any conduct or specific facts to
satisfy the offense charged. Fails to state an
offense, Fed. R. Crim. P. 12(b)(3)(B)(v) violation.

10. Superseding Indictment 20-453-WB document
79 page 17 of 30 paragraph 2 negates any
and all elements of intent and the use of the
wires because checks deposited via ATM is not
a wire transaction or a violation of 18 U.S.C. 1343.

11.

5,

11. Superseding Indictment 20-453-WB document 79 filed 8-26-21 page 20 paragraph 2 of counts 16 reads:

"From at least in or about September 2019 through in or about April 2020, in Philadelphia, in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and Elsewhere, defendants

Zumar Hamid DuBose, and
Karim Baseer DuBose

knowingly executed, and attempted to execute, and aided in abetted the execution of and attempt to execute a scheme to obtain money, funds, and assets owned by and under the care, custody and control of Citizens Bank by means of false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, and promises."

12. Superseding Indictment 20-453-WB document 79 filed 8-26-21 page 20 paragraph 2 counts 16 fails to allege: (1) what the scheme to obtain money is, (2) materiality, (3) how the scheme to obtain money was executed, (4) how the defendants aided and abetted the execution or attempt to obtain money from Citizens Bank. The paragraph # 2 only recites the statutory language of 18 U.S.C. 1344, but it does not contain any

allegations or any conduct or any specific facts at all. It is incomplete and I am not apprised of 18 U.S.C. 1344 violations at all. No elements are alleged at all to charge the offense.

13. Superseding Indictment 20-453-WB document 79 filed 8-26-21 Page 20 & 21 of 30 paragraphs 1-6 specific facts alleged falls outside the sweep to charge 18 U.S.C. 1344, 2, and lacks jurisdiction to charge a crime at all of 18 U.S.C. 1344, 2. Count 16 fails to state an offense.

14. Superseding Indictment 20-453-WB document 79 filed 8-26-21 Counts 1-17 all paragraphs "specific facts alleged falls outside the sweep to charge" 18 U.S.C. 1341, 1343, 1344, 2, 1956-1957. and the district court lack jurisdiction "quoting United States v. Brown, 752 F.3d 1344", United States v. Peter, 310 F.3d 709".

Ground 5:

Prosecutorial misconduct in the Grand Jury on 12-3-20 and 8-26-21: AUSA Kang knowingly presented USPS-OIG Special Agent Adam M. Greiss false and perjured testimony to the 12-3-20 and 8-26-21 Grand Jury in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and AUSA Kang knew the testimony was false and perjured to obtain Superseding Indictment 20-453-WB (E.D.Pa.).

Ground 5 Objections:

1. Superseding Indictment 20-453-WB document 79 filed 8-26-21 Counts 1-17 was not "returned by an Unbiased Grand Jury" "Costello v. United States, 350 U.S. 359". 12 or more Grand Jurors did not vote.
2. Superseding Indictment 20-453-WB document 79 filed 8-26-21 Counts 1-17 was obtained by Adam Greiss "false testimony" before the 12-3-20 and 8-26-21 Grand Jury, which was presented by AUSA Kang. AUSA Kang "may not use false testimony" see "Napue v. Illinois, 360 U.S. 264" "Presenting known false and perjured testimony is an instance of prosecutorial misconduct" see "United States v. Fisher, 692 F.supp. 495." "The defendant is denied due process when the prosecution knowingly uses perjured testimony" see "Giglio v. United States, 405 U.S. 150."

3. Superseding Indictment 20-453-WB document 79 filed 8-26-21 Counts 1-10 paragraphs 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40-49; Counts 11-15 paragraphs 1-5; Counts 16 paragraphs 1-6; Counts 17 paragraphs 1-6, 1-11 was based on the known false and perjured testimony ~~from~~ from Adam Greiss before the grand jury 12-3-20 and 8-26-21. "United States v. Williams, 504 U.S. 36".

4. On Thursday December 3, 2020 before the Federal Violent Crime Grand Jury of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, after first being duly sworn by the foreperson of the Grand Jury:

Adam Greiss falsely testified on (page 4 lines 1-11), (page 4 lines 16-21), (page 6 lines 19 & 22), (page 8 lines 10, 15-17, 24), (page 10 lines ~~20~~ 22), (page 22 line 10, 2, 6, 10, 24), (page 23 lines 7, 8, 12, 19), (page 25 lines 1, 4, 5, 13-16, 20-23), (page 28 line 15, 20, 24), (page 29 line 19, 20-22), (page 30 line 6-16), (page 34 line 11), (page 38 line 5, 6, 23), (page 41 lines 3, 6, 18-22, 23, 24), (page 43 lines 11, 23), (page 44 lines 3),

(page 48 line 3), (page 50 line 12),
(page 51 line 17), (page 52 line 23),
(page 53 lines 7, 11, 19, 23), (page 54 lines 2,
6, 12), of the 12-3-20 Grand Jury Transcripts.

5 On Thursday August 26, 2021 before the
Federal United Crime Grand Jury of the
United States District Court for the
Eastern District of Pennsylvania, after
first being duly sworn by the foreperson
of the Grand Jury:

Adam Greiss falsely testified on

"(page 4 lines 5, 7, 15, 21, 25), (pages
lines 3), (page 7 lines 10-12, 20-22),
(page 9 lines 6), (page 10 lines 10-15,
16-25), (page 11 lines 1-4, 12, 15, 24),
(page 12 lines 2), (page 13 lines 3-6,
16-18, 21, 23, 25), (page 14 lines 1-12,
16), (page 15 lines 8, 11-17, 23),
(page 16 lines 2, 5, 8, 16, 20), (page 17 lines
5, 10, 14, 17), (page 18 lines 1, 4, 10, 13,
16), (page 19 lines 6, 8, 10-11, 15),
(page 20 lines 14, 17), (page 21 lines 1, 4,
9, 12, 15, 18), (page 22 lines 7, 18, 20),
(page 23 lines 3, 7, 11, 15), (page 24 lines
3, 21), (page 25 lines 1, 9),

(page 26 lines 5, 11), (page 28 lines 23),
(page 29 lines 3, ~~20~~ 20), (page 30 lines 14,
19, 22), (page 31 lines 6, 10, 13, 25),
(page 32 lines 1-3, 10, 17, 20), (page 33
lines 25), (page 34 lines 11, 20),
(page 35 lines 11, 15), (page 36 lines 7,
13, 17, 21, 25), (page 37 lines 11, 14, 18, 22),
(page 38 lines 2, 7, 13, 18, 22), (page 39
lines 1, 4, 7, 11, 14, 23)" of the
8-26-21 Grand Jury Transcripts.

6. Adam Greiss committed Perjury in the
12-3-20 and 8-26-21 Grand Jury proceedings
presented by AUSA Kang. "When perjury
occurs in the context of a Grand Jury proceeding,
dismissal of an indictment can be the appropriate
remedy" see "United States v. Williams, 504 U.S. 36"
"Listing a violation of 18 U.S.C. 1623 is an example
of an action that would justify dismissal of
an indictment".

7. There is "Grave doubt" see "Bank of Nova Scotia
v. United States, 487 U.S. 250" that the Grand
Jury decision to indict Zumar, Abdush, and
Karim DuBose was free from the false and
perjured testimony of Adam Greiss presented
by AUSA Kang. The 8-26-21 Grand Jury

independent judgement function was influenced by the Adam Greiss false and perjured testimony presented by AVSA Kang, and with out it the Grand Jury could not have indicted because the false and perjured testimony was the only evidence presented to the 8-26-21 Grand Jury by the AVSA Kang. The Fed. R. Crim. P. 6 (b)(2),(C),(f), 12 (b)(3)(A)(V) has been violated and my 5th and 6th Sup process Amendments rights are violated also.

8. The defendants 6th Amendment right to a fair and speedy trial is violated by the false and perjured testimony presented to the Grand Jury on 8-21-21 by AVSA Kang.

"A Fair trial is one in which evidence subject to adversarial testing is presented to an impartial tribunal for resolutions of issues in advance of the proceeding."

quoting "Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668"

I raised the issue in pretrial motions # 116, 182, and 184. Now I bring this 28 U.S.C. 2241(a),(C)(1)(3), Writ to this U.S. Supreme Court respectfully. My 6th Amendment right to a defense is violated and right to be informed of the accusation. My detention is unconstitutional.

CONCLUSION

Wherefore, for the above stated reasons alleged in Grounds 1-5,
which are Constitutional and Jurisdictional Violations and issues,

The petition for a writ of habeas corpus should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Abdush S. DuBose 

Date: 2-10-23