

TRULINCS 18079002 - JOYNER, LEROY THOMAS JR - Unit: YAZ-B-A

FROM: 18079002

TO: Legal

SUBJECT: ***Request to Staff*** JOYNER, LEROY, Reg# 18079002, YAZ-B-A

DATE: 02/02/2026 08:25:44 AM

To:

Inmate Work Assignment: SUPREME COURT

No. _____

In The
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

LEROY TOMAS JOYNER, JR.

Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Respondent.

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the

United States Courts of Appeals

For the Eleventh Circuit

APPENDIX

Leroy Thomas Joyner, Jr. #180790-02
FCC Yazoo City (Low)
P.O. Box 5000
Yazoo City, MS 39194
Email: grasschange@gmail.com

TRULINCS 18079002 - JOYNER, LEROY THOMAS JR - Unit: YAZ-B-A

FROM: 18079002
TO: Legal
SUBJECT: ***Request to Staff*** JOYNER, LEROY, Reg# 18079002, YAZ-B-A
DATE: 04/15/2026 10:59:48 AM

To:
Inmate Work Assignment: SUPREME COURT

INDEX

DENIAL OF STAY APPLICATION ADDRESSED TO JUSTICE KENTANJI JACKSON (ATTACHMENT #1) 1a
GRANTING OF APPELLANT'S MOTION TO STAY (ATTACHMENT #2) 2a
DENIAL OF APPELLANT'S MOTION TO SUPPLEMENT (ATTACHMENT #3) 3a
NO ACTION/DEFICIENCY NOTICE FOR MOTION TO RECALL THE MANDATE (ATTACHMENT #4) 4a
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT BRIEFING NOTICE/NOTE THAT STAY HAS EXPIRED 6a
DECLARATIONS UNDER OATH OF LEROY THOMAS JOYNER, JR. 7a

Supreme Court of the United States
Office of the Clerk
Washington, DC 20543-0001

ATTACHMENT #1/6

Scott S. Harris
Clerk of the Court
(202) 479-3011

January 20, 2026

Mr. Leroy Thomas Joyner, Jr.
Prisoner ID #18079-002
FCC Yazoo City - Low
PO Box 5000
Yazoo City, MS 39194

Re: Leroy Thomas Joyner, Jr.
v. United States
No. 25A568

Dear Mr. Joyner:

The Court today entered the following order in the above-entitled case:

The application for stay addressed to Justice Jackson and referred to the Court is denied.

Sincerely,



Scott S. Harris, Clerk

ATTACHMENT #2

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Eleventh Circuit

No. 24-12605

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

LEROY THOMAS JOYNER, JR.,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Middle District of Alabama
D.C. Docket No. 1:22-cr-00242-ECM-JTA-1

ORDER:

Appellant's motion to stay the appeal is GRANTED for a period of 60 days. The stay shall expire at the end of the 60 days unless otherwise ordered by the Court.

/s/ Kevin C. Newsom
UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

ATTACHMENT #3

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Eleventh Circuit

No. 24-12605

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

LEROY THOMAS JOYNER, JR.,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Middle District of Alabama
D.C. Docket No. 1:22-cr-00242-ECM-JTA-1

ORDER:

Appellant's motions to supplement the record and initial
brief are DENIED.

/s/ Robert J. Luck
UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

ATTACHMENT #4

ELBERT PARR TUTTLE COURT OF APPEALS BUILDING
56 Forsyth Street, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

David J. Smith
Clerk of Court

For rules and forms visit
www.ca11.uscourts.gov

January 20, 2026

Leroy Thomas Joyner Jr.
FCI Yazoo City Low - Inmate Legal Mail
PO BOX 5000
YAZOO CITY, MS 39194

Appeal Number: 24-12605-EE
Case Style: USA v. Leroy Joyner, Jr.
District Court Docket No: 1:22-cr-00242-ECM-JTA-1

NO ACTION / DEFICIENCY NOTICE

Notice that no action will be taken on Motion for reconsideration of panel order filed by Appellant Leroy Thomas Joyner, Jr.. Reason(s) no action being taken on filing(s): The motion is untimely to seek reconsideration of the 02/28/25 order and there is no mandate in this case to recall.

No deadlines will be extended as a result of your deficient filing. **If you refile a corrected document out of time (after its due date), it must be accompanied by an appropriate motion, i.e.,** a motion to file out of time, a motion to reinstate if the case has been dismissed, and/or a motion to recall the mandate if the mandate has issued.

CORRECTIVE ACTION

For motions for reconsideration or petitions for rehearing that are not permitted, no corrective action is required or permitted. Your filing will not be considered.

For mistaken filings, to have your document considered, **you must file the document in the correct court.**

For CIP deficiencies, you must file a CIP on the Court's docket, complete the web-based CIP, or both before or at the same time you refile your document.

For all other deficiencies, to have your document considered, **you must refile the entire document** after all the deficiencies identified above have been corrected and **you must include**

any required items identified above **along with** the refiled document. No action will be taken if you only provide the missing items without refiling your entire document.

In addition, **if the corrected document is refiled out of time (after its due date), it must be accompanied by an appropriate motion, i.e.,** a motion to file out of time, a motion to reinstate if the case has been dismissed, and/or a motion to recall the mandate if the mandate has issued.

Clerk's Office Phone Numbers

General Information:	404-335-6100	Attorney Admissions:	404-335-6122
Case Administration:	404-335-6135	Capital Cases:	404-335-6200
CM/ECF Help Desk:	404-335-6125	Cases Set for Oral Argument:	404-335-6141

Notice No Action Taken

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

ATTACHMENT #5

ELBERT PARR TUTTLE COURT OF APPEALS BUILDING
56 Forsyth Street, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

David J. Smith
Clerk of Court

For rules and forms visit
www.ca11.uscourts.gov

January 23, 2026

Brett Joseph Talley
DOJ-USAO
131 CLAYTON ST
PO BOX 197
MONTGOMERY, AL 36101-0197

Appeal Number: 24-12605-EE
Case Style: USA v. Leroy Joyner, Jr.
District Court Docket No: 1:22-cr-00242-ECM-JTA-1

BRIEFING NOTICE

The court ordered stay has expired as of 01/22/26 and briefing has resumed.

Brief and Appendix Deadlines

The appellee's brief is due **February 23, 2026**. The supplemental appendix, if any, is due no later than 7 days after filing of the appellee's brief. The appellant's reply brief, if any, is due within 21 days after the service of the last appellee's brief. This is the only notice you will receive regarding the due date for briefs and appendices.

Form

Please see FRAP 32(a) and the corresponding circuit rules for information on the form of briefs and FRAP 32(b) and 11th Cir. Rules 30-1 and 30-2 for information on the form of appendices.

Paper Copies of Briefs and Appendices

At the conclusion of briefing, the clerk will send a notice directing each party to send to the Court the specified number of paper copies of briefs and appendices within seven days of the notice.

If the case is classed for oral argument, the clerk will send an additional notice directing each party to send to the Court the specified number of paper copies of briefs and appendices within seven days of the date of the notice.

Paper copies of briefs and appendices must not be sent until the clerk's notice(s) is received.

FROM: 18079002
TO: Legal
SUBJECT: ***Request to Staff*** JOYNER, LEROY, Reg# 18079002, YAZ-B-A
DATE: 12/05/2025 09:27:48 AM

ATTACHMENT #7

To:
Inmate Work Assignment: ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

INDEX

DECLARATIONS UNDER OATH OF LEROY THOMAS JOYNER, JR.

PROTECTION FROM ABUSE HEARING	1a
CHILD ADVOCACY CENTER #1	1a
CHILD ADVOCACY CENTER #2	2a
FARETTA HEARING	3a
MOTION HEARING	4a
PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCE	5a
FARETTA HEARING	6a
PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCE	7a
MOTION HEARING	7a
TRIAL PROCEEDING	9a
STATUS HEARING	10a
SENTENCING HEARING	10a
PROTECTIVE ORDER #1	11a
PROTECTIVE ORDER #2	14a

FROM: 18079002
TO: Legal
SUBJECT: ***Request to Staff*** JOYNER, LEROY, Reg# 18079002, YAZ-B-A
DATE: 12/02/2025 08:45:00 AM

To:
Inmate Work Assignment: ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Appellee.

v.

LEROY THOMAS JOYNER, JR.
Appellant.

*
*
*
* Case No. 24-12605
*
*
*
*
*

DECLARATION UNDER OATH OF LEROY THOMAS JOYNER, JR.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. & 1746 and a constitutional right to due process, I hereby declare the following testimonial statements and facts were transacted within proceedings held prior to Case No. 1-20-CR-00033-ECM-SMD:

PROTECTION FROM ABUSE HEARING

1. On October 31, 2018, Shelly Sanders (hereinafter "mother") filed a petition for Protection From Abuse (hereinafter "PFA Hearing") relating to her minor child, C.S. in Dale County, Alabama.
2. C.S. testified that no abuse occurred towards her from Leroy Thomas Joyner, Jr. (hereinafter "Joyner") and that there did not exist any sexual abuse between her and the Declarant.
3. There was testimony that there did not exist any physical abuse towards her by the Declarant as well as a response to a question directly from the Judge relating to any sexual contact.
4. C.S. responded to the latter question by stating that there was no sexual contact between her and the Declarant.
5. Also, she testified that she was emotionally abused at home by her parent's ongoing drug abuse and that she was being pressured to testify falsely at the PFA Hearing by the community.
6. Additionally, the mother testified to the existence of text messages and calls where she threatened C.S. to testify in favor of the PFA Application.

CHILD ADVOCACY CENTER #1

1. On January 23, 2019, the Federal Bureau of Investigations conducted an interview at the Child Advocacy Center (hereinafter

"CAC") in Dothan, Alabama.

2. The CAC Interviewer asked questions relating to homelife, school, tennis and personal well being.
3. C.S. responded by offering accusations of misconduct by family, school administrators and the Declarant.
4. She testified that the accusations allegedly occurred in the State of Alabama.
5. There was no testimony given that physical abuse occurred in any other state, especially Georgia.
6. C.S. also stated that she was sexually abused in Alabama by the Declarant.
7. There was no testimony given that any sexual abuse occurred in any other state, especially Georgia.


CHILD ADVOCACY CENTER #2


1. On February 6, 2019, the Federal Bureau of Investigations conducted a second interview at the CAC in Dothan, Alabama. The CAC Interviewer repeated some of the questions initially asked in the January 23, 2019 interview.
2. There, the CAC Interviewer asked questions regarding interstate travel across the Southeast.
3. For the first time, C.S. alleged that sexual misconduct between her and the Declarant occurred in Georgia, Louisiana, South Carolina and Alabama.
4. The CAC Interviewer then followed by questioning C.S. about why she was traveling within interstate commerce. She responded by stating that travel within interstate commerce was "just for tennis."

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

FURTHER DECLARANT SAYETH NOT

Executed on this the 17 day of ~~November~~ ^{December}, 2025.


Leroy Thomas Joyner, Jr.


ARNOLD STANTON SR, NOTARY



FROM: 18079002
TO: Legal
SUBJECT: ***Request to Staff*** JOYNER, LEROY, Reg# 18079002, YAZ-B-A
DATE: 12/17/2025 06:23:21 AM

To:
Inmate Work Assignment: ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

explanation as to why their compliance with the Protective Order was an error. Id.

9. There was no objection offered by the defense counsel to the Government's disregarding of the directives given by the Protective Order which commanded the parties to provide discovery including interviews to the defense with the caveat that it could not be in the possession of the Declarant inside a prison facility. See App. p. 11a-12a; para. 1-3.

10. Not only did the district court not adjudicate these issues, but failed to acknowledge that their issued Protective Order commanded the Government, defense counsels and itself to share discovery with the defense team "to the extent necessary to provide a defense in this case, including any direct appeal." See App. p. 11a-13a. Also, the Declarant was allowed to proceed pro se.

MOTION HEARING

1. On June 1, 2021, a motion hearing was held in Montgomery, Alabama where the district court considered arguments regarding four motions, including the raising of the non-disclosures of the star witness missing VZW records and her 2nd interview with the CAC. It was represented by the Government that only two documents for its star witness were provided by Verizon Wireless. That sentiment was echoed by the FBI Case Agent and the lead prosecutor.

2. The Magistrate Judge repeated his questions for clarity as it related to the disclosure of the discovery. Both the FBI Case Agent and the lead prosecutor repeated their assertions.

3. The standby counsel did not represent to the court that they were in possession of the non-disclosed discovery. There were also no mentioning of the Protective Order not commanding any party to provide the Declarant the discovery outside of a prison facility. Also, the district court questioned the Government as to the non-disclosure of the 2nd Interview.

4. Both the FBI Case Agent and the lead prosecutor asserted that the defense had not visited their office to view the contents of the interview. A FBI 302 Summary was provided as a substitute for the non-disclosed 2nd interview.

5. There was no objection offered by the standby counsel as to the production of that summary or the fact that it did not comply with the Protective Order.

6. Further, the Government offered that the January 23, 2019 CAC Interview had been disclosed to the defense in error. The district court did not correct any party as to their non-compliance with the Protective Order.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.


FURTHER DECLARANT SAYETH NOT.

Executed on this 17 day of DECEMBER, 2025.

Leroy Thomas Joyner, Jr.

Leroy Thomas Joyner, Jr.

Arnold Stanton Sr. 12/17/2025
ARNOLD STANTON SR., NOTARY



FROM: 18079002
TO: Legal
SUBJECT: ***Request to Staff*** JOYNER, LEROY, Reg# 18079002, YAZ-B-A
DATE: 12/02/2025 02:07:08 PM

To:
Inmate Work Assignment: ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Appellee,

v.

Case No. 24-12605

LEROY THOMAS JOYNER, JR.
Appellant.

DECLARATION UNDER OATH OF LEROY THOMAS JOYNER, JR

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. & 1746 and a constitutional right to due process, I hereby declare the following testimonial statements and facts were transacted within proceedings held under Case No. 1:21-CR-0339-RAH-SRW:

PART #1

PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCE

1. On September 22, 2021, a pretrial conference was held in Montgomery, Alabama without the Declarant who had asserted his right to self-representation (22) days prior on August 31, 2021. That motion was placed under seal and disregarded by the district court.
2. A discussion was had regarding Rule 12(b) pro se motions submitted by the Declarant. The defense counsel represented that discovery was complete despite having knowledge that a subpoena was filed on August 12, 2021 (See docket 12) and a motion to proceed pro se (See docket 15) arguing his failure to raise the non-disclosure of exculpatory evidence, to wit: 1) VZW records and 2) 2nd Interview.
3. That counsel made that misrepresentation without providing an explanation on how the issuance of the Protective Order and the non-disclosure of the exculpatory evidence supra constituted discovery being complete.
4. Their position was followed by the Government represented that discovery was complete despite having knowledge the the Protective Order commanded them to provide the defense any evidence that resulted from a VZW subpoena and the 2nd

interview.

FARETTA HEARING

1. On September 27, 2021, a Faretta Hearing was held in Montgomery, Alabama as a result of the Declarant exercising his right to self-representation on August 31, 2021.
2. The district court issued a verbal in court order that there would be no discussion as to paragraphs (5) through (8) of the motion to proceed pro se; to wit: 1) defense counsel failure to subpoena VZW; 2) his failure to raise the non-disclosure of those records with the court and 3) his failure to obtain the 2nd interview.
3. A discussion was had regarding the district court order that the defense counsel confer with the declarant as to whether or not he intended to exercise his right to self-representation.
4. The Declarant raised the non-disclosure of the 2nd Interview.
5. The Government not only denied the existence of the missing VZW records and that they were waiting for the defense to visit their office, but the defense counsel failed to interject that they were not in possession of any additional records nor the 2nd Interview.
6. Although any objections by the Declarant were continuously disregarded by the Magistrate Judge, he was allowed to proceed pro se.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.


FURTHER DECLARANT SAYETH NOT:

Executed on this the 17 day of ~~November~~ ^{DECEMBER}, 2025.

Leroy Thomas Joyner, Jr.

Leroy Thomas Joyner, Jr.

Arnold Stanton Sr 12/17/2025
ARNOLD STANTON SR NOTARY



FROM: 18079002

TO: Legal

SUBJECT: ***Request to Staff*** JOYNER, LEROY, Reg# 18079002, YAZ-B-A

DATE: 12/02/2025 02:36:26 PM

To: .
Inmate Work Assignment: ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Appellee,

v.

LEROY THOMAS JOYNER, JR.

Appellant.

*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*

Case No. 24-12605

DECLARATION UNDER OATH OF LEROY THOMAS JOYNER, JR.

Pursuant 28 U.S.C. & 1746 and a constitutional right to due process, I hereby declare the following testimonial statements and facts were transacted within proceedings held under Case No. 1:21-CR-00339-RAH-SRW:

PART #2

PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCE

1. On October 13, 2021, a pretrial conference was held in Montgomery, Alabama with the Declarant proceeding pro se along with a United States Attorney and the standby counsel in attendance.
2. Any questions regarding the status of the case was directed to the standby counsel by the district court.
3. The Declarant responses were generally interrupted or ignored by the district court.
4. Discovery was represented to be complete by the Government and the standby counsel. but the Declarant objected by raising that the defense was not in possession of the missing VZW records nor the 2nd Interview.
5. The standby counsel did not represent that the Office of Federal Defenders was not in possession of the missing VZW records or the 2nd Interview.


MOTION HEARING


1. On January 21, 2022, a motion hearing was held in Montgomery, Alabama where the district court had a discussion regarding pretrial motions, including a Rule 48(a) motion to dismiss the indictment without prejudice.


2. There was also a discussion had relating to the star witness destruction of evidence as well as regarding the pending Verizon Wireless subpoena.
3. The district court asked the Government about their charging, dismissing, charging single prosecution conduct. They responded that they could re-indict any defendant as many times as the law permitted them to do so.
4. The district court followed by inquiring if the indictment could be superseded and that question was responded to negatively by the lead prosecutor.
5. Declarant responded by expressing the potential prejudice he would suffer if re-indicted without having access to the missing VZW records and the non-disclosed 2nd interview.
6. The district court was advised that it was the Declarant position that the Rule 48(a) motion was filed in bad faith in an attempt to thwart his access to a subpoena and the 2nd interview.
7. Without making a ruling, the district court stated that all matters would be taken into consideration without noting that the Protective Order required the Government to produce the VZW records and the 2nd interview. See App. p. 14a-16a; para. 1-3.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on this the 17 day of ^{DECEMBER}~~November~~, 2025.


Leroy Thomas Joyner, Jr.


ARNOLD STANTON SR, NOTARY



FROM: 18079002

TO: Legal

SUBJECT: ***Request to Staff*** JOYNER, LEROY, Reg# 18079002. YAZ-B-A

DATE: 12/02/2025 03:09:02 PM

To:

Inmate Work Assignment: ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Appellee,

v.

LEROY THOMAS JOYNER, JR.

Appellant.

*
*
*
*
*
*
*

Case No. 1:22-CR-00242-ECM-JTA

DECLARATION UNDER OATH OF LEROY THOMAS JOYNER, JR.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. & 1746 and a constitutional right to due process, I hereby declare the following testimonial statements and facts were transacted within proceedings held under Case No. 1:22-CR-00242-ECM-JTA:

TRIAL PROCEEDING

1. On January 22-23, 2024, a trial was held in Dothan, Alabama where the Government had several witnesses, including the playing of both the January 23, 2019 and February 6, 2019 CAC Interviews.
2. Within the latter interview, the star witness made an exculpatory statement ("interstate travel was just for tennis") that was not played for the jury. The defense counsel attempted to extract that testimony out of the witness, but she provided false testimony.
3. With knowledge of that statement, the Government failed to correct the falsehood. See App. p. 1a-2a.
4. An attempt was made to have the star witness read statement from the 2nd Interview transcript, but the district court prohibited that approach. The standby counsel informed the court that the 2nd interview was not provided to the defense prior to trial.
5. That court was in possession of the transcript and could see the exculpatory statement made by the star witness during the February 6, 2019 CAC Interview.
6. The false testimony was repeated before the jury in the Government's closing argument.
7. The defense presented one witness, including the playing of a partial segment of the November 19, 2018 PFA Hearing in

Dale County, Alabama. Only a twelve second clip of that hearing was heard by the jury.

8. The jury did not hear the exculpatory statement made by the star witness during that hearing.

STATUS HEARING

1. On August 2, 2024, a status hearing was held in Montgomery, Alabama where the Declarant sought a hearing to discuss the absence of material and exculpatory evidence needed for sentencing.

2. The district court refused those transcripts, but promised that he could have them on appeal without offering an explanation as to how the defense counsels, the Government and themselves could deny the declarant transcript that were guaranteed by the Protective Order. See App. p. 11a-16a.

3. It was also discussed that the Government removed those exculpatory transcripts from the exhibits given to the jury.

4. Additionally, the standby counsel admitted to not providing the Declarant those transcripts even after he requested them for nearly (7) months.

5. Pursuant to the Federal Magistrate Act, the district was advised that the hearing and order issued was prohibited during the sentencing phase relating to a Magistrate Judge adjudicating a fact finding hearing.

SENTENCING HEARING

1. On August 8, 2024, a sentencing hearing was held in Montgomery, Alabama where the district court asked the Declarant why

he desired to have the 2nd interview transcript.

2. It was articulated that the exculpatory testimonial statements within proved his innocence.

3. Absent that exculpatory evidence and others, Declarant objected to being sentenced and enhanced without having an opportunity to object to the Pre-sentence Investigation Report.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

FURTHER DECLARANT SAYETH NOT.

Executed on this 17 day of ^{DECEMBER} November, 2025.

Arnold Stanton Sr 12/17/2025
ARNOLD STANTON SR, Notary

Leroy Thomas Joyner, Jr.
Leroy Thomas Joyner, Jr.

