

# EXHIBIT A

1 **WO**

2  
3  
4  
5  
6 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
7 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**  
8

9 United States of America,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 Jacob Mathew Medina,

13 Defendant.  
14

CV 23-00055-PHX-DLR (ESW)  
CR 19-00329-PHX-DLR

**ORDER**

15  
16 Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of Magistrate Judge  
17 Eileen S. Willett (Doc. 31) regarding Movant’s “Amended Motion to Vacate, Set Aside or  
18 Correct Sentence by a Person in Federal Custody” filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (“the  
19 Motion”) (Doc. 7).<sup>1</sup> The R&R recommends that the Court deny relief without an  
20 evidentiary hearing. The Magistrate Judge advised the parties that they had fourteen days  
21 from the date of service of a copy of the R&R to file specific written objections with the  
22 Court. (Doc. 31 at 11.) Movant filed an objection to the R&R on October 4, 2024 (Doc.  
23 35), Respondent filed its response on November 14, 2024. (Doc. 41.)

24 Movant’s first objection is his disagreement with the R&R’s finding that Ground  
25 One of his Motion, a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel, was meritless. The R&R  
26 applied the *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668, 687 (1984) test. The R&R found

27  
28 <sup>1</sup> Citations to “Doc.” are to the docket in CV 23-00055-PHX-DLR (ESW).  
Citations to “CR Doc.” are to the docket in the underlying criminal case, CR 19-00329-  
PHX-DLR.

1 nothing in the record that supported Movant's claim that his guilty plea was involuntary  
 2 due to his counsel's deficient performance. Movant's objection does not point to any  
 3 evidence. He claims that his counsel was terminated from his law firm "because of his  
 4 inadequate performance and lack of ethics towards his clients[.]" (Doc. 35 at 1.) Movant  
 5 alleges that the owner of the firm came to see Movant and told him that "nothing has been  
 6 done right in your case." (Doc. 35 at 1-2.) The alleged admission by the owner of the law  
 7 firm does not state what specifically was done by the assigned attorney that amounts to  
 8 deficient performance. A general statement of the nature relied on by Movant is not  
 9 evidence of deficient performance. Movant has not offered evidence of any deficient  
 10 performance let alone evidence that that his "counsel made errors so serious that counsel  
 11 was not functioning as the 'counsel' guaranteed the defendant by the Sixth Amendment."  
 12 *Strickland*, 466 U.S. at 687. Movant's first objection is overruled.


13 Movant next objects to the R&R's finding that Grounds Two through Five of the  
 14 Motion are waived pursuant to the plea agreement. The plea agreement contained a waiver  
 15 provision, which provides that any motions that could have been filed prior to trial are  
 16 precluded. (CR Doc. 148 at 4-5.) The trial court made a finding that Movant's plea was  
 17 made knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily. (Doc. 16-2 and 16-3.) There was nothing  
 18 offered to contradict that finding. The R&R correctly found that Grounds Two through  
 19 Five were foreclosed by the waiver provision of the plea agreement. Movant's second  
 20 objection is overruled.

21 **IT IS ORDERED** as follows:

- 22 1. Movant's Objections (Doc. 35) to the R&R (Doc. 31) are **OVERRULED**.
- 23 2. The R&R (Doc.31) is **ACCEPTED**.
- 24 3. Movant's Amended Motion to Vacate, Set Aside or Correct Sentence pursuant  
 25 to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (Doc. 7) is **DENIED**.
- 26 4. A Certificate of Appealability and leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* are  
 27 **DENIED** because Movant has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a  
 28 constitutional right.

1           5. The Clerk of the Court shall enter judgment accordingly and terminate this  
2           action.

3           Dated this 3rd day of March, 2025.

4  
5  
6  
7             
8           Douglas L. Rayes  
9           Senior United States District Judge  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

# EXHIBIT B

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

**FILED**

JUN 20 2025

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JACOB MATTHEW MEDINA,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 25-1963

D.C. Nos. 2:19-cr-00329-DLR-1  
2:23-cv-00055-DLR

District of Arizona,  
Phoenix

ORDER

Before: H.A. THOMAS and DESAI, Circuit Judges.

The request for a certificate of appealability (Docket Entry No. 7) is denied because the underlying 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion fails to state a federal constitutional claim debatable among jurists of reason. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2)-(3); *Gonzalez v. Thaler*, 565 U.S. 134, 140-41 (2012) (“When ... the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the petitioner seeking a COA must show both ‘that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right and that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling.’”) (quoting *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)).

Any pending motions are denied as moot.

**DENIED.**

# EXHIBIT C

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

AUG 15 2025

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JACOB MATTHEW MEDINA,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 25-1963

D.C. Nos. 2:19-cr-00329-DLR-1  
2:23-cv-00055-DLR

District of Arizona,  
Phoenix

ORDER


Before: PAEZ and M. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

The motion (Docket Entry No. 9) for reconsideration and reconsideration en banc is denied. *See* 9th Cir. R. 27-10; 9th Cir. Gen. Ord. 6.11.

No further filings will be entertained in this closed case.



# EXHIBIT D



**MOTION UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 2255 TO VACATE, SET ASIDE, OR CORRECT SENTENCE BY A PERSON IN FEDERAL CUSTODY**

CV-23-00055-PHX-DLR (ESW)

United States District Court		District of Arizona	
Name (under which you were convicted):		Docket or Case No:	
Jacob Matthew Medina		CR-19-00329-PHX-DLR	
Place of Confinement:		Prisoner No: 11975-508	
FCI # 1 Victorville Medium		P.O. Box 3725 Adelanto, CA 92301	
Movant		V. United States of America	
Jacob Matthew Medina			

**SEALED**

**MOTION**

1. (a) Name and location of court that entered the judgment of conviction you are challenging:

(b) Criminal docket or case number (if you know): CR-19-00329-PHX-DLR

2. (a) Date of the judgment of conviction (if you know): Unknown

(b) Date of sentencing: 01/06/2022

3. Length of sentence: 160 Months

4. Nature of crime (all counts): (1) 21 U.S.C. § 841 (b) (1) (A)(vi); 21 U.S.C. § 841 (b)(1)(A)(B)(i) (2) 21 U.S.C. 841 (b)(1)(A)(B)(vi), (3) 21 U.S.C. 841 (b)(1)(A)(B)(vi), (4) 21 U.S.C. § 846, (5) 18 U.S.C. § 924 (c)

5. (a) What was your plea: (Check one)

(1) Not guilty ☐

(2) Guilty ☒

(3) Nolo contendere (no contest) ☐

(b) If you entered a guilty plea to one count or indictment, and a not guilty plea to another count or indictment, what did you plead guilty to and what did you plead not guilty to?

Yes, I plead guilty by being coerced 21 U.S.C. § 846 (Conspiracy) and 21 U.S.C. § 841 (b) (1) (A) (vi) & (B) (i) Conspiracy to distribute 400 grams or more of fentanyl & 100 grams or more of heroin

- Plead Guilty**
6. If you went to trial, what kind of trial did you have? (Check one) Jury ☐ Judge Only ☐
7. Did you testify at a pretrial hearing, trial, or post-trial hearing? Yes ☐ No ☒
8. Did you appeal from the judgment of conviction? **"N/A" unknown if attorney filed any Notice of Appeal** Yes ☐ No ☐
9. If you did appeal, answer the following:
- (a) Name of court: **"N/A"**
- (b) Docket or case number (if you know): **"N/A"**
- (c) Result: **"N/A"**
- (d) Date of result (if you know): **"N/A"**
- (e) Citation of the case (if you know): **"N/A"**
- (f) Grounds raised: **"N/A"**
- (g) Did you file a petition for certiorari in the United States Supreme Court? Yes ☐ No ☐ **"N/A"**  
If "Yes," answer the following:
- (1) Docket or case number (if you know): **"N/A"**
- (2) Result: **"N/A"**
- (3) Date of result (if you know): **"N/A"**
- (4) Citation to the case (if you know): **"N/A"**
- (5) Grounds raised: **"N/A"**
10. Other than the direct appeals listed above, have you previously filed any other motions, petitions, or applications concerning this judgment of conviction in any court?  
Yes ☐ No ☐ **"N/A"**
11. If your answer to Question 10 was "Yes," give the following information:
- (a)(1) Name of court: **"N/A"**
- (2) Docket of case number (if you know): **"N/A"**

(3) Date of filing (if you know): "N/A"

(4) Nature of the proceeding: "N/A"

(5) Grounds raised: "N/A"

(6) Did you receive a hearing where evidence was given on your motion, petition, or application?  
Yes ☐ No ☐ "N/A"

(7) Result: "N/A"

(8) Date of result (if you know): "N/A"

(b) If you file any second motion, petition, or application, give the same information:

(1) Name of court: "N/A"

(2) Docket of case number (if you know): "N/A"

(3) Date of filing (if you know): "N/A"

(4) Nature of the proceeding: "N/A"

(5) Grounds raised: "N/A"

(6) Did you receive a hearing where evidence was given on your motion, petition, or application?  
Yes ☐ No ☐ "N/A"

(7) Result: "N/A"

(8) Date of result (if you know): "N/A"

(c) Did you appeal to a federal appellate court having jurisdiction over the action taken on your motion, petition, or application?

"N/A"

(1) First petition Yes ☐ No ☐ "N/A"

(2) Second petition Yes ☐ No ☐ "N/A"

(d) If you did not appeal from the action on any motion, petition, or application, explain briefly why you did not: "N/A"

12. For this motion, state every ground on which you claim that you are being held in violation of the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States. Attach additional pages if you have more than four grounds. State the facts supporting each ground.

**GROUND ONE: Ineffective Assistance of Counsel in conjunction with mental disease or defect.**

(a) Supporting facts (Do not argue or cite law. Just state the specific facts that support your claim):  
**Movant has placed upon record and made clear statements to his attorney that "he does not understand his plea agreement." Movant take strong medication that interfere with his thinking and brain functioning process daily. Movant asked his attorney multiple times to seek his due process constitutional law rights for a philological mental examination by an expert in mental health frontal brain cortex, learning disordered, medication side effect expert Medical Director.**

**"Due to facts that attorney was coercion, persuasion, influencing movant to plea guilty."**

**(b) Direct Appeal of Ground One:**

(1) If you appealed from the judgment or conviction, did you raise this issue?

Yes ☐ No ☐ **"N/A"**

(2) If you did not raise this issue in your direct appeal, explain why:

**"N/A"**

**(c) Post-Conviction Proceedings:**

(1) Did you raise this issue in any post-conviction motion, petition, or application?

Yes ☐ No ☐ **"N/A"**

(2) If your answer to Question (c)(1) is "Yes," state:

Type of motion or petition: **"N/A"**

Name and location of the court where the motion or petition was filed: **"N/A"**

Docket or case number (if you know): **"N/A"**

Date of the court's decision: **"N/A"**

Result (attach a copy of the court's opinion or order, if available):

**"N/A"**

(3) Did you receive a hearing on your motion, petition, or application?

Yes ☐ No ☐ **"N/A"**

(4) Did you appeal from the denial of your motion, petition, or application?

Yes ☐ No ☐ **"N/A"**

(5) If your answer to Question (c)(4) is "Yes," did you raise this issue on appeal?

Yes ☐ No ☐ **"N/A"**

(6) If your answer to question (c)(4) is "Yes," state: **"N/A"**

Name and location of the court where the appeal was filed: **"N/A"**

Docket case number (if you know): **"N/A"**

Date of the court's decision: **"N/A"**

Result: (attach a copy of the court's opinion or order if available):

**"N/A"**

(7) If your answer to Question (c)(4) or Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not appeal or raise this issue:

**"N/A"**

**GROUND TWO: Prosecutorial Misconduct in using Bolstering Evidence & Bolstering Testimony from Uncredible Witness United States Postal Inspector Andrea Brandon**

(a) Supporting facts (Do not argue or cite law. Just state the specific facts that support your claim):

**Federal Prosecutors in this case deliberately concealed favorable evidence that United State Postal Inspector Andrea Brandon overstepped her own oath of office in intentionally impersonating to be "Ms. Rodriguez" and breaching 39 U.S.C.S § 3003 and 39 U.S.C S. § 3004 by using a fictitious name and mailing address with proper identification on receiving and mail in general under the fake name of Ms. Rodriguez with the mailing address tied to law enforcement and United States Postal Inspector Andrea Brandon in "circumventing the 4th, 5th, 14th Amendment U.S. Constitution for personal gain."**

(b) Direct Appeal of Ground Two:

(1) If you appealed from the judgment or conviction, did you raise this issue?

Yes ☐ No ☐ **"N/A"**

(2) If you did not raise this issue in your direct appeal, explain why:

**"N/A"**

(c) Post-Conviction Proceedings:

(1) Did you raise this issue in any post-conviction motion, petition, or application?

Yes ☐ No ☐ **"N/A"**

(2) If your answer to Question (c)(1) is "Yes," state:

Type of motion or petition: **"N/A"**

Name and location of the court where the motion or petition was filed: **"N/A"**



39 U.S.C.S. §§ 3003, 3004 prohibits Andrea Brandon using fictitious names and mailing address for her own selfish desires into targeting "ghost831" for personal gain and financial gain in using Big Coin to hide her true identity as she is breaking other United States Code Section 18 U.S.C.S. §§ 1028, 1028A Identity Theft, Aggravated Identity Theft..

Outrageous Government Misconduct is Evident for Deliberately Entrapment Defense & Prosecutorial Misconduct stemming from United States Postal Inspector Andrea Brandon Unethical Behavior as Government Official Sworn Under Oath:

Andrea Brandon Bad Acts in the State of Arizona:

1. Tampering With Evidence Inside A United States Post Office in Mesa, Chandler, Phoenix, Glendale, Arizona areas.
2. Switching drugs seized from other defendant or defendants' case to use in another defendant case unrelated to seized drugs.
3. Warrantless Search and Seizure without a valid search warrant signed by a Judge.
4. Making false statements to other law enforcement officer in the Mesa Police Department in Mesa, Arizona and Chandler Police Department in Chandler, Arizona and elsewhere.
5. Falsifying evidence of latent fingerprints found on package tied to this movant..
6. "Racial Injustice as she has made verbally racial slurs around her colleagues that she enjoy lying and prosecuting people of color especially Blacks, Hispanic and Mexican National."
7. Breach of Office to Uphold Law, United States Code Section, and the U.S. Constitutional Rights.
8. Illegal Obtained Evidence conducted by a Andrea Brandon warrantless search and seizure
9. Planting Evidence during the course of this United States Postal Inspector Andrea Brandon entering defendant or defendants' homes in the State of Arizona.
- \*\*10.** Law Enforcement Officers tied to U.S.P.I. Andrea Brandon stealing money out of other State and Federal defendant's or defendants' homes during course of search and seizure. As State and Federal Prosecutors' knowingly and intentionally started "withholding of favorable evidence displaying material facts that Andrea Brandon is a Uncredible Witness and all her cases are questionable in regards to her unethical behavior, repeatedly falsifying records and handwritten report on words that alleged defendant's or defendants' have never verbally stated to U.S.P.I. Andrea Brandon but she has the false admission inside her handwritten report used to manipulated the tangible evidence submitted in the Discovery process by Andrea Brandon in Fraud and False Statement manner under 18 U.S.C.S. § 1001 (a)(1)(2)(3) "
11. Racial Injustice Towards Black and Brown People in the State of Arizona as United States Postal Inspector Andrea Brandon target People of Color at any means deem necessary to boost her selfish federal conviction rates.
12. Institution Racism
13. Selective and Vindictive Prosecution
14. Andrea Brandon committed a Material alteration, and structural alteration under the name of Ms. Rodriguez the buyer on the dark web in an "illegal undercover sting operation to purchase 1 gram of methamphetamine from Ghost831 of dream market." (DOUBLE AGENT/SPY)



**(b) Direct Appeal of Ground Three:**

(1) If you appealed from the judgment or conviction, did you raise this issue?

Yes ☐ No ☐ "N/A"

(2) If you did not raise this issue in your direct appeal, explain why:

"N/A"

**(c) Post-Conviction Proceedings:**

(1) Did you raise this issue in any post-conviction motion, petition, or application?

Yes ☐ No ☐ "N/A"

(2) If your answer to Question (c)(1) is "Yes", state: "N/A"

Type of motion or petition: \_\_\_\_\_

Name and location of the court where the motion or petition was filed: \_\_\_\_\_

"N/A"

Docket or case number (if you know): "N/A" \_\_\_\_\_

Date of the court's decision: "N/A" \_\_\_\_\_

Result (attach a copy of the court's opinion or order, if available):

"N/A"

(3) Did you receive a hearing on your motion, petition, or application?

Yes ☐ No ☐

"N/A"

(4) Did you appeal from the denial of your motion, petition, or application?

Yes ☐ No ☐

"N/A"

(5) If your answer to Question (c)(4) is "Yes," did you raise this issue on appeal?

Yes ☐ No ☐

"N/A"

(6) If your answer to question (c)(4) is "Yes," state: "N/A"

Name and location of the court where the appeal was filed:

"N/A"

Docket case number (if you know): "N/A" \_\_\_\_\_

Date of the court's decision: "N/A" \_\_\_\_\_

Result: (attach a copy of the court's opinion or order if available):

"N/A"



(5) If your answer to Question (c)(4) is "Yes," did you raise this issue on appeal?

Yes ☐

No ☐

"N/A"

(6) If your answer to question (c)(4) is "Yes," state: "N/A"

Name and location of the court where the appeal was filed: "N/A"

Docket case number (if you know): "N/A"

Date of the court's decision: "N/A"

Result: (attach a copy of the court's opinion or order if available): "N/A"

(7) If your answer to Question (c)(4) or Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not appeal or raise this issue:

"N/A"

(a) Ineffective Assistance of Counsel In Conjunction Obstruction Of Justice With Withholding of Evidence

(b) Ineffective Assistance of Counsel In Conjunction with Attorney Failure To Investigate

Movant, has described Ms. Rodriguez, as a Corrupt United States Postal Inspector, Informant/Confidential Source, Undercover Government Agent, Drug Addicted, and a government employee working at one or more United States Postal Offices in the Phoenix, Arizona and the Maricopa County of Arizona area as Double Agent and Super Secret Triple Agent orchestrating criminal creative activities of government entrapment for personal and financial gain to support her prior opiod addiction well-known to her colleagues that Ms. Rodriguez aka Andrea Brandon was addicted to pain medication (opiod) pills.

As certain physical evidence started walking out the evidence room and not being accounted for as U.S.P.I. Andrea Brandon would blame others and ask colleagues of her to cover-up her drug usages with tricks and scams causing a "conflict of interest and miscarriage of justice" in herself mishandling drug search and seizure forms and packages being tampered with under the control, possession, sustody of U.S.P.I. Andrea Brandon.

Everyone in this case has personal knowledge that Ms. Rodriguez/U.S.P.I. Andrea Brandon did in fact overstepped her own oath 39 U.S.C.S. §201 by harassing, begging, impede, influence, urge, luring, persuasion tactics in unbecoming law enforcement behavior including the illegal used of Computer Crimes & Threatening Communication deliberately to target the person or persons' using the alleged profile name ghost831.....

- (A) Coercive Influence
- (B) Price Fixing With Bi+Coin
- (C) Stalking
- (D) Breaching of United States Postal Inspector Legal Duty & Community Loyalty
- (E) Andrea Brandon Drug Test Results during the course of this investigation
- (F) Withholding of Brady Material
- (G) Withholding Andrea Brandon handwritten Affidavit for Ms. Rodriguez approval by U.S. Attorney General William Barr or Jefferson Session to Operate On The Dream Market For Suspect Ghost 831.

**GROUND FIVE: Entrapment Defense (Sherman-Sorrells doctrine) in conjunction with prosecutorial misconduct and ineffective assistance of counsel ("Brady Claim")**

(a) Supporting facts (Do not argue or cite law. Just state the specific facts that support your claim.):

**Ms. Rodriguez is law enforcement officer/United States Postal Inspector Andrea Brandon acting under the government authorization to lure and entrap ghost831 under any means deem necessary for federal criminal prosecution even if breaking her Oath of Offices in the process. Ms. Rodriguez had consent to breach the rule of law and her ethics to secure a "tainted arrest using flaws in the preparation of her case method and tactics. Breaking the Arizona Law & Federal Laws comes easier for Andrea Brandon due to surrounding factor decades of Arizona Corruption Reputation....."**

(b) Direct Appeal of Ground Five:

(1) If you appealed from the judgment or conviction, did you raise this issue?

Yes ☐ No ☐ "N/A"

(2) If you did not raise this issue in your direct appeal, explain why:

"N/A"

(c) Post-Conviction Proceedings:

(1) Did you raise this issue in any post-conviction motion, petition, or application?

Yes ☐ No ☐ "N/A"

(2) If your answer to Question (c)(1) is "Yes," state:

Type of motion or petition: "N/A"

Name and location of the court where the motion or petition was filed: "N/A"

Docket or case number (if you know): "N/A"

Date of the court's decision: "N/A"

Result (attach a copy of the court's opinion or order, if available): "N/A"

(3) Did you receive a hearing on your motion, petition, or application?

Yes ☐ No ☐ "N/A"

(4) Did you appeal from the denial of your motion, petition, or application?

Yes ☐ No ☐ "N/A"

(5) If your answer to Question (c)(4) is "Yes," did you raise this issue on appeal?

Yes ☐

No ☐

"N/A"

(6) If your answer to question (c)(4) is "Yes," state:

Name and location of the court where the appeal was filed: <sup>"N/A"</sup> "N/A"

Docket case number (if you know): <sup>"N/A"</sup>

Date of the court's decision: <sup>"N/A"</sup>

Result: (attach a copy of the court's opinion or order if available): <sup>"N/A"</sup>

(7) If your answer to Question (c)(4) or Question (c)(5) is "No," explain why you did not appeal or raise this issue:

"N/A"

13. Is there any ground in this motion that you have not previously presented in some federal court? If so, which ground or grounds have not been presented, and state your reasons for not presenting them:

"N/A"

14. Do you have any motion, petition, or appeal now pending (filed and not decided yet) in any court for the judgment you are challenging? Yes ☐ No ☐

"N/A"

If "Yes," state the name and location of the court, the docket or case number, the type or proceeding, and the issues raised:

"N/A"

15. Give the name and address, if known, of each attorney who represented you in the following stages of the judgment you are challenging:

"N/A"

(a) At preliminary hearing: <sup>"N/A"</sup>

(b) At arraignment and plea: <sup>"N/A"</sup>

(c) At trial: <sup>"N/A"</sup>

(d) At sentencing: "N/A"

(e) On appeal: "N/A"

(f) In any post-conviction proceeding: "N/A"

(g) On appeal from any ruling against you in a post-conviction proceeding: "N/A"

16. Were you sentenced on more than one count of an indictment, or on more than one indictment, in the same court and at the same time? Yes ☐ No ☐ "N/A"

17. Do you have any future sentence to serve after you complete the sentence for the judgment that you are challenging? Yes ☐ No ☐ "N/A"

(a) If so, give name and location of court that imposed the other sentence you will serve in the future:

"N/A"

(b) Give the date of the other sentence was imposed: "N/A"

(c) Give the length of the other sentence: "N/A"

(d) Have you filed, or do you plan to file, any motion, petition, or application that challenges the judgment or sentence to be served in the future? Yes ☐ No ☐ "N/A"

18. TIMELINESS OF MOTION: If your judgment of conviction became final over one year ago, you must explain why the one-year statute of limitation as contained in 28 U.S.C § 2255 does not bar your motion.\* (see below)

See Exhibit A is self-explanatory by the Captain Dennis that she will take it upon herself and FCI # 1 Victorville Medium federal government employees to imposed "massive punishment" on all inmates no matter if her staff members are in the wrong against any inmate or inmates it's a privilege for inmates to be housed at FCI # 1 Victorville Medium. Exhibit A also demonstrate in clear and convincing evidence a Eighth Amendment Cruel and Unusual Punishment and Extraordinary and Compelling Circumstance for Movant mailing this Motion to Vacate Conviction, Set Aside, or Correct a Sentence also grounds for Stay In The Proceeding due to Double Jeopardy Clauses experiencing here at FCI # 1 Victorville Medium. Motion mailed 12/23/2022.

\*The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. §2255, paragraph 6, provides in part that:

A one-year period limitations shall apply to a motion under this section. The limitation period shall run from the latest of:

- (1) the date on which the judgment of conviction became final;
- (2) the date on which the impediment to making a motion created by governmental action inviolation of the Constitution or laws of the United States is removed, if the movant was prevented from making such a motion by such governmental action;

- (3) the date on which the right asserted was initially recognized by the Supreme Court, if that right has been newly recognized by the Supreme Court and made retroactively applicable to cases on collateral review; or
- (4) the date on which the facts supporting the claim or claims presented could have been discovered through the exercise of due diligence.

---

Therefore, Movant asks that the Court grant the following relief:

**Movant asked this Court to set this case for in-person "evidentiary hearing due to Government Attorney use of Uncredible Witness N.S.P.II. Andrea Brandon bad acts/corruption. or any other relief to which movant is entitled.**

**Newly Discovered Evidence that U.S.P.I. Andrea Brandon had a "conflict of interest" in the investigation, interviews, and gathering warrantless search and seizure without a valid Search Warrant/Search Warrant Affidavit To Establish Probable, Participation in the urge, luring, influence, coercion of entrapment of ghost831 using a fake name Ms. Rodriguez.**

**Outrageous Government Misconduct Is  
Blatant Evidence & Bolstering Andrea  
Brandon Testimony & Tainted Evidence.**

**(OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE THROUGH ANDREA BRANDON)**

I, declare (or certify, verify, or state) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct and that this Motion Under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 was placed in the prison mailing system on 12/23/2022.

**FCI # 1 Victorville Medium**

(month, date, year)

**P.O. Box 3725  
Adelanto, CA 92301**

Executed (signed) on 12/23/2022 (date)

XX

  
Signature of Movant

If the person signing is not movant, state relationship to movant and explain why movant is not signing this motion.

**Jacob Matthew Medina  
Reg: 11975-508  
FCI # 1 Victorville Medium  
P.O. Box 3725  
Adelanto, CA 92301**

# CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Jacob Matthew Medina #11975-508 hereby certify that I have served a true and correct copy of the following:

Motion Under 28 U.S.C. § 2255  
To Vacate, Set Aside, Or Correct  
Sentence By A Person In Federal Custody

Which is deemed filed at the time it was delivered to prison authorities for forwarding, **HOUSTON V. LACK**, 101 L. Ed. 2d 245 (1988),  
upon the defendant/defendants and or his attorney/attorneys of record, by placing same in a sealed, postage prepaid envelope addressed to: Sandra Day O'Connor  
U.S. Courthouse  
401 W. Washington Street Room #130  
Phoenix, Arizona 85003

and deposited same in the United States Mail at the Federal Correctional Institution, FCI # 1 Victorville Medium  
P.O. Box 3725  
Adelanto, CA 92301

I declare, under penalty of perjury (Title 28 U.S.C. §1746), that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated this 23 day of December, 2022.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jacob Matthew Medina  
\_\_\_\_\_



**EXHIBIT A**

**FCI # 1 VICTORVILLE INMATE BULLETIN**

**INSTITUTIONAL UPDATE BY T. DENNIS, CAPTAIN**

**DATE : 09/27/2022 ("Mass Punishment Evidence")**

**FCI # 1 VICTORVILLE INMATE BULLETIN**

**INSTITUTIONAL UPDATE BY T. DENNIS, CAPTAIN**

**DATE: 11/16/2022 ("Mass Punishment Evidence")**

1. Psychiatric Evidence
2. Mass Punishment
3. Eighth Amendment Claim for Cruel and Unusual Punishment Grave Deprivation
4. Hindering Due Process By Federal Government Employees under T. Dennis, Captain & N.T. McKinney, Warden watch at FCI # 1 Victorville Medium in the Adelanto, California 92301

# FCI I VICTORVILLE INMATE BULLETIN

## INSTITUTIONAL UPDATE


The purpose of this bulletin is to highlight key expectations with cell sanitation while you are housed at FCI I Victorville.

The below listed items are not an all-encompassing list and does not replace the rules and regulations provided in the Admission and Orientation (A&O) Handbook.

Cell Sanitation -- All occupied cells are expected to be ready for inspection between the hours of 7:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding holidays. Below is a list of areas that will be inspected:

- Unassigned beds and lockers need to be empty. Not used as storage.
- Pictures are only allowed to be posted inside the lockers.
- No provocative or explicit pictures are allowed.
- No clotheslines
- No "curtains" are allowed in the cell
- Common areas (desk area etc.) needs to be organized.
- Lockers need to be closed and not have towels or other items hanging on them.
- No homemade shelving
- No pictures on walls
- No items on the vents or hanging from the vents or fire sprinkler system
- No food service items are allowed in the cell (i.e. bags of milk, fruit, vegetables, etc.)
- Windows should neither be obstructed nor used for storage.

Failure to follow these procedures may result in disciplinary action

  
T. Dennis, Captain

09-27-2022

Date

# FCI I VICTORVILLE INMATE BULLETIN

## INSTITUTIONAL UPDATE

**This notice is being provided to the inmate population regarding the current status of FCI I Victorville**

On November 14, 2022, the FCI I Victorville was secured. You received an institutional update, dated September 27, 2022, which explained some key expectations of the inmate population. However, these expectations are being disregarded. As mentioned before there is zero-tolerance of fighting/assaultive behavior, and or disruptive behavior. Furthermore, there will be zero-tolerance for the use/possession of intoxicants and or the use/possession of prison made weapons.

I will reiterate that it is important to follow the rules and regulations, in order to maintain a safe and secure institution.

Showers will be conducted Monday/Wednesday/Fridays. At this time telephones/emails are not authorized until further notice.

As matters continue to be reviewed; in order to ensure the safe and orderly operation of FCI I Victorville, FCI I Victorville will remain secured, and visitation will be cancelled until further notice.

Updates will continue to be disseminated as needed, as we work toward restoring the institution to normal operations, barring any issues.

Your cooperation is expected and appreciated.

//s//

T. Dennis, Captain

11-16-2022

Date