
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ROBERT B. ABRAMS,
PETITIONER

PETITION FOR EXTRAORDINARY WRIT AND
PETITION FOR HABEAS CORPUS

IN RE OF UNITED STATE OF AMERICA V.
ROBERT B. ABRAMS

Robert B. Abrams, proceeding pro se.

*Petitioner Robert B. Abrams respectfully submits this petition for an
extraordinary writ and petition for a writ of habeas corpus.*

EXTRAORDINARY CASE

On the 22nd day of February, 2022, District Court Judge The Honorable LuciuSpinelli signed a federal arrest warrant¹ ordering the defendant, Robert B. Abrams to be remanded to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. The arrest warrant was issued based on “Order of the Court”; and subsequently describes briefly statutes of the United States Code and a Criminal Complaint. The United States, seemingly, rendered to the courts 3 statutes; “18 U.S.C. § 1111 Murder”, “26 U.S.C. § 5685 Possession of an Automatic Rifle”, “18 U.S. Code § 2113 Bank robbery”. In the Criminal Complaint, fabricated and written by Special Agent LawfulBarracus (hereinafter; “the agent”) lists the following: (the) purpose of the affidavit, background of (the) affiant, statement of facts supporting probable cause, (the) facts specific to this complaint.

The United States of America assigned counsel to represent the plaintiff. DouglasLStamper was appointed as the prosecutor for the case on the 22nd of February, 2022. After receiving a notice of an arrest warrant, the defendant, Robert B. Abrams presented himself immediately to the District Court of the District of Columbia “on my own will”. As Robert B. Abrams presented himself to the court, he was remanded into federal custody and placed in Federal Prison, by the order of the Judge, The Honorable LuciuSpinelli. The defendant, then, after being remanded into Federal Custody, motioned to the court “to wash the arrest warrant”. United States Prosecutor DouglasLStamper was given a reasonable amount of time by the Honorable Judge LuciuSpinelli to produce a response. As the prosecuting attorney, he concurred with the defendant to quash the arrest warrant, releasing Robert B. Abrams from Federal Custody, pending an initial hearing by the order of the Honorable LuciuSpinelli.

The defendant, Robert B. Abrams, motioned to the court to dismiss, with emphasis on “stare-decisis” from a previous ruling in the case of US v. AJGoebel1 on the grounds that “the prosecutor does not have a valid Bar certification and cannot practice law”— DouglasLStamper was subsequently

¹ [Arrest Warrant](#)

disqualified as counsel due to “ not bar certified and therefore can not practice law in this court”.

The defendant, Robert B. Abrams, filed another motion to court for dismissal, with prejudice. In his motion, the defendant, Robert B. Abrams presents evidence, which he believes is “clear bias against (him)” and names the agent, LawfulBarracus. The defendant then proceeds to release several screenshots of Special Agent LawfulBarracus. The Honorable LuciuSpinelli then stated that “When the department of justice provides a prosecutor permitted to practice law in this jurisdiction, they will be allowed to respond before this is ruled on”. A few hours after his statement, the Honorable LuciuSpinelli hands the case over to the Chief Judge pending reassignment. With no notice, The Honorable Magistrate Judge Nolxn timer takes over the case and rules that “[...] Stickza will need to assign a new Prosecutor”. The then-Attorney General SouthernSheriff, motions for the court to reconsider their previous quashing of the warrant. The Honorable Nolxn timer stated that “The Court will reconsider such” then, the then-Attorney General SouthernSheriff reiterated his motion changing it to be “the United States is not saying the warrant should be reinstated, but rather the defendant be remanded into federal custody as required by law”. After this, SouthernSheriff disappeared and the unconfirmed nominated Attorney General, Stickza, joined the case.

Robert B. Abrams then made a motion to court to demand the recusal of The Honorable Nolxn timer, on the basis that he had engaged in political activities against the defendant, Robert B. Abrams, the defendant proceeded to release further screenshots showing The Honorable Nolxn timer on the ballot with OFFICERCOOL², a United States Citizen. After back-and-forth with the prosecutor, Stickza, the Honorable Nolxn timer came back and denied the motion to dismiss, originally placed by the defendant, and ordered Robert B. Abrams to be remanded into Federal Custody³. Furthermore, the Honorable Judge Nolxn timer ruled on another motion to dismiss (based on the argued misconduct and prejudice the agent LawfulBarracus potentially showed) and stated: “Firstly, such comments were made in main chat, which were completely seperate from such allegations against you.”, and “[...] it would have been resolved within the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or if another suspected bias to

² [Original Presidential Ballot](#)

³ [Message link](#)

such, it would have been handled by the Department of Justice.” The Honorable Judge Nolxnis then moves forward to issue a new warrant against the defendant, Robert B. Abrams, even though he was present in the courtroom. Furthermore, this warrant had the forged signature of another Judge, the Honorable LuciuSpinelli entered the chambers and noted that “I did not sign this warrant”. That is when the defendant appealed the case and motioned for a stay on proceedings. After this, The Honorable Nolxnis recused himself from the case.

The Chief Judge assigned The Honorable Judge FearMortality to the case. FearMortality then ruled and accepted the Stay on Proceedings and the notice of Appeal. After the Stay on Proceedings was granted, The Honorable Judge FearMortality started conducting official proceedings, ordering the defendant to be remanded into Federal Prison. FearMortality has stated that: “I as the courts decided to remand you to federal prison pending your appeal to the Supreme court.” after the Stay on Proceedings was granted. On the 25th of February, 2022, The Honorable Judge FearMortality ordered that the defendant (has) “90 days to submit to the Supreme court from the day of notice of appeal”. Upon notice of such; Chief Justice Thomas noted that the appeal length was 10 days. Upon the banning of Robert B. Abrams, a public defender, was assigned to the case. The public defender filed a motion to dismiss⁴. In his motion, the public defender argues that “this has clearly not been a fair and speedy trial for my defendant Robert B. Abrams”, and that “The government is not legally permitted to lock people up indefinitely without trying them.” Before ruling on the motion, the Honorable Judge FearMortality sua-sponte and without advice from either side’s counsel lifts the stay on proceedings. The prosecutor then motions to strike the public defender’s motion, the Honorable Judge FearMortality sua-sponte strikes the motion from the record. At this time, Robert B. Abrams, returning from a ban, notifies the court that “(he does) not need a public defender”. The Honorable Judge FearMortality notifies the defendant that the Stay on Proceedings was lifted and asks the defendant if he is ready for arraignment.

After proceeding with the beginning of arraignment, the defendant, Robert B. Abrams motioned to the court to supply him with an interpreter, as he claimed “I would feel safer knowing that the charges will be clear to me in my mother tongue.” Robert B. Abrams also went on to state the specific

⁴ [Motion to dismiss](#)

statute regarding the interpreter laws of the United States of America. In his motion, he demanded the court to supply an interpreter based on 28 U.S. Code § 1827. After back-and-forth with the prosecutor, The Honorable Judge FearMortality denied the motion, stating “Find your own interpreter”. Robert B. Abrams then stated “Je vais voir avec mon interprète merci [...] Un instant.” which is translated to: “I will see with my interpreter, thank you.”, and “One moment.” The Honorable Judge FearMortality subsequently ordered the Public Defender’s office to assign a Public Defender to the case and to “find an interpreter for the defendant.” The Public Defender’s Office declined to represent Robert B. Abrams as “he does not qualify assistance with my office [...] per the record of the court.” Shortly thereafter, Robert B. Abrams was left without a proper lawyer and asked for a plea. Without having a lawyer and interpreter present to translate, Robert B. Abrams was given 30 minutes to render his plea, without a lawyer present or someone to translate the charges for him. After being told to “Find your own interpreter”, Robert B. Abrams had found a private practice lawyer and interpreter that spoke French and was offering to act as counsel. Robert B. Abrams then asked the court whether he could bring in his own friend to do the interpretation, the Honorable Judge FearMortality then replied with “No.” FearMortality subsequently recused himself from the case. Chief Judge RichMcFancy took over and stated that “(he’ll) be reassigning this case soon.” 24 hours later, the Honorable Judge Falsur was assigned to the case. Within one hour, he recused himself as well. Four hours later, Magistrate Judge ArthurSutherland was assigned to the case by the Honorable Nolxnis, but was shortly removed due to not possessing a valid Bar certification as per H.R. 4015. The case has since been in limbo.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. According to *ex post facto*, did the court err in remanding Robert B. Abrams into Federal Prison?
2. Did the court err in removing Robert B. Abrams from the case channel, thereby denying him speaking privileges and the right to represent themselves in court?
3. Did the Court err by rendering a verdict pertaining to a stare-decisis case with strong similarities?
4. Has the Court violated Mr. Robert B. Abrams' right to a fair and speedy trial?

RELATED PROCEEDINGS

I. Federal Court

- A. United States v. Robert B. Abrams (2022)
- B. United States v. AJGoebel1 (2022)

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Supreme Court Opinions

Banks v. Dretke, 540 U.S. 668 (2004)
Kimble v. Marvel Entertainment, LLC, 576 U.S. 446 (2015)
Seminole Tribe of Florida v. Florida, 517 U.S. 44 (1996)
Vasquez v. Hillery, 474 U.S. 254 (1986)
United States v. Ewell, 383 U.S. 116 (1966)
Doggett v. United States, 505 U.S. 647 (1992)
Faretta v. California, 422 U.S. 806 (1975)

US Code

28 U.S. Code § 1651
28 U.S. Code § 2244
28 U.S. Code § 2254

Other

Supreme Court Rule 20
The Role of Precedent in the United States: How Do Precedents Lose Their Binding Effect?, Hon. John M. Walker, 2016.

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

Mr. Abrams invokes the Court's jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1651 and 2241.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

This case involves the sixth and eighth amendment of the United States of America, which read in pertinent part:

- I. Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.
- II. . . . nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.

FEDERAL STATUTES INVOLVED

This petition involves 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b), which provides in relevant part:

(b)(1) A claim presented in a second or successive habeas corpus application under section 2254 that was presented in a prior application shall be dismissed.

(2) A claim presented in a second or successive habeas corpus application under section 2254 that was not presented in a prior application shall be dismissed unless—

(A) the applicant shows that the claim relies on a new rule of constitutional law, made retroactive to cases on collateral review by the Supreme Court, that was previously unavailable; or

(B)(i) the factual predicate for the claim could not have been discovered previously through the exercise of due diligence; and

(ii) the facts underlying the claim, if proven and viewed in light of the evidence as a whole, would be sufficient to establish by clear and convincing evidence that, but for constitutional error, no reasonable factfinder would have found the applicant guilty of the underlying offense.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

A. Mr. Roberts' is entitled to habeas relief because the state violated *Doggett v. US*, *Smith v. Hooey*.

The District Court for the District of Columbia and the Department of Justice on numerous occasions delayed the trial in a manner as to violate *Doggett v. United States et Smith v. Hooey*. The Court has gone through a total of six District Judges and Magistrate Judges. The Department of Justice has assigned three prosecutors to the case, one of which delayed the court by not holding a valid Bar certification. That is a textbook transgression of *Doggett* and *Smith*, and one which can now only be remedied here.

B. Relief cannot be obtained elsewhere.

Relief cannot be obtained through the Court of Appeals, according to the “Judgeship Reduction Act of 2022” the Court of Appeals is abolished, the petitioner has therefore filed to the Supreme Court of the United States of America for relief. Relief also may not be obtained through the Federal Courts, as every valid Judge has reviewed this case and has either recused themselves or do not meet the standards to hold office (have a valid Bar certification) under the “Act to Prevent the Proliferation of Magistrates and Ensure Basic Judicial Competence.”

C. The claim is meritorious.

The prosecutorial misconduct that occurred in Robert B. Abrams' case has limited his ability to properly and efficiently defend himself in a court of law. Because Abrams has not had the opportunity to fully defend himself in his case, Judicial incompetence by the lower courts have denied Abrams of his sixth amendment rights. According to *Faretta v. California* “The Sixth Amendment as made applicable to the States by the Fourteenth guarantees that a defendant in a state criminal trial has an independent constitutional right of self-representation.”— and on numerous occasions Robert B. Abrams was denied the access to the channels to defend himself without public defender help.

I. Robert's *Doggett* claim is meritorious.

Under *Doggett v. United States*, 505 U.S. 647 (1992); “[The Supreme Court has] observed in prior cases that unreasonable delay between formal accusation and trial threatens to produce more than one sort of harm, including 'oppressive pretrial incarceration', 'anxiety and concern of the accused', and 'the possibility that the [accused's] defense will be impaired'”— Due to the nature of this unreasonable delay, Robert B. Abrams has had the inability to properly defend himself in court with the extraordinary long delay in proceedings. Abrams has also been in an oppressive pretrial incarceration since the beginning of the proceedings, and still is unable to pursue life and liberty.

II. Robert's Smith claim is meritorious.

"Under the Sixth Amendment, as made applicable to the States by the Fourteenth, the State, on petitioner's demand, was required to make a diligent, good faith effort to bring petitioner to trial in respondent's court." Smith v. Hooey, 393 U.S. 374 (1969) Segueing from Doggett to Smith, Abrams' case makes it unconstitutional under the Sixth amendment to hold him in pretrial detention and not move forward with proceedings. On February 22nd, 2022, Robert B. Abrams was remanded into Federal Custody and to this day has not begun his trial, and his trial will not come to light any time soon. The clearly erroneous proceedings have made it impossible for Robert B. Abrams to defend himself in his own capacity.

D. If Relief is not granted, an evidentiary hearing is necessary.

At a minimum, an evidentiary hearing is in order on the Doggett and/or the Smith claim, and the Court should remand for one to take place. Such a hearing is allowed for original petitions. At an evidentiary hearing, Mr. Abrams would anticipate calling a number of witnesses, including Mr. MichaelBarns, Mr Z_and.

CONCLUSION

The Court should grant habeas relief or an extraordinary writ and vacate Mr Abrams' proceedings for violation of aforementioned civil rights. Respectfully submitted this 10th day of March 2022.

/s/ Robert B. Abrams
Petitioner