

* BLACK AMERICAN ILLEGALLY AND FALSLY ENSLAVED FOR THE PAST ONGOING 19 YEARS BY FOUR FEDERAL JUDGES! BLACK MAN HELD ILLEGALLY/FALSE IMPRISONED BY FOUR FEDERAL JUDGES, SINCE OCTOBER 2003! DO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF BLACK LIVES MATTER? APPARENTLY BLACK AMERICAN CONST. RIGHTS & LIVES DON'T MATTER TO 4 FEDERAL JUDGES?
I HAVE A DREAM THAT ONE DAY I WILL BE JUDGED, NOT BY THE COLOR OF MY SKIN, BUT BY THE CONTENT OF MY CHARACTER & IMPARTIAL LEGAL JUSTICE *

RE: S.O.S., Distress Call: any social media attention, political, legal, info. or economical help you provide is Appreciated!

MAILING ADDRESS: RAWJEWEL RUHBAYAN, #51657-083, FCI BUTNER MEDIUM II, P.O. BOX 1500, BUTNER, NC. 27509

PHONE CONTACT:

E-MAIL ADDRESS:

SOCIAL MEDIA CONTACT:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONTACT INFO.....	pg. 1
SUMMARY OF FOUR JUDGES AND THEIR CO-CONSPIRATORS' COVERUP	pg. 1
NAMES & IDENTITIES OF THE FOUR JUDGES AND THEIR CO-CONSPIRATORS.....	pg. 1-2
THE COVERUP'S FULL HISTORY AND LEGAL FACTS.....	pg. 2-3
LEGAL FACTS THAT CLEARLY PROVE THE FOUR JUDGES HOLD ME ILLEGALLY DETAINED, SINCE OCT. 2003.....	pg. 4-6

SUMMARY OF FOUR JUDGES AND THEIR CO-CONSPIRATORS' COVERUP

Four federal judges, since August 20, 2004 are criminally hiding my filed, on August 20, 2004, brief's pages 11-12 and have criminally switched pages 11-12's contested calculation facts from my actual sentence of: 21 months and my actual release date of: October 2003 to their false sentence of: life; and their false release date of: without parole; in order to corruptly hold me illegally detained, beyond my entitled fully served statutory maximum 21 months sentence & its release date of Oct. 2003; and to elude their obligation of liability to redress me at least \$12,500 a day for each day of the ongoing 19 years I've suffered loss of my liberty, since Oct. 2003; pursuant to the federal Govt.'s national monetary damages precedent announced, in the year 1988, in the federal case of Velez v. United States, 693 f. Supp. 51 (S.D. NEW YORK/1988)(Plaintiff illegally detained for 2 days received a total of \$25,000 (i.e. \$12,500 for each day of false imprisonment.);

Further from the years April 2005-2022 the four judges and their known three co-conspirators, continue to refuse, impede and deprive me of my Const. 5th Amendment right to access to the court's to redress my 5th and 6th Amend. rights' challenged calculation facts of my brief's pages 11-12 or to redress their coverup High Crime of my continued nearly 19 years of false imprisonment due to their illegal SOPHISTRY of having switched my brief's pages 11-12's contested Const. calculation facts with subtly deceptive and false calculation facts;

Presently, in the federal court's, I have an active civil rights claim against these four judges, involving their violation to my 19 years violation to my 5th Amend. right to access to court, concerning my brief's pages 11-12. My civil rights suit may be found at the 1) EASTERN DISTRICT COURT OF NORTH CAROLINA, WESTERN DIVISION, under the CASE NO.: 5:21-CT-3113-BO and is assigned to Judge Boyle; 2) COURT OF APPEALS AT RICHMOND, VIRGINIA, under the CASE NO.: 21-7419.

NAMES AND IDENTITIES OF FOUR JUDGES AND THEIR THREE CO-CONSPIRATORS

The four judges High Crime is that they hold me FALSE IMPRIOSNED, continually since Oct. 2003; their names are

Appellate Court Judges Robert B. King, Allyson K. Duncan, William W. Wilkins of Richmond, VA. and District Court Judge Rebecca Beach Smith of Norfolk, VA..

And these four judges three co-conspirators' High Crime is that they've MISPRIONSED me, continually since Oct. 2003, due to their neglect, in reporting or preventing, the four judges continual nearly 19 years High Crime of my FALSE IMPRISONMENT. The three co-conspirators are certain known and unknown officers within 1) the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals of Richmond, Virginia: is handled by chief clerk PATRICIA S. CONNER; & JUDICIAL COMPLAINT, under 27 u.s.c. 351et.seq: is handled by SECRETARY FOR COUNCIL: JAMES N. ISHIDA, and -----2)(a) the U.S. Attorney General's Offices at 8000 WORLD TRADE CENTER, 101 WEST MAIN ST. SUITE 8000 NORFOLK, VA. 23510 is handled by A.U.S.A. ALAN MARK SALSBURY AND ANDREW CURTIS BOSSE (b) 150 FAYETTVILLE ST. suite 201, Raleigh, NC. 27601 and, (c) 950 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., WASHINGTON, DC. 20530., and----- 3) The Federal Bureau of Prisons ("FBOP"): certain known officers, within the FBOP, In order to keep me from reporting about the 4 judges HIGH CRIME of my illegal detention and to hamper my active civil suit against these 4 judges, have been tampering with, peeping through, delaying and hindering all my incoming and out going legal & social mail; and all my financial money orders to prevent me from making social contacts with outside society. Further the FBOP has been providing me with inadequate health care.

THE COVERUP'S FULL HISTORY AND LEGAL FACTS

For my non-violent offense of obstruction of justice that occurred in September 2000, under the mandatory United States Sentencing Guidelines ("USSG") offense section 2j1.3, the statutory maximum sentence range I could receive was 15- 21 months; pursuant to Congress' mandatory language, in the legal tenet of 18 U.S.C. section 3553(b)(1)(e.g. section 3553(b)(1), in quote reads: " The court SHALL IMPOSE a SENTENCE of the kind and WITHIN THE (prescribed sentence) RANGE"). Due to the 21 months period I served, in preconviction detention awaiting my trial, from my initial arrest and detention, on January 8, 2002 through to the jury's verdict of guilty, on Oct. 27, 2003, I was accredited with having fully served my 21 month sentence, by Oct. 2003; pursuant to Congress' mandatory language, in the legal tenet 18 USC section 3585(b)(section 3585(b) in quote reads: "A Defendant SHALL BE GIVEN CREDIT toward the service of a term of imprisonment FOR ANY TIME he spent in official detention PRIOR TO THE DATE THE SENTENCE COMMENCES"). Therefore I had a perfect Legitimate Expectation of Finality as to the severity of my detention's custodial release date, not exceeding or being beyond Oct. 2003; pursuant to Congress' mandatory language, in 18 USC section 3624(a)(section 3624, in quote reads: " A prisoner SHALL BE RELEASED by the Bureau of Prisons ON THE DATE OF THE EXPIRATION OF THE PRISONER'S TERM OF IMPRISONMENT"). *****It is important to note that, according to the CANONS OF REPEALMENT, for sentencing purposes only, from the years of 1987- Jan 12, 2005 the mandatory sentencing language within the new guideline statues 18 USC sections 3553(b)(1), 3585(b) & 3624 (a) acted as an implied repeal or supersession of the old statutes mandatory sentencing language of 18 USC sections 371, 1512(b)(1), 1512(j), 1622 and 1623. Therefore the four judges statutory maximum of sentence range of authorized authority was controlled by the new guideline statues and not the old because my offense occurred, in Sept. 2000 and was fully served by Oct. 2003, which is within the time window of the new guideline statues *****.

However, district court judge Smith held me illegally/false imprisoned, beyond Oct. 2003, until on the date of February 4, 2004, judge Smith, with wholly exhausted and pretended sentence and detention authority, imposed upon me an illegal sentence and detention of LIFE, WITHOUT PAROLE. Needless to say I appealed.

On August 20th 2004 I filed a 14 page supplemental brief, with the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals of Richmond, VA.. My brief's CASE RECORD NUMBER is: #04-4103 ; AND ITS DOCKET NUMBERS ARE: #45-46. On my brief's pages 11-12 I raised calculation facts that both showed and contested that any detention of me beyond October 2003 violated my 5th & 6th Amend. rights to a legitimate expectation of finality as to the severity of my sentence to be 21 months and my detention's release date to be Oct 2003; based on Congress' mandatory legal tenets of section 3553(b)(1), section 3585(b) and 3624(a), under the the U.S. Supreme Court's Directive of Booker ("DOB"), 543 U.S. 220 at 268 (Jan. 8, 2005), and its required application of the legal tents of the Sixth Amendment Holding of Booker ("SAHB"), 543 U.S. at 226-234, to the contested calculation facts set forth, on pages 11-12 of my brief. Pages 11-12 of my brief, in quote reads as follows:

"In Summary the Defendant's sentence should be based on an Adjusted Offense Level of 12 and a Criminal History Category of III, which would have provided for a sentence range of 15-21 months, with no applicable upward departure. CONCLUSION: For the reasons stated above, the Defendant's sentence should be vacated and remanded to the district court to resentence without the enhancements and upward departures, in violation of BLAKELY. "

In April 2005, the "FOOTNOTE SIX" of court record Ruhbayan, 406 f.3d 292 at 298 footnote six (4th cir./App. Ct./Apr. 2005), verifies appellate judges King, Duncan and Wilkins acknowledged they received my 14 page supplemental brief, as filed, on Aug. 20, 2004. But they hid my brief, in the tiny coffin of FOOTNOTE SIX and therein gave no mention, consideration or conclusive decision judgment, on the merits of my 5th Amend. right's contested calculation facts of pages 11-12 of my brief. In fact, after the tiny coffin of FOOTNOTE SIX, the record as a whole of my former case shows at all subsequent times and court proceedings judges King, Duncan, Wilkins and Smith utterly refuse, impede and deprive me of my 5th Amend. right to access of court to redress my 5th & 6th Amend. challenges of my brief's pages 11-12, under the DOB, 543 U.S. at 268, and its required

application of the mandatory legal tenets of section 3553(b)(1), section 3585(b) and 3624(a) of the SAHB, 543 U.S. at 226-234.

Further "FOOTNOTE NINE" of court record Ruhbayan, 406 f.3d at 301 footnote nine, verifies the judges King, Duncan and Wilkins lowered the tiny coffin of FOOTNOTE SIX into the tiny grave site of FOOTNOTE NINE, in an their corrupt attempts, to forever bury alive or coverup my constitutional rights' challenges of my brief's pages 11-12. Specifically they corruptly hid my brief and its pages 11-12, in the tiny coffin of FOOTNOTE SIX, then they proceeded, in the grave site of FOOTNOTE NINE, to criminally alter or switch, my, above, pages 11-12's Constitutionally contested calculation facts of a B.O.L. OF 12, C.H.C. OF III and and STATUTORY MAXIMUM OF SENTENCE RANGE of 15-21 months with their "ASSUMING, WITHOUT DECIDING", 'sophistry' of the, below, subtly deceptive & false calculation facts of a B.O.L. OF 32, C.H.C. OF VI and STATUTORY MAXIMUM OF SENTENCE RANGE OF 210-405 months. FOOTNOTE NINE, in quote reads as follows:

"ASSUMING, WITHOUT DECIDING, that the trial court correctly calculated Ruhbayan's Criminal History at VI and his Offense level at 32, application of the section 3B1.1(a) enhancement (resulting in an offense level of 36) increased the applicable sentencing range by 62 months, from 210-262 months to 324-405 months"

Ultimately, after Appellate judges King, Duncan and Wilkins coverup and buried alive my brief's pages 11-12's contested Constitutional challenges and their High Crime of holding me illegal detained, beyond my entitled Oct. 2003 release date, they vacated both my custodial and supervised release portions of sentences and remanded them back to district court judge Smith, so judge Smith could complete the coverup's 'coup de grace', by applying the newly announced, on January 12, 2005, advisory legal tenets of the Remedial Holding of Booker ("RHB"), 543 U.S. at 245-246, in order to prejudice my Legitimate Expected Finality of release date of Oct. 2003. Judge Smith, under the advisory legal tenets of RHB, 543 U.S. at 245-246, reimposed upon me a wholly pretended authorized custodial portion of sentence of LIFE, WITHOUT PAROLE.

Importantly at my 1st resentencing of Nov. 2005, 2nd direct review of May 2007, 2nd resentencing of Mar. 2009, 1st 28 U.S.C. section 2255 hearing of Apr. 2011 and all my collateral review hearings' motions I filed each year, subsequent thereafter to my section 2255 hearing of Apr. 2011, those four judges would only apply the advisory legal tenets of the new rule of the RHB to the custodial portion of my sentence and impeded my access to the court to exhume my brief's pages 11-12's 5th & 6th Amend.'s contested calculation facts, from the earlier above indicated tiny coffin of FOOTNOTE SIX or tiny grave site of FOOTNOTE NINE of the court record of Ruhbayan, 406 f.3d 292.