

**IN THE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA
CLASS ACTION NO. _____**

ALL THE WAY RIGHT CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION AND P.I.P.E. ORG. ON BEHALF OF THE
REVEREND E. VICTOR, SR. AND ALL FALSELY INCARCERATED VICTIMS OF
LOUISIANA'S "BILL OF ATTAINDERS."

VERSUS

LOUISIANA GOVERNOR JEFFREY LANDRY, GENERAL MANAGER & SEC. OF DEPT. OF
CORRECTION, LOUISIANA'S LEGISLATIVE, JUDICIAL, AND EXECUTIVE BRANCHES OF
GOVERNMENT, Et. A1

**PRE-CONVICTION APPLICATION
SUPPORT OF HABEAS CORPUS**

NOTE: This is not an application for Post-Conviction relief on the behalf of Petitioners. All Louisiana's nonunanimous jury verdict "Incarcerated Victims" are in Legal Contemplation axomatically perpetual pre-trial detainees, hostages and slaves held unconstitutionally Under The Color Of Law.

This is specifically an Habeas Relief demanding that all held falsely incarcerated non unanimous jury verdict victims continued custody be validated by the illegal custodian (SEC of the Louisiana Dept. of Corr., all branches of the state of Louisiana government) while under the watchful eyes of all Louisiana's Federal District and Appeals Courts, et al.

This class action habeas is to compel the Louisiana Legislative, Judicial, and Executive Branches of State government to show cause as to why Louisiana's Constitution Article 1 Sec. 17 and 782 of the La. Criminal Court of Procedures Bill of Attainder is not contrary to the UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION ARTICLE 1, SECTION 9, CLAUSE 3, written PROHIBITATION, which states emphatically:

"No State shall..., pass any Bill of Attainder..."

Afortiori, states are forbidden to punish, penalize or to inflict on U.S. citizens any pain, no matter what their form, without a judicial trial... i.e. without Trial by Jury.

Federal Judges shall entertain habeas corpus applications on behalf of person(s) in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws and Treaties of the United States.

1. STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION TO HEAR THE MATTER

Under 28 U.S.C., Sec. 2241, federal courts have jurisdiction to entertain state prisoner(s) if their confinement is the result of a violation of federal law. Such a petition may be filed in the district in which the prisoner(s) is/are incarcerated. In re Green, 39 F. 3d 582, 583 (5th Cir. 1994).

2.

- (A) There exists no custody de jure nor sentence which could become final, due to the United States Constitution Art. 1, section 9, clause 3 prohibition of State legislation of "Bill of Attainders", and / Expost Facto Laws, U.S. C Art. 1, section 10.
- (B) In the absence of any final order/ judgment showing the compliance with the mandates of U.S.C., Article 1, Sec. 9, Clause 3, and/ or U.S.C. Art. 10 prohibitions. All "Incarcerated Victims" of Louisiana's racial pervasive statute(s), La. Constitution Art. 1, Sec. 17 and 782 of La's Criminal Code of Procedures, are all perpetual pretrial detainees falsely incarcerated in violation of the U.S.C. 5th and 6th Amendments Incorporated to the states by the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. Petitioner(s) move this court for their Immediate Release.
- (C) This challenge does not come before this Honorable Court in the context of a challenge of conviction. Instead, these claims are controlled by U.S.C. 28, Sec. 2241, and the La. C.Cr.P. 362 (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (7), U.S.C. 5th and 6th Amendments and the "right to be left alone enforced," See, *Fain v Duff*, 488 F.2d. 218, 224 (5th Cir, 1973).

3. TYPE OF HABEAS DEFINED AS PRE-CONVICTION

This habeas petition is of the nature of a pre-conviction complaint challenging the past, present and continued illegal custody of petitioners whereas the General Manager of the Department of Corrections/ Secretary of the Department of Corrections, Governor Jeffrey Landry, State of Louisiana et al., presently maintains the illegal custody of petitioner(s) in the total absence of legal justification for the illegal custody. As well as non-conformity with the U.S.C. Art. 1, Sec. 9, Clause 3, prohibition which forbids the enactment/ enforcement of any "Bill of Attainder".

4.

The illegality of this custody can easily be proven at an evidentiary and/ contradictory hearing including/ requiring the presence of each of the following: (a) the parties being illegally detained and their legal representatives and (b) the General Manager of the Dept. of Corrections/ Secretary of the Dept. of Corrections, Attorney General of the State of Louisiana or his designee(s)..

5.

Challenge to the fact or duration of prisoner's confinement or custody as opposed to channels to challenge to conditions of petitioner(s) confinement, is a proper habeas issue. *Williams v. Foti*, 86, 4124 (E.D. La. 09/29/86) 1986 WL 11179, citing *Preiser v. Rodriguez*, 411 U.S. 475, 498, 93 S.Ct. 1827, 1840 36 L.Ed 439 (1973).

6.

The record will bare whole that there exist no lawful verdict, nor a lawful trial, nor Order/ Judgment of Sentence, nor custody which are in any way legally sound against this challenge of petitioner(s) which can enforce the illegal custody of aggrieved petitioners.

7.

Deliberate violations and/ or deliberate disregards for the "clean" and "express" mandatory clear language of the U.S.C. Art. 1, Sec. 9, Clause 3, prohibitions against "Bill of Attainders", U.S.C. 5th, 6th, and 14th amendments, 18 U.S.C., Sec. 241 and 242, 42 U.S.C. 1985, 1986, 1983, the

civil rights act of 1964, can never be used to legalize the past, present nor to continued illegal custody of petitioner(s) herein.

WHEREFORE, THE RELATOR/PETITIONER(S), Prays that this Honorable Court should and ought to issue it's Great Writ of Habeas Corpus ad subjiciendum directed to the Governor of the State of Louisiana one Jeffrey Landry and All defendants et.al. (supra) directing and requiring them to release immediately from custody the relators and all aggrieved nonunanimous jury verdict falsely incarcerated victims of the State of Louisiana's "Bill of Attainder" and racial animus scheme to manufacture wrongful incarceration of African Americans without constitutional Trial by Jury. To release from illegal custody petitioners and/ or deliver said petitioners for an evidentiary hearing on this very serious matter. *Gerstein v. Pugh*, 420 U.S. 103, 95 S. Ct. 854, 43 L.Ed. 2d. 54 (1975); La. Const. Art. 1, Sec. 21; La. C.Cr.P. Art. 354/363, et. seq. Wherefore, in Faith we set forth hands this-----day of-----, 2026.

We reserve the right to add indispensable Parties...

Relator/Petitioners request for the Honorable Court to appoint a Class Action Federal Defense Attorney or reserves the right to enroll a Class action attorney.