

**NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION**

To be cited only in accordance with  
Fed. R. App. P. 32.1

# United States Court of Appeals

For the Seventh Circuit  
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Submitted May 21, 2009\*

Decided May 22, 2009

**Before**

WILLIAM J. BAUER, *Circuit Judge*

JOHN L. COFFEY, *Circuit Judge*

DANIEL A. MANION, *Circuit Judge*

No. 08-2058

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
*Plaintiff-Appellee,*

*v.*

RICHARD E. WARREN,  
*Defendant-Appellant.*

Appeal from the United States District  
Court for the Northern District of  
Illinois, Eastern Division.

No. 05 CR 921

Elaine E. Bucklo  
*Judge.*

## ORDER

Richard Warren used a classic Ponzi scheme in trying to defraud a hedge fund out of \$25 million. The fund manager jumped at the chance to earn a return of 80 to 100 percent in a few weeks by investing in what Warren described as a no-risk program overseen by the Federal Reserve. The fund got its money back only after federal investigators intervened.

---

\*After an examination of the briefs and the record, we have concluded that oral argument is unnecessary. Thus, the appeal is submitted on the briefs and the record. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Eventually a jury found Warren guilty on 11 counts of wire fraud, *see* 18 U.S.C. § 1343, and the district court sentenced him to a total of 200 months in prison. Warren, who is pro se, argues in this direct appeal that the district court lacked both personal and subject-matter jurisdiction because he is a “citizen of GOD’s Kingdom and not of Earth.” He made the same frivolous argument 42 times in papers filed in the district court, to no avail. District courts have subject-matter jurisdiction over any indictment charging a federal crime, 18 U.S.C. § 3231; *United States v. Roberts*, 534 F.3d 560, 568 (7th Cir. 2008); *United States v. Hernandez*, 330 F.3d 964, 977-78 (7th Cir. 2003), as well as personal jurisdiction over any defendant brought before the court to answer an indictment, *United States v. Burke*, 425 F.3d 400, 408 (7th Cir. 2005); *United States v. Jones*, 938 F.2d 1425, 1428 n. 6 (7th Cir. 1993). And since Warren raises no other challenge to his convictions or sentence, the judgment of the district court is

AFFIRMED.