IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION AT DAYTON

JEFFREY ANTONIO BROWN,

Petitioner, : Case No. 3:17-cv-080

- vs - District Judge Thomas M. Rose
Magistrate Judge Michael R. Merz

CHAE HARRIS, Warden,
Warren Correctional Institution,

:

Respondent.

DECISION AND ORDER OVERRULING OBJECTIONS

This case is before the Court on Petitioner's Objections (ECF No. 70) to the Magistrate Judge's Decision and Order/Report and Recommendations of May 22, 2018 (ECF No. 65). The Court has reviewed the Objections as required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a) for non-dispositive matters and 72(b)(3) for dispositive matters.

Petitioner's claimed status as a "Moorish American citizen of the Land" has no bearing on the resolution of this case. Petitioner, as a person in custody of the State of Ohio, has invoked the jurisdiction of this Court to determine under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 whether he is in custody pursuant to a judicial order that violates the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States. He has the same rights under that statute as any other natural human being thus confined. His claimed status as a Moorish American does not confer upon him any rights not enjoyed by any other person this confined, nor does he have any rights under the treaty between the United States and the Kingdom of Morocco of 1787.

Petitioner's demand for a "Certified Delegation of Authority Order" is rejected. No such document exists nor is there any provision of federal law that provides for creation of such a document.

Petitioner's demand for a certified copy of Magistrate Judge Merz's Sworn Oath of Office is also rejected. The Court takes judicial notice that Michael R. Merz too the prescribed oath of office as a United States Magistrate Judge before the Honorable Carl B. Rubin in open court on November 20, 1984, and has served continuously in that office since that date.

The Court finds that it has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this case by virtue of 28 U.S.C. § 2241. Petitioner's challenge to the jurisdiction of the Ohio courts in this case has been dealt with in the Decision and Order of May 4, 2018 (ECF No. 53).

The existence of Fed. R. Civ. P. 6, providing for motions for extension of time, does not imply or create a right to have such a motion granted.

Accordingly, Petitioner's Objections (ECF No. 70) are OVERRULED in their entirety.

June 6, 2018

*s/Thomas M. Rose

Thomas M. Rose
United States District Judge