May 15th 2024

To: The office of The Clerk, Supreme Court of United States Mr. scott s. Harris

I am Danting to appeal a decision made in the Fifth Circuit. I have yet to recieve my case file from my previous counsels after several requests nor the ordered transcripts from the court. I am seeking an extension to file a Drit of Certiorari that will raise an issue that needs to be avisioned to plea deals being unconstitutional.

Specifically the question raised will be, can a guitty plea be valid, if the defendant is not aware what they are guilty of until the sentence is pronounced.

Thank you and the court for your consideration.

Jasm Dun

RECEIVED

MAY 3 1 2024

OFFICE OF THE CLERK SUPREME COURT, U.S.

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

No. 23-10710 Summary Calendar United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

> FILED March 5, 2024

Lyle W. Cayce Clerk

United States of America,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

JASON WADE GRANT,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas USDC No. 5:22-CR-105-11

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, STEWART, and SOUTHWICK, Circuit Judges.
PER CURIAM:*

The attorney appointed to represent Jason Wade Grant has moved for leave to withdraw and has filed a brief in accordance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *United States v. Flores*, 632 F.3d 229 (5th Cir. 2011). Grant has filed a response. The record is not sufficiently developed to allow us to make a fair evaluation of Grant's claims of ineffective assistance of

^{*} This opinion is not designated for publication. See 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.

No. 23-10710

counsel; we therefore decline to consider the claims without prejudice to collateral review. See United States v. Isgar, 739 F.3d 829, 841 (5th Cir. 2014).

We have reviewed counsel's brief and the relevant portions of the record reflected therein, as well as Grant's response. We concur with counsel's assessment that the appeal presents no nonfrivolous issue for appellate review. Accordingly, the motion for leave to withdraw is GRANTED, counsel is excused from further responsibilities herein, and the appeal is DISMISSED. See 5TH CIR. R. 42.2.

United States Court of Appeals

FIFTH CIRCUIT
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

LYLE W. CAYCE CLERK

TEL, 504-310-7700 600 S. MAESTRI PLACE, Suite 115 NEW ORLEANS, LA 70130

March 05, 2024

MEMORANDUM TO COUNSEL OR PARTIES LISTED BELOW

Regarding: Fifth Circuit Statement on Petitions for Rehearing or Rehearing En Banc

No. 23-10710 USA v. Grant USDC No. 5:22-CR-105-11

Enclosed is a copy of the court's decision. The court has entered judgment under Fed. R. App. P. 36. (However, the opinion may yet contain typographical or printing errors which are subject to correction.)

Fed. R. App. P. 39 through 41, and Fed. R. App. P. 35, 39, and 41 govern costs, rehearings, and mandates. Fed. R. App. P. 35 and 40 require you to attach to your petition for panel rehearing or rehearing en banc an unmarked copy of the court's opinion or order. Please read carefully the Internal Operating Procedures (IOP's) following Fed. R. App. P. 40 and Fed. R. App. P. 35 for a discussion of when a rehearing may be appropriate, the legal standards applied and sanctions which may be imposed if you make a nonmeritorious petition for rehearing en banc.

Direct Criminal Appeals. Fed. R. App. P. 41 provides that a motion for a stay of mandate under Fed. R. App. P. 41 will not be granted simply upon request. The petition must set forth good cause for a stay or clearly demonstrate that a substantial question will be presented to the Supreme Court. Otherwise, this court may deny the motion and issue the mandate immediately.

Pro Se Cases. If you were unsuccessful in the district court and/or on appeal, and are considering filing a petition for certiorari in the United States Supreme Court, you do not need to file a motion for stay of mandate under Fed. R. App. P. 41. The issuance of the mandate does not affect the time, or your right, to file with the Supreme Court.

Court Appointed Counsel. Court appointed counsel is responsible for filing petition(s) for rehearing(s) (panel and/or en banc) and writ(s) of certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court, unless relieved of your obligation by court order. If it is your intention to file a motion to withdraw as counsel, you should notify your client promptly, and advise them of the time limits for filing for rehearing and certiorari. Additionally, you MUST confirm that this information was given to your client, within the body of your motion to withdraw as counsel.

Sincerely,

LYLE W. CAYCE, Clerk

By:

Casey A. Sullivan, Deputy Clerk

Enclosure(s)

Mr. Brandon Elliott Beck

Mr. Jason Wade Grant Mr. Brian W. McKay

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

No. 23-10710 Summary Calendar United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

FILED March 5, 2024

Lyle W. Cayce Clerk

United States of America,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

JASON WADE GRANT,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas USDC No. 5:22-CR-105-11

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, STEWART, and SOUTHWICK, Circuit Judges.

JUDGMENT

This cause was considered on the record on appeal and the brief on file.

IT IS ORDERED and ADJUDGED that the appeal is DISMISSED as frivolous.

The judgment or mandate of this court shall issue 7 days after the time to file a petition for rehearing expires, or 7 days after entry of an order denying a timely petition for panel rehearing, petition for rehearing en banc, or motion

No. 23-10710

for stay of mandate, whichever is later. See FED. R. APP. P. 41(b). The court may shorten or extend the time by order. See 5TH CIR. R. 41 I.O.P.