

Pg 1 of 2

Case # 09-00112-01-CR-W-ODS



10.14.2009

Dear Magistrate  
Robire Latson

My name is Clinton Taylor and I am informing you that at this time I have a civil rights complaint against. My court appointed counsel Travis Poudexter therefore his reactions may not be towards my best interest of quality representation therefore to prevent a conflict of interest with my representation I request the courts remove Travis Poudexter from the criminal case imposed on me which he represents

Thank You

Clinton Taylor 21415095

State of Kansas  
County of Leavenworth



*Rakefet Gill*

*Motion for Ineffective Assistance*

Comes now the defendant untrained and without knowledge of the law hereby request that court appointed counsel Travis Poudexter be removed from my case for the following reasons. I have repeatedly asked Travis to object to outrageous government misconduct and he has refused my request Washington v Hofbauer 228 F.3d 689 (6th Cir 2000) Counsel's failure to object to prosecutors misconduct was ineffective assistance. Travis allow special agents to strongarm second DNA sample from defendant rather than objecting to rail road tactics as requested Fisher v Gibson 282 F.3d 1283 (10th Cir 2002) Counsel failed to adequately argue against weak prosecution was ineffective counsel also Joshua v Dewitt 341 F.3d 436 (6th Cir 2003) Counsel's failure to challenge probable cause was ineffective assistance. Travis has acted in bad faith towards the defendant by failing to argue any defensive exculpatory evidence as requested by client Mickens v Taylor actual conflict of interest must cause some lapse in representation contrary to the defendant's interest.

*Move To Dismiss*

The defendant request the court to grant move to dismiss because in bad faith the

Pg 2 of 2

Government wrongfully withholds possible exculpatory information from expert witnesses Veronica Lopez and Gomez as well as both store clerks in cell phone store U.S. ex rel Moritt v Hicks 492 F. Supp 98 (DNJ 1980) the defendant hereby request an...

In Camera Review, Motion

Requesting that expert witnesses Lopez, Gomez and both store clerks (phone) statements be cross examined in court which was denied by prosecution. Prosecutor may not unilaterally decide what material is Relevant under Jencks U.S. v Smith 984 F2d 1084 (10th Cir 1993). U.S. v Astor 632 F2d 478, 481 (3rd Cir 1980) Prosecution must exercise some efforts to obtain exculpatory material, at least from other Government investigative agencies Pennsylvania v Richie 480 U.S. 39 (1987) I request to also review these documents in person (also witness working in area whom witnessed a suspect with tan coat on) statement

I have filed numerous complaints against Travis Poudertee in writing as well as on record Due Process requires one be represented with effective counsel. In my civil suit against Travis I requested he be revoked from Bar so there is no way he could be mentally stable to represent me defensively in trial I respectfully ask for replacement of counsel. If forced to go to trial with Poudertee all though the courts are aware of my complaints I will be forced to pursue a civil rights complaint of Deliberate Indifference, therefore in Good faith I request Magistrate Larson to acknowledge Travis lack of pretrial and defensive arguments and in the interest of justice provide me with new counsel whom is not biased in filing pretrial motions for his clients