# PETITION FOR WRIT OF CORAM NOBIS

**United States District Court · Middle District of Florida · Tampa Division**

**Francesco Giovanni Longo v. United States of America et al.**

Collateral to Case No. 8:05-cr-263-T-17MSS

28 U.S.C. § 1651(a) · All Writs Act · Morgan · Denedo

Filed: April 27, 2026 · in forma pauperis

---

## United States District Court · Middle District of Florida · Tampa Division

### Canadian habeas-corpus analog under United States v. Morgan, 346 U.S. 502 (1954); United States v. Denedo, 556 U.S. 904 (2009)

**Supersedes:** `CORAM_NOBIS_MDFL_v3_FINAL.md` (2026-04-23).

**v4 correction matrix (all changes made pursuant to `NOMENCLATURE_LOCK.promptinclude.md` v2 and `CASE_FACTS_CORRECTIONS.promptinclude.md` v2, both 2026-04-24):**

| v3 form (withdrawn) | v4 correct form | Authority |
|---|---|---|
| Judge **Elizabeth Kabakovich** (sentencing) | Judge **Elizabeth A. Kovachevich** (sentencing; USDC MDFL Senior Judge 1982–2023) | NOMENCLATURE_LOCK §2 |
| (omitted) | **"John Kovachevich" / "Kabakovich"** = phantom signatory on 2006 extradition/ committal docket — NO federal judge of either name — now pleaded as distinct synthetic-authority node | NOMENCLATURE_LOCK §2 · §13.1 |
| AUSA **Mark O'Brian** | AUSA **Mark O'Brien** | NOMENCLATURE_LOCK §2 |
| **Pollock** (LAO certificate 2005) | **Pollock** (LAO certificate 2005; employed in Ducharme's office at material time) | NOTES_2026-04-26_voice_dump §2 |
| **William Lintz, FBI-JTTF**, operational supervisor of Dutton | **William Lintz** — U.S. Special Operations surveillance / Five Eyes SIGINT coordination (NOT DEA, NOT FBI-JTTF); Dutton's SIGINT enabler | CASE_FACTS_CORRECTIONS §1.1 v2 |
| Case No.: **__**__ | **Case No. 8:05-cr-263-T-17MSS** (docket of record) · v4 pleads coram nobis collaterally to that conviction | NOMENCLATURE_LOCK §3 |
| Jogi/#07-13206 as fabricated consular-notification appeal (one paragraph) | Full integration of **EXHIBIT 13 · JOGI APPEAL FRAUD FORENSICS** into Part III §J as precedent-capture operation, with §§ 1–8 of EXHIBIT 13 pleaded as particularized grounds | EXHIBIT 13 (2026-04-27) |
| (absent) | **Deliberate-notice doctrine** (EXHIBIT 14) pleaded as qualified-immunity-piercing in Part III §K | EXHIBIT 14 |

---

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA TAMPA DIVISION**

In the matter of:

**FRANCESCO GIOVANNI LONGO,** Petitioner in his own right and as Trustee of the Canadian People's Trust v2,

v.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,** Respondent,

and as individually-named co-conspirators:

**GLENN DUTTON,** former Special Agent, United States Drug Enforcement Administration; **WILLIAM LINTZ,** former officer, United States Special Operations surveillance apparatus with Five Eyes SIGINT-coordination authority, and signals-intelligence enabler of Defendant Dutton; **MARK O'BRIEN,** former Assistant United States Attorney, Middle District of Florida; **ELIZABETH A. KOVACHEVICH,** presiding sentencing judge (deceased February 2023); **JOHN/JANE DOE "KABAKOVICH"** — the phantom judicial signatory whose name appears on the 2006 Canadian extradition/committal docket and for whom no federal or Canadian judicial officer of that name exists in any judicial registry; pleaded as a synthetic-authority node used to manufacture the appearance of judicial authorization; **"PRESTON"** (given name subject to FOIA / Privacy Act disclosure), senior handler, United States Department of Justice / Drug Enforcement Administration; **JOHN DOES USM-1 and USM-2,** Deputy United States Marshals, 2007 custodial transfer from Toronto West Detention Centre; **JOHN DOE FBI-1,** Special Agent or Analyst, Federal Bureau of Investigation, responsible for FBI number 674-928-AC1; **JOHN/JANE DOE USCIS-VA-1,** United States Citizenship and Immigration Services adjudicator and/or Federal Bureau of Investigation Criminal Justice

Information Services operator at a Virginia intake point responsible for intercepting and suppressing the Petitioner's BOP-to-RCMP fingerprint transmission chain in or about 2011–2016; **RICHARD MacCHEYNE,** former Detective, Toronto Police Service.

Case No.: __ (coram nobis, collateral to 8:05-cr-263-T-17MSS)

## PETITION FOR WRIT OF CORAM NOBIS

### (28 U.S.C. § 1651(a) — All Writs Act)

Pursuant to **28 U.S.C. § 1651(a)**, the common-law writ of coram nobis as preserved and applied to federal criminal proceedings in United States v. Morgan, 346 U.S. 502 (1954), and reaffirmed as continuingly available in United States v. Denedo, 556 U.S. 904 (2009), Petitioner **Francesco Giovanni Longo** respectfully moves this Honourable Court for a Writ of Coram Nobis vacating the Petitioner's conviction and 78-month sentence entered in this District under docket **8:05-cr-263-T-17MSS**; declaring the 2005 indictment, the purported extradition paperwork, Eleventh Circuit appeal **#07-13206**, and the post-2011 federal biometric-record chain void ab initio for the reasons set forth below; and ordering such further relief as the interests of justice require.

The Petitioner is a natural person; a citizen of Canada, born 24 April 1972 in Windsor, Ontario; now resident in Windsor, Ontario, Canada. He is no longer in United States federal custody — he was deported to Canada in or about 2011 — and coram nobis, not habeas corpus, is therefore the proper procedural vehicle for the relief sought. Morgan, 346 U.S. at 510–11.

## I. JURISDICTION, VENUE, AND STANDING

1. This Court has jurisdiction over this petition under **28 U.S.C. § 1651(a)** (All Writs Act), supplemented by **28 U.S.C. § 1331** (federal question) and **28 U.S.C. § 1343(a)(3)–(4)** (civil-rights conspiracies).

2. Venue is proper in this District under **28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)** because the conviction under docket 8:05-cr-263-T-17MSS was entered in this District; the indictment issued from this District's United States Attorney's Office; the 2004 Billy Womack laboratory flip on which the entire downstream prosecution was fabricated occurred in Lakeland, Polk County, Florida, within this District; and the February 14, 2007 sentencing hearing, including the videotaped on-record statement of Judge Elizabeth A. Kovachevich that she "[was] going to make an example of" the Petitioner, occurred in the Tampa Division of this District.

3. The Petitioner has standing to seek coram nobis relief because (a) he suffers **continuing collateral consequences** from the fraudulently procured 2007 conviction, including but not limited to an erroneous federal criminal record maintained under **FBI Number 674-928-AC1**; a continuing cross-border travel bar; damage to reputation and earning capacity; and, as pleaded in Part III §E, an **affirmative federal cover-up** of his fingerprint record that ensured the conviction was concealed from Royal Canadian Mounted Police biometric checks in connection with his subsequent approved US green-card application; and (b) **sound reasons exist for failure to seek earlier relief** — AUSA Mark O'Brien's direct post-sentencing cell-visit threat to "get [him] twelve years" if the Petitioner pursued an ineffective-assistance-of-counsel

challenge (see Part II §G and Part III §F) explains and excuses the delay; the Petitioner was systematically denied legal aid in Ontario from 2005 to 2026; and only in 2026, upon publication of the Sovereign Archive at `canadianpeoplestrust.pages.dev`, was the Petitioner able to assemble and verify the evidentiary record necessary to this filing. Morgan, 346 U.S. at 511.

4. Petitioner **proceeds in forma pauperis** per his concurrently filed indigency application. The 2005 Legal Aid Ontario certificate issued to **Pollock** on the Petitioner's behalf remains **unconsumed and live**, and every subsequent Legal Aid Ontario application by the Petitioner from 2005 through 2026 has been refused — a pattern of systematic denial that is itself pleaded in the parallel Bivens action as an element of the ab initio tort and that justifies every procedural indulgence this Court may afford a pro se petitioner.

---

## II. CORE FACTS — CHRONOLOGICAL

### A. 2003 — Toronto Police funnels expunged-mugshot material across the border

1. In or about 2003, the Petitioner was the subject of a Tampa, Florida domestic-violence arrest. That charge **was thereafter expunged** pursuant to Florida law. The expungement order, by statute, removed the record from lawful prosecutorial, investigative, and evidentiary use.

2. Upon information and belief, **Defendant MacCheyne**, then a Detective of the Toronto Police Service, caused the 2003 expunged Tampa mugshot to be transmitted across Five Eyes intelligence-sharing

channels to DEA Special Agent Defendant Dutton and to Defendant Lintz (U.S. Special Operations surveillance / Five Eyes SIGINT coordination), for operational use notwithstanding the expungement order. This is pleaded in particularized form at Exhibit 04C of the Sovereign Archive.

**B. 2004 — The Billy Womack ecstasy-lab arrest and staged-mugshot informant cultivation**

1. In or about 2004, Defendant Dutton arrested one **Billy Womack** in connection with an ecstasy laboratory in Lakeland, Polk County, Florida (within this District). Defendant Dutton, with the SIGINT enablement of Defendant Lintz and under the handler-authority of Defendant Preston, thereafter converted Mr. Womack into a cooperating witness.

2. Mr. Womack was thereafter **photographed in three booking photographs (February 10, March 28, and June 19, 2005) wearing the same shirt and in the same pose across supposed different arrest dates**. The visual forensic analysis establishing this is particularized in Exhibit 04 of the Sovereign Archive. The purpose of the staging was to fabricate a plausible cooperating-witness timeline usable to corroborate downstream prosecutions for which no actual evidence existed.

**C. 2004–2005 — Twenty months of surveillance producing zero evidence**

1. From approximately 2004 through approximately mid-2005, Defendant Dutton and Defendant Lintz conducted **twenty months** of surveillance against the Petitioner. That surveillance produced **zero**

**competent inculpatory evidence**. This void is particularized in Exhibit 04A.

2. The absence of any evidence during the full twenty-month surveillance window is material because it demonstrates that the entire downstream prosecution proceeded not from discovered evidence but from **manufactured evidence** — the only path available to Defendants once they had committed to a predetermined outcome.

### D. 2005 — The 69-day pre-crime warrant and the fabricated indictment

1. On or about **June 21, 2005**, a warrant was issued in this District against the Petitioner. The alleged underlying conduct date recorded in the indictment is **August 29, 2005** — i.e., the warrant was issued **sixty-nine (69) days before** the conduct it purports to authorize arrest for. A warrant issued in anticipation of conduct that has not yet occurred cannot lawfully exist under the Fourth Amendment.

2. The warrant instrument itself bears no Article III or Article I judicial signature. Signature appears in the "deputy clerk" slot (Deputy Clerk **Sheryl Loesch**), where the Fourth Amendment and Shadwick v. City of Tampa, 407 U.S. 345 (1972), require a neutral and detached magistrate. On Petitioner's forensic analysis, the underlying instrument supporting Petitioner's extradition from Canada is, on its face, **a commercial bail-bonds slip bearing a hand-written case number**. A facially defective instrument of this character is void ab initio under the Fourth Amendment, Franks v. Delaware, 438 U.S. 154 (1978), and Malley v. Briggs, 475 U.S. 335 (1986). Particularized at Exhibit 04A.

3. The conduct pleaded in the indictment alleges activity by the Petitioner during a period in which the Petitioner was in **documented Canadian custody on unrelated matters** in Windsor — including, on February 22, 2006, recorded custody entry in Windsor case file #94545. The temporal impossibility — hereafter the **"78-month impossibility"** — is particularized in Exhibit 04F. No prosecutor acting with reasonable diligence could have advanced the indictment; the advancement was therefore **knowingly false**, constituting fabrication-of-evidence within the meaning of Manuel v. City of Joliet, 580 U.S. 357 (2017), and McDonough v. Smith, 588 U.S. 109 (2019).

**E. 2005–2007 — Eighteen months of Windsor jail pre-transfer, during which Defendants continued to push for extradition**

1. The Petitioner was held in a **Windsor, Ontario jail for approximately eighteen (18) months** on the Canadian side of the border while the extradition proceedings were pending. Throughout those eighteen months, Defendants Dutton, Lintz, O'Brien, and MacCheyne **continued to operationally push** for cross-border transfer and US prosecution, notwithstanding that the Petitioner was, the entire time, in lawful Canadian custody and physically unable to flee, obstruct, or pose any exigency.

2. Eighteen months of continuous operational decision-making is not oversight, inadvertence, or mistake. It is **premeditated malice** within the meaning of Pierson v. Ray, 386 U.S. 547 (1967); Monroe v. Pape, 365 U.S. 167 (1961); and Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents, 403 U.S.

388 (1971). It rebuts, on the face of the timeline alone, any good-faith or qualified-immunity defense.

**F. 2006 — Canadian Form 1 §12: counsel signing where judicial officer required**

1. The Canadian extradition packet, Form 1 Section 12, was signed by **defence counsel (surname Alibhai)** in the slot reserved by Canadian Extradition Act statute for a **judicial officer**. Counsel is not a judicial officer. This defect renders the Canadian authorization ab initio void and vitiates every downstream US act that relied on it. Particularized in Exhibit 04B.

2. The Canadian extradition docket additionally reflects the purported name **"Kabakovich"** in a judicial-signatory position. No federal judge of that name has ever existed in any U.S. or Canadian judicial registry. This is the phantom signatory pleaded as Defendant **JOHN/JANE DOE "KABAKOVICH"** herein. The use of a synthetic-authority node to produce the appearance of judicial sign-off on the extradition docket is itself a fabrication of federal records within the meaning of **18 U.S.C. § 1519**.

**G. 2007 — Custodial transfer from Toronto West Detention Centre**

1. In or about early 2007, Defendants John Does USM-1 and USM-2 took custody of the Petitioner on Canadian soil at **Toronto West Detention Centre** — an immigration-holding facility at which a Canadian citizen could not lawfully be held except under the machinery of the Extradition Act — and transported the Petitioner into the United States on the basis of the instruments pleaded above. Under Malley v.

Briggs, no reasonable marshal could have relied in good faith on a hand-written, clerk-signed bail-bonds-slip warrant in combination with Form 1 §12 signed by counsel rather than a judge. Liability attaches individually.

2. **The Petitioner was never formally released from Canadian custody** by Canadian release paperwork before US Marshals took custody on Canadian soil. On Petitioner's information and belief, no Canadian release-of-custody document exists in the Windsor Superior Court of Justice file for the Petitioner covering the custodial transfer event. This is pleaded as a predicate for the parallel Canadian habeas petition under Mission Institution v. Khela, 2014 SCC 24, and in this coram-nobis proceeding for the purpose of establishing that **Canadian custody was never lawfully surrendered** — rendering the US custody that followed a cross-border kidnapping under colour of law cognizable under **18 U.S.C. § 1201**. See Exhibit 04A.

**H. February 14, 2007 — Sentencing before Judge Elizabeth A. Kovachevich**

1. Petitioner was sentenced on **February 14, 2007**, in this District, before **the Honourable Elizabeth A. Kovachevich, Senior United States District Judge** (MDFL 1982–2023; deceased February 2023). Judge Kovachevich is the real and identifiable judicial officer who presided at sentencing. **Every prior characterization in any Sovereign Archive material of the presiding judge as "Kabakovich," a "phantom," a "John Doe judicial signatory," or a figure whose "name may be wholly fabricated" referred to a**

**separate synthetic-authority node on the 2006 Canadian extradition docket and NOT to the real sentencing judge; all such characterizations as applied to the sentencing judge are hereby withdrawn** (see NOMENCLATURE_LOCK §2; CASE_FACTS_CORRECTIONS §1.2 v2). The phantom "Kabakovich" remains pleaded separately herein as **JOHN/JANE DOE "KABAKOVICH"**.

2. **"Counsel" assigned to the Petitioner at sentencing was a stand-in and did not meaningfully represent the Petitioner.** The court record preserves the verbatim observation that "counsel of Mr. Longo does not even see Michael Bryan's name, allows him to testify" — referring to the fact that **Michael Bryan**, a witness who had already been convicted and who had already testified in a prior matter, was permitted to testify at the Petitioner's sentencing without pre-hearing notice to defense counsel and without the disclosure of Mr. Bryan's prior-conviction and prior-testimony record required by **Brady v. Maryland**, 373 U.S. 83 (1963); **Giglio v. United States**, 405 U.S. 150 (1972); and **Kyles v. Whitley**, 514 U.S. 419 (1995). This is an independent coram-nobis ground. See §III.A below.

3. The sentencing hearing was **videotaped by a single courtroom videographer**. Present on the record were: (a) Judge Kovachevich, presiding; (b) AUSA Mark O'Brien, prosecuting; (c) the stand-in defense counsel; (d) Defendant Glenn Dutton; (e) a **probation officer** — whose presence at sentencing is itself a procedural anomaly, given that under standard federal practice pre-sentence investigation and probation assignment are completed between plea/verdict and sentencing and the

assigned probation officer does not typically appear as a live participant at sentencing proceedings; and (f) the videographer. On the record, and on that videotape, **Judge Kovachevich stated that she was "going to make an example of" the Petitioner**. That statement is preserved in the court transcript and videotape.

**G-2. Post-sentencing — O'Brien cell-visit threat**

1. After sentencing, Defendant O'Brien approached the Petitioner in his cell and stated, in substance, that if the Petitioner pursued an **ineffective-assistance-of-counsel appeal**, Defendant O'Brien would "get [him] twelve years" — a direct retaliatory threat by a federal prosecutor against a criminal defendant for considering the exercise of his Sixth Amendment right. This constitutes witness-intimidation under **18 U.S.C. § 1512(b)(1)–(3)** and obstruction of justice under **18 U.S.C. § 1503**, is actionable in the parallel Bivens action, and serves as an additional independent ground for coram-nobis relief here.

**H. February 28, 2007 — Eleventh Circuit appeal #07-13206 filed without Petitioner's authorization**

1. On **February 28, 2007** — fourteen days after sentencing, on the last day of the FRAP 4(b)(1)(A) window — an appeal was filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit in the name Francesco Longo under docket **#07-13206**. **The Petitioner did not sign, authorize, prepare, or knowingly cause to be filed any such appeal.** The appeal was drafted and filed by Defendant O'Brien or his office, using the Petitioner's name without authorization, for the purposes pleaded in full at Part III §J below and at EXHIBIT 13 (JOGI

APPEAL FRAUD FORENSICS, 2026-04-27). The appeal argued a losing Vienna Convention on Consular Relations Article 36 claim in the Eleventh Circuit **twelve days before** Jogi v. Voges, 480 F.3d 822 (7th Cir. 2007), was published on March 12, 2007 establishing individual enforceability of Article 36 in the Seventh Circuit.

2. The appeal expressly declined to raise ineffective assistance of counsel — the one ground that would have vacated the conviction. This foreclosure was the operational purpose of both the O'Brien cell-visit threat (§G-2) and the unauthorized filing itself (§H). See Part III §J for full particulars.

**I. 2007–2013 — Seventy-eight months of unlawful custody**

1. The Petitioner served approximately **seventy-eight (78) months** of federal imprisonment on the basis of the instruments pleaded above. Every month of that custody was unlawful. The Eighth Amendment prohibits the imposition of sentence disproportionate to actual conduct; custody produced by a facially void warrant, fabricated cooperating-witness corroboration, phantom judicial authorization on the extradition side, counsel-as-judicial-officer on the Canadian extradition Form 1 §12, and an unauthorized appeal is per se cruel and unusual within the meaning of Ingraham v. Wright, 430 U.S. 651 (1977), and Hutto v. Finney, 437 U.S. 678 (1978).

**J. July 27, 2011 — Deportation**

1. On or about **July 27, 2011**, the Petitioner was deported to Canada. From that date forward he has not been in United States federal

custody and coram-nobis, not habeas, is accordingly the correct procedural vehicle. Morgan and Denedo.

## K. 2011–2016 — The green-card approval and the Virginia fingerprint intercept

1. After deportation, the Petitioner applied for and was **APPROVED for a United States green card**.

2. In connection with the ordinary biographical and biometric vetting of that green-card application, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) ran fingerprint checks in Canada. **The RCMP checks came back negative** — i.e., RCMP records reflected **no prior US federal biometric exchange** tying the Petitioner, under his Canadian identity, to the 78-month BOP commitment on whose basis he had been deported three years earlier.

3. This result is physically impossible if the US Bureau of Prisons had processed the Petitioner's 78-month commitment through ordinary intake channels. Standard BOP intake fingerprints every detainee; for a Canadian national, those prints flow through FBI Criminal Justice Information Services, Interpol channels, and Canada-US Law Enforcement Cooperation agreements to RCMP. The only plausible inferences consistent with the RCMP-negative result are: (i) the Petitioner's BOP intake fingerprints were **never transmitted** to RCMP; (ii) the transmission occurred but was **intercepted and suppressed** before reaching RCMP records; or (iii) the prints on file at BOP for the person convicted as "Francesco Longo" **did not match** any person

RCMP had fingerprinted — i.e., BOP held the wrong person's prints or they were destroyed.

4. The Petitioner specifically recalls that his green-card adjudication was processed through a USCIS/FBI-adjacent facility **in Virginia**. Virginia hosts United States Department of Justice Headquarters, Federal Bureau of Investigation Headquarters, Drug Enforcement Administration Headquarters, and (operationally co-located with Virginia intake points) the FBI Criminal Justice Information Services Center at Clarksburg, West Virginia — the same region hosting the Defendants' chain of command.

5. **This is an affirmative federal cover-up.** Someone with operational access to federal biometric transmission chains caused the Petitioner's 78-month BOP record to be absent from the cross-border biometric database that RCMP queried. That suppression is: (a) a distinct overt act in furtherance of the § 1985(3) conspiracy pleaded in the parallel Bivens action; (b) a Privacy Act violation (5 U.S.C. § 552a) and a potential violation of **18 U.S.C. § 1519**; (c) direct evidence that the Defendants' consciousness of guilt extended through at least 2011–2016, foreclosing any limitations defense on the underlying fabrication; and (d) the basis for the addition of Defendant **John/Jane Doe USCIS-VA-1** to this matter.

6. The Petitioner seeks and will seek, through concurrent FOIA/Privacy Act requests, (a) the complete USCIS A-file for his green-card application; (b) the complete FBI CJIS fingerprint-history log covering 1992–2026; and (c) BOP intake documentation for every Francesco Longo commitment during the 2007–2013 window.

**L. 2021 — Windsor retroactive-charge fabrication**

1. In or about 2021, the Petitioner was arrested in Windsor, Ontario (arresting officer: **Jason Bellaire** — the same officer who had participated in the Petitioner's 2005 Windsor arrest; see Exhibit 09) on charges the underlying conduct of which had allegedly occurred **before** the arrest and was subsequently retrospectively constructed by Windsor Police — including Chiefs Pamela Bellaire and Michael Degraaf — in coordination with the cross-border network described herein. Particularized in Exhibit 09.

**M. 2025–2026 — Self-representation, disclosure fraud, real-time monitoring**

1. On **June 18, 2025**, the Petitioner terminated Canadian defence counsel Laura Joy and has been self-represented from that date forward. On **June 27, 2025**, a fraudulent "Virtual Crown" digital disclosure Version 2 was delivered to the Petitioner as the second of a sequence of manipulated disclosure artifacts. See NOMENCLATURE_LOCK §4.

2. Within days of the February 2026 publication of the Sovereign Archive, the Petitioner's canary-token infrastructure registered **coordinated probes from United States Department of Justice federal-network IP subnets, from a static Cogeco residential IP in Windsor, Ontario, and from Hetzner infrastructure in Nürnberg and Helsinki** (Exhibit 03).

3. The real-time monitoring re-sets the **continuing-violation** clock on the entire 2004–2026 conspiracy under Heard v. Sheahan, 253 F.3d 316 (7th Cir. 2001), and Scherer v. Balkema, 840 F.2d 437 (7th Cir. 1988).

## III. LEGAL GROUNDS FOR CORAM NOBIS RELIEF

### A. Brady / Giglio / Kyles — suppression of exculpatory and impeachment evidence

1. Defendants suppressed from the defense, at every stage, the following material and exculpatory evidence: (i) Billy Womack's true arrest history and the visual forensic record of the staged-mugshot cooperating-witness timeline (three photographs, same shirt, same pose, Feb 10 / Mar 28 / Jun 19 2005); (ii) the expunged status of the 2003 Tampa domestic-violence record and its improper cross-border transmission; (iii) Michael Bryan's prior conviction and prior testimony in a related matter; (iv) the fact that the instrument supporting extradition was a hand-written, deputy-clerk-signed commercial bail-bonds slip and that the Canadian Form 1 §12 was signed by counsel rather than a judicial officer; (v) the fact that the June 21, 2005 warrant pre-dated the August 29, 2005 conduct allegation by 69 days; (vi) the fact that the 78-month indictment period overlapped with the Petitioner's documented Canadian custody; and (vii) the fact that the Article 36 "appeal" referenced at sentencing was never signed, filed, or authorized by the Petitioner. Under Brady v. Maryland, Giglio v. United States, and Kyles v. Whitley, the cumulative materiality of these suppressions is decisive.

### B. McDonough / Manuel — fabrication-of-evidence

1. The staged Womack mugshots, the fabricated Article 36 consular appeal (#07-13206 — see §J below), the phantom "Kabakovich" judicial signatory on the Canadian extradition docket, the retrospectively-

engineered 2021 Windsor charge narrative, and the affirmative post-2011 suppression of the BOP→RCMP fingerprint chain collectively establish a pattern of **fabrication of evidence** within the meaning of McDonough v. Smith and Manuel v. City of Joliet. The fabrications are themselves the confession: **an innocent person's prosecution does not require wholesale fabrication. Only a guilty prosecutor needs a fabricated trial.** Defendants had no real case and therefore manufactured one.

**C. Franks / Malley / Shadwick — void-ab-initio warrant**

1. The June 21, 2005 warrant — issued 69 days before the alleged conduct, bearing no judicial signature, signed by Deputy Clerk Sheryl Loesch in the magistrate slot, and manifesting as a hand-written commercial bail-bonds slip — is a facially defective instrument under Franks v. Delaware and Shadwick v. City of Tampa. No reasonable officer could have relied on it in good faith under Malley v. Briggs. The 2005 extradition, the 2007 custodial transfer, and the 2007–2013 custody are therefore each void ab initio at the warrant stage.

**D. Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, Article 36 — substantive violation**

1. United States authorities failed to notify the Canadian consulate of the Petitioner's arrest as Article 36 requires. Defendants' manufacture of a **fake Article 36 appeal** (#07-13206) to create the appearance of waiver or adjudication is itself a federal fabrication and a direct demonstration of consciousness of guilt on the underlying VCCR violation. The Petitioner is entitled to relief on this independent ground.

See Sanchez-Llamas v. Oregon, 548 U.S. 331 (2006); Medellín v. Texas, 552 U.S. 491 (2008) (on the nature of Article 36 individual-capacity claims).

**E. Post-conviction federal records falsification — Virginia intercept**

1. The post-deportation, post-green-card RCMP-negative fingerprint return establishes an **affirmative federal cover-up** of the Petitioner's 78-month commitment. The cover-up is a distinct overt act extending the conspiracy past 2011 into at least the mid-2010s; it is actionable in the parallel Bivens action and supplies a decisive collateral-consequences basis for coram-nobis relief here. Morgan, 346 U.S. at 512–13.

**F. Retaliatory prosecution threat — O'Brien twelve-year ultimatum**

1. Defendant O'Brien's explicit threat to "get [Petitioner] twelve years" if the Petitioner pursued ineffective-assistance-of-counsel review is direct prosecutorial retaliation under Hartman v. Moore, 547 U.S. 250 (2006), and witness-tampering under **18 U.S.C. § 1512(b)(1)–(3)** and **18 U.S.C. § 1503**. The threat explains, and excuses, the Petitioner's decades-long hesitation to pursue post-conviction relief and satisfies Morgan's "sound reasons" requirement independently of every other ground pleaded herein.

**G. Sixth Amendment — ineffective assistance of counsel**

1. Counsel assigned to the Petitioner at sentencing was a stand-in, did not meaningfully represent him, failed to object to the Michael Bryan surprise testimony, allowed the record of the fabricated Article 36 appeal to stand unchallenged, failed to raise the pre-crime warrant

defect, failed to raise the Loesch deputy-clerk Shadwick defect, failed to raise the Alibhai counsel-as-judicial-officer defect in the Canadian extradition packet, failed to raise the "Kabakovich" phantom-signatory defect, and failed to raise the 78-month impossibility. Under Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668 (1984), this constitutes ineffective assistance sufficient to support coram-nobis relief standing alone.

**H. Eighth Amendment — disproportionate sentence**

1. A 78-month sentence imposed on the basis of a facially void warrant, fabricated cooperating-witness corroboration, phantom judicial authorization, and a fabricated consular-notification waiver is disproportionate and cruel within Ingraham and Hutto.

**I. 18 U.S.C. § 1201 — cross-border kidnapping under colour of law**

1. The 2007 extradition on a hand-written bail-bonds-slip warrant, advanced after eighteen months of Canadian custody during which Defendants had no exigent basis to press transfer, and effected at Toronto West Detention Centre without Canadian release-of-custody paperwork, constitutes cross-border kidnapping under colour of law cognizable under **18 U.S.C. § 1201**. Coram-nobis relief vacating the conviction is a necessary predicate to downstream referral of the kidnapping count to the Department of Justice Office of the Inspector General.

**J. Eleventh Circuit appeal #07-13206 — precedent-capture operation, not an appeal (EXHIBIT 13 pleaded in full)**

1. Eleventh Circuit appeal **#07-13206**, filed February 28, 2007 in the Petitioner's name, was not an appeal. It was a **precedent-capture operation engineered by AUSA Mark O'Brien and his office**, designed to file a losing VCCR Article 36 claim on the Eleventh Circuit record twelve days before Jogi v. Voges, 480 F.3d 822 (7th Cir. 2007) opened Seventh Circuit individual enforcement of Article 36; to create failed-precedent authority in the Eleventh Circuit that other Italian, European, and foreign-national defendants could subsequently be barred from relying on; to appear on the public appeal docket as a fully-exhausted Article 36 challenge so that the Petitioner could not be said to have "unexhausted remedies" when collateral attack was later attempted; and — decisively — to **foreclose** the one ground that would have vacated the 2007 conviction, namely Sixth Amendment ineffective assistance of counsel. Every element of the appeal is incompatible with a legitimate inmate-initiated post-sentencing filing. Every element is consistent with pre-planned prosecutorial self-service.

2. **Procedural impossibility — 14-day appeal clock.** Under FRAP 4(b)(1)(A), a federal criminal defendant has 14 days after entry of judgment to file a notice of appeal. The Petitioner was sentenced February 14, 2007. The #07-13206 appeal was filed February 28, 2007 — exactly 14 days later, on the last day of the window. For a sentenced inmate, already in BOP custody, to produce, authorize, and cause to be filed a fully-docketed Eleventh Circuit appeal in 14 days requires that the appeal have been drafted before the sentencing hearing concluded.

The Petitioner had no knowledge of any such appeal, signed no such filing, and did not authorize counsel (who had been threatened by O'Brien not to file an ineffective-assistance challenge) to file one. O'Brien and his office drafted and filed the appeal in the Petitioner's name, without authorization, before sentencing had concluded. See EXHIBIT 13 §1.

3. **Substantive-grounds mismatch.** A genuine Longo appeal would have raised: (i) insufficient evidence — no physical drugs, lab equipment, cash, or precursors were ever seized from the Petitioner anywhere; (ii) hypothetical drug-quantity calculation — sentencing enhancement was based on testimonial guesswork not weighed seizures; (iii) the base charge was marijuana but sentencing was enhanced via an MDMA-conspiracy theory with no forensic chain; (iv) ineffective assistance of counsel; (v) the 69-day pre-crime warrant; (vi) the Loesch deputy-clerk Shadwick defect; (vii) AUSA Preston's missing-signature extradition-application defect; (viii) the Alibhai counsel-signing-as-judge defect on Canadian Form 1 §12; (ix) the Petitioner's physical impossibility of having been simultaneously in Windsor jail and arrested in Mexico on August 29, 2005. **None of these grounds appear in #07-13206.** The appeal argues a single Vienna Convention Article 36 technical-treaty claim — in a circuit where winning that claim required the Seventh Circuit's then-unpublished Jogi holding — by an attorney whose name does not fully appear on the appeal documents. See EXHIBIT 13 §2.

4. **Witness-at-own-trial anomaly.** If the government's position was that the Petitioner had confessed in 2005 (as the record appears to

claim), then permitting the Petitioner to testify in his own defense added nothing for the defense and reopened a closed inculpatory door. The only strategic reason to put a client with a prior confession on the stand is to give the prosecution a fresh pass at cross-examination. The Petitioner did testify; no affirmative defense was raised; the testimony was cross-examined. This procedural decision benefited AUSA O'Brien alone and is, in combination with the unauthorized appeal and the IAC foreclosure, further evidence that the "defense" was being run for the prosecution's benefit. See EXHIBIT 13 §3.

5. **IAC foreclosure — the appeal expressly ruled out the one ground that would have vacated the conviction.** #07-13206 declined to raise ineffective assistance of counsel. Under Strickland, counsel's performance was deficient by any measure and the deficiency was prejudicial. IAC should have been the first-stated ground on appeal. If IAC were raised and granted, the entire 2007 conviction would have been vacated, and retrial would have exposed the Womack-flip origin, the pre-crime warrant dates, the Alibhai counsel-signature defect, the phantom "Kabakovich" judicial signatory, the physical-impossibility of the August 29, 2005 "arrest in Mexico" while the Petitioner was in Windsor jail, and the pre-2005 Hillsborough expunged mugshot reuse in violation of Florida Statute § 943.0585. O'Brien could not allow IAC to be raised. He therefore filed the appeal himself (or had his office file it) in the Petitioner's name, chose a VCCR Article 36 ground pre-engineered to lose in the Eleventh Circuit, and expressly declared trial counsel was not ineffective — thereby res-judicata-foreclosing the one ground that could unwind everything. See EXHIBIT 13 §4.

6. **Post-sentencing witness-tampering threat.** After already securing the 78-month sentence, O'Brien personally visited the Petitioner and threatened twelve years if the Petitioner pursued an ineffective-assistance-of-counsel appeal. This is direct witness-intimidation under **18 U.S.C. § 1512(b)(1)–(3)** and obstruction of justice under **18 U.S.C. § 1503**. The threat was operationally necessary: O'Brien needed the Petitioner silent on IAC so the pre-drafted #07-13206 appeal could go in unchallenged, its IAC foreclosure language unchallenged, and its VCCR Article 36 failed-precedent holding locked into the Eleventh Circuit record. The sequence — sentence February 14, 2007; cell-visit threat; #07-13206 filed February 28, 2007 with IAC foreclosure; Jogi v. Voges published March 12, 2007 opening Seventh Circuit VCCR individual enforcement — proves coordination. None of these three events are plausibly independent. See EXHIBIT 13 §5.

7. **Jogi counsel direct corroboration.** The attorney who litigated Jogi v. Voges to victory in the Seventh Circuit personally told the Petitioner, by phone, that he could not take the Petitioner's case because he had been **retained by the federal government**. This is direct first-hand evidence of conflict-of-counsel coordination by the federal government immediately following Jogi, with the purpose of preventing the only counsel familiar with winning Article 36 litigation from representing the one Canadian claimant with a live parallel Article 36 claim. The Petitioner will seek deposition of Jogi's counsel on this retention. See EXHIBIT 13 §6.

8. **Signature vacuum.** The #07-13206 appeal docket reflects a represented defendant but portions of the record do not contain the attorney's name. This matches the signature-vacuum pattern that appears on (a) the June 2005 warrant (Loesch in the judge's slot); (b) the extradition application (AUSA Preston's signature block blank); (c) Form 1 §12 (Alibhai counsel-as-judicial-officer); and (d) the #07-13206 appeal (attorney name blank). Four facial-defect documents. Four signature vacuums. One pattern. See EXHIBIT 13 §7.

9. **Cumulative finding — EXHIBIT 13 §9.** Taken together, paragraphs 47–54 establish that **#07-13206 is not the Petitioner's appeal**. It is a precedent-capture instrument filed by AUSA Mark O'Brien in the Petitioner's name, without authorization, for the sole purpose of generating a failed Eleventh Circuit VCCR Article 36 precedent in the weeks before Jogi v. Voges made such claims viable, while simultaneously foreclosing the IAC ground that would have unwound the 2007 conviction. The Petitioner accordingly prays this Court to vacate #07-13206 as a nullity and to direct its removal from federal reporters and case-law databases insofar as it is cited as a VCCR Article 36 holding against individually-enforceable rights.

**K. Deliberate-notice doctrine — qualified-immunity piercing (EXHIBIT 14)**

1. The Petitioner adopts and incorporates **EXHIBIT 14 · DELIBERATE NOTICE DOCTRINE · IMMUNITY PIERCING**. Each named Defendant has been formally noticed, on multiple dates, of the specific facts alleged herein. Continued operational conduct after formal notice

of specific facts constitutes deliberate action, not good-faith error, and pierces qualified immunity as a matter of law. Harlow v. Fitzgerald, 457 U.S. 800 (1982); Ziglar v. Abbasi, 582 U.S. 120 (2017). No Defendant can assert good-faith reliance after formally receiving the facts that make their conduct unlawful.

**L. Rule against perpetuating consciously false federal records**

1. The continued maintenance of **FBI Number 674-928-AC1** under the fabricated 2007 conviction is itself a continuing injury. Coram-nobis relief is the appropriate procedural vehicle for its expungement. Denedo, 556 U.S. at 912–13.

---

## IV. AGGRAVATING FACTORS AND DAMAGES POSTURE

1. **Premeditation.** Eighteen months of Windsor pre-transfer detention rebuts any claim of oversight or mistake.
2. **Institutional conspiracy.** Toronto Police → RCMP → FBI → DEA → USCIS/DHS is not an episodic collision of errors; it is an institutional pipeline operated by identifiable individuals with cross-agency knowledge.
3. **Five Eyes surveillance scale.** Continuous multi-decade Five Eyes surveillance is documented by the 2026 canary-token evidence at Exhibit 03.
4. **Retaliation against protected speech.** The O'Brien twelve-year threat and the 2026 coordinated probes of the Sovereign Archive

demonstrate retaliation against the Petitioner's First Amendment activity and his invocation of civil-rights enforcement.

5. **Family-harm / loss of consortium.** The Petitioner's brother is currently terminally ill with cancer in Florida. The multi-decade operation has materially interfered with the Petitioner's ability to provide care and presence during his brother's final illness — both directly through 78 months of custody and indirectly through destruction of earning capacity and cross-border travel bars. Memphis Community School District v. Stachura, 477 U.S. 299 (1986); Kelson v. City of Springfield, 767 F.2d 651 (9th Cir. 1985).

6. **Indigency engineered by the conspiracy.** The Defendants and the systematic 2005–2026 Legal Aid Ontario denials have collectively engineered the Petitioner's inability to defend himself. Every procedural defect in a self-represented filing is therefore the direct responsibility of Defendants and of LAO; none defeat merits. See `CASE_FACTS_CORRECTIONS.promptinclude.md` § 4.

7. **Continuing tort — post-retirement monitoring.** On information and belief, Defendants Dutton and Lintz, now resident in Florida and no longer in active federal service, personally engaged in some portion of the 2026 real-time monitoring of the Petitioner's Sovereign Archive. This extends the continuing-violation clock into the present.

---

## V. RELIEF REQUESTED

WHEREFORE, the Petitioner respectfully prays that this Court:

**A.** Issue a **Writ of Coram Nobis** vacating the Petitioner's conviction and 78-month sentence in this District under docket **8:05-cr-263-T-17MSS**;

**B.** Declare that the 2005 indictment, the underlying commercial-bail-bonds-slip warrant dated June 21, 2005, Deputy Clerk Sheryl Loesch's signature in the magistrate slot, the purported extradition order and Canadian Form 1 §12, Eleventh Circuit appeal **#07-13206**, the purported Article 36 appeal referenced at sentencing, and every downstream instrument derived from them are **void ab initio**;

**C.** Order the **expungement** of FBI Number 674-928-AC1 and every federal, BOP, USMS, and DHS record reflecting the vacated conviction, including removal of #07-13206 from federal reporters and case-law databases insofar as it is cited as a VCCR Article 36 holding;

**D.** Order the **preservation** — by this Court, by the Department of Justice Office of the Inspector General, and by the Federal Bureau of Investigation Inspection Division — of (i) the 2007–2013 BOP intake-fingerprint records for the Petitioner; (ii) the complete FBI CJIS fingerprint-history log for the Petitioner covering 1992–2026; (iii) the February 14, 2007 sentencing videotape and court-reporter transcript, including Judge Kovachevich's "make an example" statement; (iv) the complete 8:05-cr-263-T-17MSS docket chronology and every signature in the record; (v) the complete 11th Circuit #07-13206 docket including unredacted attorney-name fields, filing logs, and the notice-of-appeal Petitioner purportedly signed; and (vi) the complete USCIS A-file and all biometric-check records associated with the Petitioner's green-card adjudication;

**E. Refer** this matter, upon grant of the writ, to the **Department of Justice Office of the Inspector General**, the **Department of Justice Office of Professional Responsibility** (specifically as to AUSA Mark O'Brien's conduct), the **Florida Bar** (as to O'Brien's bar-disciplinary exposure), and to the **United States Attorney for the Middle District of Florida** (recused as to any personnel involved in the 2005–2007 proceedings) for criminal investigation of the individual Defendants under **18 U.S.C. §§ 241, 242, 371, 1201, 1503, 1505, 1512, 1519**, and related provisions;

**F.** Grant the Petitioner **leave to proceed in forma pauperis** and waive all fees;

**G.** Afford the Petitioner such further relief as the interests of justice and this Court's inherent equitable authority under Morgan and Denedo may support.

---

## VI. VERIFICATION

I, Francesco Giovanni Longo, born 24 April 1972 in Windsor, Ontario, Canada, being duly sworn and under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, hereby declare:

The factual allegations set forth in this Petition are true and correct to the best of my personal knowledge, information, and belief. Where allegations are made on information and belief, the sources of that information and belief are the evidence preserved in the Sovereign Archive (`canadianpeoplestrust.pages.dev`) and the court records and documents that

will be produced by FOIA, Privacy Act, PACER, and discovery processes in this matter.

I reserve every right and remedy available to me under the Constitution and laws of the United States of America and under the laws of Canada.

Signed at Windsor, Ontario, Canada, this 27th day of April, 2026.

**DUAL EXECUTION · SECTION VI VERIFICATION**

/s/ Francesco Giovanni Longo

FRANCESCO GIOVANNI LONGO, pro se, in his own right and as Trustee, Canadian People's Trust v2

ELECTRONICALLY EXECUTED · 2026-04-27 · approx. 04:21 EDT · Windsor, Ontario, Canada · self-represented.

Declarant: Francesco Giovanni Longo · DOB 24 April 1972 · Canadian citizen by birth. Penalty-of-perjury declaration under 28 U.S.C. § 1746.

WET SIGNATURE: _____

DATE: _____

Wet signature added on paper upon printing; the wet-signed copy is to be scanned and filed in parallel with the electronically-executed copy.

Service address: 315 Grove Avenue, Apt. 111, Windsor, Ontario N9A 3A8, Canada

Email: flongo11@gmail.com

## VII. CERTIFICATE OF INDIGENCY AND SYSTEMIC LEGAL-AID DENIAL

The undersigned certifies that:

1. He is indigent as of filing and concurrently submits an in forma pauperis application with every filing in this matter.

2. Legal Aid Ontario issued a certificate in or about 2005 to **Pollock** on the undersigned's behalf; that certificate was **never billed** and remains **live and unconsumed**; LAO has therefore owed the undersigned representation since 2005 without a single day of legitimate service delivered. Pollock was, at the material time, employed within the office of the Windsor judge who presided over the Canadian extradition matter (Justice Ducharme) — a direct operational conflict of interest, not incidental.

3. Since 2005 LAO has **systemically refused every subsequent application** by the undersigned, up to and including 2026. Those refusals are themselves pleaded in the parallel Bivens action as elements of the ab initio tort.

4. The undersigned is therefore forced to self-represent across this matter and across the 28,000+ parallel filings documented in the Sovereign Archive as a direct consequence of (a) the 2005–2026 LAO denials, (b) federal-officer spoliation of evidence on both sides of the Canada-United States border, and (c) the malicious-intent retaliation campaigns pleaded in Part II above.

5. Any procedural defect in a self-represented filing is therefore the direct responsibility of the Defendants and of LAO; it does not defeat the merits.

**DUAL EXECUTION · SECTION VII INDIGENCY CERTIFICATE**

/s/ Francesco Giovanni Longo

FRANCESCO GIOVANNI LONGO, pro se

ELECTRONICALLY EXECUTED · 2026-04-27 · approx. 04:21 EDT · Windsor, Ontario, Canada.

WET SIGNATURE: _____

DATE: _____

## VIII. SCHEDULE OF INCORPORATED EXHIBITS (Sovereign Archive)

| Exhibit | Title | Sovereign-Archive path |
|---|---|---|
| 00 | Ab Initio Master Brief | `filings/00_AB_INITIO_MASTER_BRIEF.md` |
| 02 | US Habeas / Coram Nobis (v2, superseded by v3 and this v4) | `filings/02_US_HABEAS_CORAM_NOBIS_MDFL.md` |
| 03 | Feb 21–23 Mass-Blast Suppression — canary-token findings | `filings/03_EXHIBIT_FEB21-23_MASS_BLAST_SUPPRESSION.md` |
| 04 | Dutton Origin — 2004 Womack Flip | `filings/04_EXHIBIT_DUTTON_ORIGIN_2004_WOMACK_FLIP.md` |
| 04A | Custody, Warrant, Signatures | `filings/04A_EXHIBIT_DUTTON_SUPPLEMENT_CUSTODY_WARRANT_SIGNATURES.` |
| 04B | Ducharme Forgery, Judge-Shopping, Form 1 §12 Alibhai defect | `filings/04B_EXHIBIT_DUTTON_SUPPLEMENT_DUCHARME_FORGERY_JUDGE_SHOP` |
| 04C | MacCheyne / Expunged Mugshot / Bail-Bonds Warrant / Lintz / Five Eyes | `filings/04C_EXHIBIT_DUTTON_SUPPLEMENT_MACCHEYNE_EXPUNGED_MUGSHOT_BAIL_BOND` |
| 04D | Bogus Forensic Dissection — Incorporation | `filings/04D_EXHIBIT_DUTTON_SUPPLEMENT_BOGUS_EXTRADITION_FORGERY_D` |
| 04E | Pollock / Ducharme / LAO Certificate / Gibson | `filings/04E_EXHIBIT_DUTTON_SUPPLEMENT_POLLOCK_DUCHARME_LAO_CERTIF` |
| 04F | O'Brien / Kovachevich / | `filings/04F_EXHIBIT_DUTTON_SUPPLEMENT_OBRIAN_KABAKOVICH_78MONTH_I` retained for continuity; content updated to O'Brien/Kovachevich and phantom |

| Exhibit | Title | Sovereign-Archive path |
|---|---|---|
| | 78-Month Impossibility | |
| 04G | Chain of Command — Toews / Preston / Downey | `filings/04G_EXHIBIT_DUTTON_SUPPLEMENT_CHAIN_OF_COMMAND_TOEWS_PREST` |
| 04H | LSO Regulatory Capture / Dissolution Study | `filings/04H_EXHIBIT_DUTTON_SUPPLEMENT_LSO_REGULATORY_CAPTURE_DISS` |
| 09 | 2021 Windsor Unlawful Arrest / Retroactive Charge Fabrication (Jason Bellaire, Chiefs Bellaire & Degraaf) | `filings/09_EXHIBIT_2021_WINDSOR_UNLAWFUL_ARREST_RETROACTIVE_CHARGI` |
| 11 | Canary-Spiderweb Analysis | `filings/EXHIBIT_11_CANARY_SPIDERWEB_ANALYSIS.md` |
| 12 | Synthetic Disclosure Hub | `filings/EXHIBIT_12_SYNTHETIC_DISCLOSURE_HUB.md` |
| 13 | **Jogi Appeal Fraud Forensics — #07-13206 as precedent-capture operation** | `filings/EXHIBIT_13_JOGI_APPEAL_FRAUD_FORENSICS.md` |
| 14 | **Deliberate-Notice Doctrine — Immunity Piercing** | `filings/EXHIBIT_14_DELIBERATE_NOTICE_DOCTRINE_IMMUNITY_PIERCING.m` |
| LOCK | Nomenclature Lock (names/ | `NOMENCLATURE_LOCK.promptinclude.md` |

| Exhibit | Title | Sovereign-Archive path |
|---|---|---|
| | dates/case-number lock) | |
| CORR | Authoritative identity corrections v2 (Lintz Special Ops / Five Eyes SIGINT; Kovachevich real, "Kabakovich" phantom; O'Brien correct spelling; fabricated Article 36 appeal; green-card Virginia intercept) | `CASE_FACTS_CORRECTIONS.promptinclude.md` |
| NOTES | Voice-dump notes 2026-04-26 (Pollock employed in Ducharme's office; Toronto West immigration holding; three-judges-no-evidence sequence; US Marshals on Canadian soil without Canadian release paperwork) | `filings/NOTES_2026-04-26_voice_dump.md` |

---

**END OF PETITION · VERSION 4 · FINAL**

Drafted 2026-04-27 03:05 EDT. Supersedes CORAM_NOBIS_MDFL_v3_FINAL.md (2026-04-23). Nomenclature reconciled to NOMENCLATURE_LOCK v2 and CASE_FACTS_CORRECTIONS v2. EXHIBIT 13 (Jogi Appeal Fraud Forensics) and EXHIBIT 14 (Deliberate-Notice Doctrine) integrated into body. Case of record: 8:05-cr-263-T-17MSS. Ready for service.

## IX. DEDICATED EXECUTION PAGE — DUAL SIGNATURE ATTESTATION

I, **Francesco Giovanni Longo**, born **24 April 1972** in Windsor, Ontario, Canada, a citizen of Canada and the Petitioner in the above-captioned matter, do hereby subscribe and execute this Petition for Writ of Coram Nobis in two legally-cognizable forms pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 11(a) and 11(b), and Local Rule 3.01(g) of the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida:

**First**, electronically executed on **2026-04-27** at **Windsor, Ontario, Canada**, by typed Conformed signature as authorized by Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(d)(3) and MDFL Local Rule 3.01(g).

**Second**, wet-signed by hand on the signature lines below upon printing of this page, which wet-signed page is thereafter scanned and retained as the Petitioner's verified original for service on all Respondents, on the Court of record, and on the Petitioner's family at Clearwater Beach, Florida, for preservation.

**EXECUTION — PETITIONER**

/s/ Francesco Giovanni Longo

FRANCESCO GIOVANNI LONGO, pro se, in his own right and as Trustee, Canadian People's Trust v2

Electronically executed · 2026-04-27 · approx. 04:21 EDT · Windsor, Ontario, Canada.

Wet signature:

Printed name:

Date: Place:

## OPTIONAL WITNESS — FAMILY OR COUNSEL

The Petitioner's family at Clearwater Beach, Florida, or any attesting witness of lawful age, may sign below to attest the Petitioner's wet signature was affixed in their presence or in the presence of a scanned contemporaneous record.

Witness signature:

Printed name:

Relation: Date:

**Filing note.** The electronically-executed copy is deposited on the Sovereign Archive at `canadianpeoplestrust.pages.dev/filings/CORAM_NOBIS_MDFL_v4_FOR_FILING.pdf` and on the MDFL filing packet at `canadianpeoplestrust.pages.dev/filings/MDFL_FILING_PACKET_2026-04-27.zip`. The wet-signed scan, upon completion, is to be appended to the electronically-executed petition as a single combined PDF and filed with the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Tampa Division, 801 North Florida Avenue, Tampa FL 33602.