

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA** )  
)  
)  
                                  **Plaintiff,** )  
)  
**v.** )  
)  
**RONALD LASLEY,** )  
)  
                                  **Defendant.** )

---

**Case No. 07-20067-002-CM**

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

Presently before the court is a motion filed by defendant titled “Take Judicial Notice in the Nature of Rule 201. Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Facts and Administrative Notice; In the Nature of Writ of Error Coram Nobis and Demand for Dismissal for Failure to State the Proper Jurisdiction and Venue” (Doc. 117). Defendant filed a letter as an attachment to his motion, in which he noted that his motion “is not a 2254, 2255, or 60(b), nor any other statutory motions . . . .” (Doc. 117-1 at 1.) Defendant’s motion is largely incoherent. The issues raised in defendant’s motion were addressed in *United States v. Hobbs*, No. 4:12CR14AGF(MLM), 2012 WL 2458425, at \*11–16 (E.D. Mo. May 15, 2012). For the same reasons as the court denied the defendant’s motion in *Hobbs*, defendant’s motion (Doc. 117) is denied in its entirety.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that defendant’s motion “Take Judicial Notice in the Nature of Rule 201. Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Facts and Administrative Notice; In the Nature of Writ of Error Coram Nobis and Demand for Dismissal for Failure to State the Proper Jurisdiction and Venue” (Doc. 117) is denied.

Dated this 18<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2013, at Kansas City, Kansas.

s/ Carlos Murguia  
**CARLOS MURGUIA**  
**United States District Judge**