

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
DUBLIN DIVISION**

GLADYS HARUN	)	
	)	
v.	)	CR 323-003
	)	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	)	
	)	

**GOVERNMENT’S RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO HARUN’S MOTIONS TO
SUPPLEMENT AND FOR SEQUENCING**

Harun moves the Court to: (1) expand the record under Rule 7 of the Rules Governing Section 2255 proceedings; and (2) rule on her motion to expand¹ before evaluating the Government’s motion to dismiss her 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion. (Docs. 72 at 1, 3-4, 71; 73 at 1.) The Court should deny both motions.

First, the Court should evaluate the Government’s motion to dismiss Harun’s § 2255 motion before ruling on her motion to expand because, “[i]n general, *if a motion is not dismissed*, a judge may direct the parties to expand the record by submitting additional materials relating to the motion.” *Prada v. United States*, 692 F. App’x 572, 574 (11th Cir. 2017) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 2255, Rule 7(a)) (emphasis added). “The purpose is to enable the judge to dispose of some habeas petitions not dismissed on the pleadings without the time and expense required for an evidentiary hearing.” *Id.*

Second, the Court should deny Harun’s motion to expand because where the record conclusively shows that the § 2255 petitioner is not entitled to relief, expanding

¹ Harun’s motion uses the term “supplement,” but Rule 7 discusses “expand[ing]” the record. (Doc. 72 at 1-3, 71); 28 U.S.C. § 2255, Rule 7(a).

the record is unnecessary. *See id.* at 574-75 (citing 28 U.S.C. § 2255, Rule 7(a)). Here, Harun seeks to expand the record to “demonstrate that the restitution order and prison sentence rest on false premises,” and to support her “innocence of any financial wrongdoing.” (Doc. 72 at 3-4.) However, as set forth in the Government’s motion to dismiss, these claims are non-cognizable. (Doc. 68 at 22, 25). And, her other claims are waived by her guilty plea, belied by the Rule 11 colloquy, and unavailing. (Doc. 68 at 16-25.) So, the record conclusively shows that Harun is not entitled to § 2255 relief. Therefore, her § 2255 motion should be dismissed and her motion to expand should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

TARA M. LYONS
ACTING UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

//s// Channell V. Singh

Channell V. Singh
Assistant United States Attorney
Georgia Bar No. 216540

P.O. Box 8970
Savannah, Georgia 31412
(912) 652-4422

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that I have on this day served all the parties in this case in accordance with the notice of electronic filing (“NEF”) that was generated as a result of electronic filing in this Court. Additionally, a copy has been mailed to:

Gladys Harun
192 Amelia Dr.
Byron, GA 31008

This August 13, 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

TARA M. LYONS
ACTING UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

//s// Channell V. Singh

Channell V. Singh
Assistant United States Attorney
Georgia Bar No. 216540

Post Office Box 8970
Savannah, Georgia 31412
(912) 652-4422