IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	:	CRIMINAL ACTION
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
MARQUIS WILSON	:	No. 14-cr-209-1

ORDER

AND NOW, this 5th day of December 2016, upon consideration of defendant Marquis Wilson's Pro Se Motion To Dismiss Due to Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction (Doc. No. 226), it is hereby ORDERED that the motion is DENIED.

Defendant is currently represented by counsel. A person who is represented by counsel may not engage in "hybrid representation" by acting pro se while represented. *See United States v. Turner*, 677 F.3d 570, 578 (3d Cir. 2012) ("Pro se litigants have no right to 'hybrid representation' because '[a] defendant does not have a constitutional right to choreograph special appearances by counsel.'" (quoting *McKaskle v. Wiggins*, 465 U.S. 168, 183 (1984))). While defendant remains represented by counsel, he may only file the instant motion through his attorney.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Legrome D. Davis

Legrome D. Davis, J.

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO