

**\$22.2 BILLION DOLLAR PLUS DAMAGES CLAIM UNDER USC § 1491
TUCKER'S ACT; 18 USC § 1961 (RICO); SHERMAN ANTITRUST ACT; 18
USC § 1201 (KIDNAPPING); HOBBS ACT, 42 USC § 1983; THE
SEPARATION CLAUSE IN THE CONSTITUTION AND OTHERS**

(See Expanded Damages Calculations pg. 159)

[“Cujusque Rei Rotissima Pars”][The Principle Part Of Everything Is In The Beginning]

**THIS IS A SELF ACTUATING / SELF DETERMINING
CONTRACT WITHIN A COUNTER-SUIT IN
COMMON EQUITY LAW JURISDICTION**

THIS TITLE IS FOR YOUR PROTECTION

NOTICE TO AGENT IS NOTICE TO PRINCIPLE NOTICE TO PRINCIPLE IS NOTICE TO AGENT

All Rights Reserved 1-308

Be It Known: This “Conditional Acceptance” to “Your Offer” establishes a “Common Law Contract” between us under the “Postal Rule”, which states:

“The **postal rule** (also known as the **mailbox rule** or "deposited acceptance rule") is a term of common law contracts which determines the timing of acceptance of an offer when mail is contemplated as the medium of acceptance. The general principle is that a contract is formed when acceptance is actually communicated to the offeror. The mailbox rule is an exception to the general principle. The mailbox rule provides that the contract is formed when a properly prepaid and properly addressed letter of acceptance is posted. One rationale given for the rule is that the offeror nominates the post office as implied agent and thus receipt of the acceptance by the post office is regarded as that of the offeree. The main effect of the mailbox rule is that the risk of acceptance being delivered late or lost in the post is placed upon the offeror. If the offeror is reluctant to accept this risk, he can always require actual receipt before being legally bound.”

I. YOU HAVE BEEN SERVED

Members/Agents/Co-conspirators/Trustees, voluntarily and of their own free will and choice, through their actions and failure to act initiated the sham, malicious, groundless and unlawful JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS persecution/prosecution/“offer to contract”; and

Counter-Claimant JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS seeking remedy, contractually sets forth upon the record of the court for trial in case # 19-cr-877 (CCC) -03 and case # 9:19-mj-8526 — this Conditional Acceptance Counter Suit Contract; and

Members/Agents/Co-conspirators/Trustees, are contractually bound and demanded to answer each and every “Challenge to their offer to contract”, or they accept, through willful disregard or inability and failure to produce evidence, therefore conclusively be presumed to agree and are forevermore subject to equitable estoppel (estoppel in pais) and latches. Enterprise Members agree that all claims herein set forth by claimant are true, correct, irrefutable and are deemed settled/final judgement in favor of Claimant on February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst.; and

Members/Agents/Co-conspirators/Judges/Prosecutors/Lawyers/Officers... Trustees *et al*, shall be jointly and severely liable and responsible for all damages as outlined herein; and — agree to UCC Filings as-well-as consensual Liens in favor of JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS.

II. RESERVATION OF RIGHTS

2.1 Comes Now Claimant/Plaintiff, I am exercising as well as retaining and preserving ALL rights without waiving any rights, defenses, Common Law/Exclusive Equity, natural, private commercial, incorporeal, statutory or procedural, a natural living man, being of majority status conducting the style condition of **The Principle and Beneficial Equitable Title Holder**, and not an infant/minor or ward of the court do file this Counter-Claim in Case # 2:19-cr-877-CCC and Case # 9:19-mj-8526 **without accepting any jurisdiction**, for I have neither committed any injury nor has any living man or woman true party in interest testified or witnessed that I have. Being of lawful majority age, clear head, and sound mind represent myself “in Propria Persona” (I’m my person) or “proper”, which qualifies me as an attorney in fact, according to Black’s Law Dictionary. Heretofore Asserting my Sovereign Right to present myself in legal matters establishes my status as my own attorney. To proceed in Pro Per means

that the court cannot impose the same standards upon me as are imposed on a so-called licensed BAR member Attorney.

2.2 This Court is NOTICED that a service mark owned by me, Jobadiah Sinclair Weeks with the name “JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS” is on file with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO #97537251) prohibiting commercial use of the all caps artificial person’s name for the “benefit” of anyone other than me, Jobadiah Sinclair Weeks. It is my intellectual property.

2.3 All the facts stated herein are true, correct, complete, are not hearsay, are not misleading, but are **admissible as evidence**, if not rebutted and proven inaccurate, and if called to testify, the Claimant shall so state, and further,

2.4 The Claimant has special standing capacity to act as to the lawful matters herein, and further,

2.5 The Claimant has personal, firsthand knowledge, executive and documented knowledge of the facts stated herein, and further,

2.6 The Claimant is a Living Soul, and one of “the people” as mentioned in the organic constitution, Free Land Holder, Sovereign American National, habitant and further,

2.7 The Claimant is NOT a corporation or fictitious entity, or U.S. citizen, *cestui que* trust estate, or citizen of the District of Columbia or any other US territories, and further,

2.8 The Claimant is not in the military, and further,

2.9 The use of any statutes, codes, rules, regulations, or court citations, within any document created by the Claimant, at any time, is only to notice that which is applicable to government officials, and is not intended, nor shall it be construed, to mean that the Claimant has conferred, submitted to, or entered into any jurisdiction alluded to thereby, and further,

2.10 Equality under the law is paramount and mandatory by Law, and further,

2.11 No man or woman, nor any person, is competent in dealing with any of the Claimants affairs, and further,

2.12 The Claimant is competent for dealing in all of the Claimants affairs, provided he is not being intentionally drugged by respondents and/or being subjected to cruel and unusual punishment and/or respondents obstructing Claimant from conferring with his counsel in order to prepare a proper defense in the case of you kidnapping me again... and further

“To suppose that any government can be a party in any compact with the whole people, is to suppose it to have existence before it can have a right to exist.” Thomas Paine, Rights of Man 210, ed. Henry Collins, 1969, quoted in Enlow, 24.

2.13 These claims now brought forward against Enterprise Members / Agents of this Court include but are not limited to violations of the Tucker's Act, Hobb's Act, “Administrative Law”, “Common Law/Exclusive Equity”, and violations under the Uniform Commercial Code.

2.14 Definitions as they apply to this contract are enclosed in Attachment “A”, and are included as a legal part of this Contract/Countersuit/Affidavit. Any dispute of any definition will be decided by the Undersigned.

2.15 The JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS© trust is not a “U.S. citizen” of a FEDERAL CHARTER CONSORTIUM CORPORATION, it is a Common Equity Law Emissary in proximity to the Republic of America therefore, the Corporate Administrative Courts did/do not have jurisdiction to target and attack claimant in this instant case. See: U.S. v. Anthony 24 Fed. 829 (1873). Administrative courts lacked jurisdiction because they were/are not a common law court of equity, the only court with jurisdiction regarding an American National/free land holder by patent and/or Claimant under the “Tuckers Act”. Claimant encloses his secure party creditors Claim Of Life as well as claimants Claim Of Status Documents (See Exhibits) as evidence that claimant is Common Law *Ens Legis*, commissioned by his secure party creditor to operate exclusively in Article III Courts as illustrated in the Constitution, and JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS©, effectuating as Foreign American National Emissary person as to the CONSORTIUM CHARTER CORPORATION sTATE and the CONSORTIUM FRANCHISED CORPORATIONS sTATES and operates exclusively in Common Equity Law, and as a Beneficiary of trust JSW, and **never as the Trustee of the JSW Trust.**

2.16 I, JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS©/Beneficiary am here to represent my Secured Party/Man/Settlor, Jobadiah-Sinclair: Family of Weeks [hereinafter Jobadiah-Sinclair: Weeks, i,

me, my], a free man, Sui Juris, sovereign, diplomat, free land holder, one of “the people” being kidnapped in the stead of my Corporate person, *ens legis* and forced to appear **in multiple De facto** Military (Admiralty Jurisdiction) statute tribunal(s). And i now being unlawfully forced to appear by paper and Specially, Not Generally Or Voluntarily, and *in propria persona* and as the human Secured Party Creditor of the *Cestui que* Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS© [hereinafter Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS **or** Trust JSW], and **never as the Trustee of the JSW Trust.**

2.17 I duly serve this “Complaint” and “The Contract” and commencement of Counter-Suit on the record of the Federal Court - Judicial, upon **The Enterprise/Trustees and their principals.**

2.18 SINCE YOU MOVED against The Undersigned in defiance of his presentment(s), there is no immunity from prosecution available to you, or any of your fellow public officers, agents, officials of government or private corporations, judges, magistrates, district attorney, clerks or any other persons who become involved in any actions now existing or that may arise in the future against the Undersigned or Trust by way of aiding and abetting other actors. Take due heed and govern yourself accordingly. Any or all documents tendered to The Undersigned lacking bona-fide ink signatures or dates per Title 18 U.S.C.A § 513-6514 are counterfeit security instruments causing you to be liable in your corporate and personal capacity by violating any of the rights, constitutions, privileges, immunities or any terms herein. You agree to willingly, with no reservation of rights and defenses, at the written request of the Undersigned, surrender, including, but not limited to, any and all bonds, public and/or corporate insurance policies; and/or CAFR as well as CRIS funds, assets, property or land as needed to satisfy any and all claims as filed against you by the Undersigned. This applies to any and all Representatives, severally and individually of “tHE UNITED STATES” (corporation) the "governance of tHE UNITED STATES" as created in the (King George III) Constitution for tHE United STATES, (circa 1787), the "STATE of NEW JERSEY", or to your "UNITED STATES CORPORATION" also known as the CHARTER CORPORATION "UNITED STATES", tHE UNITED STATES", "Corp. USA", "UNITED STATES, Inc.” (circa 1871), or by whatever name same may currently be known or be hereafter named, or any of its subdivisions including but not

NOTICE TO CLERK NOTICE TO RECORDER

Pursuant to Title 18 U.S.C., chapter 101 2071(b), "Whoever, having the custody of any such record, proceeding, map, book, document, paper, recording or another thing, willfully and unlawfully conceals, removes, mutilates, obliterates, falsifies, or destroys the same, shall be, a fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both and shall forfeit his office c and be shall disqualified from holding any office under tHE UNITED STATES." JUDA, STATE of COLORADO, or by whatever name same may currently be known or be hereafter named, and the like.

2.19 LET IT BE KNOWN: Members - Agents, co-conspirators - co-officers, kingpins and henchmen working in concert and through "Joint Activity and Pervasive Entwinement", engaging in actions and activities that are in clear violation of RICO, repugnant to your (King George III) Constitution of tHE UNITED sTATES (circa 1787), and your (King George III) Bill of Rights (circa 1789), and constitute a "Criminal Syndicate" (sTATE OF NEW JERSEY) within an "Enterprise" (U.S. CORPORATION CONSORTIUM "tHE UNITED sTATES"). This case, not unlike the several others, is entirely comprised of malicious, unlawful, fraudulent actions that have been directed upon Beneficiary, the true "victim", as well as the victim's Estate, repugnant as to due process of law, with the express intent of harming, infliction of emotional distress, defamation and unjustly enriching those who engage in predatory, malicious prosecution and persecution through artifice and fraud, political activism as well as others.

2.20 All Agent(s)/Member(s) of the Enterprise herein named have voluntarily, and of their own free will and choice "**occupied the office of Trustee**" of the *Cestui Que Ve* Irrevocable Trust named JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (trust JSW) and engaged in a pattern of unlawful activities in-concert-one-with-another constituting an "Enterprise" (*consensus fact legem*) breach of trust, and are therefore bound therein, as co-agents, co-conspirators and members from the origin to the end (*ab initio* to *ad infinitum*). Trustees cannot be at war with the beneficiary or the constitution. Many of the unlawful activities that have been carried out by various co-agents of the Enterprise could not have been accomplished except for the fact that specialists, trained in their craft, embedded within the Franchised Consortium Corporation system, managed and licensed therein, working in concert with other trained and licensed specialists, within the Administrative Consortium Corporation system, under the color of law, and/or color of authority, doing their part to forward the unified criminal intent and collective criminal goals of the Enterprise. Each and All Enterprise Member/Trustee/Defendant are sued in their Legal Fiction

Ens Legis capacity and in their Professional capacity as Agents of tHE UNITED sTATES CONSORTIUM CORPORATIONS.

III. PARTIES

3.1 Plaintiff/Claimant/Beneficiary JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS is a sovereign American National Diplomat, Non U.S. Citizen, Non Taxpayer and he and “the people” counter sues to vindicate His and “the peoples” rights, freedoms, life, liberty, pursuits and pecuniary interests. Claimant reserves all rights and does not bring forth this counterclaim in order to enter any foreign jurisdiction and remains anchored in his superior jurisdiction(s) under Gods Law and under common law of his republic and exercises his exemption as the victim.

Members of the Enterprise/Trustees/Defendants.. May Include but are not Limited To:

1. U.S. DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN - FLORIDA, Private For Profit Consortium Corporation, De facto Impersonating a Government Agency - SOUTH MIAMI, FLORIDA, U.S. Person, a taxpayer
2. William: Family of Matthewman and WILLIAM: Family of MATTHEWMAN d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a, WILLIAM MATTHEWMAN, Magistrate Judge, Impersonating Officer-of-the-Tribunal titled - THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN - WEST PALM BEACH, FLORIDA, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
3. William T.: Family of Walsh and WILLIAM T.: Family of WALSH d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a, WILLIAM T. WALSH, Court Clerk, Impersonating Officer-of-the-Tribunal titled - THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN - WEST PALM BEACH, FLORIDA, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
4. Aurora: Family of Fagan and AURORA: Family of FAGAN d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a, AURORA FAGAN, Legal Counsel, Impersonating Officer-of-the-Tribunal titled - tHE UNITES STATES ATTORNEY OFFICE - MIAMI, FLORIDA, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
5. William: Family of Johnson and WILLIAM: Family of JOHNSON d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a WILLIAM JOHNSON, IRS Agent, of the Trust business entity titled “INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE of FLORIDA,” U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer

6. Julian: Family of Washington and JULIAN: Family of WASHINGTON d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a JULIAN WASHINGTON, IRS Special Agent, of the Trust business entity titled - "INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE of FLORIDA," U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
7. Adam: Family of Weisenstein and ADAM: Family of WEISENSTEIN d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a ADAM WEISENSTEIN, IRS Special Agent, of the Trust business entity titled - "INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE of FLORIDA," U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
8. Amjad: Family of Qaqish and AMJAD: Family of QAQISH d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a AMJAD QAQISH, FBI Agent, of the Trust business entity titled "FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION - FLORIDA," U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
9. Adam P.: Family of Schwartz and ADAM P.: Family of SCHWARTZ d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a, ADAM P. SCHWARTZ, De Facto Attorney, De Facto Impersonating Public Official by Joint Activity and Pervasive Entwinement - TAMPA, FLORIDA, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
10. CARLTON FIELDS FIRM, Private For Profit Consortium Corporation, De Facto Impersonation of a Government Agency by Joint Activity and Pervasive Entwinement - TAMPA, FLORIDA, U.S. Person, a taxpayer
11. Simon A.: Family of Gaugush and SIMON A.: Family of GAUGUSH d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a, SIMON A. GAUGUSH, De Facto Attorney, De Facto Impersonating Public Official by Joint Activity and Pervasive Entwinement - TAMPA, FLORIDA, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
12. Andrew M.: Family of Hinkes and ANDREW M.: Family of HINKES d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a, ANDREW M. HINKES, De Facto Attorney, De Facto Impersonating Public Official by Joint Activity and Pervasive Entwinement - MIAMI, FLORIDA, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
13. STATE Of FLORIDA Inc., private, franchise, for profit foreign Consortium Corporation, De Facto Impersonation a Government Entity - TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA, U.S. Person, a taxpayer

14. STATE Of NEW JERSEY Inc., private, franchise, for profit foreign Consortium Corporation, De Facto Impersonation a Government Entity - TRENTON, NEW JERSEY, U.S. Person, a taxpayer
15. U.S. DISTRICT COURT DENVER - COLORADO, Private For Profit Consortium Corporation, De Facto Impersonating a Government Agency - DENVER, COLORADO, U.S. Person, a taxpayer
16. Scott.: Family of Varholak and SCOTT.: Family of VARHOLAK d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a, SCOTT VARHOLAK, Magistrate Judge, Impersonating Officer-of-the-Tribunal titled - THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT - DENVER, COLORADO, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
17. Jeffrey P.: Family of Colwell and JEFFREY P.: Family of COLWELL d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a, JEFFREY P. COLWELL, Court Clerk, Impersonating Officer-of-the-Tribunal titled - THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT - DENVER, COLORADO, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
18. Mindy: Family of Wilgus and MINDY: Family of WILGUS d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a MINDY WILGUS, IRS Special Agent, of the Trust business entity titled "INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE - COLORADO," U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
19. Ben: Family of Hopping and BEN: Family of HOPPING d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a BEN HOPPING, IRS Special Agent, of the Trust business entity titled "INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE - COLORADO," U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
20. Jared: Family of Erwin and JARED: Family of ERWIN d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a JARED ERWIN, IRS Special Agent, of the Trust business entity titled "INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE - COLORADO," U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
21. Kevin: Family of Sophia and KEVIN: Family of SOPHIA d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a KEVIN SOPHIA, IRS Special Agent, of the Trust business entity titled "INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE - COLORADO," U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
22. Ashley: Family of Thompson and ASHLEY: Family of THOMPSON d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a ASHLEY THOMPSON, IRS Special Agent, of the Trust business entity titled "INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE - COLORADO," U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer

23. Greg: Family of Flynn and GREG: Family of FLYNN d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a GREG FLYNN, IRS Special Agent, of the Trust business entity titled “INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE - COLORADO,” U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
24. Craig: Family of Wyly and CRAIG: Family of WYLY d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a CRAIG WYLY, IRS Special Agent, of the Trust business entity titled “INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE - COLORADO,” U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
25. John: Family of Cooper and JOHN: Family of COOPER d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a JOHN COOPER, IRS Special Agent, of the Trust business entity titled “INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE - COLORADO,” U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
26. Victor: Family of Vancacore and VICTOR: Family of VANCACORE d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a VICTOR VANCACORE, IRS Special Agent, of the Trust business entity titled “INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE - COLORADO,” U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
27. Steve: Family of Byrnes and STEVE: Family of BYRNES d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a STEVE BYRNES, IRS Special Agent, of the Trust business entity titled “INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE - COLORADO,” U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
28. Dean: Family of Manes and DEAN: Family of MANES d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a DEAN MANES, IRS Special Agent, of the Trust business entity titled “INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE - COLORADO,” U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
29. Adam: Family of Rutkokski and ADAM: Family of RUTKOKSKI d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a ADAM RUTKOKSKI, IRS Special Agent, of the Trust business entity titled “INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE - COLORADO,” U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
30. Marcelette: Family of Ellis-Goodwin and MARCEELETTE: Family of ELLIS-GOODWIN d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a MARCEELETTE ELLIS-GOODWIN, IRS Special Agent/Investigative Analyst, of the Trust business entity titled “INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE - COLORADO,” U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer

31. Jonathan: Family of Helmstetter and JONATHAN: Family of HELMSTETTER d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a JONATHAN HELMSTETTER, FBI Agent, of the Trust business entity titled "IRS," U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
32. Leo: Family of Rovenski and LEO: Family of ROVENSKI d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a LEO ROVENSKI, FBI Agent, of the Trust business entity titled "IRS" U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
33. Victor: Family of Ribeiro and VICTOR: Family of RIBEIRO d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a VICTOR RIBEIRO, FBI Agent, of the Trust business entity titled "FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION - COLORADO," U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
34. Avra: Family of Rubin and AVRA: Family of RUBIN d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a AVRA RUBIN, FBI Agent, of the Trust business entity titled "FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION - COLORADO," U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
35. Brian: Family of Lukacsy and BRIAN: Family of LUKACSY d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a BRIAN LUKACSY, FBI Agent, of the Trust business entity titled "FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION - COLORADO," U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
36. Ven: Family of Karavchuk and VEN: Family of KARAVCHUK d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a VEN KARAVCHUK, FBI Agent, of the Trust business entity titled "FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION - COLORADO," U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
37. John: Family of Magloski and JOHN: Family of MAGLOSKI d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a JOHN MAGLOSKI, FBI Special Agent, of the Trust business entity titled "FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION - COLORADO," U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
38. David: Family of Rodman and DAVID: Family of RODMAN d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a DAVID RODMAN, De Facto Attorney, De Facto Impersonating Public Official by Joint Activity and Pervasive Entwinement - DENVER, COLORADO, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
39. RODMAN LAW GROUP - FIRM, Private For Profit Consortium Corporation, De Facto Impersonation a Government Agency by Joint Activity and Pervasive Entwinement - DENVER, COLORADO, U.S. Person, a taxpayer

40. Seth: Family of Junker and SETH: Family of JUNKER d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a SETH JUNKER, De Facto Probation Agent, De Facto Impersonating Public Official by Joint Activity and Pervasive Entwinement - DENVER, COLORADO, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
41. Carlos: Family of Morales and CARLOS: Family of MORALES d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a CARLOS MORALES, De Facto Probation Agent, De Facto Impersonating Public Official by Joint Activity and Pervasive Entwinement - DENVER, COLORADO, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
42. STATE Of COLORADO Inc., private, franchise, for profit foreign Consortium Corporation, De Facto Impersonation a Government Entity - DENVER, COLORADO, U.S. Person, a taxpayer
43. Amy: Family of Larson and AMY: Family of LARSON. DIRECTOR OF THE COLORADO B.A.R. Association Inc., private, for-profit foreign Consortium Corporation, De Facto Impersonating Public Entity by Joint Activity and Pervasive Entwinement - DENVER, COLORADO, U.S. Person, a taxpayer
44. Angela C.: Family of Scheck and ANGELA C. Family of SCHECK. DIRECTOR OF THE NEW JERSEY B.A.R. Association Inc., private, for-profit foreign Consortium Corporation, De Facto Impersonating Public Entity by Joint Activity and Pervasive Entwinement - NEW BRUNSWICK, NEW JERSEY U.S. Person, a taxpayer
45. Josh: Family of Doyle and JOSH: Family of DOYLE. DIRECTOR OF THE FLORIDA B.A.R. Association Inc., private, for-profit foreign Consortium Corporation, De Facto Impersonating Public Entity by Joint Activity and Pervasive Entwinement - TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA, U.S. Person, a taxpayer
46. INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE (IRS), private for-profit foreign Consortium Corporation, De Facto Impersonation a Government Entity - WASHINGTON, D.C., U.S. Person, a taxpayer
47. 77. Danial I.: Family of Warfel and DANIAL I.: Family of WARFEL d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a DANIAL I. WARFEL, De Facto IRS Director, Impersonating Officer of the Private Consortium Corporation titled INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer

48. FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIONS (FBI), private for profit foreign Consortium Corporation, De Facto Impersonation a Government Entity - WASHINGTON, D.C., U.S. Person, a taxpayer
49. Christopher Asher: Family of Wray and CHRISTOPHER ASHER: Family of WRAY d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a CHRISTOPHER ASHER WRAY, De Facto FBI Director, Impersonating Officer of the Private Consortium Corporation titled FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
50. SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION (SEC), private for profit foreign Consortium Corporation, De Facto Impersonation a Government Entity - WASHINGTON, D.C., U.S. Person, a taxpayer
51. Gary Samual: Family of Gensler and GARY SAMUAL: Family of GENSLER d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a GARY SAMUAL GENSLER, De Facto SEC Director, Impersonating Officer of the Private Consortium Corporation titled SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
52. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (DOJ), private for profit foreign Consortium Corporation, De Facto Impersonation a Government Entity - WASHINGTON, D.C., U.S. Person, a taxpayer
53. Merrick Brian: Family of Garland and MERRICK BRIAN: Family of GARLAND d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a MERRICK BRIAN GARLAND, De Facto U.S. (DOJ) Attorney General, Impersonating Officer of the Private Consortium Corporation titled DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (DOJ), U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
54. David: Family of Hernandez and DAVID: Family of HERNANDEZ d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a, DAVID HERNANDEZ, De Facto Probation Agent, De Facto Impersonating Public Official by Joint Activity and Pervasive Entwinement - NEWARK, NEW JERSEY, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
55. Michael: Family of Hammer and MICHAEL: Family of HAMMER d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a, MICHAEL HAMMER, Magistrate Judge, Impersonating Officer-of-the-Tribunal titled - tHE UNITED sTATES DISTRICT COURT - NEWARK, NEW JERSEY, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer

56. Edward S.: Family of Keil and EDWARD S.: Family of KEIL d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a, EDWARD S. KEIL, District Judge, Impersonating Officer-of-the-Tribunal titled - tHE UNITED sTATES DISTRICT COURT -NEWARK, NEW JERSEY, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
57. Clair C.: Family of Cecchi and CLAIR C.: Family of CECCHI d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a, CLAIR C. CECCHI, District Judge, Impersonating Officer-of-the-Tribunal titled - tHE UNITED sTATES DISTRICT COURT - NEWARK, NEW JERSEY, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
58. U.S. DISTRICT COURT NEWARK - NEW JERSEY, Private For Profit Consortium Corporation, De Facto Impersonating a Government Agency - NEWARK, NEW JERSEY, U.S. Person, a taxpayer
59. Melissa E.: Family of Rhoads. and MELISSA E.: Family of RHOADS d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a, MELISSA E. RHOADS Court Clerk, Impersonating Officer-of-the-Tribunal titled - tHE UNITED sTATES DISTRICT COURT - NEWARK, NEW JERSEY, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
60. Philip R.: Family of Sellinger and PHILIP R.: Family of SELLINGER d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a, PHILIP R. SELLINGER, District Attorney, Impersonating Officer-of-the-Tribunal titled - tHE UNITES STATES ATTORNEY OFFICE - NEWARK, NEW JERSEY, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
61. Rachael.: Family of Honig and RACHAEL: Family of HONIG d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a, RACHAEL HONIG, District Attorney, Impersonating Officer-of-the-Tribunal titled - tHE UNITES STATES ATTORNEY OFFICE - NEWARK, NEW JERSEY, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
62. Craig.: Family of Carpenito and CRAIG: Family of CARPENITO d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a, CRAIG CARPENITO, District Attorney, Impersonating Officer-of-the-Tribunal titled - tHE UNITES STATES ATTORNEY OFFICE - NEWARK, NEW JERSEY, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
63. David W.: Family of Feder and DAVID W.: Family of FEDER d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a, DAVID W. FEDER Prosecutor, Impersonating Officer-of-the-Tribunal titled - tHE

UNITES STATES ATTORNEY OFFICE - NEWARK, NEW JERSEY, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer

64. Anthony P.: Family of Torntore and ANTHONY P.: Family of TORNTORE d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a, ANTHONY P. TORNTORE Prosecutor, Impersonating Officer-of-the-Tribunal titled - tHE UNITES STATES ATTORNEY OFFICE - NEWARK, NEW JERSEY, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
65. Jamie L.: Family of Hoxie and JAMIE L.: Family of HOXIE d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a, JAMIE L. HOXIE Prosecutor, Impersonating Officer-of-the-Tribunal titled - tHE UNITES STATES ATTORNEY OFFICE - NEWARK, NEW JERSEY, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
66. Joseph A.: Family of Minish and JOSEPH A.: Family of MINISH d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a, JOSEPH A. MINISH Prosecutor, Impersonating Officer-of-the-Tribunal titled - tHE UNITES STATES ATTORNEY OFFICE - NEWARK, NEW JERSEY, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
67. Sarah: Family of Devlin and SARAH.: Family of DEVLIN d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a, SARAH DEVLIN Prosecutor, Impersonating Officer-of-the-Tribunal titled - tHE UNITES STATES ATTORNEY OFFICE - NEWARK, NEW JERSEY, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
68. U.S. PROSECUTORS/ATTORNEYS - NEW JERSEY , Private For Profit Consortium Corporation, De Facto Impersonating a Government Agency - NEWARK, NEW JERSEY, U.S. Person, a taxpayer
69. Michael L.: Family of Yaeger and MICHAEL L.: Family of YAEGER d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a, MICHAEL L. YAEGER, De Facto Attorney, De Facto Impersonating Public Official by Joint Activity and Pervasive Entwinement - FLORHAM PARK, NEW JERSEY, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
70. Kelly A.: Family of Maciel and KELLY A.: Family of MACIEL d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a, KELLY A. MACIEL, De Facto Probation Agent, De Facto Impersonating Public Official of Joint Activity and Pervasive Entwinement - NEWARK, NEW JERSEY, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer

71. Susan M.: Family of Smalley and SUSAN M.: Family of SMALLEY d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a, SUSAN M. SMALLEY, De Facto Probation Agent, De Facto Impersonating Public Official by Joint Activity and Pervasive Entwinement - NEWARK, NEW JERSEY, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
72. Natalie: Family of Shreve and NATALIE: Family of SHREVE d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a, NATALIE SHREVE, De Facto Probation Agent, De Facto Impersonating Public Official by Joint Activity and Pervasive Entwinement - NEWARK, NEW JERSEY, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
73. Donald (Mac) of the family McPherson and DONALD: Family of MCPHERSON De Facto Attorney, De Facto Impersonating Public Official by Joint Activity and Pervasive Entwinement Peoria, ARIZONA Citizen, a taxpayer
74. Josh: Family of Lockwood and JOSH: Family of LOCKWOOD. De Facto Attorney, De Facto Impersonating Public Official by Joint Activity and Pervasive Entwinement and IRS informant. Citizen, a taxpayer Golden, COLORADO
75. sTATE Of NEW JERSEY Inc, private, franchise, for profit foreign Consortium Corporation, De Facto Impersonation a Government Entity - TRENTON, NEW JERSEY, U.S. Person, a taxpayer
76. tHE UNITED sTATES Inc., private for profit foreign Consortium Charter Corporation, De Facto Impersonation a Government Entity - WASHINGTON D C, U.S. Person, a taxpayer
77. Scott: Family of Smith and SCOTT: Family of SMITH d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a SCOTT SMITH, FBI Agent, of the Trust business entity titled "FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION," U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
78. Roger: Family of Duh and ROGER: Family of DUH. d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a ROGER DUH, FBI Agent, of the Trust business entity titled "FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION," U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
79. Christy: Family of Maguire and CHRISTY: Family of MAGUIRE d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a CHRISTY MAGUIRE, FBI Agent, of the Trust business entity titled "FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION," U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer

80. Hanna: Family of Yang and HANNA: Family of YANG d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a HANNA YANG, FBI Agent, of the Trust business entity titled "FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION," U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
81. Shannon: Family of Dasilva and SHANNON: Family of DASILV d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a a, SHANNON DASILVA, De Facto Probation Agent, De Facto Impersonating Public Official by Joint Activity and Pervasive Entwinement - NEWARK, NEW JERSEY, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
82. Caroline: Family of Crenshaw and CAROLINE: Family of CRENSHAW d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a CAROLINE CRENSHAW, De Facto SEC Commissioner, Impersonating Officer of the Private Consortium Corporation titled SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
83. Joseph: Family of Dagrossa and JOSEPH: Family of DAGROSSA d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a a, JOSEPH DAGROSSA, De Facto Probation Agent, De Facto Impersonating Public Official by Joint Activity and Pervasive Entwinement - NEWARK, NEW JERSEY, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
84. Jamie Lee: Family of Lizarraga and JAMIE LEE: Family of LIZARRAGA d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a JAMIE LEE LIZARRAGA, De Facto SEC Commissioner, Impersonating Officer of the Private Consortium Corporation titled SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
85. James: Family of Clark iii and JAMES: Family of CLARK iii d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a a, JAMES CLARK, District Judge, Impersonating Officer-of-the-Tribunal titled - THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT -NEWARK, NEW JERSEY, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
86. Hester: Family of Pierce and HESTER: Family of PIERCE d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a HESTER PIERCE, De Facto SEC Commissioner, Impersonating Officer of the Private Consortium Corporation titled SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer
87. Mark T: Family of Uyeda and MARK T: Family of UYEDA d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a a MARK T. UYEDA, De Facto SEC Commissioner, Impersonating Officer of the Private

Consortium Corporation titled SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer

88. David: Family of Tonini and DAVID: Family of TONINI d/b/a Impersonating a Trustee of the Social Security Cestui que Trust JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and d/b/a, DAVID TONINI, District Attorney, Impersonating Officer-of-the-Tribunal titled - tHE UNITES STATES ATTORNEY OFFICE - DENVER, COLORADO, U.S. Citizen, a taxpayer

3.2 With Completion of Service and designation of Witnesses To:

1. Judge Advocate General of the Navy (JAG)
Vice Adm. Christopher C. French
2. Deputy Judge Advocate General of the Navy
Rear Adm. Lia Reynolds

“Indeed, no more than (an affidavit) is necessary to make the Prima fascia case.”
United States v. Kis, 658 F.2d, 526, 536 (7th cir., 1981);

IV. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4.1 Jurisdiction: This Court has jurisdiction over actions arising against All Enterprise Members in this matter pursuant to the Tucker Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1491; 18 U.S.C. § 1961 et seq. (Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act – RICO); the Sherman Antitrust Act 15 U.S.C. § 1-7 et seq.; 18 U.S.C. § 1201 (Kidnapping), and others which grants the U.S. District Court jurisdiction over claims for damages against tHE UNITED sTATES arising from illegal or wrongful government actions. Claims arising under common law, unlawful tax seizures, and violations of the Fifth and Eighth Amendments further support the jurisdiction of this Court. Further, this case involves violations of federal antitrust laws and Others.

4.2 Jurisdiction is proper “other jurisdiction” wherein the Constitution, whereby Judicial Power SECTION authorizes such out of necessity. The judicial power shall be vested in one Supreme Courts, (who may extend such powers in a Court of Appeals, in District Courts, in the Federal Court of Claims), and in such other courts and may be established by positive law i.e. Equity, as Equity is the law, as Equity is everything and law without equity **must still render equity.**

4.3 We must remember, as shall be discussed briefly in a moment, that an attorney who represents an individual who has not yet attained the age of majority, is said to represent a Ward Of The Court. An attorney holds an administrative position as an officer of the court and as such, the attorney becomes for the Ward an appointed guardian ad litem. **Now in proof that the trust exists**, and is for all necessities and purposes a “RESULTING TRUST”, in that upon attaining majority, the securities, assets, properties of the infant estate becomes **the rightful property of the beneficiary who has attained the age of majority.** Seeing that this is a “Resulting Trust”, by operation of law and as a result of the principles of equity, and that it involves a minor and/or infant and/or the properties of an infant, the proper jurisdiction is that of equity who has and maintains a right of such inherent jurisdiction.

4.4 Therefore, this court has the power to decree in equity upon this **Express Trust matter** in camera/chambers, and may enforce the Bill of Rights put forth in this bill as expressed in the Constitution.

4.5 **Venue:** Venue is proper in the U.S. District Court - Judicial, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391, as the Enterprise Members/Trustees/Defendants, whose base of operation (“the nest”) is registered in New Jersey, and many of the Defendants, including federal employees, operate within the direct supervision, rules and procedures of the New Jersey Court, and because a substantial part of the criminal acts carried out by agents, impersonating government officials of New Jersey.

4.6 **Rule of Law,** Whereby this cause, being a complaint in **exclusive equity jurisdiction**, (as it directly involves property/estate/securities of an infant/minor), cites the rule of law as follows:

4.7 Bill of Rights, No persons to include infants/minors property shall be taken, damaged or destroyed for or applies to public use without adequate compensation being made, unless by the consent of such person, and, when taken, except for the use of the state, such compensation shall be first made, or secured by deposit of money. (Takings clause)

4.8 Jurisdiction over the estate of an infant is inherent in equity, but it may also be vested by administrative constitutional and administrative statutory provisions in particular courts; the administrative institution of proceedings affecting and infant's property makes the infant a ward of the court (held in trust, for such the seizure of rights and/or property could only be instituted as a result of a prior relationship i.e. a special relationship, whereby the infant/miner is the beneficiary. The state (court) representing they are the settler, and its agents and/or officers the trustees, constituting a trust relationship, in equity), which has broad powers and the duty to protect his or her interests.

4.9 Courts of equity have GENERAL AND INHERENT JURISDICTION over the property of infants. Primary jurisdiction over the estate of infants may, under administrative constitutional or administrative statutory provisions, be vested in the probate, county, district, or other specific Court.

4.10 The jurisdiction can be exercised only when the court has acquired jurisdiction as to the particular infant/minor or subject matter (jurisdiction over estates/trusts are exclusive in nature over which courts of equity have exclusive jurisdiction, and such matters must be heard at equity). The commencement of a proceeding affecting what you refer to as "the infant's property" vest the court with jurisdiction over his or her estate, pursuant to which the court acts in *loco parentis* or as a guardian, and the infant becomes its ward. **It is the duty of the officers of the court to safeguard the infants property interests with great care i.e. in trust.**

4.11 After the jurisdiction of the court has attached, either through an appearance which equates to submitting to the court's jurisdiction, and/or a plea being entered by the infant/miner, the court in its administrative capacity has broad, comprehensive and plenary powers over the estate of the infant/miner, however, courts of equity have exclusive jurisdiction over the property of the infant/miner. This court may adjudicate the rights and equities of the infant and

property, **yet only in equity**, and it may cause to be done whatever may be necessary to preserve and protect the infant's estate which includes the property/assets of said estate. However, the exercising of such powers must be tempered with reasonable limitations, and one major limitation is that courts of equity have exclusive jurisdiction over the property/assets of an infant.

4.12 Therefore, **the court cannot act in violation of administrative, constitutional or statutory limitations on its powers** or permit the impounding of the infant's funds for the **creation of a trust**, which the court or parties have done by establishing the instant matter, and thus attempt to deprive the infant/minor of the right to the absolute enjoyment of the funds of one who has come fourth now, and is **appearing at the age of majority in correction of any presumptions by previous actions or appearances in this manner.**

4.13 An infant is not competent to waive the administrative statutory requirements enacted for his or her benefit and protection, with respect to the manner in which the jurisdiction of the court may be exercised, unless and until they attain the age of majority, then they can either petition for the removal of minor's disabilities and or express the trust.

4.14 Respondents could not have had a valid claim against infant/minor without personal knowledge and a copy of Photo, Finger-prints, A Forced Plea, Coercion, Threats, False imprisonment, a False commercial claim is/are not considered lawful evidence and/or knowledge, because such copies are held as a forgery, evidence of involuntary servitude.

4.15 Furthermore, courts in conducting "Commercial" Business of the court must give/ disclose to or upon a party upon demand the bookkeeping entries (both receivables and payables) with an affidavit, and demand is hereby made for immediate production of all "evidence" otherwise its hearsay that has been entered into the court which is in-admissible. The infant/minor, as you have labeled the beneficiary, having attained the age of majority hereby challenges the bookkeeping and **demands the full accounting** on the accounts receivables and accounts payables and all dividends, profits, rents, escrows, etc. resulting from the deposit of TRUST/ Estate of the ward/Beneficiary onto the courts accounts receivables and other general intangibles.

V. MOVEMENT FOR RELIEF

5.1 Complainant is entitled to the relief of damages in equity, as ‘equity must cause equity to be done, though the heavens fall’; Complainant is entitled to relief in the form of damages for the following reasons:

5.2 Respondent(s) have taken the private property of the complainant under extreme duress and threat of violence against Complainants life, property, liberties without just compensation, due process and without the expressed and/or written consent of Complainant. Responded had/has a duty to respond to all complaints and questions because of the legal **special relationship** of the parties and **by not responding, they responded, which is in breach of trust**, because the infant estate and duty of care associated therewith/thereto is an express trust:

“Verified Memorandum of Principles of Law and Points of Authorities on Express Special Relationship Trusts”

5.3 The court and its officers have claimed and are exerting authority as though they are legal title holder of not only the express trust, but also the constructive trust.

5.4 As now has been placed on the record I share the same or similar name as the named Accused in their cases # 9:19-mj-8526 & # 2:19-cr-877-CCC. However, for clarification, I am not now, or ever acting in the capacity as the named/alleged “defendant”, **I am the Beneficiary and Equitable Title Holder**. This is misidentification. None of this information is foreign to the court, this matter must proceed in equity, failure and/or refusal to proceed at equity, under exclusive jurisdiction will constitute contempt of justice.

VI. ELEMENTS OF A TRUST

6.1 Settlor/Grantor- intended to create a trust, which is perceived by the reasonable observer, as in the case of the New Deal and the several Federal Acts and associated state regulations-

- a. The Emergency Banking Relief Act of March 9th, 1933
- b. The Social Security Act of 1934, the Trust Indenture Act
- c. The Social Security Trust

d. The Treasury Trust Fund

6.2 These are each Specific and Special RELATIONSHIP Agreements, as they are specifically designed and voluntarily submitted to as required by the 13th Amendment Authorizing such.

a. Rights Must Be Identified

b. As evidenced by Due Process of Statutory Provisions and the 14th Amendment sections 1 & 4

c. Identification of Beneficiary - Whom the property is held on behalf of (held in-trust)

d. Shares/Assets/Property must be Identified

e. The Trust Must Be Workable

f. Must have an ending i.e. - can't last forever

All elements of a Trust Are Present - 31 C. F. R. § 363.6

Minor means an individual under the age of 18 years. The term minor is also used to refer to an individual who has attained the age of 18 years that has not yet taken control of the Securities contained in his or her minor account.

Minor account means an account that a custodian controls on behalf of a minor, that is linked to the custodian's primary account. (See 31 C.F.R. § 363.10 and § 363.27 for more information about Minor accounts.)

6.3 **The Federal Government** (Charter Corporation) **is purporting to occupy the office of the Settler** directly and through the “state” and local governments (this indication is specified by the use of the Lower Case “state” and “government”, and other proper nouns). Through various acts of Congress, and through the Age of Majorities Act's.

6.4 The identity of the **Equitable Beneficial Title Holder is the Minor** both un-attained and attained, until they control the Securities/Shares in the trusted account.

6.5 The Rights are Identified by **the right to attain the Age of Majority, to gain control of Securities Held in one's Minor Account**, and to be free from the Minors Disabilities.

6.6 The Trust is workable in that the Custodian/Fiduciary/Trustee/Ministerial Clerk *must hold the minor/infant account in trust* on/for the benefit/benefit of a minor/infant, that is linked to the custodian's primary account (in Most Instances the Federal and State Treasuries).

6.7 The "minor status" regarding the Trust may not last forever as it and the duties of all parties attaining the age of Majority, and documenting such in a definitive manner by attaching an affidavit attesting such to his or her birth certificate.

6.8 The aforementioned is a general court rule, meaning that it applies in principle in all birth certificate attaining related matters, and administrative proceedings. **A Power of Attorney** titled in part - Jobadiah-Sinclair: Weeks power-of-attorney-general IN FACT, # JSW1111981CSA-087815225SA, A PRIVATE SPECIAL RELATIONSHIP EXPRESS TRUST, encompassing all related matters and associated properties is at issue invoking EXCLUSIVE JURISDICTION AT/IN COMMON EQUITY LAW. (See exhibits)

6.9 This matter does not involve a statutory and/or constitutional provision respecting a minor and/or infant, this matter exclusively and specifically involves an estate/trust and the property of an Individual who has reached the age of majority and has exercised remedy by reclaiming his rightful position as the Equitable Beneficial Title Holder.

6.10 Generally, an infant may acquire property rights, but he or she is not registered as capable of managing his or her property. Hence, the law does not entrust him or her with the custody or control of his or her estate. The reason, and infant/minor is not capable of managing his or her own property, is because they have not yet attained the age of 18 and/or taken control of the securities, assets, properties held in their minor account, a general principle of Equitable law.

6.11 Generally, as an equitable principle, the statute of limitations, is suspended as against infants during their disability, or either do not begin to run against an infant until the obtaining of majority, or where infancy does not toll the statutes, the **infant is allowed a statutory period after attaining majority** to contest any adverse possessions which commence during infancy. Here, the inference is upon the infant attaining the age of majority, the same with respects to a minor and/or juvenile, and as noted, such a person/individual shall remain a minor

and or infant until such time as they gain control of the assets held in their minor account through equity.

6.12 With this supporting affidavit, the complaint states that this court in good conscience and good reason shall aid the complainant in his demand or show cause via facts and conclusions of Equitable law why he is not entitled to just compensation in other Equitable relief to which he is entitled as equitable beneficial title holder.

6.13 Complainant demands this court to compensate him for the damages in the amount as specified in the contract and the value of the full estate plus interest, for the court is under obligation in the exercise of its inherent equitable powers to do equity.

6.14 Complainant additionally **demands an injunction to issue** against Respondents and the Attorneys for an UNLAWFUL taking of trust property, private information and solicitation against the complainant where he is not entitled to act against the trust with just or any other cause, for such is construed as intermeddling with the estate of the infant/minor, for which there are strict and severe penalties.

Sources cited:

6.15 Damages - The power to award damages in a proper case, as a necessary incident to other purely equitable relief and in the same decree, is fully admitted, and even to award damages alone in very special cases; but the jurisdiction has been exercised with the utmost caution and reserve. See JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION OF JURISDICTION, Pomeroy, Equitable Jurisprudence

6.16 A Court of equity grants to relief of compensatory damages in connection with some other specific relief, and under very peculiar circumstances it decrees the payment of damages alone. Several kinds of equitable suits are wholly pecuniary in their relief, as those for contribution and exoneration. See JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION OF JURISDICTION, Pomeroy, Equitable Jurisprudence:

6.17 Maxims of Equity and Adjudication States that a court of equity, See JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION OF JURISDICTION, Pomeroy, Equitable Jurisprudence (§ 56), are to protect and enforce rights to property the object of suits in chancery. The term “property”, as

used in this section, includes ALL that is the subject of exclusive individual ownership; or, to be more specific, includes not only lands, houses, goods and chattels, rights and credits, but, also, a man's person, and his wife and minor children, and his right to work, and to sell and acquire property, and engage in any lawful business, and his and their reputation, health and capacity to labor, and his and their rights to enjoy the senses of sight, smell, hearing and taste, and his and their right of speech and locomotion, and his and their right to enjoy their sense of moral propriety when normal. As men live by their labor and property, no man is presumed to part with either without receiving or expecting an equivalent in value. Hence, whenever one person has obtained either the labor or property of another he should pay or account thereof, unless he can prove it was a gift; and so, whatever injury one person does to another's property or capacity to labor should be made good.

VII. NATURE OF THE ACTION

A. Defendants/Members/Trustees Form an Enterprise in Order to Carry Out Unconscionable Persecutions as Cover for Their True Criminal Scheme.

7.1 The Plaintiffs/Beneficiary were engaged in a private joint venture operating entirely outside of U.S. jurisdiction in a foreign Country, involving over 1 million foreign nationals from 100 foreign countries. The Private Membership Association venture (i.e. Bitclub Network) conducted its transactions entirely in cryptocurrency, and no funds were ever transacted using U.S. currency. They used Bitcoin which is not money. Their policy was to not touch the US financial system. They did not allow U.S. taxpayers or U.S. citizens to join the PMA so as to stay clear of the jurisdiction of the US mafia and their organized criminal syndicate masquerading as a legit government that is of, for and by the people.

7.2 Without any legal authority or jurisdiction to do so, the Enterprise Members/ Trustees/Defendants, initiated a scheme to seize and destroy what would be the equivalent of Billions of Dollars in digital assets and computer equipment belonging to a private foreign joint venture and its participants. This seizure was carried out in violation of the International Law principles, particularly the doctrine of extraterritoriality, which limits the U.S. government's ability to act outside its borders.

7.3 The Defendants conspired together to initiate the unlawful seizure of assets. Enterprise Members/Trustees/Defendants engaged in fraudulent and unethical conduct, including submitting false claims and invoking non-applicable U.S. tax laws and others, to justify their actions. The Enterprise Members/Trustees/Defendants acted in bad faith, abusing the power granted to them under U.S. law. — U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey, the U.S. District Court for the States of Florida and Colorado, the SEC, the IRS, the DOJ, the Federal Reserve/Treasury and the FBI, among others are willfully operating OUT OF ORDER and order must be restored immediately. You cannot allow them to get away with these crimes!

7.4 Enterprise Members/Trustees/Defendants violated International Treaties and their unlawful seizure of assets violated U.S. treaty obligations with foreign countries, including those related to the mutual respect for sovereignty, extradition treaties, and international agreements on taxation. The U.S. has no extraterritorial tax jurisdiction over individuals and entities operating entirely outside its borders, especially when no U.S. citizens or residents are involved in the business activities. If a couple under cover FBI agents violate Bitclub's policies and join the PMA, it doesn't justify creating 1 million victims. Especially when the FBI agents MADE A PROFIT mining Bitcoin with Bitclub!

7.5 Federal regulatory agencies, including the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), have failed to respect the limitations of their statutory authority in relation to cryptocurrency markets. Despite lacking explicit Congressional authorization, (which even Congress cant grant to begin with) the SEC and others have attempted to fabricate jurisdiction and then assert that fabricated jurisdiction over the crypto industry through so-called enforcement actions. These actions are premised on the unsupported theory that all transactions involving digital assets are "investment contracts" and, therefore, securities subject to federal securities laws. This theory, which stretches the definition of an investment contract beyond recognition, ignores both the plain text of existing statutes and well-settled Supreme Court precedent.

7.6 The SEC's campaign to regulate the digital asset industry amounts to a deliberate overreach. Cryptocurrencies and other digital assets do not inherently represent investment contracts, nor do they establish the type of ongoing relationship between issuer and buyer envisioned under securities law. By asserting expansive regulatory authority without

Congressional authorization, the SEC, under “The Color Of Law” has improperly subjected the crypto industry to a federal regime designed for entirely different financial instruments and stifling innovation in the process.

7.7 This overreach constitutes an intentional and premeditated indifference as to the Major Questions Doctrine. The SEC’s claim of authority to regulate the crypto market hinges on a willful disregard of 90-year-old statutes and [un]Do Process of Law in a manner that Congress never intended. Such transformative power requires clear Congressional authorization, which has not been granted. The SEC’s logic, if accepted, would open the door to unbounded regulatory control over not just cryptocurrencies but any asset that could be perceived as increasing in value.

7.8 Recognizing the tenuous foundation of its authority, the SEC has avoided formal rule-making under the Administrative Procedure Act. Instead, it has adopted an “enforcement-only” approach, leveraging its “discretion” to intimidate market participants without public accountability. This strategy leaves businesses in a state of regulatory uncertainty, discourages innovation, and creates a chilling effect on the crypto industry. Entities subject to enforcement actions are forced to choose between expensive legal battles and unfavorable settlements, with some opting to relocate overseas.

7.9 At its core, the SEC’s actions represent a misuse of power that undermines federalism, separation of powers, and constitutional principles. Regulatory authority over cryptocurrencies resides with Congress, which has not delegated such authority to federal agencies. By acting without proper authorization, the SEC is infringing on the peoples right to contract, the sovereignty of states and denying the public the benefits of decentralized innovation. Worse, this regulatory overreach harms the very citizens the agency claims to protect, as its actions stifle competition, deter market participation, and disrupt the development of tailored regulatory frameworks that could better address the unique nature of digital assets.

7.10 These enforcement actions are not grounded in lawful authority but are instead an unjustified and malicious application of regulatory power under the color of law. Federal agencies cannot enforce compliance in areas where they lack jurisdiction, and the SEC’s current approach exceeds the limits of its statutory mandate. Its actions erode public trust and highlight the urgent need for Congress to define a clearly defined regulatory exemption for digital assets.

7.11 The SEC's enforcement actions and the broader governmental campaign against cryptocurrency platforms, buyers, sellers, and promoters are not merely regulatory overreach; they constitute malicious attacks intended to corner and control the digital asset market. These actions, executed under the pretext of investor protection, serve to eliminate or severely weaken competition in violation of the Hobbs Act. By targeting legitimate market participants, the conspirators aim to suppress innovation, create monopolistic conditions, and ultimately advance their own interests in promoting Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDCs). Do you guys at the SEC really want your grandkids to wake up in a micro chipped, social credit score, CBDC slave society?

7.12 This coordinated effort reflects a conspiracy against the administration of justice and established commerce laws, both domestically and internationally. The tactics employed—ranging from ambiguous enforcement actions to public vilification of the crypto industry—exhibit a calculated intent to disrupt fair market competition. These acts are further compounded by the looming introduction of CBDCs, which federal agencies and their collaborators intend to position as the primary digital financial instrument. Such conduct demonstrates not only anti-competitive behavior but also a deliberate undermining of public trust in the free market.

7.13 The Hobbs Act prohibits wrongful acts that interfere with commerce through coercion, extortion, or threats, and the ongoing actions against the crypto industry align disturbingly with these definitions. By exerting regulatory and legal pressure on private actors while conspiring to launch a state-backed alternative, federal agencies and their partners are exploiting their positions of power to manipulate the market for their own benefit. This deliberate campaign stifles innovation, restricts consumer choice, and threatens to monopolize a burgeoning sector, contravening principles of fair competition enshrined in national and international commerce laws.

7.14 Furthermore, this conspiracy undermines the fundamental integrity of the justice system. Federal agencies tasked with enforcing laws equitably are instead weaponizing their authority to achieve predetermined outcomes, prioritizing their own economic and political agendas over the rule of law. Politics should NOT trump law! This erosion of justice creates a chilling effect not only in the cryptocurrency industry but also across the broader financial

ecosystem, as businesses and individuals come to question the impartiality and legitimacy of regulatory enforcement.

7.15 On an international scale, these actions violate principles of free trade and cooperation, threatening to destabilize global commerce. Cryptocurrencies and blockchain technologies are integral to a rapidly globalizing economy, offering unprecedented opportunities for innovation and financial inclusion. How anyone could see this as a bad thing that needs to be stopped at all costs is beyond me. By targeting this industry for suppression while advancing CBDCs, the conspirators are impeding cross-border innovation and trust, directly contravening the global norms of fair competition and collaborative economic development.

7.16 At its heart, this campaign against the cryptocurrency industry is not about regulation but domination. It represents a dangerous abuse of power by those entrusted to serve the public, distorting markets and undermining justice to advance their own financial instruments. Such actions demand rigorous scrutiny and accountability to restore trust, ensure the fair administration of justice, and protect the integrity of national and international commerce.

7.17 The SEC, despite being fully aware that cryptocurrencies do not constitute securities under the law, has willfully refused to relinquish its overreaching and usurped position of authority. Acting under the pretense of regulatory enforcement and "color of law" authority, the SEC has enticed other federal entities—including the FBI, IRS, DOJ, courts, and others—into adopting similarly unconscionable actions. This coordinated effort reflects a systemic abuse of power, resulting in violations of domestic and international law and causing irreparable harm to innocent individuals, including Beneficiary.

7.18 Just one example of the fact the malicious and conspiratorial actions of these entities are not isolated but are part of an orchestrated enterprise designed to unlawfully seize assets, destroy legitimate private ventures, is their willingness to operate outside the UNITED STATES and outside their jurisdiction and harm individuals outside the jurisdiction of the UNITED STATES. By targeting a foreign joint venture involving over one million non-taxpaying individuals from 100 different countries — all of whom conducted transactions solely in cryptocurrency and without any use of U.S. currency — the co-conspirators flagrantly violated international commerce laws and the sovereignty of foreign nations.

7.19 The coordinated actions of these enterprise members and co-conspirators constitute a systematic effort to attack and harm innocent individuals, including me, the Beneficiary, and to decimate legitimate “foreign ventures”... ventures clearly beyond their jurisdiction. The false attribution of alleged crimes to me has led to profound and far-reaching consequences, including the destruction of a private venture and the unjustifiable damage to over one million non-taxpaying foreign individuals from over a hundred “foreign countries” around the globe.

7.20 This instant scheme, perpetrated under the pretense of law enforcement, has involved gross abuses of power by the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey, the U.S. District Court for the States of Florida and Colorado, the SEC, the FBI, the DOJ, the Federal Reserve among others. These entities, often acting in concert with private attorneys impersonating public officials (18 U.S.C. § 912 Impersonation of a federal officer), have weaponized their positions to target individuals and ventures within and outside the lawful jurisdiction of tHE UNITED sTATES, further exacerbating the harm inflicted.

7.21 At its core, this enterprise represents a fundamental betrayal of public trust and an affront to the principles of justice, sovereignty, and fair competition. The actions of these entities have not only caused irreparable harm to innocent parties but have also undermined the credibility of U.S. regulatory and judicial institutions on the international stage.

7.22 The deliberate defamation and wrongful targeting of me, the Beneficiary is a key example of the malicious intent driving this conspiracy. The destruction of the private foreign venture, involving no U.S. citizens or currency, demonstrates the lengths to which the co-conspirators have gone to secure their unlawful objectives. These actions demand urgent investigation, accountability, and redress to restore justice and safeguard the principles of international law.

7.23 The breadth and severity of the violations detailed above reveal a systemic pattern of misconduct that rises to the level of racketeering under the **Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO), 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961–1968**. The coordinated actions of the SEC, FBI, IRS, DOJ, the Federal Reserve, courts, and their co-conspirators demonstrate the hallmarks of a criminal enterprise: a repeated and organized pattern of fraud, extortion,

defamation, and jurisdictional overreach aimed at seizing assets and consolidating control over the digital asset market.

7.24 The totality of these violations, including the unlawful seizure of assets, defamation of Beneficiary/plaintiff, and the destruction of a foreign joint venture, constitutes a concerted effort to manipulate the market for personal or institutional gain. The conspirators have repeatedly abused their positions of authority to execute these actions, acting under the guise of lawful enforcement but in direct contravention of domestic and international laws.

7.25 Under RICO, a "pattern of racketeering activity" exists when two or more predicate offenses occur within a 10-year period and are related in purpose or method.

7.26 Given the scale and scope of these violations, it is evident that the individual parties and entities involved are acting OUT OF ORDER, with their actions undermining not only the integrity of the cryptocurrency market but also the public's confidence in the judicial and regulatory systems. The coordinated nature of these offenses demands immediate intervention to prevent further harm and ensure accountability.

7.27 The failure to address these unconscionable actions threatens to further erode the rule of law, disrupt international commerce, and perpetuate harm against innocent individuals and legitimate enterprises. By allowing this pattern of misconduct to continue unchecked, THE UNITED STATES risks damaging its credibility as a fair and impartial actor on both domestic and global stages. Immediate corrective measures are necessary to dismantle the criminal enterprise at the heart of these actions and to restore faith in the institutions tasked with protecting the public good.

In judicio non creditor nisi juratis, (In a trial, credence is given only to those who are sworn.)

VIII. COMPLAINT

B. True Concealed Nature of the Malicious Persecution of JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS

8.1 Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDCs) are touted as a digital form of a

nation's fiat currency, issued and regulated by the central bank. The concept of CBDCs emerged in the late 2000s and early 2010s, largely as a response to the rise of cryptocurrencies like Bitcoin. Bitcoin's decentralized, blockchain-based nature spurred central banks to explore how Central Bank Digital Currency technology could compete or more necessarily, could dominate the various cryptocurrencies emerging in the wake of the loss of confidence regarding the 2007 banking debacle, collapse, and subsequent bail-outs, while maintaining government control. In this context, the private U.S. Federal Reserve banking cartel, in collaboration with the Bank of England, became involved in the active development of digital currency solutions, despite the fact that such actions involved fraudulent misrepresentation and malfeasance by public officials acting outside their authority. This misconduct falls within 18 U.S.C. § 1952 (racketeering), as it demonstrates a pattern of illegal activity involving government officials in violation of their duty to the public.

8.2 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The Bank of England is often credited with pioneering early discussions of CBDCs. In 2014, the bank published a paper analyzing the potential of issuing a digital currency titled "Innovations in Payment Technologies and the Emergence of Digital Currencies," which analyzed the implications of digital currencies like Bitcoin and the possibility of a central bank issuing its own digital counterpart. The "official lid" was quickly clamped down on that container even though tidbits of information (unofficial) were locatable if one looked hard enough. Simultaneously, advances in blockchain technology and the increasing digitization of financial systems prompted other central banks, including those in Sweden (Riksbank) and China, to begin investigating digital currencies. The fact that this process was accompanied by unlawful governmental overreach, including unlawful use of power by public officials to suppress competing digital assets, constitutes 2C:30-5 (official misconduct) and 2C:29-1 (obstructing administration of law) under New Jersey law.

8.3 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The U.S. Federal Reserve, the Central Bank of the UNITED STATES and the Bank of England, were jointly and actively engaged in research of CBDCs throughout the mid-2010s. By 2016, Federal Reserve policymakers were actively trying to stay ahead of the evolving financial landscape and the need to force the implementation of their own

digital currencies (CBDCs) for the U.S. financial system in order to “maintain control” — but were falling behind. Their coordinated efforts to suppress and interfere with the success of cryptocurrencies involved 18 U.S.C. § 1951 (interference with commerce, robbery, or extortion), as they engaged in economic extortion to harm both domestic and international markets in the cryptocurrency sector. This effort resulted in the illegal seizure and suppression of private property through fraud, theft and governmental coercion.

8.4 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; Desperate for a solution, “enhanced regulatory intervention” (against crypto) emerged as the only option likely to “cool the market” and “prevent a breakout,” hopefully affording the Central Banking System an opportunity to rein in the burgeoning advancements now threatening the centuries-old financial monopoly and their implementation of their CBDCs. This scheme, carried out by a network of federal and state agents, judges, and prosecutors, constitutes 18 U.S.C. § 1341 (mail fraud) and 18 U.S.C. § 1343 (wire fraud), as fraudulent documents were sent through the postal system and wire communications to deceive victims and the public and perpetuate unlawful financial activities. Furthermore, the individuals involved in orchestrating this plot engaged in 18 U.S.C. § 1581 (peonage and involuntary servitude) by using their power to entrap, embondage, extort, and coerce individuals like me in violation of our GOD GIVEN, enshrined, constitutional rights.

8.5 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The scheme required a sophisticated disinformation campaign representing that cryptos were: unsafe, not an actual thing, that they were not backed by anything, were a scam, etc. etc. etc. — all the while, development and positioning were being undertaken behind the curtain. This misinformation campaign, which ultimately led to widespread damage to the cryptocurrency market, falls within the scope of 18 U.S.C. § 1583 (enticement into slavery/apartheid), as individuals were knowingly misled and coerced into making financial decisions based on false and misleading information—actions that unlawfully impacted their personal and economic freedoms. Additionally, these actions can be seen as part of a broader RICO conspiracy, where an illegal enterprise was involved in fraud, obstruction, and coercion under 18 U.S.C. § 1952 and 18 U.S.C. § 1956 (money laundering).

8.6 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; Simultaneously, so-called regulatory agencies such as the SEC, IRS, FBI, DOJ, the Federal Reserve, etc., were being weaponized against THE UNITED STATES citizens and the U.S. economy regarding crypto, coin mining, and all things involving competing digital assets. This coordinated action was part of a racketeering enterprise that utilized these agencies to engage in 18 U.S.C. § 1584 (sale into involuntary servitude) by forcing individuals into unfair legal proceedings without proper jurisdiction or legal foundation, thereby depriving them of their freedom, property and rights. This also constitutes 2C:5-2 (conspiracy) and 2C:13-8 (human trafficking) under New Jersey law, as the actions taken by these agencies were part of a broader conspiracy to create a system that forced private citizens into compliance with fraudulent government claims and armed thuggery.

8.7 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; Early in 2018, the persecutions and prosecutions campaign was well underway with teams of agents fabricating what they were now deeming “criminal acts” regarding crypto, even though Congress and the Judiciary have never provided any “legal framework” regarding cryptos because they have no jurisdiction to do so. Agencies, operating under the color of law, waged an all-out assault upon international ventures regardless of the fact that the “worldwide jurisdiction” they have granted themselves constitutes a willful and egregious breach of STATE Law, Federal Law International Law, Treaties, Trade Agreements and breach of Trust. This unlawful use of power, including the creation of fraudulent charges and the destruction of legitimate business practices, constitutes 18 U.S.C. § 1503 (obstruction of justice), 18 U.S.C. § 1956 (money laundering), and 2C:13-5 (criminal coercion). The criminal enterprise's members also violated the Tucker Act, which governs claims against the U.S. government, through fraudulent misappropriation and theft of private assets, including digital currency, via wrongful and unconstitutional actions. Enterprise Members immediately began patting each other on the back regarding the “Record Number” of prosecutions... persecutions that, once brought out into the light of day, revealed the malicious and insidious nature of the persecutions being waged against innocent individuals and private ventures alike, even though just a cursory examination of facts proves that there is not a single “true law” that applied — not a single Official, Agent, Judge, Agency, Officer, or “Public servant/agent” had jurisdiction and/or

authority. This unconscionable conduct perpetrated against innocent individuals and entities for over a decade is also willful and malicious conduct perpetrated against the Rule of Law and Due Process of Law, which constitutes violations of 18 U.S.C. § 1952 (racketeering), 18 U.S.C. § 1951 (interference with commerce), 2C:30-6 (official deprivation of civil rights), and 18 U.S.C. § 1581 (peonage), among others.

8.8 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; In tHE UNITED sTATES, officials kept a tight lid on their scheme, even though it had been in process for most of a decade. The first significant public mention by a U.S. official was not officially let out of the CBDC bag until April 2019, when Federal Reserve Chair Jerome Powell acknowledged the institution's research into CBDCs. During a speech and subsequent testimony before Congress, Powell highlighted the potential benefits of a digital dollar, such as improving payment systems and fostering financial inclusion. Most did not make the connection while arrests (kidnappings) were being made, property and assets were being seized (stolen/pillaged), lives and fortunes were being destroyed (plundered). This ongoing pattern of criminal conduct—culminating in the unlawful seizure of private property and the kidnapping of individuals—was part of an ongoing RICO conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. § 1962 (Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act). The actions of the Federal Reserve, working in concert with other state and federal actors, involved 18 U.S.C. § 1956 (money laundering) as they sought to conceal and convert illicitly obtained assets for their own gain, including private digital assets like cryptocurrencies. Moreover, 18 U.S.C. § 1581 (peonage) and 18 U.S.C. § 1584 (sale into involuntary servitude) were violated by the illegal detention of individuals whose wealth was plundered and whose freedoms were violated under the guise of regulatory intervention.

8.9 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The disparity between the existing currency/fiat exchange system, with all its controls and choke points, and the emerging digital exchange system, revealed the undeniable reality of how corrupt, archaic, and burdensome the fiat system had become. It was now undeniable in light of the COVID-19 plandemic/terror/genocide campaign, enacted to disrupt markets, strip and/or convert wealth, and provide cover for factions to gain advantage along with broader control. However, that premeditated scheme also inadvertently highlighted

inadequacies, deficiencies, and shortcomings regarding the existing Federal Reserve Systems. In 2020, discussions around a "digital dollar" were becoming mainstream, with legislators exploring its feasibility in relation to economic stimulus distribution. The Digital Dollar Project, spearheaded by the private sector and former Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) officials, further advanced the concept. The conduct outlined here constitutes a clear violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1343 (wire fraud), as the scheme to implement a CBDC was predicated upon fraudulent misrepresentations to both the public and lawmakers about the supposed benefits of the digital dollar. This would constitute 18 U.S.C. § 1951 (interference with commerce, robbery, or extortion), as officials and their accomplices interfered with lawful financial transactions and manipulated public perception under the guise of financial reform. Additionally, the Hobbs Act would apply to the systemic extortion committed by this enterprise, particularly in relation to the digital dollar's push to coerce market participants into accepting a centralized, manipulated financial system.

8.10 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; All this was added layers in the scheme. The magical narrative revolves around a "Digital Dollar" as though it is a "new advancement in banking." The reality behind the smoke and mirrors is that well over ninety plus percent of ALL banking operations are digital. Major segments of U.S. and global citizens have not touched a paper dollar in years. The days of "cashing a check" in order to "pay the bills" have long since gone extinct. Banking had gone digital decades ago. So, what does the CBDC exactly do that is so magical and innovative? The narrative that the digital dollar would represent an innovation in banking was, in fact, a fraudulent misrepresentation meant to hide the true intentions of those behind the CBDC project. This is consistent with violations of 18 U.S.C. § 1341 (mail fraud) and 18 U.S.C. § 1343 (wire fraud), as the government misled both the public and private sector about the true goals of the CBDC program, specifically its purpose to centralize control over financial transactions while bypassing necessary legal frameworks and transparency that blockchain technology offers. Additionally, the centralization efforts underlying the CBDC initiative could be seen as 2C:13-5 (criminal coercion) and 2C:29-1 (obstruction of the administration of law) under New Jersey state law, as the scheme was designed to coerce individuals into compliance with the illicit goals of the central banking cartel.

8.11 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; There are many aspects of a decentralized, blockchain-based monetary transaction platform (not CBDCs) that would change the landscape regarding financial transactions, such as every transaction being recorded, creating an un-hackable digital footprint (of which the Central Banking System definitely does not want). Blockchain financial transactions would bring transparency regarding transactions (which the Central Banking System definitely does not want). Blockchain financial transactions would decentralize financial transactions (which the Central Banking System definitely does not want). Blockchain financial transactions would empower financial transactions 24/7/365 (which the Central Banking System definitely does not want). Blockchain would enable instantaneous transactions seamlessly and globally for a fraction of the cost or no cost at all (which the Central Banking System definitely does not want). Blockchain puts the power of the people's wealth back into the control of the people (which the Central Banking System definitely does not want). These facts clearly highlight why the central banking system—and its illicit supporters—**engaged in a RICO conspiracy**, as they took steps to manipulate and obstruct the free market for decentralized digital currencies through 18 U.S.C. § 1956 (money laundering) and 18 U.S.C. § 1831 (economic espionage). The criminal enterprise's objective to prevent blockchain technology from offering transparency and financial autonomy was a direct violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1951 (extortion) and 18 U.S.C. § 1343 (wire fraud) as they used deceitful means and fraud to hide their true goals.

8.12 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The landscape of digital assets had transformed dramatically over the years, emerging as a mainstream financial instrument that transcends traditional banking boundaries while attracting both scrutiny and interest from governments worldwide. Digital assets have revolutionized financial transactions by eliminating intermediaries such as banks, thereby reducing wait times, settlement delays, and associated fees. This innovation has proved particularly valuable for the approximately 20% of American adults, and others, who have limited or no access to traditional banking services, offering them unprecedented access to financial markets and 24/7 liquidity. The attempt by officials to suppress the rise of decentralized digital assets, through force, fraud, and manipulation, falls within the parameters of 18 U.S.C. § 1952 (racketeering), as the actions of the criminal enterprise sought to disrupt international

commerce and trade, violating both U.S. law and international treaties governing free markets and trade. These actions, along with the extortion of individuals who relied on cryptocurrencies as a means to circumvent the archaic banking system, further constitute violations of 18 U.S.C. § 1583 (enticement into slavery/apartheid) and 18 U.S.C. § 1584 (sale into involuntary servitude) as individuals were unlawfully coerced into participating in fraudulent financial systems. Additionally, the broader 2C:30-7 (crime of pattern of official misconduct) under New Jersey law applies here, as the enterprise's members, acting in their official capacities, engaged in a consistent pattern of illegal conduct, conspiring to violate both domestic and international financial laws.

8.13 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The widespread adoption of digital assets is evidenced by remarkable statistics: approximately one in five Americans—over 50 million individuals—now owns digital assets. Globally, this adoption is even more pronounced, with countries like Nigeria, Vietnam, and the Philippines leading in peer-to-peer cryptocurrency trading volume. El Salvador made history by becoming the first country to adopt Bitcoin as legal tender in 2021, followed by the Central African Republic in 2022. Major international corporations like Microsoft, PayPal, Visa, and Mastercard have integrated cryptocurrency capabilities into their services, while traditional financial powerhouses such as BlackRock, Fidelity, and Goldman Sachs have established dedicated digital asset divisions. Despite the growth and widespread adoption of digital assets, U.S. government agencies and officials, as part of a RICO conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. § 1962 (Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act), systematically sought to undermine, disrupt, and delegitimize this legitimate financial innovation to maintain control over the global monetary system. Their actions violated 18 U.S.C. § 1951 (interference with commerce, robbery, or extortion) as they coerced private entities and individuals into surrendering control of digital asset markets, employing unlawful tactics to obstruct international commerce and prevent decentralized financial systems from flourishing.

8.14 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The digital asset industry has achieved remarkable scale, with a total valuation exceeding the equivalent of \$3 trillion and daily trading volumes in the equivalent of \$50 billion dollars. Bitcoin alone maintains a circulation value of approximately \$1.9 Trillion

establishing itself as a significant international digital asset. Its still new to people. When mass adoption happens, which Bitclub was leading the charge by exposing millions of people to the technology, it will be worth a whole lot more. Major financial centers worldwide have embraced cryptocurrency mining/staking/trading, with notable exchanges operating across jurisdictions including tHE UNITED sTATES, Singapore, Hong Kong, Switzerland, and the United Arab Emirates. The European Union's Markets in Crypto-Assets (MiCA) regulation represents one of the world's first comprehensive regulatory frameworks for digital assets, demonstrating the growing institutional acceptance of cryptocurrency markets. However, U.S. officials, motivated by a desire to retain control over global monetary systems, engaged in 18 U.S.C. § 1832 (theft of trade secrets) and 18 U.S.C. § 1831 (economic espionage) by unlawfully monitoring, hacking, and stealing valuable intellectual property from blockchain and cryptocurrency ventures. These actions—coordinated by federal agencies under the color of law—furthered a RICO enterprise that deliberately obstructed the development of a decentralized financial landscape that could compete with the central banking system.

8.15 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The legitimacy of digital assets received a substantial boost when the SEC approved proposals by Nasdaq and the New York Stock Exchange to list shares of Bitcoin trusts, resulting in over \$25 billion in the equivalent of Bitcoin being held in exchange-traded funds—with \$1 billion accumulated in just two weeks following the approval. This milestone was preceded by similar approvals in other major markets, including Canada, Brazil, and Australia, highlighting the global momentum toward mainstream financial integration. International banking giants like JPMorgan Chase, despite initial skepticism, have developed their own blockchain-based payment systems, while central banks worldwide are exploring or implementing digital currencies (CBDCs) based on similar technology. Despite this global progress, U.S. officials involved in the criminal enterprise employed 18 U.S.C. § 1341 (mail fraud) and 18 U.S.C. § 1343 (wire fraud) to deceive the public and private entities regarding the supposed "regulatory needs" of the digital asset market, undermining efforts to integrate blockchain technology into traditional financial systems. Furthermore, these actions were compounded by 2C:28-3 (unsworn falsification to authorities) under New Jersey law, as federal

and state agents fabricated false reports and documents to create a false legal narrative against digital asset exchanges and businesses, thus stymying the development of decentralized finance.

8.16 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; States within the U.S. have recognized the economic potential of the digital asset industry, implementing proactive measures to attract industry participants. Several states, including notable examples like Texas and Florida, have created favorable regulatory environments to facilitate digital asset operations, viewing the industry as a means to diversify their economies and enhance their tax bases. This state-level embrace of digital assets has manifested through various initiatives, including tax policies designed to attract digital asset miners. States like Kentucky, Texas, and Wyoming have implemented tax breaks for mining operations, while others, such as Colorado, have taken the progressive step of accepting digital assets for state tax payments. However, state officials and federal agents, working together under a RICO conspiracy, sought to discredit and manipulate these state-level innovations by orchestrating 18 U.S.C. § 1956 (money laundering) operations to hide and funnel illicitly obtained funds to central bank interests, undermining local and state efforts to compete in the digital asset market. The criminal enterprise also engaged in 2C:30-6 (crime of official deprivation of civil rights) under New Jersey state law, as officials in both state and federal positions actively interfered with state-level laws, using their positions to prevent the successful implementation of digital asset legislation that benefitted the economy and financial freedom of state citizens.

8.17 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The industry's growth trajectory suggests continued expansion, with some analysts predicting the crypto market cap could reach \$7.5 trillion by the end of 2025. Major financial centers like Dubai, Singapore, and London are competing to become global crypto hubs, establishing specialized regulatory frameworks and innovation zones to attract digital asset businesses. The integration of blockchain technology extends beyond cryptocurrencies into areas such as decentralized finance (DeFi), with the total value locked in DeFi protocols exceeding \$100 billion. This demonstrates the technology's potential to reshape not just currency markets but the entire financial services industry. As digital assets became a dominant financial tool, the U.S. criminal enterprise escalated its actions, violating 18 U.S.C. §

1581 (peonage), 18 U.S.C. § 1584 (sale into involuntary servitude), and 18 U.S.C. § 1957 (monetary transactions in property derived from unlawful activity) to seize control over individuals' private wealth and assets, including digital currencies, using state and federal law enforcement in coordination with private financial interests. This extortionate control of decentralized systems demonstrates an ongoing RICO conspiracy designed to suppress innovation and protect centralized banking interests.

8.18 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; Perhaps most notably, while governments worldwide grapple with regulatory approaches to cryptocurrency, many are simultaneously exploring ways to participate in and benefit from this technological revolution. China, despite restricting private cryptocurrency trading, has launched one of the world's most advanced CBDCs with the digital yuan. The European Central Bank is developing the digital euro, while the Federal Reserve is researching a digital dollar. This parallel track of regulation and adoption by governmental bodies underscores the transformative potential of digital assets and blockchain technology in the global financial system. However, U.S. officials, in an effort to prevent competition to their centralized power, orchestrated 18 U.S.C. § 1952 (racketeering) and 18 U.S.C. § 1956 (money laundering) operations to both create artificial barriers to digital asset adoption and divert financial capital from decentralized systems into centralized control mechanisms. This was part of a larger scheme of 2C:13-8 (human trafficking) and 2C:5-2 (conspiracy) under New Jersey state law, in which government agents exploited the illegal detention of individuals and businesses involved in the digital asset industry, using coercive tactics to manipulate and control the global financial market, obstructing the free flow of capital and opportunity.

8.19 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The universal acceptance of cryptocurrencies is further evidenced by their increasing role in international trade and remittances. Countries facing economic sanctions or currency restrictions have turned to cryptocurrencies as alternative payment channels, while international businesses utilize stable coins for cross-border transactions to avoid traditional banking delays and fees. Major payment processors like Stripe and Square have integrated cryptocurrency support, enabling millions of merchants worldwide to accept digital asset payments seamlessly. This convergence of traditional and digital finance, coupled with growing

institutional adoption and regulatory frameworks, signals the irreversible integration of cryptocurrencies into the global financial infrastructure. Despite the positive global trends, U.S. government officials and agencies, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1951 (interference with commerce) and 18 U.S.C. § 1952 (racketeering), orchestrated an intentional disruption of the digital asset market, employing illicit tactics to block or delay the integration of cryptocurrencies into international trade. Their actions included 18 U.S.C. § 1581 (peonage) and 18 U.S.C. § 1584 (sale into involuntary servitude), as agents and officials leveraged their power to coerce individuals and businesses into adhering to unlawful regulations, effectively stifling the growth of decentralized financial systems and unfairly obstructing global commerce.

C. No Authority in the World has Made a True Legal Finding that Crypto's are Securities OR Crypto's are Inherently Illegal - NOT Even the U.S. Congress or Supreme Court or Security and Exchange Commission!

8.20 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The evolution of cryptocurrency persecutions in THE UNITED STATES presents a striking narrative of enforcement overreach, particularly given the historical context of its inception and early development. Bitcoin and other digital assets operated for nearly a decade without any suggestion of SEC jurisdiction, operating in a space that was explicitly recognized as outside traditional securities frameworks. This historical reality starkly contrasts with later attempts at regulatory enforcement, especially considering the absence of Congressional authorization of regulations and therefore subsequent oversight. These actions by federal officials, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1503 (obstruction of justice) and 18 U.S.C. § 1341 (mail fraud), exemplified a concerted effort to fabricate regulatory frameworks and legal narratives where none legally existed, thus obstructing legitimate business and financial activity. The attempt to falsely label cryptocurrencies as securities was nothing more than a political maneuver to quash decentralized financial systems and redirect wealth into centralized control, breaching the principles of fairness and due process.

8.21 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The regulatory vacuum surrounding digital assets during their formative years is well-documented and acknowledged by key officials. It wasn't until 2017, nearly a decade after Bitcoin's creation, that the SEC first ventured to even suggest any

regulatory authority over digital assets through its DAO Report. Even then, this authority was narrowly construed to specific circumstances involving initial offerings rather than the broader digital asset ecosystem. This limited scope was explicitly confirmed by William Hinman, then-Director of the SEC's Division of Corporate Finance, in his pivotal 2018 Yahoo Finance Summit speech, where he definitively stated that **"a digital asset all by itself is not a security,"** and specifically excluded Bitcoin and Ethereum from securities classification. Despite this clear lack of regulatory clarity, federal officials—acting in complicity under 2C:2-6 (Liability for conduct of another; complicity)—proceeded to engage in 18 U.S.C. § 1589 (forced labor or trafficking for labor) by coercing private entities into false compliance with non-existent regulations. These actions continued to target the legal operations of cryptocurrency platforms by using 18 U.S.C. § 1956 (money laundering) and 2C:5-2 (conspiracy) to target companies and individuals for the fraudulent application of regulations that were never legally codified.

8.22 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; This understanding was not isolated to a single official but represented a broad consensus among SEC leadership. Then - SEC Chair Jay Clayton endorsed this interpretation, as did Commissioner Hester Peirce in her 2019 remarks at Missouri Law School. Perhaps most tellingly, current SEC Chair Gary Gensler, during his tenure as an MIT professor, explicitly stated that "3/4 of the [digital asset] market is non-securities. It's just a commodity, a cash crypto." This position was further reinforced during his early tenure as SEC Chair when he testified before Congress that "only Congress" could address digital asset regulation, acknowledging that exchanges trading in crypto assets lacked a regulatory framework at the SEC. William Hinman stated "neither of the two most prominent digital assets, Bitcoin and Ethereum is a security, and secondary sales of those digital assets are not investment contracts." Despite these clear statements and positions, 18 U.S.C. § 1343 (wire fraud) was employed by members of the criminal enterprise to perpetrate fraud on both the public and cryptocurrency markets, knowingly making false statements about the regulatory status of digital assets. Furthermore, 2C:13-1 (kidnapping) and 2C:13-3 (false imprisonment) were among the tactics used by agents and officials to suppress opposition and dissent, preventing the freedom of legal actors in the industry by engaging in unlawful arrests, detentions, and imprisonments. These officials acted outside their constitutional limits, conspiring to manipulate and control the

financial market while impeding the growth of legitimate and globally recognized digital currencies.

8.23 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The foundation for excluding most digital assets from securities regulation rests on sound logical and legal principles. Digital assets, in their typical form, share more characteristics with traditional collectible assets like fine art, vintage cars, or baseball cards than with securities. While their value may fluctuate based on market forces, they generally do not convey any legal or equitable interest in a profit-sharing enterprise, nor do they create ongoing obligations between parties. This is particularly true for secondary market transactions on digital asset exchanges, which simply represent direct exchanges of value without additional commitments or obligations. Despite these clear characteristics, 18 U.S.C. § 1341 (mail fraud) and 18 U.S.C. § 1956 (money laundering) were used by federal and state officials to illegally manipulate and misclassify digital assets as securities, intentionally misleading market participants to suppress and disrupt the industry. This malicious conduct was executed under the color of law to advance a politically motivated agenda, resulting in unwarranted harm to legitimate businesses and private citizens.

8.24 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The current landscape of selective enforcement actions appears particularly problematic given this historical context. The stark contrast between the SEC's initial hands-off approach and its current aggressive stance raises serious questions about regulatory consistency and fairness. This shift in position occurred without any corresponding change in Congressional authorization or statutory framework, making the current enforcement actions arbitrary and outside the scope of the agency's legitimate authority. 18 U.S.C. § 1503 (obstruction of justice) and 18 U.S.C. § 1952 (racketeering) reflect how the government intentionally obstructed legitimate business activities, using unjustified regulatory actions as a tool of suppression, rather than upholding fair enforcement standards. Additionally, 18 U.S.C. § 1343 (wire fraud) was instrumental in the deception carried out by government agencies that misled market participants into believing that digital assets fell under SEC jurisdiction without statutory foundation, thereby violating the principle of due process and fair notice.

8.25 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The regulatory void in cryptocurrency's early years was not an oversight but a reflection of the fundamental nature of these assets. Like other industries, digital asset participants must comply with generally applicable laws, including consumer protection regulations and fraud prohibitions. However, the absence of specific securities characteristics in typical digital asset transactions has significant implications for regulatory jurisdiction. Digital asset platforms, functioning primarily as facilitators of asset exchanges rather than securities transactions, should not be subject to registration requirements or regulations designed for traditional securities brokers and exchanges. In 2C:5-2 (conspiracy), officials conspired to create regulations in bad faith, knowing that these actions were illegal and outside the scope of their authority. These actions were taken to impede innovation and the development of an industry that had operated legally for years without the regulatory burden typically associated with securities, effectively criminalizing what was not inherently illegal.

8.26 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; This historical analysis demonstrates a clear pattern: from Bitcoin's inception through the first decade of the cryptocurrency industry's development, regulatory **authorities explicitly recognized these assets as outside their jurisdiction.** The current attempt to retroactively impose securities regulations on an industry that developed explicitly outside this framework, without Congressional authorization, raises serious questions about regulatory overreach and selective enforcement. This situation is particularly concerning given the documented statements from multiple SEC officials, including the current Chair, acknowledging the limitations of their authority in this space. These retroactive enforcement actions amount to 18 U.S.C. § 1341 (mail fraud) and 18 U.S.C. § 1343 (wire fraud) as they clearly constitute deliberate deception and manipulation of facts, aimed at securing regulatory control over an industry with no legal mandate. Moreover, 18 U.S.C. § 1584 (sale into involuntary servitude) may apply where agents used force and manipulation to suppress individuals and businesses involved in cryptocurrency.

8.27 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; This historical record strongly suggests that any meaningful regulation of digital assets requires explicit Congressional action rather than agency

reinterpretation of existing securities laws. The current approach of selective enforcement not only contradicts the industry's developmental history but also appears to exceed the SEC's congressionally authorized mandate, potentially undermining the principles of fair notice and due process in regulatory enforcement. The 18 U.S.C. § 1589 (forced labor or trafficking for labor) statute also becomes relevant when considering how individuals and businesses were coerced into compliance under false pretenses, subjected to undue regulatory pressure in violation of their rights. Moreover, 18 U.S.C. § 1957 (engaging in monetary transactions derived from unlawful activity) could apply where financial institutions facilitated the laundering of seized funds or assets tied to wrongful enforcement actions against cryptocurrency businesses.

D. It is an Established Fact that there could be No Agency Enforcement of Cryptos, Especially Bitcoin and Ethereum.. because there were no Regulations Set Forth By Congress and Therefore No Authority Enacted or Granted to ANY Agency for Enforcement.

8.28 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The historical record definitively establishes that cryptocurrency operates entirely outside the jurisdiction of U.S. regulatory agencies, including the SEC. This wasn't merely a regulatory gap, but rather a widely acknowledged and legally established fact. The complete absence of regulatory authority over cryptocurrencies, especially Bitcoin and Ethereum, was not only accepted but explicitly confirmed by regulatory officials themselves, creating a clear precedent that makes current enforcement actions particularly problematic from a legal standpoint. 18 U.S.C. § 1503 (obstruction of justice) is evident in the efforts by various agencies to manipulate the public narrative and suppress cryptocurrency businesses, despite clear legal and regulatory precedents establishing that these assets were not subject to SEC oversight. Further, the Tucker Act was violated when the government failed to honor legal claims made by businesses or individuals adversely affected by the unlawful regulatory actions, undermining the constitutional principle of just compensation for wrongful government conduct.

8.29 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The stark transformation of the SEC's position under Chair Gary Gensler represents a troubling departure from established legal principles and previous agency positions. Initially, Gensler himself acknowledged the SEC's limited authority, stating before the

Aspen Security Forum even as late as August 2021 that the agency **"need[ed] additional Congressional authorities"** to regulate major sectors of the digital asset industry. However, in a remarkable transformation, Gensler all of a sudden declared the SEC suddenly "ha[d] enough authority" to regulate digital asset transactions, despite no legally required Congressional action or statutory changes. This flip-flopping stance constitutes 18 U.S.C. § 1951 (interference with commerce) and 18 U.S.C. § 1956 (money laundering) as the SEC's actions served to create an unlawful monopoly over the digital asset market through fraudulent regulatory claims, while intentionally suppressing competition and innovation. The 2C:28-3 (unsworn falsification to authorities) applies in cases where SEC officials made false public statements about their regulatory authority to manipulate market conditions and enforce measures without legal justification, undermining the foundation of lawful governance.

8.30 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The SEC's current enforcement campaign, launched without formal rule-making procedures, raises serious questions about the agency's operation under "color of law" rather than legitimate statutory authority. Commissioner Hester Peirce publicly acknowledged this weakness, noting that a formal rule-making process would force the SEC "to admit that [it] likely need[s] more, or at least more clearly delineated, statutory authority to regulate certain crypto tokens and to require crypto trading platforms to register." The Administrative Procedure Act (APA), under 5 U.S.C. § 553 (Rulemaking), mandates that regulatory agencies engage in formal rule-making to ensure transparency, public input, and accountability. By bypassing this process, the SEC's actions not only violated 5 U.S.C. § 553 (rule-making) but also 18 U.S.C. § 1503 (obstruction of justice), as the agency knowingly circumvented the necessary legal framework to enforce its policies, obstructing the rule of law and the public's right to participate in regulatory processes.

8.31 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; Instead of pursuing proper rule-making channels, the SEC has opted for aggressive enforcement actions based on expansive legal theories it had previously disavowed. This approach began with the 2022 Coinbase-related lawsuit and expanded to include numerous actions against industry participants, culminating in major cases against Coinbase and Binance in June 2023. These actions represent a troubling pattern of retrospective liability

imposition without clear statutory authority or proper rule-making procedures. By doing so, the SEC has engaged in 18 U.S.C. § 1341 (mail fraud) and 18 U.S.C. § 1343 (wire fraud) by misrepresenting its legal authority to market participants and regulators. The SEC's selective enforcement under non-existent regulatory guidelines also likely constitutes 18 U.S.C. § 1951 (interference with commerce) and 18 U.S.C. § 1956 (money laundering), as the SEC's actions unlawfully interfered with the crypto market to divert financial assets for government gain, without any lawful basis for their actions.

8.32 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The absence of clear regulatory guidelines, combined with selective enforcement actions, has created what Commissioners have described as an "untenable" situation with "opaque and arbitrary" standards. The SEC's refusal to propose regulations for public comment, while simultaneously increasing enforcement actions by more than 50% in 2023 over 2022, demonstrates a problematic approach to regulation through enforcement rather than proper statutory authority. Such a strategy undermines 18 U.S.C. § 1957 (engaging in monetary transactions) derived from unlawful activities and 18 U.S.C. § 1952 (racketeering) by utilizing unjust enforcement tactics that interfere with fair business practices and arbitrarily punish actors without clear rules, defying basic principles of regulatory fairness. The SEC's actions also breach 5 U.S.C. § 706 (Administrative Procedure Act) which calls for agency actions to be "in accordance with law" and for rules to be "reasonable," as the SEC's enforcement without clear rules violates the fairness that the APA guarantees.

8.33 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; This approach fundamentally violates principles of fair notice and due process. As multiple SEC Commissioners have observed, "using enforcement actions to tell people what the law is in an emerging industry" is not a "fair way of regulating." The fact that even the Justice Department, in parallel criminal actions, has not alleged that certain digital assets are securities further highlights the questionable nature of the SEC's current position. By retroactively applying securities laws to digital assets without Congressional authorization, the SEC is effectively engaging in 18 U.S.C. § 1503 (obstruction of justice), 18 U.S.C. § 1956 (money laundering), and 18 U.S.C. § 1951 (interference with commerce). The SEC has hindered legitimate business practices, retroactively imposing criminal liabilities, and by doing so,

violated 14th Amendment Due Process guarantees. These actions were intended to deter innovation and entrepreneurial activity, obstructing free commerce, and subjecting companies to the financial equivalent of economic extortion, thereby violating constitutional rights and creating an unlawful enforcement regime.

8.34 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; Both the judicial and historical records conclusively demonstrates that there was never a legal basis for cryptocurrency regulation by U.S. agencies. Furthermore, as a direct result of the SEC's willful refusal to acknowledge their lack of authority and jurisdiction, other agencies became emboldened to "get their share" of the Billions being routinely and unlawfully pilfered as of at least 2018 and later. These "enforcement regimes," comprised of criminal operators throughout multiple agencies—including but not limited to the FBI, SEC, IRS, the DOJ, the Federal Reserve and U.S. Courts, and various so-called Private Sector recruits operating without Congressional authorization or proper rule-making procedures—represent an unprecedented expansion of agency power that violates fundamental principles of administrative law and due process. The involvement of agencies outside their jurisdiction, combined with RICO violations (18 U.S.C. § 1961), clearly demonstrates a criminal enterprise using government resources to target the cryptocurrency industry. This pattern of criminality also violates 18 U.S.C. § 1346 (Honest Services Fraud), as government officials engaged in this conspiracy were unlawfully depriving cryptocurrency industry participants of their honest services through illegal enforcement actions and non-transparent regulations.

E. The Weaponization of the Agencies for Ulterior Motives

8.35 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The current actions of the SEC and other so-called regulatory agencies reveal a disturbing pattern of systematic overreach that appears strategically designed to clear the competitive landscape for the implementation of Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDCs). This coordinated campaign of regulatory aggression, conducted under "color of law" and funded through misappropriated public resources, constitutes a violation of federal and state statutes, including but not limited to 18 U.S.C. § 1951 (relating to interference with commerce by extortion) and 2C:5-2 (Conspiracy) under New Jersey law. These violations indicate a coordinated conspiracy among public officials to suppress competition in the digital asset

market, constituting an illegal restraint of trade in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1 (Sherman Antitrust Act) and 18 U.S.C. § 1952 (racketeering). As such, immediate judicial intervention through both temporary restraining orders and permanent injunctions is necessary to halt what amounts to weaponized regulation, which is unconscionable, particularly given the intentional lack of regulation in the first instance.

8.36 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The SEC's current enforcement approach represents a radical departure from established legal principles and **demonstrates a clear "bent of mind" toward eliminating competition in the digital asset space.** This becomes particularly evident when examining the agency's attempt to redefine nearly all digital asset transactions as "investment contracts," a position that directly contradicts the Supreme Court's long-standing precedent in *Howey*. The Court explicitly defined investment contracts as involving "a contract or scheme for 'the placing of capital or laying out of money in a way intended to secure income or profit from its employment.'" The SEC's current interpretation grotesquely distorts this definition beyond recognition, constituting 18 U.S.C. § 1341 (mail fraud) and 18 U.S.C. § 1343 (wire fraud), as the agency appears to be sending fraudulent communications through official channels to further its unlawful agenda of economic suppression and interference.

8.37 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The agency's status is further evidenced by its own Commissioner Mark T. Uyeda's warning about "the absence of any limiting principle in the SEC's approach." The implications of the SEC's current interpretative overreach are staggering—if their theory were accepted, it would grant them authority to regulate virtually any transaction involving items purchased with an expectation of appreciation, from collectible sneakers to vintage watches. This boundless expansion of authority clearly exceeds Congressional intent and represents a clear abuse of power, which under 18 U.S.C. § 1503 (obstruction of justice), could reflect an intent to distort or undermine the true purpose of the securities laws in favor of an anti-competitive agenda, violating public trust.

8.38 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The timing and nature of these enforcement actions strongly suggest a coordinated effort to clear the path for CBDCs by systematically weakening existing

cryptocurrency markets and participants. This campaign of regulatory warfare is being conducted through malicious litigation funded by public resources, raising serious questions about the misappropriation of taxpayer funds for what appears to be an anti-competitive agenda. 18 U.S.C. § 1956 (money laundering) and 2C:21-28 (money laundering under New Jersey law) are implicated here as the SEC's unlawful actions seem designed to conceal or disguise the financial effects of their illegal strategy. The pattern of selective enforcement and the timing of these actions strongly suggest a predetermined strategy to eliminate private sector competition ahead of CBDC implementation, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1831 and 1832 (economic espionage and theft of trade secrets).

8.39 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The SEC's disregard for established legal precedent is particularly evident in its treatment of secondary market transactions. The agency now claims that mere public statements about potential future value are sufficient to transform standard asset sales into investment contracts. This position contradicts decades of case law establishing that investment contracts require ongoing contractual obligations and a common enterprise—elements conspicuously absent in typical digital asset transactions. As noted in previous court decisions, even cases involving less formal arrangements still required some form of ongoing business relationship between parties, a feature notably absent in standard cryptocurrency transactions. The SEC's overreach, under the guise of consumer protection, may also constitute 18 U.S.C. § 1957 (engaging in monetary transactions in property derived from specified unlawful activity carried out by the enterprise), as the agency seems to be engaging in prohibited transactions to further its anti-competitive campaign.

8.40 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The urgency for judicial intervention is underscored by the systematic nature of this regulatory overreach. The agencies are operating well outside their statutory authority, engaging in what amounts to regulation through enforcement rather than proper rule-making procedures. This approach not only violates administrative law principles but also suggests a coordinated effort to reshape the financial landscape through extra-legal means. The unlawful conduct is further compounded by violations of 2C:30-6 (official deprivation of civil rights under New Jersey law), as public officials may be involved in corrupt practices that

deprive affected parties of their civil rights by engaging in conduct that is outside of lawful authority.

8.41 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The establishment of investment contracts, as historically understood and applied by courts, requires an ongoing contractual obligation for managing a common profit-sharing enterprise—a fundamental element entirely absent in typical digital asset transactions. The SEC's attempt to bypass this requirement represents not just legal overreach but a fundamental transformation of securities law that would grant it virtually unlimited jurisdiction over any transaction involving potential appreciation. This represents an unlawful abuse of public resources, and the agency's actions could be further investigated under 2C:27-12 (crime of corruption of public resources under New Jersey law).

8.42 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; This systematic weaponization of regulatory authority, conducted under the pretense of consumer protection but apparently aimed at clearing the way for CBDCs, represents a clear abuse of power that demands immediate judicial intervention. The coordinated nature of these actions, their timing, and their selective enforcement patterns strongly suggest an orchestrated campaign to eliminate private sector competition in the digital currency space. The misuse of public funds to pursue this agenda also violates 18 U.S.C. § 1584 (sale into involuntary servitude), as the actions of these agencies could be construed as coercing individuals and entities into involuntary financial servitude through illegal, anti-competitive practices.

8.43 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The need for immediate injunctive relief is paramount. The agencies' actions represent an ongoing harm to the digital asset industry and, by extension, to market competition and innovation in the financial sector. Their operation under "color of law," rather than legitimate statutory authority, combined with the apparent misuse of public funds for anti-competitive purposes, creates an urgent need for judicial intervention to prevent further damage to the industry and the broader financial ecosystem. This regulatory conduct constitutes 18 U.S.C. § 1951 (interference with commerce by extortion) and 18 U.S.C. § 1583 (enticement into

slavery), as it constitutes a coordinated attempt to financially enslave legitimate market participants for the benefit of a centralized digital currency system.

F. Agencies willful disregard for the rule of law and Due Process

8.44 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), working in concert with various federal agencies, constitutes an enterprise that has conspired and worked in concert to carry out a campaign to eliminate competition in violation of the Hobbs Act (18 U.S.C. § 1951). This coordinated effort falls under RICO (18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-1968), involving a pattern of racketeering activity, engaging in multiple criminal acts as part of the Enterprise's scheme, including obstruction of justice (18 U.S.C. § 1503), fraud (18 U.S.C. §§ 1341, 1343), constructive fraud, extortion, coercing compliance, and extracting financial gains under the guise of regulatory authority. These actions violate 2C:5-2 (Conspiracy) under New Jersey law, as they represent a concerted effort by federal agencies to suppress competition in the digital asset space through illegal means. The Enterprise's actions are intended to unlawfully extract financial resources from the digital asset market and stifle innovation through coordinated misconduct.

G. Willful Disregard of — Major Questions Doctrine

8.45 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The Major Questions Doctrine, as reaffirmed in *West Virginia v. EPA*, 597 U.S. 697 (2022), establishes a critical boundary for ALL administrative agencies like the SEC, requiring explicit congressional authorization for actions that have vast economic and political implications. By attempting to redefine “investment contract” to include digital assets, the SEC has overstepped its statutory limits, constituting fraud and abuse of power in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1341 (mail fraud) and 18 U.S.C. § 1343 (wire fraud). This unilateral action bypasses legislative intent, undermines the separation of powers, and introduces legal uncertainty into the digital asset industry. The SEC's actions also violate 2C:13-5 (Criminal coercion) under New Jersey law, as their aggressive enforcement tactics amount to coercion, forcing businesses to comply with an expanding regulatory framework that exceeds statutory authority. This overreach harms domestic innovation and weakens THE UNITED STATES' position in the global digital economy, encouraging capital flight and diminishing global competitiveness in blockchain technology and fintech.

8.46 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The SEC's actions, in concert with other agencies, constitute a violation of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO) (18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-1968). The coordinated efforts to suppress the digital asset industry represent a criminal enterprise designed to monopolize control over this emerging market. By engaging in fraudulent interpretations of statutory authority, extortionate enforcement tactics, and systemic abuse of power, the SEC and its allies form an Enterprise aimed at stifling competition. This scheme undermines trust in U.S. regulatory institutions and harms national commerce by forcing companies to exit domestic markets in favor of jurisdictions with more predictable and transparent regulatory environments. 18 U.S.C. § 1952 (racketeering) and 2C:21-28 (money laundering under New Jersey law) also apply as the Enterprise's efforts may involve the laundering of proceeds from their illegal activities through financial institutions or other means. Internationally, this diminishes THE UNITED STATES' reputation as a leader in free-market innovation, allowing foreign competitors to dominate the blockchain space.

8.47 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The Enterprise has engaged in obstruction of justice, violating 18 U.S.C. § 1519 (destruction of evidence and obstruction of justice), by interfering with judicial processes, manipulating evidence, and misrepresenting its authority to the courts. This undermines the integrity of the judicial system, depriving affected parties of fair adjudication and due process. Willful obstruction of justice by rogue factions within multiple federal agencies, operating under agency guidelines and policies, not only disrupts domestic commerce by creating regulatory uncertainty but also discourages international companies from entering U.S. markets, fearing arbitrary enforcement actions. This loss of trust in the judicial and regulatory framework diminishes foreign investment and hinders cross-border trade in digital assets and related technologies. 18 U.S.C. § 1503 (obstruction of justice) also applies to their willful attempt to conceal their unlawful activities and shield them from legal scrutiny.

8.48 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The Enterprise's unauthorized claims on private property, particularly its efforts to enforce penalties or seize assets without just compensation, violate the Tucker Act (28 U.S.C. § 1491) and amount to regulatory takings in violation of the Fifth

Amendment's takings clause, infringing on constitutional protections. These actions violate 18 U.S.C. § 1584 (sale into involuntary servitude) by seizing private assets and restricting their use, thereby violating the rights of property owners. Domestically, such behavior disrupts businesses' ability to plan and operate, creating a chilling effect on innovation and entrepreneurship. Internationally, these actions deter foreign investment, as companies perceive the U.S. as an unreliable and hostile regulatory environment. The broader impact is a decline in the global perception of tHE UNITED sTATES as a stable hub for financial and technological growth.

8.49 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; By circumventing the Administrative Procedures Act (APA) (5 U.S.C. §§ 551-559), the Enterprise has undermined due process and violated statutory requirements for public participation and transparency in rule-making. Issuing informal guidance and enforcement actions without adhering to formal rule-making procedures creates confusion and unpredictability in the digital asset market. This regulatory inconsistency stifles national commerce by making it nearly impossible for businesses to comply with unclear rules, potentially violating 18 U.S.C. § 1343 (wire fraud) if the agencies intentionally misrepresented their authority through these informal actions. Internationally, the lack of adherence to due process tarnishes tHE UNITED sTATES' reputation for regulatory fairness, encouraging companies to seek more stable jurisdictions for their operations and investments.

8.50 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The Enterprise's public statements targeting digital asset companies have caused reputational and financial harm without substantiating claims through formal legal processes. Such defamatory actions harm national commerce by eroding public trust in legitimate businesses, causing declines in market value, and discouraging investment in the sector. These actions could be considered defamation under 2C:28-8 (impersonating a public servant or law enforcement officer), as the SEC and its allies have purportedly misrepresented their authority and engaged in actions intended to harm the reputation of businesses. Internationally, these actions signal an unpredictable regulatory landscape, deterring global partnerships and cross-border collaborations in the digital asset and blockchain industries.

8.51 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The Enterprise's overreach in categorizing digital assets as securities

without clear statutory authority violates both the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. This creates a patchwork of inconsistent enforcement actions that confuse market participants and hinder the growth of the digital asset industry. Domestically, this discourages innovation, as companies are uncertain about the legal status of their products and services. 18 U.S.C. § 1831 (economic espionage) and 18 U.S.C. § 1832 (theft of trade secrets) also apply's since the SEC's actions involve the illegal acquisition or use of proprietary business information, as companies face pressure to hand over confidential information or alter their business models. Internationally, the aggressive and arbitrary nature of the Enterprise's actions undermines the global competitiveness of U.S.-based digital asset firms, as they lose market share to competitors in jurisdictions with clearer and more supportive regulatory frameworks.

8.52 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The SEC's coordinated efforts with other agencies to suppress the digital asset industry appear to be part of a broader strategy to clear the path for a Central Bank Digital Currency (CBDC). This campaign, marked by anti-competitive behavior, regulatory overreach, and selective enforcement, effectively stifles innovation and competition in the private sector. Domestically, these actions harm consumers and businesses by reducing choices and driving up costs, while internationally, they erode trust in U.S. regulatory institutions and diminish the appeal of the dollar-based financial system. This strategy ultimately undermines tHE UNITED sTATES' economic and technological leadership on the global stage, as other nations take the lead in developing and adopting blockchain-based solutions. 18 U.S.C. § 1951 (interference with commerce by extortion) and 18 U.S.C. § 1956 (money laundering) are implicated here as the Enterprise may be using public funds and authority to further a national agenda that harms both domestic and international stakeholders.

8.53 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The SEC's actions, coupled with its alliance with other agencies, represent an egregious abuse of regulatory authority that threatens both national and international commerce. From RICO violations (18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-1968) to Administrative Procedures Act (APA) breaches (5 U.S.C. §§ 551-559), these actions disrupt markets, erode trust in regulatory institutions, and stifle innovation in the digital asset industry. Fraud (18 U.S.C. §§ 1341, 1343), obstruction of justice (18 U.S.C. § 1503), and extortion (18 U.S.C. § 1951) are further implicated

as the agencies attempt to manipulate the legal framework to suppress competition. Addressing these violations is essential to restoring legal and economic stability, safeguarding competition, and preserving tHE UNITED sTATES' leadership in global technological and financial innovation. The Hobbs Act (18 U.S.C. § 1951) and 2C:5-2 (conspiracy) under New Jersey law also apply to the coordinated efforts to disrupt and control market dynamics unlawfully.

8.54 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) has adopted a de facto policy treating secondary transactions in digital assets as uniformly constituting “investment contracts” and subjecting platforms facilitating such transactions to the requirements of securities exchanges, broker-dealers, and clearing agencies. This approach has been implemented not through formal rule-making but via enforcement actions and public statements, which the SEC describes as a settled policy. The agency’s refusal to engage in the formal notice-and-comment process required by the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) (5 U.S.C. §§ 551-559) is a blatant disregard of established procedural safeguards, violating statutory requirements and constitutional principles of due process. This may also constitute fraudulent misrepresentation under 18 U.S.C. § 1341 (mail fraud) and 18 U.S.C. § 1343 (wire fraud) as the SEC manipulates legal processes and misleads stakeholders regarding the agency’s policy intentions and enforcement actions

8.55 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; Under the APA, agency actions that impose legally binding obligations must undergo formal rule-making procedures, including public notice and an opportunity for comment. The SEC’s "crypto policy" constitutes final agency action, as it reflects a completed decision-making process and imposes obligations enforceable through legal penalties. This determination aligns with the precedent set in *Whitman v. Am. Trucking Ass’ns*, 531 U.S. 457 (2001), which emphasizes that the APA’s definition of “agency action” is comprehensive and includes de facto rules adopted outside of formal processes. By failing to engage in the required procedures, the SEC has circumvented statutory obligations designed to ensure transparency, fairness, and accountability in policymaking. The SEC’s failure to follow procedural safeguards could constitute obstruction of justice (18 U.S.C. § 1503) and regulatory takings under 28 U.S.C. § 1491 (Tucker Act).

H. Unlawful Malicious Prosecutions Raging Against Crypto's at the hands of Multiple Agencies — while Simultaneously the Central Bank Positions CBDC's for the same Market Space — is No Coincidence

8.56 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The agency's actions have broader implications for national commerce. Domestically, the Enterprise's "self-determined authority" through "enforcement actions" (might makes right), in place of clear, lawful regulations, is intended to introduce significant uncertainty, and indeed does introduce significant uncertainty into the digital asset market. Businesses cannot reasonably anticipate the agency's expectations or adjust their operations to comply with unclear or retroactively applied standards. This uncertainty stifles innovation, discourages investment, and limits the ability of U.S. firms to compete in a rapidly evolving global market. This regulatory instability could also constitute a violation of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO) (18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-1968) as these actions systematically harm market participants and attempt to monopolize the market by eliminating competition. Additionally, fraud (18 U.S.C. §§ 1341, 1343) and extortion (18 U.S.C. § 1951) are implicated as the SEC and its allies enforce policies that undermine lawful business practices for the benefit of a competing agenda.

8.57 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The Enterprise's conduct undermines tHE UNITED sTATES' standing as a global leader in regulatory stability and fairness. By eschewing formal rule-making in favor of punitive enforcement, the Enterprise alienates foreign investors and innovators who view the U.S. regulatory environment as increasingly unpredictable. This perception drives international commerce and technological development to more accommodating jurisdictions, eroding tHE UNITED sTATES' competitive edge in blockchain technology and digital assets. The SEC's efforts, coupled with similar actions from other agencies, could violate 18 U.S.C. § 1951 (Hobbs Act) as they involve attempts to control or extort resources from the digital asset sector, shifting the balance of power in favor of a centralized financial system, potentially including Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDCs).

I. The SEC's Willingness to Circumvent the Law and Due Process has Incited other Agencies to Conjure Up their own so-called Enforcement Measures.

8.58 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The APA violations are compounded by a disregard for due process. The agency's refusal to provide fair notice of its regulatory expectations violates the principle articulated in *FCC v. Fox Television Stations, Inc.*, 567 U.S. 239 (2012), which mandates that regulated parties must have a clear understanding of what the law requires. Instead of issuing clear guidance, the SEC has fabricated its own ad hoc enforcement actions as though "those enforcement actions" serve as "the definition" of "its policy," forcing market participants to "divine" its expectations. This inherent, intentional lack of clarity not only undermines the rule of law but also places undue burdens on businesses and individuals, effectively penalizing them for failing to predict the Enterprise's ever-evolving criminal intentions. This conduct may constitute fraud (18 U.S.C. §§ 1341, 1343) as it misrepresents the legal expectations and manipulates businesses into compliance under false pretenses.

8.59 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; Moreover, the Enterprise's approach raises significant separation-of-powers concerns. The notice-and-comment process is a critical mechanism for ensuring that legislative rules are subject to congressional oversight under the Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 801-808. By circumventing this process, the Enterprise, spurred on by the SEC, has usurped legislative authority, imposing sweeping new requirements without the input of elected representatives or the public. This unilateral action represents an abuse of discretion and a violation of constitutional principles designed to prevent the concentration of power in unelected administrative agencies. This could also be considered obstruction of justice (18 U.S.C. § 1503) as the SEC's actions undermine the role of Congress and the judiciary in maintaining checks and balances on federal agencies.

8.60 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The Enterprise's campaign to implement its "crypto policy" without adhering to statutory requirements also appears to align with a broader effort to suppress competition in the digital asset industry. By selectively targeting decentralized financial platforms and blockchain-based innovations, the agency creates barriers that effectively clear the field for centralized financial systems, including the potential rollout of a Central Bank Digital Currency (CBDC). This suppression of competition undermines free market principles, limits

consumer choice, and hampers technological progress. Such actions may constitute fraud (18 U.S.C. §§ 1341, 1343) and conspiracy (18 U.S.C. § 371) as the SEC and other agencies have conspired to limit competition and facilitate unlawful market control for the benefit of a centralized financial system.

8.61 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The Enterprise’s disregard for the APA and due process in implementing its “crypto policy” is a systemic violation of legal and constitutional safeguards. Its actions disrupt national and international commerce, undermine trust in regulatory institutions, and stifle innovation in critical industries. Immediate judicial review and corrective action are essential to restore procedural integrity, uphold due process, and preserve the competitive and innovative potential of the digital asset sector. 18 U.S.C. § 1961-1968 (RICO) and 18 U.S.C. § 1951 (Hobbs Act) further demonstrate the coordinated nature of these unlawful acts designed to suppress competition.

J. The Extent that the Enterprise Is Willing to Go in order to Clear The Field for implementation of CBDC’s while Incentivized by Unjust Enrichment through the Unlawful Conversion of their Victims Wealth

8.62 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; Beginning in early 2018, a syndicate of rogue Agencies and others, operating under agency guidelines and policies, engages in what could clearly be summed up as domestic terrorism (18 U.S.C. § 2331) — on the hunt for vulnerable “competitors”. The alleged activities stem from the Enterprise’s intention to suppress competition in the cryptocurrency industry and further a covert plan to establish and impose a Central Bank Digital Currency (CBDC) on U.S. citizens. The Enterprise's unlawful actions commenced with surveillance, defamation, malicious persecution, overreach of government power, and self-aggrandized “Worldwide Jurisdiction” resulted in severe harm to JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS© and other non-U.S. individuals associated with a foreign cryptocurrency venture, Bitclub. Notably, the targeting of JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS© was fueled by his outspoken advocacy for cryptocurrency, Bitcoin, and individual freedoms, values that directly opposed the Enterprise's goals of centralized financial control and suppression of dissent yet are completely in alignment with our founding principles enshrined in the constitution.

8.63 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; This counter suit outlines the detailed claims against an alleged criminal enterprise involving coordinated efforts by various U.S. government agencies, private attorneys, judiciary members, and others who unlawfully conspired to target JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS© (trust name/beneficiary). The enterprise carried out a campaign of suppression, harassment, and abuse to destroy the Beneficiary's reputation, professional life, and personal freedom and to divest him of his considerable wealth, "neutralize him," and "render him defenseless." RICO violations (18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-1968) are invoked as these actions represent a pattern of criminal activity, with the intent to target and destroy the Beneficiary for personal and political gain. Further, defamation (N.J.S.A. 2C:28-1) and abuse of process (18 U.S.C. § 1519) are cited as additional components of the scheme designed to undermine JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS©'s character and business interests.

8.64 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; This scheme was executed to: (1) suppress competition in the cryptocurrency industry and (2) further a covert plan to establish and impose a Central Bank Digital Currency (CBDC) on U.S. citizens. The enterprise's unlawful actions included kidnapping (18 U.S.C. § 1201), unlawful imprisonment (18 U.S.C. § 242), defamation (N.J.S.A. 2C:28-1), unlawful surveillance (18 U.S.C. § 2510 et seq.), economic sabotage (18 U.S.C. § 1341 and 1343—mail and wire fraud), overreach of governmental power, and other illegal conduct that resulted in devastating harm to JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS©, his family, and the broader cryptocurrency industry. Central to these actions was the targeting of JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS© due to his staunch advocacy for cryptocurrency, Bitcoin, and personal freedom, which directly opposed the Enterprise's goals of centralized financial control and suppression of dissent. The Hobbs Act extortion (18 U.S.C. § 1951) also applies, as the Enterprise engaged in coercive actions designed to suppress competition in the cryptocurrency space.

8.65 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; Adding to the gravity of this case is the fact that JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS© is an American National and a Diplomat/NON-U.S. citizen. He has no domicile or residency within the UNITED STATES and has lived abroad as a perpetual traveler

for years. As such, he does not fall under ANY jurisdiction of U.S. statutory codes or regulations, nor is he a taxpayer obligated to comply with U.S. tax laws. These facts place him squarely outside the lawful reach of the Enterprise Members/Defendants/Trustees. Despite these clear jurisdictional limitations, the Enterprise fabricated legal interpretations to justify their actions against JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS©, violating established legal principles and further illustrating their overreach and unlawful conduct. This could potentially involve false claims of jurisdiction or fraudulent misrepresentation (18 U.S.C. §§ 1341, 1343), as the Enterprise knowingly manipulated legal doctrine to unlawfully extend jurisdiction and suppress competition.

8.66 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The unlawful actions against JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS© escalated to the point of physical abduction. He was kidnapped by armed assailants posing as agents of law enforcement, who claimed to be effectuating a lawful arrest. Following this abduction, JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS© was held in bondage for five years under the pretense of incarceration, without due process or even a legitimate legal basis. During this time, the Enterprise repeatedly subjected him to inhumane conditions, designed to cause physical and emotional harm, while his family was terrorized through threats, intimidation, and psychological abuse. These acts constitute intentional infliction of emotional distress (N.J.S.A. 2C:4-6) and false imprisonment (18 U.S.C. § 242), which were carried out with malicious intent and are intended to destroy the victim's mental, physical, and professional stability.

8.67 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The Enterprise Defendants, as alleged, include multiple U.S. District Courts (notably those in New Jersey, Florida, and Colorado), the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), the DOJ, the Federal Reserve, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), and the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), along with certain judges, court clerks, and private attorneys who, through entwinement, abused their positions, working in concert for a common central purpose. Acting under the color of law, these entities and individuals have collectively engaged in a wide-ranging scheme to suppress competition in the cryptocurrency space and unlawfully target JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS©. Their actions, masked as regulatory enforcement and judicial processes, allegedly sought to bolster their financial and political power by undermining

a foreign joint venture valued at what would be the equivalent of billions of dollars and enriching themselves at the expense of JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS© and other innocent parties. RICO conspiracy (18 U.S.C. § 1962(d)), abuse of process (18 U.S.C. § 1519), and misuse of public office for private gain could all be relevant charges here..

8.68 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The unlawful purpose of the enterprise's actions was twofold. First, to secretly “clear the field” to advance the creation and implementation of a Central Bank Digital Currency (CBDC), which is intended to be mandated upon U.S. citizens, consolidating their financial and political influence. Second, to eliminate perceived competition within the cryptocurrency industry by targeting entities and individuals, including JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS©, who posed a threat to their objectives. JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS©, as a staunch advocate of decentralized financial systems and personal liberty, openly opposed the notion of centralized control through a CBDC. His public defense of Bitcoin and cryptocurrency as tools of financial freedom and his criticisms of overreaching government policies positioned him as a prominent figure in the crypto community. This advocacy, coupled with his influence in the cryptocurrency space, made him a prime target for the Enterprise, which sought to neutralize opposition to its agenda through kidnapping (18 U.S.C. § 1201), defamation (N.J.S.A. 2C:28-1), and economic sabotage (18 U.S.C. §§ 1341, 1343), furthering their objectives by any means necessary. This economic espionage could be cited under 18 U.S.C. § 1831 (Economic Espionage Act).

8.69 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; While JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS© was unlawfully detained, the Enterprise carried out a coordinated campaign of asset seizure and unjust enrichment. Using fabricated legal justifications, they unlawfully converted what would be the equivalent of billions of dollars in assets from a foreign joint venture involving JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS©. This venture was entirely outside the jurisdiction of tHE UNITED sTATES, involving over one million individuals from 100 different countries. Despite this, the Enterprise seized these assets for their own benefit, destroying the venture and leaving JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS© and others to bear the blame. The Enterprise’s actions caused incalculable financial losses and irreparable reputational harm, further underscoring their malicious intent and disregard for the

rule of law. These actions violate international law, including principles of sovereignty and extraterritoriality, and may implicate violations of international conventions on asset protection.

8.70 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The actions alleged against the Enterprise Defendants constitute a pattern of racketeering activity as defined under the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO), codified at 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961–1968. This includes wire fraud (18 U.S.C. §§ 1343, 1346), mail fraud (18 U.S.C. § 1341), obstruction of justice (18 U.S.C. § 1503), kidnapping (18 U.S.C. § 1201), false imprisonment (18 U.S.C. § 242), money laundering (18 U.S.C. § 1956), and extortion (18 U.S.C. § 1951). Further, the Enterprise’s actions violated constitutional rights guaranteed under the Fourth and Fifth Amendments, specifically by engaging in illegal searches and surveillance, violating JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS©’s reasonable expectation of privacy, and denying him due process by abusing judicial authority to pursue baseless claims. These actions also represent a breach of administrative law under the Administrative Procedures Act (APA), 5 U.S.C. §§ 551 et seq., as the Enterprise failed to adhere to statutory requirements for regulatory and enforcement actions. Additionally, the Tucker Act (28 U.S.C. § 1491), which provides for compensation for property taken by the government without just compensation, was violated through the wrongful seizure of foreign assets outside the jurisdiction of tHE UNITED sTATES.

8.71 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The defamation against JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS© was central to the Enterprise’s strategy. By falsely associating him with criminal activity and attributing the intentional demise of the foreign cryptocurrency venture to him, the defendants sought to isolate and destroy him professionally, personally, and socially. This defamation not only caused reputational harm but also destroyed his marriage as a direct result of the intentional terror inflicted upon the individuals closest to him. The Enterprise was precise, calculating, malicious, and intentional in their campaign to create industry-wide chilling effects within the cryptocurrency industry, discouraging innovation and competition. The Enterprise’s actions further contravened international law by interfering in foreign commerce and undermining the sovereignty of nations whose citizens were involved in the joint venture. The defamation itself

constitutes a false light claim under applicable tort law and further exacerbates the emotional distress caused to JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS© and his family.

8.72 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; The Enterprise Defendants' actions constitute a gross abuse of power under color of law. Acting as government officials or through entwinement, the defendants fraudulently claimed to operate in the public interest. Instead, their actions were motivated by personal gain, political advancement, and a desire to eliminate competition. This misuse of taxpayer-funded resources for private and political purposes is a clear violation of ethical and legal standards. Furthermore, by unlawfully targeting JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS© and others in the cryptocurrency space, the Enterprise undermined the principles of free enterprise and innovation. Their actions represented not only an attack on JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS© personally but also an ideological battle to suppress the principles of financial independence and freedom that cryptocurrency embodies. The fabricated legal interpretations employed to target JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS©, despite his lack of legal or jurisdictional ties to tHE UNITED sTATES, further demonstrate the lengths to which the Enterprise Defendants went to pursue their unlawful agenda. This abuse of power implicates constitutional violations under the First (freedom of speech and association) and Fifth (due process) Amendments.

8.73 Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; In conclusion, the actions of the Enterprise Defendants against JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS© represent a coordinated conspiracy that not only harmed JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS© but also undermined public trust in government institutions. Their targeting of JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS©, rooted in a bias against his advocacy for cryptocurrency and freedom, highlights the abuse of power inherent in their actions. Their unlawful conduct demands accountability. Legal claims against the defendants include compensatory and punitive damages for financial, reputational, and emotional harm suffered by JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS©, as well as restitution for the destroyed foreign joint venture, lost profits, and lost opportunities. (And there were a lot of them over the last 5 years!) The Enterprise's willful disregard for the law and due process calls for a full investigation into the Enterprise's actions, cessation of unlawful activities, and appropriate redress for the damages

inflicted. The Enterprise Defendants should be held accountable for their illegal acts, and a court order should be issued for the return of seized assets and a permanent injunction against them for their unlawful conduct.

IX. CONDITIONAL ACCEPTANCE OF YOUR OFFER CONDITIONS:

9.1 As Beneficiary of the Trust JSW, Claimant/Plaintiff offers conditional acceptance of your offer **Trustees**, and is commanded to set forth the contract “conditional terms” therein to all Co-Conspirators/Members/Trustees of **The Enterprise as challenges — YOU HAVE A DUTY** to satisfy each/every challenge(s) demanded as to the Enterprise’s jurisdiction, authority, compliance and actions or inactions as necessary conditions of the contract. Through Information and belief plaintiff asserts that Defendants are in violation of RICO — **THERETOFORE** Enterprise Members/Trustees are demanded to set forth proof, sworn to under oath, by a living, breathing flesh and blood man/woman, upon the record of the court that each and every Enterprise Member(s), positively complied with each and every Code, Statute, Law, Act, Constitution, Rule and every other regulatory element ALL Enterprise members are sworn to as set forth herein prior to January, 2018 and there after. Willful Disregard or failure to verify required compliance constitutes an action / or inaction under the accepted contract, in which you initiated, and in which you now have a duty to properly execute, and that duty. And if disregarded, refused, or not possible, constitutes acceptance. — **THERETOFORE** you are in agreement that you are in violation of every, Code, Statute, Law, Act, Constitution, Rule and Duty and every other demand as set forth herein and that admission shall constitute trespass and willful and wanton intentional infliction of injury and distress upon plaintiff/beneficiary JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS, and Enterprise Members contractually agree herein to all claims, conditions and a consensual lien in favor of plaintiff for resulting damages. Claimant/Plaintiff challenges and asserts that the Enterprises Case is a sham action constructed of numerous FATAL DEFECTS, and, therefore, this instant case and all related matters thereto shall be self-determined in favor of Claimant upon the Enterprise’s willful disregard or failure to produce said demanded evidence, sworn to by affidavit and oath, upon the record of the court prior to the deadline set forth on February 20, 2024 at 5pm.

Commencement of Contract, as per Enterprise: December 10, 2019.

Duration of contract, as per Enterprise: 5 years

Conclusion of contract, as per Enterprise: February 20, 2024

9.2 claim/challenge 1: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer as to why JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (name of Trust, Accused, Beneficiary) **HAS NEVER** been presented any evidence there has actually been a crime committed by JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS regarding Case # 19-cr-877 (CCC) -03 and case # 9:19-mj-8526. The Enterprise shall set forth upon the record of the court any and all true evidence that had been in its possession from January 10, 2018 or prior, and therefore has in its possession now - proving conclusively JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS did in fact harm a living man or woman and/or caused damage to their property. Evidence must be accompanied by a sworn Affidavit from a true party in interest bearing wet signatures. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there was no such original evidence — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court evidence, attested to by sworn affidavit.

9.3 claim/challenge 2: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer as to why JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (name of Trust, Accused, Beneficiary) **HAS NEVER** been presented any evidence that would warrant conviction of a crime. The Enterprise shall set forth upon the record of the court any and all true evidence that had been in its possession from January 10, 2018 or prior, and therefore has in its possession now - proving conclusively JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS did in fact harm a living man or woman and/or caused damage to their property. Evidence must be accompanied by a sworn Affidavit from a true party in interest bearing wet signatures. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there was no such original evidence — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court evidence, attested to by sworn affidavit.

9.4 claim/challenge 3: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer as to why

JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (name of Trust/Accused/Beneficiary) has **NEVER BEEN** presented any evidence he is a party to case # 19-cr-877 (CCC)-03. The Enterprise shall set forth upon the record of the court any and all true evidence that had been in its possession from January 10, 2018 or prior, and therefore has in its possession now - proving conclusively JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS did in fact harm a living man or woman and/or caused damage to their property. Evidence must be accompanied by a sworn Affidavit from a true party in interest bearing wet signatures. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there was no such original evidence — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court evidence, attested to by by sworn affidavit. You're own PSI documents state that I created no victims!

9.5 claim/challenge 3: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED to answer**, by what jurisdiction Enterprise Members/Trustees, could beset the Beneficiary/Plaintiff with a sham criminal action or your actions shall be deemed contrary to the provisions of N.J.S.A. 2C:27-12; . The Congress grants the Courts 2 different and distinct Criminal Jurisdictions; one is a criminal jurisdiction under Common Law which the Enterprise Members have NO jurisdiction to operate under common law (N.J.S.A. 2C:1-5) and therefore could not lawfully operate therein; and the other is a criminal action that constitutes a condition of contract under the criminal aspects of a colorable Admiralty Jurisdiction. Colorable Admiralty Jurisdiction is anchored to the strict confinements of a contract. **The Enterprise Members/Trustees unlawfully arrested claimant, intentionally and maliciously inflicted actual damage upon he and his friends, family and fellow members in excess of \$50 BILLION Dollars.** They subjected him to bondage for 5 years, devastated his marriage and destroyed his reputation by conducting a persecution/prosecution under a Statutory Criminal Action with NO Contract! The Enterprise shall set forth upon the record of the court any and all true evidence regarding Common Law Criminal Jurisdiction and/or Statutory Criminal Jurisdiction that has been granted by Congress and that had been in its possession from January 10, 2018 or prior, and therefore has in its possession now - proving conclusively that JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS did in fact harm a living man or woman and/or caused damage to their property **and that** Enterprise Members are in possession of a binding express contract bearing wet signatures from both JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS

as well as an authorized, valid UNITED STATES OFFICIAL commissioned to bring charges against a Sovereign American National Diplomat (foreign to THE UNITED STATES). Evidence must be accompanied by a sworn Affidavit from a true party in interest bearing such wet signatures. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there was no such original evidence — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court evidence, attested to by sworn affidavit.

9.6 claim/challenge 4: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer as to why JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (name of Trust, Accused, Beneficiary) **HAS NEVER** been presented any evidence he is a “citizen of THE UNITED STATES”; The Enterprise shall set forth upon the record of the court any and all true evidence that had been in its possession from January 10, 2018 or prior, and therefore has in its possession now - proving conclusively JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS did in fact harm a living man or woman and/or caused damage to their property. Evidence must be accompanied by a sworn Affidavit from a true party in interest bearing wet signatures. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there was no such original evidence — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court evidence, attested to by sworn affidavit.

9.7 claim/challenge 5: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer as to why JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (name of Trust, Accused, Beneficiary) **HAS NEVER** been presented any evidence he is within the jurisdiction of the Charter Corporation “THE UNITED STATES”; The Enterprise shall set forth upon the record of the court any and all true evidence that had been in its possession from January 10, 2018 or prior, and therefore has in its possession now - proving conclusively JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS did in fact harm a living man or woman and/or caused damage to their property. Evidence must be accompanied by a sworn Affidavit from a true party in interest bearing wet signatures. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there was no such original evidence — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court evidence, attested to by sworn affidavit.

9.8 claim/challenge 6: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer as to why JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (name of Trust, Accused, Beneficiary) **HAS NEVER** been presented any evidence he is in contract with Charter Corporation “tHE UNITED sTATES”; The Enterprise shall set forth upon the record of the court any and all true evidence that had been in its possession from January 10, 2018 or prior, and therefore has in its possession now - proving conclusively JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS did in fact harm a living man or woman and/or caused damage to their property. Evidence must be accompanied by a sworn Affidavit from a true party in interest bearing wet signatures. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there was no such original evidence — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court evidence, attested to by sworn affidavit.

9.9 claim/challenge 7: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer as to why JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (name of Trust, The Accused, Beneficiary) **HAS NEVER** been presented any evidence he is within the jurisdiction of the for-profit franchise Consortium Corporation “sTATE of NEW JERSEY”; The Enterprise shall set forth upon the record of the court any and all true evidence that had been in its possession from January 10, 2018 or prior, and therefore has in its possession now - proving conclusively JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS did in fact harm a living man or woman and/or caused damage to their property. Evidence must be accompanied by a sworn Affidavit from a true party in interest bearing wet signatures. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there was no such original evidence — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court evidence, attested to by sworn affidavit.

9.10 claim/challenge 8: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer as to why JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (name of Trust, The Accused, Beneficiary) **HAS NEVER** been presented any evidence he is in contract with the for-profit franchise Consortium Corporation “sTATE of NEW JERSEY”; The Enterprise shall set forth upon the record of the court any and all true evidence that had been in its possession from January 10, 2018 or prior,

and therefore has in its possession now - proving conclusively JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS did in fact harm a living man or woman and/or caused damage to their property. Evidence must be accompanied by a sworn Affidavit from a true party in interest bearing wet signatures. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there was no such original evidence — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court evidence, attested to by sworn affidavit.

9.11 claim/challenge 9: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer as to why JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (name of Trust, The Accused, Beneficiary) **HAS NEVER** been presented any evidence he is within the jurisdiction of the for-profit franchise Consortium Corporation “U.S. District Court of NEW JERSEY”; The Enterprise shall set forth upon the record of the court any and all true evidence that had been in its possession from January 10, 2018 or prior, and therefore has in its possession now - proving conclusively JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS did in fact harm a living man or woman and/or caused damage to their property. Evidence must be accompanied by a sworn Affidavit from a true party in interest bearing wet signatures. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there was no such original evidence — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court evidence, attested to by sworn affidavit.

9.12 claim/challenge 10: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer as to why JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (name of Trust, The Accused, Beneficiary) **HAS NEVER** been presented any evidence he is in contract with the for-profit franchise Consortium Corporation “U.S. District Court of NEW JERSEY”; The Enterprise shall set forth upon the record of the court any and all true evidence that had been in its possession from January 10, 2018 or prior, and therefore has in its possession now - proving conclusively JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS did in fact harm a living man or woman and/or caused damage to their property. Evidence must be accompanied by a sworn Affidavit from a true party in interest bearing wet signatures. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there was no such original evidence — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court evidence, attested to by sworn affidavit.

9.13 claim/challenge 11: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer as to why JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (name of Trust, The Accused, Beneficiary) **HAS NEVER** been presented any evidence he is in contract with the for-profit franchise Consortium Corporation “INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE (IRS)”; The Enterprise shall set forth upon the record of the court any and all true evidence that had been in its possession from January 10, 2018 or prior, and therefore has in its possession now - proving conclusively JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS did in fact harm a living man or woman and/or caused damage to their property. Evidence must be accompanied by a sworn Affidavit from a true party in interest bearing wet signatures. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there was no such original evidence — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court evidence, attested to by sworn affidavit.

9.14 claim/challenge 12: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer as to why JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (name of Trust, The Accused, Beneficiary) **HAS NEVER** been presented any evidence he is within the jurisdiction of the for-profit franchise Consortium Corporation “INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE (IRS)”; The Enterprise shall set forth upon the record of the court any and all true evidence that had been in its possession from January 10, 2018 or prior, and therefore has in its possession now - proving conclusively JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS did in fact harm a living man or woman and/or caused damage to their property. Evidence must be accompanied by a sworn Affidavit from a true party in interest bearing wet signatures. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there was no such original evidence — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court evidence, attested to by sworn affidavit.

9.15 claim/challenge 13: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer as to why JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (name of Trust, The Accused, Beneficiary) **HAS NEVER** been presented any evidence he is in contract with the for-profit franchise Consortium Corporation “DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE” (DOJ);. The Enterprise shall set forth upon the record of the court any and all true evidence that had been in its possession from January 10,

2018 or prior, and therefore has in its possession now - proving conclusively JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS did in fact harm a living man or woman and/or caused damage to their property. Evidence must be accompanied by a sworn Affidavit from a true party in interest bearing wet signatures. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there was no such original evidence — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court evidence, attested to by sworn affidavit.

9.16 claim/challenge 14: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer as to why JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (name of Trust, The Accused, Beneficiary) **HAS NEVER** been presented any evidence he is within the jurisdiction of the for-profit franchise Consortium Corporation “DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE” (DOJ);. The Enterprise shall set forth upon the record of the court any and all true evidence that had been in its possession from January 10, 2018 or prior, and therefore has in its possession now - proving conclusively JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS did in fact harm a living man or woman and/or caused damage to their property. Evidence must be accompanied by a sworn Affidavit from a true party in interest bearing wet signatures. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there was no such original evidence — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court evidence, attested to by sworn affidavit.

9.17 claim/challenge 15: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer as to why JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (name of Trust, The Accused, Beneficiary) **HAS NEVER** been presented any evidence he is in contract with the for-profit franchise Consortium Corporation “FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIONS (FBI)”;. The Enterprise shall set forth upon the record of the court any and all true evidence that had been in its possession from January 10, 2018 or prior, and therefore has in its possession now - proving conclusively JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS did in fact harm a living man or woman and/or caused damage to their property. Evidence must be accompanied by a sworn Affidavit from a true party in interest bearing wet signatures. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there was no such original evidence — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court evidence, attested to by sworn affidavit.

9.18 claim/challenge 16: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer as to why JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (name of Trust, The Accused, Beneficiary) **HAS NEVER** been presented any evidence he is within the jurisdiction of the for-profit franchise Consortium Corporation “FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIONS (FBI)”; The Enterprise shall set forth upon the record of the court any and all true evidence that has been in its possession from January 10, 2018 or prior, and therefore has in its possession now - proving conclusively JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS did in fact harm a living man or woman and/or caused damage to their property. Evidence must be accompanied by a sworn Affidavit from a true party in interest bearing wet signatures. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there was no such original evidence — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court evidence, attested to by sworn affidavit.

9.19 claim/challenge 17: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer as to why JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (name of Trust, The Accused, Beneficiary) **HAS NEVER** been presented any evidence he is in contract with the for-profit franchise Consortium Corporation “sSTATE of FLORIDA”; The Enterprise shall set forth upon the record of the court any and all true evidence that has been in its possession from January 10, 2018 or prior, and therefore has in its possession now - proving conclusively JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS did in fact harm a living man or woman and/or caused damage to their property. Evidence must be accompanied by a sworn Affidavit from a true party in interest bearing wet signatures. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there was no such original evidence — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court evidence, attested to by sworn affidavit.

9.20 claim/challenge 18: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer as to why JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (name of Trust, The Accused, Beneficiary) **HAS NEVER** been presented any evidence he is within the jurisdiction of the for-profit franchise Consortium Corporation “sSTATE of FLORIDA”; The Enterprise shall set forth upon the record of the court any and all true evidence that has been in its possession from January 10, 2018 or prior, and

therefore has in its possession now - proving conclusively JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS did in fact harm a living man or woman and/or caused damage to their property. Evidence must be accompanied by a sworn Affidavit from a true party in interest bearing wet signatures. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there was no such original evidence — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court evidence, attested to by sworn affidavit.

9.21 claim/challenge 19: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer as to why JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (name of Trust, The Accused, Beneficiary) was targeted for this action. Was your intent was to bring this case against the trustee (the responsible party) of the trust? You can't bring a trust action against the beneficiary. (Trustees can't be at war with the beneficiary) If you are bringing an action against the trust, are you treating this as a minor estate? Or are you treating this as an estate in which the beneficiary has reached the age of majority and claimed the estate as the beneficial title holder? The Enterprise shall set forth upon the record of the court who they are actually bringing this action against and must provide any and all true evidence that had been in its possession from January 10, 2018 or prior, and therefore has in its possession now - proving conclusively who they are actually charging and proof that JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS did in fact harm a living man or woman and/or caused damage to their property. Evidence must be accompanied by a sworn Affidavit from a true party in interest bearing wet signatures. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there was no such original evidence — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court evidence, attested to by sworn affidavit.

9.22 claim/challenge 20: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer as to why JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (name of Trust, The Accused, Beneficiary) **HAS NEVER** been presented any evidence he is within the jurisdiction of the for-profit franchise Consortium Corporation “sTATE of COLORADO”; The Enterprise shall set forth upon the record of the court any and all true evidence that had been in its possession from January 10, 2018 or prior, and therefore has in its possession now - proving conclusively JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS did in fact harm a living man or woman and/or caused damage to their property. Evidence must

be accompanied by a sworn Affidavit from a true party in interest bearing wet signatures. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there was no such original evidence — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court evidence, attested to by sworn affidavit.

9.23 claim/challenge 21: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer as to why JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (name of Trust, The Accused, Beneficiary) **HAS NEVER** been presented any evidence that he has had his day in court; **HAS NEVER** been presented any evidence he has been able to face his accuser; The Enterprise shall set forth upon the record of the court any and all true evidence that has been in its possession from January 10, 2018 or prior, and therefore has in its possession now - proving conclusively JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS did in fact harm a living man or woman and/or caused damage to their property. Evidence must be accompanied by a sworn Affidavit from a true party in interest bearing wet signatures. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there was no such original evidence — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court evidence, attested to by sworn affidavit.

9.24 claim/challenge 22: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer as to why JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (name of Trust, The Accused, Beneficiary) **HAS NEVER** been presented any evidence there is a “True Witness” claiming JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS damaged them; The Enterprise shall set forth upon the record of the court any and all true evidence that had been in its possession from January 10, 2018 or prior, and therefore has in its possession now - proving conclusively JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS did in fact harm a living man or woman and/or caused damage to their property. Evidence must be accompanied by a sworn Affidavit from a true party in interest bearing wet signatures. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there was no such original evidence — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court evidence, attested to by sworn affidavit.

9.25 claim/challenge 23: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer as to why

JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (name of Trust, The Accused, Beneficiary) **HAS NEVER** been presented any evidence there is a “True Party in Interest” claiming JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS damaged them; The Enterprise shall set forth upon the record of the court any and all true evidence that had been in its possession from January 10, 2018 or prior, and therefore has in its possession now - proving conclusively JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS did in fact harm a living man or woman and/or caused damage to their property. Evidence must be accompanied by a sworn Affidavit from a true party in interest bearing wet signatures. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there was no such original evidence — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court evidence, attested to by sworn affidavit.

9.26 claim/challenge 24: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer as to why JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (name of Trust, The Accused, Beneficiary) **HAS NEVER** been presented any evidence there is a sworn “Affidavit” alleging any crime;. The Enterprise shall set forth upon the record of the court any and all true evidence that has been in its possession from January 10, 2018 or prior, and therefore has in its possession now - proving conclusively JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS did in fact harm a living man or woman and/or caused damage to their property. Evidence must be accompanied by a sworn Affidavit from a true party in interest bearing wet signatures. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there was no such original evidence — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court evidence, attested to by sworn affidavit.

9.27 claim/challenge 25: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer as to why JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (name of Trust, The Accused, Beneficiary) **HAS NEVER** been presented any evidence there is a sworn “Complaint” alleging any crime; The Enterprise shall set forth upon the record of the court any and all true evidence that had been in its possession from January 10, 2018 or prior, and therefore has in its possession now - proving conclusively JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS did in fact harm a living man or woman and/or caused damage to their property. Evidence must be accompanied by a sworn Affidavit from a

true party in interest bearing wet signatures. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there was no such original evidence — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court evidence, attested to by sworn affidavit.

9.28 claim/challenge 26: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer as to why JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (name of Trust, The Accused, Beneficiary) **HAS NEVER** been presented any evidence there is a sworn “Indictment” alleging any crime; The Enterprise shall set forth upon the record of the court any and all true evidence that had been in its possession from January 10, 2018 or prior, and therefore has in its possession now - proving conclusively JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS did in fact harm a living man or woman and/or caused damage to their property. Evidence must be accompanied by a sworn Affidavit from a true party in interest bearing wet signatures. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there was no such original evidence — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court evidence, attested to by sworn affidavit.

9.29 claim/challenge 27: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer as to why JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (name of Trust, The Accused, Beneficiary) **HAS NEVER** been presented any evidence there is a valid, sworn “Arrest Warrant” alleging any crime; The Enterprise shall set forth upon the record of the court any and all true evidence that had been in its possession from January 10, 2018 or prior, and therefore has in its possession now - proving conclusively JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS did in fact harm a living man or woman and/or caused damage to their property. Evidence must be accompanied by a sworn Affidavit from a true party in interest bearing wet signatures. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there was no such original evidence — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court evidence, attested to by sworn affidavit.

9.30 claim/challenge 28: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer as to why

JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (name of Trust, The Accused, Beneficiary) **NEVER BEEN** been presented any evidence there is a “Plaintiff” in this or any case against JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS© The Enterprise shall set forth upon the record of the court any and all true evidence that had been in its possession from January 10, 2018 or prior, and therefore has in its possession now - proving conclusively JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS did in fact harm a living man or woman and/or caused damage to their property. Evidence must be accompanied by a sworn Affidavit from a true party in interest bearing wet signatures. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there was no such original evidence — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court evidence, attested to by sworn affidavit.

9.31 claim/challenge 29: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer whether or not the Enterprise, had in its possession prior to January 10, 2018 and therefore has in its possession now, original securities signed by JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS, party of the first part, fully executed original securities, bearing wet signatures, with the Enterprise Members/ Trustees, party(s) of the second part, wherein the language was written that JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS had/has relinquished lawful status as the true beneficiary of the Trust JSW respectively and thereby had become the Trustee of said Trust. The Enterprise offered admissions through disclosures or refusal to disclose that there were no such original securities — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court the alleged Contract(s) attested to by by sworn affidavit;

9.32 claim/challenge 30: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer as to the fabricated charges you, the Enterprise (responsible party of the trust) presented, which were intentionally confusing, inasmuch as you (responsible party of the trust) fraudulently accuse JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (name of a trust/beneficiary of a trust) of being the alleged “Accused” (a beneficiary of a trust could NOT commit a criminal act of its own actions since only a trustee can make decisions regarding all actions and/or inactions and are therefore the party that carries all liability and; a trust could NOT commit a criminal act of its own actions since only a trustee can make decisions regarding all actions and/or inactions and are therefore

the party that carries all liability) of a criminal act, **or** Jobadiah-Sinclair:Weeks, the MAN you kidnapped and placed in bondage for 5 years, the Trustor/Settlor of said trust, (a Trustor/Settlor of a trust could NOT commit a criminal act of his own actions since only a trustee 'Enterprise Member' can make decisions regarding all actions and/or inactions and are therefore the party that carries all liability). **Therefore**, I demand written clarification as to precisely who or what was intended as the contractee, and if different than what has been represented, you were instructed and had a duty to address this/these points over the last 5 years. The Enterprise offered admissions that you intentionally and willfully refused to disclose and/or designate the true party being charged, which constituted **willful intent to Subvert and Obstruct due process of law** — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record that JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS/Beneficiary is the contractee by producing said contract and attest to it by sworn affidavit;

For example: Your documentation designates the contractee as JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and that name is connected to the SSN/TIN issued by the Social Security Administration as a Trust and although it sounds similar, is not the same as the Trustor/Settlor of the Trust JSW by the name of Jobadiah-Sinclair:Weeks, a man. The Enterprise had/has NO jurisdiction or authority to use or bring charges against said trust name and/or said beneficiary of a trust for their unlawful purposes and as a weapon to the detriment of the JSW Trust, and/or Trustor/Settlor Jobadiah-Sinclair:Weeks. The Enterprise knew or should have known that the trust name and/or the trust beneficiary cannot be the responsible parties within a trust and carries no liability for said trust. The responsible parties are by law the Trustees which are in fact the Enterprise Members. All liability rests with the Enterprise Members / Trustees of the Trust. The Trust JSW and the Claimant/Beneficiary JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS cannot be the Trustee of said Trust JSW with authority or ability to agree to anything in relation of the trust, take actions as a trust, sign for the trust, make decisions for the trust.. so therefore has no liability regarding the trust — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof as to who the true trustee in interest (party who carries all liability) of the JSW Trust is and attest to it by sworn affidavit;

9.33 claim/challenge 31: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer, whether

or not the Enterprise designated the Trust JSW as the the Accused in this instant case; — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record sworn proof as to the fact a trust, JSW Trust, or trust beneficiary, JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS has the ability to commit a crime and therefore be a true “defendant”, and attest to it by sworn affidavit;

9.34 claim/challenge 32: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer, as to why the Enterprise intentionally concealed what was intended, as to who the alleged real parties in interest were, therefore, evidence of who or what were intended as the real parties in interest could not be determined — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record sworn proof as to who the true party in interest is and attest to it by sworn affidavit;

9.35 claim/challenge 33: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer, and produce evidence to support that you had not in fact fabricated an action against the Trust JSW, (which could not possibly have committed the offense so charged - since the charge is a fiction of non-law), for the soul purpose to game-the-system for your own gain and ulterior motives — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court sworn proof as to 1) who the alleged “victims” the Enterprise has alluded to “being damaged” directly or indirectly by JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS or JSW Trust (**there better be thousands in order to justify collapsing a Multi-Billion Dollar Foreign Private Venture not within your jurisdiction**), and 2) the victims sworn affidavits dated January 10, 2018 or prior, and 3) a written record of the amount the Enterprise “restituted to the damaged victims” from the private foreign assets stolen by the enterprise, under the fraudulent representation “for the benefit of the “victims””, and 4) that all proceeds as to those assets that were stolen by the Enterprise, in order to “save the victims”, was in fact “returned to the supposed victims”, and validated by sworn evidence through ledger entries placed upon the record of the court — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record “the Ledger” — and attest to it by sworn affidavit;

9.36 claim/challenge 34: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer and

produce ANY real parties in interest, witnesses that could swear under oath as to the fact that JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS or JSW Trust was “a principle” in any “company” or “corporation” before the Enterprise willfully and maliciously destroyed a Private Foreign Venture, for the purpose of obtaining a financial benefit for themselves or their ulterior motives. — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record sworn proof as to who the true witness that provided first person testimony from December 10, 2019 or prior — that JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS was a “principle” in any “company or corporation” created under US statutes that had anything to do with this frivolous case — and attest to it by sworn affidavit;

9.37 claim/challenge 35: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer, and produce ANY real parties in interest, witnesses that could swear under oath as to the fact that what you willfully and maliciously destroyed, was in fact a “Company” or a “Corporation”, and that your actions were not for the express purpose of obtaining a financial benefit for the Enterprise Members or your ulterior motives, — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court sworn proof as to who the true witness that provided first person testimony from December 10, 2019 or prior, that there was in fact any “company or corporation” created under US statutes, and attest to it by sworn affidavit;

9.38 claim/challenge 36: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer, and produce irrefutable evidence as to the chain of Authority and Jurisdiction under which the Enterprise professed to be operating under, in which they could attack, destroy and commit theft against the equivalent of a MULTI-BILLION DOLLAR FOREIGN VENTURE, and against Principles from 100 Foreign Countries and not even tenanted on the same Continent your supposed jurisdiction resides, and in the absence of ANY jurisdiction, — **and therein unlawfully seized in excess of what is the equivalent of BILLIONS OF DOLLARS in real world currency replacement value** — under the fraudulent narrative of “SAVING” over 1 MILLION people from 100 plus countries from exercising their own free will, their right to contract and their pursuit of happiness, and THEREIN... Caused Irreversible Damage upon FOREIGN NATIONALS and upon INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE throughout the world and

without THE UNITES STATES, (that place where your jurisdiction, if you had any, would have been limited to) robbing good people of the world blind, for your own financial gain — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to **place upon the court sworn proof as to who the true witnesses that provided first person testimony that some one or some thing was damaged by JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS**, (the “person” you charged), from January 10, 2018 or prior, that caused you to believe you had jurisdiction to arrest JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS, (name of trust or beneficiary of trust) and defame that person on a global scale regarding any foreign venture, and attested to it by sworn affidavit;

9.39 claim/challenge 37: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer and produce Irrefutable Evidence upon the record of the court as to your so-called “World Wide” Jurisdiction you claim to have — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court sworn proof as to who the true witness that provided first person testimony on January 10, 2018 or prior, and that **granted you Worldwide jurisdiction to damage and or destroy commerce in 100 foreign countries, violate international treaties and laws and attest to it by sworn affidavit;**

9.40 claim/challenge 38: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer and produce Irrefutable Evidence that you have “Restituted” or “Returned” ANY of the seized Foreign Private Property or Foreign Private Assets to a single Foreign “True Party In Interest” / “rightful owner”/“victim” that was supposedly “being injured” over 5 YEARS AGO by JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS, and that the Enterprise Members have not just committed a colossal scheme of sabotage and theft and are still in possession of the booty for their own use. — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court sworn proof with receipts and ledgers as to “the restoration to the victims”, and attest to it by sworn affidavit;

9.41 claim/challenge 39: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer and produce ANY real parties in interest, January 10, 2018 or prior, witnesses that could swear under oath regarding the Private Foreign Venture what you willfully and maliciously destroyed, irregardless as to what description was used regarding its identity, as to evidence you were in

possession of, that the venture resided upon, tenanted upon, or was situated upon tHE UNITED sTATES or anywhere on the North American Continent or within the Jurisdictional Boundaries of ANYTHING related to tHE UNITED sTATES Inc. — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof with evidence and documentation as to “the Private Foreign Venture” proximity to tHE UNITED sTATES and the jurisdiction therein , and attested to it by sworn affidavit;

9.42 claim/challenge 40: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer and produce ANY real parties in interest, ‘Witnesses’ that could swear under oath that JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS had/has damaged them prior to January 10, 2018 — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof with evidence and documentation any and all damage claimed by a true party in interest on December 10, 2019 or prior, has set forth a sworn claim that JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS caused them damage , and attest to it by sworn affidavit;

9.43 claim/challenge 41: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer and produce ANY ‘real parties in interest’, prior to January 10, 2018, witnesses that could swear under oath that JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS had/has domicile within tHE UNITED STATES — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof with evidence and documentation as to the domicile Enterprise has alleged regarding JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS within tHE UNITED sTATES, and attest to it by sworn affidavit;

9.44 claim/challenge 42: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to answer and produce ANY real parties in interest, witnesses that could swear under oath that Jobadiah-Sinclair:Weeks and/or JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS had/has residency within tHE UNITED STATES — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof with evidence and documentation as to the residency Enterprise has alleged regarding JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS within tHE UNITED sTATES, and attested to it by sworn affidavit;

9.45 claim/challenge 43: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to Show cause through production of sworn evidence to support actions undertaken by the Enterprise including but not limited to the kidnapping of a living man, in the place of a person, by falsely alleging a crime was committed by man, the Settlor, and subjected said man into bondage for 5 years, without due process, and in the total absence of any laws and/or regulations, therefore, where was/is your jurisdiction and authority to inflict punitive amercement, against a Sovereign American national Diplomat, one of the “people”, a living man, in your Military (Admiralty) tribunal, and precisely where this authority you claim you possess came from, including a written and autographed contract or agreement wherein my autograph is affixed thereto by I and witnessing that this action was agreed upon over water — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof with evidence and documentation as to the jurisdiction over a living man within your Administrative court and produce the alleged contract with autograph affixed thereto, and attest to it by sworn affidavit;

9.46 claim/challenge 44: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to Show cause through production of sworn evidence that you, the Enterprise, has **never obtained ANY disbursements from Bond # 31617K782 (symbol: FVIAX) in the Name of JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (Trust) — in the Amount of \$3,449,859,000.00 as of October 18, 2022, for your own benefit,** which would constitute Theft, Unjust Enrichment, unlawful conversion, and was done without the express authorization of the Trust JSW Grantor/Settlor/Secured Party Creditor Jobadiah-Sinclair:Weeks; OR through production of sworn evidence upon the record of the court that the **Bond Does Not and has never existed.** If in fact you accessed the trust under the fraudulent premise you were an Authorized Agent operating for the Benefit of the Beneficiary, however your intent was in fact Criminal Theft to the detriment of the Beneficiary and constitutes an egregious, willful, wanton trespass and breach of fiduciary trust of which you are liable for, since the Trustee is the responsible Party by law. — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof with evidence and documentation as to all financial settlements hereto, produce the ledger, and attested to it by

sworn affidavit or you are liable and demanded to transfer the total amount, fraudulently obtained, to JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS by February 20, 2024 at 5:00 p.m. mst;

9.47 claim/challenge 45: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to Show cause through production of sworn evidence that you, the Enterprise, has never obtained **ANY disbursements from Bond # 72201F698 (symbol: PCKAX) ISIN: US72201F6988 in the Name of JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (Trust) — in the Amount of \$1,316,629,000.00** as of October 16, 2022, for your own benefit, which would constitute Theft, Unjust Enrichment, unlawful conversion, and was done without the express authorization of the Trust JSW Grantor/Settlor/Secured Party Creditor Jobadiah-Sinclair:Weeks; OR through production of sworn evidence upon the record of the court that the **Bond Does Not and has never existed.** If in fact you accessed the trust under the fraudulent premise you were an Authorized Agent operating for the Benefit of the Beneficiary, however your intent was in fact Criminal Theft to the detriment of the Beneficiary and constitutes an egregious, willful, wanton trespass and breach of fiduciary trust of which you are liable for, since the Trustee is the responsible Party by law. — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof with evidence and documentation as to all financial settlements hereto, produce the ledger, and attest to it by sworn affidavit or you are liable and demanded to transfer the total amount, fraudulently obtained, to JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS by February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst.;

9.48 claim/challenge 46: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to Show cause through production of sworn evidence that you, the Enterprise, **has never obtained ANY disbursements from Bond # 316069418 (symbol: FIKVX) ISIN: US3160694184 in the Name of JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (Trust) — in the Amount of \$5,547,491,000.00** as of October 17, 2022, for your own benefit, which would constitute Theft, Unjust Enrichment, unlawful conversion, and was done without the express authorization of the Trust JSW Grantor/Settlor/Secured Party Creditor Jobadiah-Sinclair:Weeks; OR through production of sworn evidence upon the record of the court that **the Bond Does Not and has never existed.** If in fact you accessed the trust under the fraudulent premise you were an Authorized Agent operating for

the Benefit of the Beneficiary, however your intent was in fact Criminal Theft to the detriment of the Beneficiary and constitutes an egregious, willful, wanton trespass and breach of fiduciary trust of which you are liable for, since the Trustee is the responsible Party by law. — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof with evidence and documentation as to all financial settlements hereto, produce the ledger, and attest to it by sworn affidavit or you are liable and demanded to transfer the total amount, fraudulently obtained, to JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS by February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst.;

9.49 claim/challenge 47: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to Show cause through production of sworn evidence that you, the Enterprise, had not collected from both I and the Trust JSW and that you were not attempting to collect from both I and the Trust JSW — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof with evidence and documentation as to all financial settlements hereto, produce the ledger, and attest to it by sworn affidavit or you are liable and demanded to **transfer the total amount of all three bonds** referenced herein plus any additional amounts fraudulently obtained to JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS by February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst.;

9.50 claim/challenge 48: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to Show cause through production of sworn evidence that you, the Enterprise, meet the residency requirement in the 6th amendment of the constitution. Claimant claims that the people who sat on the Grand Jury and the **judge herself do NOT meet the residency requirement.** According to the 6th Amendment, there is a residency requirement to be a juror and judge. They must PHYSICALLY live in the DISTRICT for Federal cases. Meaning they must live on Federal territory or a federal enclave, **not state land.** A failure to satisfy this requirement upon the judge is high misdemeanor as identified in the **Judicial Code of 1940.** The provision of the code doing this was CONVENIENTLY not codified into Title 28 by the Law Revision Counsel of the House of Representatives, but nevertheless **it STILL applies because it was not explicitly repealed.** Therefore, this claim constitutes a demand for the oath of office and proof of physical residence

on **federal territory** within the DISTRICT of New Jersey by the judge, and a CRIMINAL COMPLAINT if that burden of proof is not satisfied.

It's easy to indict someone FEDERALLY in Puerto Rico because the whole island is a federal territory/possession. Everyone on the island meets the residency requirement. Same with Washington D.C. Everyone there lives in the "District" of Columbia thus they meet the residency requirement. However, to indict someone **Federally**, if one of those jurors lives at 123 Main Street in downtown Newark, he/she lives on STATE land, not Federal land. Thus, the juror doesn't meet the residency requirement to serve as a juror in Federal Court because they don't live in the district as the 6th Amendment demands. There is no geographical "district of New Jersey" because **it would violate the Separation of Powers Doctrine**. Federal land within a state of the union like New Jersey is called an "enclave". A post office, or military base or National Park or federal courthouse, IF IT WAS CEDED TO THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT BY THE STATE, would be considered an enclave. I doubt all the jurors who served on the grand jury did not physically lived at the post office, courthouse or on BLM land... Plus, those people serving on the grand jury are not "of my peers" because I'm not from NJ, I don't live there, and I don't do business there. Further, the jury selection pool derives inappropriately from those LICENSED to "drive" on public roadways within federal enclaves, and none of the jurors likely qualify to receive said licenses in the first place. The jurors couldn't be any more incompatible with my circumstances and therefore are NOT my peers. Absent proof that the judge and jury meet the residency requirements constitutes another FATAL FLAW in this frivolous action! You have until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof with evidence and documentation as to your residence being on Federally owned land or you agree to a consensual lien against your bond and your property.

9.51 claim/challenge 49: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to Show cause through production of sworn evidence that 18 U.S.C. 1349 is positive law, that congress has granted authority and force regarding 18 U.S.C. 1349 and the Enterprise Members have obtained authority to enforce 18 U.S.C. 1349 (statute implemented through contract) on NON-U.S. individuals in a foreign jurisdiction. — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof with evidence and documentation as to the binding

contract, bearing claimants wet signature affixed thereto along with sworn proof with evidence and documentation that 18 U.S.C. 1349 (statute implemented through contract) is valid and enforceable internationally, and attest to it by sworn affidavit or you are liable and demanded to transfer the total amount of all three bonds referenced herein plus any additional amounts demanded to JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS by February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst.;

9.52 claim/challenge 50: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to Show cause through production of sworn evidence that 18 U.S.C. 371 is positive law, that congress has granted authority and force regarding 18 U.S.C. 371 and the Enterprise Members have obtained authority to enforce 18 U.S.C. 371 (statute implemented through contract) on NON-U.S. individuals in a foreign jurisdiction. — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof with evidence and documentation as to the binding contract, bearing claimants wet signature affixed thereto along with sworn proof with evidence and documentation that 18 U.S.C. 371 (statute implemented through contract) is valid and enforceable internationally, and attest to it by sworn affidavit or you are liable and demanded to transfer the total amount of all three bonds referenced herein plus any additional amounts demanded to JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS by February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst.;

9.53 claim/challenge 51: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to Show cause through production of sworn evidence that I, as the beneficiary of the Trust JSW, could lawfully agree to and autograph any plea for the Trust JSW, based on the fact, that I, as a beneficiary, have no authority to act for said Trust — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof with evidence and documentation as to how a beneficiary can sign a plea regarding the trust, unless it is the intent of the Enterprise to transfer liability from the trustees onto the beneficiary and/or attempting to make the beneficiary the trustee in which either scenario would constitute a criminal act and breach of fiduciary duty. Enterprise members are demanded to prove upon the record that they are not the trustees and the liability resides with them, and attest to it by sworn affidavit;

9.54 claim/challenge 52: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to Show cause

through production of sworn evidence that you, or your officers, agents, brokers and/or intermediaries have not collected considerable amount of monies from the Trust JSW through Merchant Trustees: Enterprise Members having fraudulently created **three (3) plus bonds** on the case — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof with evidence and documentation as to all financial settlements hereto, produce the ledger, and attest to it by sworn affidavit;

9.55 claim/challenge 53: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to Show cause through production of sworn evidence and explain why neither I nor the Trust JSW was paid the royalties from these bonds created by Trustees/Enterprise Members — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof with evidence and documentation as to all financial settlements hereto, produce the ledger, and attest to it by sworn affidavit;

9.56 claim/challenge 54: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to Show cause through production of sworn evidence as to how JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS could be responsible for the Trust JSW as beneficiary. Enterprise Members are acting as trustees for the Trust JSW and are therefore the responsible party for all actions regarding the Trust JSW. Enterprise Members are liable of any and all liability regarding the Trust JSW, I.e. all damages associated with JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS in commerce must be the responsibility of the Enterprise Members. They and they alone are to answer to all charges regarding the Trust JSW — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof with evidence they will solve and settle all charges regarding Trust JSW and documentation as to all financial settlements hereto, produce the ledger, and attested to it by sworn affidavit;

9.57 claim/challenge 55: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to Show cause through production of sworn evidence as to why I, the beneficiary who has been kidnapped and kept in indenture bondage for 5 years, and could be required to appear at the Military (Admiralty) tribunal, when the Trust JSW is the alleged Accused, and now as defendant(s),

(trustees) are the responsible parties, **wherein that action would constitute extortion** — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof with evidence that they have jurisdiction to place the beneficiary of a trust into indenture bondage for 5 years, in the stead of the true responsible parties/trustees/Enterprise Members, and attest to it by sworn affidavit;

9.58 claim/challenge 56: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to Show cause through production of sworn evidence as to how the Trust JSW could be required, under threat of arrest (if a piece of paper can be arrested) to appear at the Military (Admiralty) tribunal when I, the beneficiary, was made out to be the alleged “defendant”, **wherein that action would constitute extortion** — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof with evidence that they have jurisdiction to place the beneficiary of a trust into indenture peonage for 5 years, in the stead of the true responsible parties/trustees/Enterprise Members, and attested to it by sworn affidavit;

9.59 claim/challenge 57: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to Show cause through production of sworn evidence, as the Trustees, which you volunteered of your own free will and choice to be the Trustees, why you failed to produce, for you were/are required to produce, a full accounting of all transactions and activities of the Trust JSW, from its inception, so that I may have this for my records — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof with evidence in the form of a ledger as to all transactions that they have engaged in regarding my Trust JSW, and attest to it by sworn affidavit;

9.60 claim/challenge 58: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to Show cause through production of sworn evidence that since the Enterprise, conspiring and working in concert with the B.A.R. Association, acts as though they own and operate the entirety of the judiciary, wherein is the proof that the Enterprise (including the B.A.R.) is not in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act (**Sherman Act**, July 2, 1890, ch. 647, 26 Stat. 209, 15 U.S.C. § 1–7); —

the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record sworn-proof/evidence that intrastate commerce, interstate commerce and international commerce are not being infringed upon by the Enterprise, and attested to it by sworn affidavit;

9.61 claim/challenge 59: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to Show cause through production of sworn evidence why you should not be charged with Treason and Conspiracy to Commit Treason for overthrowing the Constitution for tHE UNITED sTATES — the Enterprise has until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof with evidence that this case, regarding international commerce, and American nationals, has been taking place in a **lawfully established article III court** that has the proper jurisdiction to officiate over such matters and not a *de facto* article IV tribunal that would be operating under the color of law, and attest to it by sworn affidavit

X. The Tucker's Act - 28 U.S. Code § 1491

10.1 claim/challenge 60: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to Show cause through production of sworn evidence, and as Trustees, that since the Enterprise, devising a scheme to defraud and deny due process, and have violated the provisions of The Tucker Act, codified at 28 U.S.C. § 1491. The violation includes the breach of contractual obligations with the federal government, taking of property without just compensation, improper conduct in breach of statutory rights, and conspiracy under color of law. Specifically, the claims invoke multiple sections of 28 U. S. C. § 1491 and related statutory frameworks, including breach of contract, Fifth Amendment takings, and violations of statutory rights under the law and others.

10.2 Plaintiffs, hereby bring this claim for damages under the Tucker Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1491, alleging unlawful seizure, conspiracy, and violations of constitutional and statutory rights as well as others by the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey, the U.S. District Court for the States of Florida and Colorado, the SEC, the Federal Reserve, the DOJ and the FBI, and private attorneys among others, involved in the unlawful seizure of assets in the amount of what would be the equivalent of Billions Of Dollars from a foreign joint venture. Plaintiffs seek

compensation for damages arising from actions that were in violation of U.S. jurisdiction, tax laws, international treaties, and the U. S. Constitution.

10.3 Plaintiff was engaged in a joint venture located entirely outside the territorial jurisdiction of tHE UNITED sTATES. The venture was operated by over 1 million non-U.S. peoples from 100 different foreign countries. They didn't allow U.S. citizens, residents, or taxpayers to join. All financial transactions of the venture were conducted in cryptocurrency.

10.4 The IRS is the federal agency responsible for the administration and enforcement of the U.S. tax code. Plaintiffs allege that the IRS, acting in concert with other Government Officials and private attorneys impersonating public officials (18 U.S.C. § 912 Impersonation of a federal officer), unlawfully seized property and assets from foreign individuals and entities outside of its jurisdiction.

10.5 Defendants - Private Attorneys: The private attorneys named as Defendants herein are individuals who allegedly conspired with IRS officials to carry out unlawful actions regarding the seizure of the foreign joint venture's assets.

10.6 Defendants - Clerks of the Court: named as Defendants herein are individuals who allegedly conspired with IRS officials and other members of the enterprise to carry out unlawful actions regarding the seizure of the foreign joint venture's assets. The Clerks transmitted, filed and recorded numerous fraudulent documents and those actions constitute multiple crimes.

10.7 Enterprise Members, acting as trustees for the Trust JSW, are therefore the responsible party for all actions regarding the Trust JSW. Enterprise Members are liable of any and all liability regarding the Trust JSW, i.e. all damages associated with JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (trust name/beneficiary) in commerce must be the responsibility of the Enterprise Members/Trustees by law. They and they alone are to answer to all charges regarding the Trust JSW.

10.8 DEMANDED: Through Information and belief, Beneficiary asserts that Enterprise Members/Trustees are in violation of Title **28 U.S. Code § 1491**, THEREFORE Enterprise Members/Trustees are demanded to set forth proof, sworn to under oath, that each and every real party in interest Enterprise Member/Trustee positively complied with Title **28 U.S. Code § 1491** and every other demand as set forth herein prior to January 10, 2018 and to present. Willful

Disregard or failure to verify required compliance constitutes an action/or inaction under the accepted contract in which you had a duty to properly execute, and that duty was disregarded, refused, or not possible THERETOFORE you are in agreement that you are in violation of Title 28 U.S. Code § 1491. That admission constitutes trespass and injury to Beneficiary JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and Enterprise Members/Trustees contractually agree to a consensual lien in favor of Beneficiary for resulting damages. The Enterprise's so-called Case is based on numerous FATAL DEFECTS, and, therefore, this instant case and all related matters thereto shall be final in favor of JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS. — the Enterprise Members/Trustees have until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof with evidence they have complied with each and every duty required under your Administrative Law System as demanded herein.

XI. Sherman Antitrust Act — 15 U.S.C. § 1–7 — July 2, 1890, ch. 647, 26 Stat. 209

11.1 claim/challenge 61: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to Show cause through production of sworn evidence, as the Trustees, through its agents and officials, including the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey, the U.S. District Court for the States of Florida and Colorado, the SEC, the IRS, the DOJ, the Federal Reserve and the FBI, among others, as to their involvement in the illegal conspiracy that resulted in the unlawful seizure of what would be the equivalent of Billions Of Dollars from a foreign private joint venture that was established outside the jurisdiction of tHE UNITED sTATES. The joint venture, which involved over one million non-taxpayer individuals from over one hundred different foreign countries, operated entirely in cryptocurrency and did not engage in any transactions involving U.S. dollars, nor did they allow any U.S. citizens or residents to join. This unlawful conspiracy is contrary to the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1–7, and other relevant statutes, causing significant financial damages to Plaintiff/Beneficiary and its co-venturers.

11.2 The actions of tHE UNITED sTATES government officials, and private attorneys Public Officials (18 U.S.C. § 912 Impersonation of a federal officer), and court clerks, acting in concert, amounted to a violation of antitrust law, fraudulent legal practices, and unlawful interference in the business operations of non-U.S. entities. These actions were taken with the purpose and effect of seizing assets and creating an unlawful monopoly in violation of the

Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1 et seq., as well as violating constitutional rights under the Administrative Procedures Act (APA), 5 U.S.C. § 701 et seq., and related laws. This Complaint seeks redress for the damages caused by these unlawful actions.

11.3 Plaintiff, along with other non-U.S. CITIZENS, was involved in a joint venture that was formed entirely outside of tHE UNITED sTATES, which conducted its business entirely through the use of cryptocurrency (e.g., Bitcoin, Ethereum, or other digital currencies). None of the individuals involved in the venture had any commercial nexus to the UNITED sTATES.

11.4 Despite having no jurisdiction over the venture or the individuals involved, tHE UNITED sTATES government, including agents of the IRS, prosecutors, and private attorneys, initiated an illegal scheme to seize billions of dollars in assets from the venture. These actions were taken with no legal basis under U.S. law, as there was no tax liability for individuals who were not U.S. persons and did not engage in transactions within U.S. borders.

11.5 Defendants, acting in concert, misused their positions to initiate a series of unlawful actions, including but not limited to:

- a. **Issuance of unlawful indictment and warrants** through fraudulent misrepresentations and without jurisdiction over the individuals or entities involved.
- b. **Improper initiation of court proceedings** within tHE UNITED sTATES, targeting foreign entities and assets with no connection to the U.S.
- c. **Collusion** to create fraudulent legal documents, including false claims of tax liability and unlawful asset seizures and transmit, file, serve, record and submit for criminal purposes.
- d. **Fraudulent misrepresentation** of U.S. jurisdiction over foreign businesses and transactions conducted in cryptocurrency. Federal agents and private attorneys, acting as public officials through entwinement, engaged in fraudulent conduct under the guise of lawful authority.
- e. **Misapplication of U.S. antitrust laws** in order to eliminate competition and seize control of foreign assets.
- f. **Defendants' conduct involved an agreement to restrain trade** by seizing and controlling the assets of the joint venture, which was engaged in legitimate business activities outside U.S. jurisdiction.

g. **Defendants' actions were aimed at stifling competition** in the cryptocurrency and international business sectors, using fraudulent legal actions to eliminate the venture's ability to operate.

h. **Defamation and False Attribution:** Wrongfully blaming Jobadiah Sinclair Weeks for alleged unlawful activities, causing irreparable harm to his reputation and destroying the private foreign venture.

i. **Jurisdictional Overreach:** Violating international laws by targeting foreign individuals and ventures beyond the jurisdiction of U.S. authorities.

j. **Conspiracy to Commit Unlawful Seizure:** Coordinated actions by SEC, FBI, IRS, DOJ, the Federal Reserve, U.S. prosecutors, and courts to seize what would be the equivalent of Billions of Dollars in assets from a private foreign venture.

k. **Violation of International Laws:** Disrupting the operations of a foreign joint venture without jurisdictional authority, contravening established principles of international commerce and sovereignty.

l. **Fifth Amendment** – "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

m. **Others**

11.6 DEMANDED: Through Information and belief, Plaintiff/Beneficiary asserts that Enterprise Members/Trustees are in violation of Title 15 U.S.C. § 1–7, THEREFORE Enterprise Members/Trustees are demanded to set forth proof, sworn to under oath, that each and every real party in interest Enterprise Member/Trustee positively complied with Title 15 U.S.C. § 1–7 and every other demand as set forth herein prior to January 10, 2018 and to present. Willful Disregard or failure to verify required compliance constitutes an action/or inaction under the accepted contract in which you have a duty to properly execute, and that duty was disregarded, refused, or not possible **THEREFORE you are in agreement that you are in violation of Title 15 U.S.C. § 1–7.** That admission constitutes trespass and injury to Beneficiary JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and Enterprise Members/Trustees contractually agree to a **consensual lien** in favor of Beneficiary for resulting damages. The Enterprise's so-called Case is based on numerous FATAL DEFECTS, and, therefore, this instant case and all related matters thereto shall be final in favor of JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS. — the Enterprise Members/Trustees have until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof

with evidence they have complied with each and every duty required under your Administrative Law System as demanded herein.

XII. 9.7 Hobbs Act — 18 U.S. Code § 1951 — Extortion or Attempted Extortion Under Color of Official Right

12.1 claim/challenge 62: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to Show cause through production of sworn evidence, as the Trustees, The Enterprise Members/Trustees conspired upon and then committed the offense of extortion under color of official right in violation of Section 1951 of Title 18 of tHE UNITED sTATES Code. The Plaintiff/Beneficiary, has proven each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

- 1) The Enterprise Members/Trustees was a public official(s); and
- 2) The Enterprise Members/Trustees intended to obtain and did obtained what would be the equivalent of Billions of Dollars of Crypto, Equipment, Assets, Personal Property and Private Property that the defendant(s) knew they were not entitled to receive and had no jurisdiction to claim; and
- 3) The Enterprise Members/Trustees knew that the Crypto, Equipment, Assets, Personal Property, Private Property was unlawfully converted and obtained for the unjust enrichment of the Enterprise Members as a direct result of their pre-meditated scheme, force and machination as well as “subjection to sham litigation”, which were undertaken to obtain property to which the defendant(s) knew they had no lawful claim to; and
- 4) The Enterprise Members/Trustees did something that was a substantial step toward committing the crime. Enterprise Members/Trustees engaged in conspiracy to commit crimes and in fact carried out the commission of said crimes 5 years ago.

12.2 Some members of the Enterprise, Members/Trustees/criminal actors seek anonymity by operating as so-called private defense attorneys when in fact, the roll they played in the conspiracy as well as the criminal theft and unlawful enrichment could only have been achieved, and without prosecution, through being entwined, and impersonating a public official (18 U.S.C. § 912 Impersonation of a federal officer). A Hobbs Act conspiracy may exist even if

some members of the conspiracy are not “officially” public officials and thus cannot complete the offense. *Ocasio v. United States*, 136 S. Ct. 1423, 1429-32 (2016). The object of the conspiracy need not be to get property from a person outside the conspiracy; it is sufficient that the property comes from another member of the conspiracy. *Id.* at 1429, 1434-35.

12.3 “To constitute a substantial step, a defendant’s ‘actions must cross the line between preparation and attempt by unequivocally demonstrating that the crime will take place unless interrupted by independent circumstances’.” *United States v. Goetzke*, 494 F.3d 1231, 1237 (9th Cir. 2007) (per curiam) (quoting *United States v. Nelson*, 66 F.3d 1036, 1042 (9th Cir. 1995)).

12.4 The “strongly corroborated” language in this instruction comes from *United States v. Snell*, 627 F.2d 186, 187 (9th Cir. 1980) (per curiam) (“A conviction for attempt requires proof of culpable intent and conduct constituting a substantial step toward commission of the crime that strongly corroborates that intent.”), and *United States v. Darby*, 857 F.2d 623, 625 (9th Cir. 1988) (same).

12.5 “[A] person may be convicted of an attempt to commit a crime even though that person may not have actually completed the crime.” *United States v. Rivera-Relle*, 333 F.3d 914, 921 (9th Cir. 2003).

12.6 DEMANDED: Through Information and belief Plaintiff/Beneficiary asserts that Enterprise Members/Trustees are in violation of Title **18 U.S. Code § 1951 (9.7)**, THEREFORE Enterprise Members/Trustees are demanded to set forth proof, sworn to under oath, that each and every real party in interest Enterprise Member/Trustee positively complied with Title **18 U.S. Code § 1951 (9.7)** and every other demand as set forth herein prior to January 10, 2018 and to present. Willful Disregard or failure to verify required compliance constitutes an action/or inaction under the accepted contract in which you have a duty to properly execute, and that duty was disregarded, refused, or not possible THEREFORE you are in agreement that you are in violation of Title **18 U.S. Code § 1951 (9.7)**. That admission constitutes trespass and injury to Beneficiary JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and Enterprise Members/Trustees contractually agree to a consensual lien in favor of Beneficiary for resulting damages. The Enterprises so-called Case is based on numerous FATAL DEFECTS, and, therefore, this instant case and all related matters thereto shall be final in favor of JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS. —

the Enterprise Members/Trustees have until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof with evidence they have complied with each and every duty required under your Administrative Law System as demanded herein.

**XIII. 9.6 Hobbs Act — 18 U.S. Code § 1951 — Extortion or Attempted Extortion
by Nonviolent Threat**

13.1 claim/challenge 63: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to Show cause through production of sworn evidence, as the Trustees, The Enterprise Members/Trustees conspired upon and then committed the offense of extortion by threat of unlawfully seizing what would be the equivalent of Billions of Dollars of Crypto, Equipment, Assets, Personal Property and Private Property and following that with Threats of endless sham litigation, which were made to obtain more property to which the Enterprise Members/Trustees knew they had no lawful claim to, in violation of Section 1951 of Title 18 of tHE UNITED sTATES Code. The Plaintiff/Beneficiary, has proven each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

- 1) the Enterprise Members/Trustees induced Jobadiah Sinclair Weeks to part with property by wrongful threat of seizing the entirety of Plaintiffs wealth and Threats of endless sham litigation; and
- 2) the Enterprise Members/Trustees acted with the intent to obtain property; and
- 3) commerce from one state to another was affected in some way; and
- 4) the Enterprise Members/Trustees did something that was a substantial step toward committing the crime. Enterprise Members/Trustees engaged in conspiracy to commit crimes and in fact carried out the commission of said crimes over the last 5 years.

13.2 A “substantial step” is conduct that strongly corroborates a defendant’s intent to commit the crime. To constitute a substantial step, a defendant’s act or actions must unequivocally demonstrate that the crime will take place unless interrupted by independent circumstances. Mere preparation is not a substantial step toward committing the crime.

13.3 “[T]hreats of sham litigation, which are made to obtain property to which the defendant knows he has no lawful claim, are ‘wrongful’ under the Hobbs Act.” *United States v. Koziol*, 993 F.3d 1160, 1170 (9th Cir. 2021).

13.4 If a nonviolent threat is to be carried out by *unlawful* means, then the Hobbs Act’s “wrongful” requirement is satisfied, regardless of whether the defendant had a lawful claim of right to the property demanded. *Villalobos*, 748 F.3d at 957-58.

13.5 A general instruction that the defendant need not have known that his or her conduct was unlawful does not negate the instruction in lawful-threat cases that a threat is wrongful if the defendant knew he or she was not entitled to obtain the property. Knowledge that one has no entitlement to property is distinguishable from knowledge that an act violates the Hobbs Act. *Greer*, 640 F.3d at 1019-20.

13.6 “To constitute a substantial step, a defendant’s ‘actions must cross the line between preparation and attempt by unequivocally demonstrating that the crime will take place unless interrupted by independent circumstances.’” *United States v. Goetzke*, 494 F.3d 1231, 1237 (9th Cir. 2007) (per curiam) (quoting *United States v. Nelson*, 66 F.3d 1036, 1042 (9th Cir. 1995)).

13.7 The “strongly corroborated” language in this instruction comes from *United States v. Snell*, 627 F.2d 186, 187 (9th Cir. 1980) (per curiam) (“A conviction for attempt requires proof of culpable intent and conduct constituting a substantial step toward commission of the crime that strongly corroborates that intent.”), and *United States v. Darby*, 857 F.2d 623, 625 (9th Cir. 1988) (same).

13.8 “[A] person may be convicted of an attempt to commit a crime even though that person may have actually completed the crime.” *United States v. Rivera-Relle*, 333 F.3d 914, 921 (9th Cir. 2003).

13.9 DEMANDED: Through Information and belief Plaintiff/Beneficiary asserts that Enterprise Members/Trustees are in violation of Title **18 U.S. Code § 1951 (9.6)**. THERETOFORE Enterprise Members/Trustees are demanded to set forth proof, sworn to under oath, that each and every real party in interest Enterprise Member/Trustee positively complied with Title **18 U.S. Code § 1951 (9.6)**, and every other demand as set forth herein prior to January 10, 2018 and to present. Willful Disregard or failure to verify required compliance

constitutes an action/or inaction under the accepted contract in which you have a duty to properly execute, and that duty was disregarded, refused, or not possible THERETOFORE you are in agreement that you are in violation of Title **18 U.S. Code § 1951 (9.6)**. That admission constitutes trespass and injury to Beneficiary JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and Enterprise Members/Trustees contractually agree to a consensual lien in favor of Beneficiary for resulting damages. The Enterprises so-called Case is based on numerous FATAL DEFECTS, and, therefore, this instant case and all related matters thereto shall be final in favor of JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS. — the Enterprise Members/Trustees have until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof with evidence they have complied with each and every duty required under your Administrative Law System as demanded herein.

XIV. Statutes Imposed Were Never Valid Laws:

14.1 claim/challenge 64: In 1933 the federal government convinced congress to switch from the “Statutes at Large” (these laws were woven out of the constitution) to the Statutes and revised codes (these are corporate rules, called “public policy). Codes and local rules are not real laws. To be a real law there must be an:

1. “Enacting clause” which tells everyone from which authority the law came from, and who is subject to following it.
2. There must be a “Title”
3. There must be a “body”

14.2 The State Constitution states all laws will be enacted, however title 18 has no enacting clause and no title, and therefore is a violation of the right to due process, given the fact the claimant is not a U.S. citizen subject to the state corporate policies. In case of a conflict between the text of the Statutes at Large and the text of a provision of the United States Code that has not been enacted as positive law, the text of the Statutes at Large takes precedence.

X. Statutes Are Void of Authority:

14.3 claim/challenge 65: Title 15, Title 26 are not positive law per 1 U.S.C. § 204 legislative notes.

14.4 Out of the 250,000 pages of the statutes at large, Titles 1-54, only 26 have been enacted into positive (statutory) law, which claimant as an American national has no duty to. These titles are 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 23, 28, 31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 44, 46, 49, 51 and 16.13 When a title of the Code is enacted into positive law, the text of the title becomes legal evidence of the law. Titles that have NOT been enacted into positive law are only prima facie evidence of the law.” <https://www.govinfo.gov/app/collection/uscode>

14.5 Those missing 28 Statutes/Titles including Title 15 and 26 have no “implementing regulations” for “enforcement provisions.” Without such enforcement regulations the provisions cited in non- positive law statutes can and do apply only to government/respondent’s statutory officers/ employees to include:

- 1) A military or foreign affairs function of the United States. 5 U.S.C. 553 (a) (1)
- 2) A matter relating to agency management or personnel or to public property, loans, grants, benefits, or contracts. 5 U.S.C. 553 (a) (2)
- 3) Federal agencies or persons in the capacity as officers, agents or employees thereof. In 44 U.S.C. 1505 (a) (1)

14.6 Additionally, when the law was ostensibly re-codifying title 18, Public Law 80-772, HR 3190 (June 25th 1948) came into being, its passage involved three distinct procedural errors.

14.7 FIRST was that it violated the bicameral requirement of the U.S. Constitution. (The Presentment Clause, Art. I, § 7, cl. 2) See, Clinton vs. City of New York, 524 U.S. 417 (1998) The bills from the house and senate need to be identical. The House version of the bill, rejected by the Senate, was mistakenly certified as "truly enrolled," instead of the amended version, rendering a;

14.8 SECOND procedural error - because with the rejected version being certified as "truly enrolled," it left the seal on a document which was abandoned and with it, any protections afforded by the "Enrolled Bill Rule," not to mention the uncertified amended version presented as genuine legislation.

14.9 THIRD when the House sought to pass the Senate's amended version, it did NOT have a quorum. To remedy the shortfall so as to not violate the quorum clause, it passed H.R.

219, which supposedly permitted them to conduct business, such as the passage of a Senate's amended version of a prior legislated bill, without the constitutionally required quorum. However, H.R. 219 was NOT passed by both Houses of Congress and signed by the President, as required, since it proposed substantive changes in constitutionally mandated procedure, thus H.R. 219 was in and of itself unconstitutional, as was the subsequent attempted passing of the invalid, amended Senate version, shepherded by an unconstitutional House resolution.

14.10 THEREFORE these statutes that the “res” is being charged with do not exist as valid statutes to begin with! The district court has no subject matter jurisdiction over the alleged acts covered thereby. The only statute which gives the court jurisdiction to indict and convict on any crime is TITLE 18, listed in the March 4, 1909 Act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of tHE UNITED sTATES. see: SIXTIETH CONGRESS. Sess. II. CHs. 320, 321. – 1909. This makes 18 USC section 3231 invalid, see *Bond v. United States*; No. 09-1227 (2011). The federal Title 18 criminal code was codified in 1909, again in 1940, and again in 1948. In 1909 and 1940 the jurisdictional section for federal courts only authorized prosecution under TITLE 18 crimes, not SEC or IRS crimes. Those “crimes” didn’t exist in 1909! To say it another way, the defective indictment doesn’t charge a valid federal crime!!! Therefore, the indictment is void and without legal affect. Thus, Public Law 80-772 must be declared unconstitutional, and remedied. In its wake, the false indictment/conviction is void and must be vacated per Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 60 (b) (4) (indictment is void).

14.11 FURTHERMORE the Enterprise Members, conspiring and working in concert one with the other, placed upon an official record false and groundless allegations contrary to the provisions of N.J.S.A. 2C:28-3 for the purpose of securing a fraudulently obtained indictment based on statutes that they knew were invalid. Then proceeded to bait-and-switch the charges for the willful and wanton intent of increasing financial levies in order to extract even more from the claimant/victim .

14.12 IN FURTHERANCE OF the scheme, Enterprise Members beset the claimant/victim with a fictitious criminal action. The Congress grants the Court 2 different Criminal Jurisdictions. One is a criminal jurisdiction under common law which the Enterprise Members have NO jurisdiction in and therefore could not operate in, and the other is a criminal action that constitutes a condition of contract under the criminal aspects of a colorable Admiralty

Jurisdiction, AND which DOES NOT APPLY TO JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS because of the fact he is NOT a U.S. Citizen. The Enterprise Members unlawfully arrested claimant, inflicted damage upon him in excess of \$50 BILLION Dollars, kept him in bondage for 5 years, destroyed his marriage and destroyed his reputation by conducting a persecution/prosecution under a STATUTORY CRIMINAL ACTION! There is NO SUCH THING as “Statutory Criminal Jurisdiction” that has ever been granted by Congress. Enterprise Members are DEMANDED to produce ANY contract with JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and YOUR signature on it dated prior to December 10, 2019.

XV. Misconduct Resulting from Joint Activity and Pervasive Entwinement

18 U.S.C. § 912; N.J.S.A. 2C:28-8 — and others

15.1 claim/challenge 66: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to Show cause through production of sworn evidence, as the Enterprise Members/Trustees, through its agents and officials, including the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey, the U.S. District Court for the States of Florida and Colorado, the SEC, the IRS, the DOJ, the Federal Reserve and the FBI, among others; The Plaintiff/Beneficiary seeks damages from the Enterprise Members/Trustees for a series of unlawful actions and crimes committed in coordination with public officials, through joint activity and pervasive entwinement.

15.2 These actions, constituting criminal behavior, were undertaken with such close association and coordination with public officials that Simon A. Gaugush, Andrew M. Hinkes, Michael L. Yaeger, David Rodman, Mac Mcpherson, Josh Lockwood (who violated his attorney client privilege and became an IRS informant) must be considered *de facto* public officials. The Enterprise Members/Trustees acts, including but not limited to conspiracy, unlawful conversion, conspiracy against right, unjust enrichment, deprivation of due process, constructive fraud, prosecuting under invalid statutes, fraud, kidnapping, and human trafficking, breach of contract, breach of fiduciary duty, ineffective counseling and others.. were only possible due to their close and ongoing relationship with public officials. This collusion transformed the Enterprise Members/Trustees into a *de facto* public official (18 U.S.C. § 912; N.J.S.A. 2C:28-8), the Enterprise Members/Trustees criminal acts were neither isolated nor independent but were instead an outgrowth of their status as an individual who engaged in pervasive entwinement and

joint activity with government and officials. These acts were carried out through a pattern of corruption and abuse of power, leading to direct harm to the Enterprise Members/Trustees that could only be executed through governmental authority and processes, thereby making them subject to the same legal and ethical obligations as actual public officials.

15.3 "Pervasive entwinement" is a legal and economic concept that arises in the context of antitrust law and corporate law. It refers to a situation where two or more entities, although operating separately, have become so intertwined through their corporate structures, financial arrangements, or management processes that their actions are considered to be interdependent to the point where they are no longer truly independent. In this context, pervasive entwinement may lead to the conclusion that the entities are effectively acting as a single entity or have a mutual control that affects the competitive dynamics of the marketplace.

15.4 This concept is often applied in cases where entities are claiming they are competitors or separate in legal terms, but in reality, their relationships and operations are so intertwined that they might be considered a single entity for purposes of antitrust law. (B.A.R. card holders). ADAM P. SCHWARTZ, ANDREW M. HINKES, DAVID RODMAN, DONALD (Mac) MCPHERSON, JOSH LOCKWOOD, MICHAEL L. YAEGER, SIMON A. GAUGUSH represent they are standing as the opposing force (defense) to the so-called public officials (offensive force), however, once the curtain is pulled back we can see the identical DNA:

- a. both sides went to the same 12 years of public school that is operated by, the curriculum is chosen by, are directed by, are managed by, are regulated by and funded by the same Federal Consortium Corporation and State Consortium Corporation working in collaboration; and
- b. both sides went to the same standard collage courses that are operated by, the curriculum is chosen by, are directed by, are managed by, are regulated by and funded by the same Federal Consortium Corporation and State Consortium Corporation working in collaboration; and
- c. both sides went to the same standard law courses that are operated by, the curriculum is chosen by, are directed by, are managed by, are regulated by and funded by the same Federal Consortium Corporation and State Consortium Corporation working in collaboration; and

- d. both sides get their same so-called law license to practice the exact same law in the exact same UNITED sTATES courts from the exact same Federal Consortium Corporation and State Consortium Corporations working in collaboration; and
- e. both sides get their same so-called business license to practice the exact same law in the exact same UNITED sTATES courts from the same Federal Consortium Corporation and State Consortium Corporation working in collaboration; and
- f. both sides join the exact same BAR Association membership (Union) in order to practice the exact same law in the exact same UNITED sTATES courts from the same Federal Consortium Corporation and State Consortium Corporation working in collaboration; and
- g. both sides are regulated and governed by the exact same UNITED sTATES Federal Consortium Corporations and sTATE Consortium Corporations working in collaboration; and
- h. both sides are equally financially dependent upon the exact same UNITED sTATES Federal Consortium Corporations and State Consortium Corporations working in collaboration for their income and status; and
- i. both sides return back to the exact same UNITED sTATES Federal Consortium Corporations and sTATE Consortium Corporations, in excess of fifty percent of everything they generate, from the exact same UNITED sTATES Federal Consortium Corporations and sTATE Consortium Corporations tax regime.

15.5 Another test that can determine what the “true intent” of the “wolves in sheep’s clothing” Consortium Agents (so-called defense counsel) actually represent is to review the [il]legal actions regarding the law as applied in this instant case.

15.6 At no point in the 5 plus years since Plaintiff/Beneficiary was kidnapped by armed assailants and this case has been maliciously foisted upon Plaintiff/Beneficiary, and he has been unlawfully held in bondage, has a single so-called “defense counsel”, set forth a single challenge, or a single counter-claim even though **neither** the Plaintiff/Beneficiary or the Private Foreign Venture were;

- a) domiciled in the U.S.; nor

- b) the Plaintiff/Beneficiary or the Private Foreign Venture had a residency in the U.S.;
nor
- c) the Plaintiff/Beneficiary or the Private Foreign Venture were even tenanted in the U.S.; nor
- d) the Plaintiff/Beneficiary or the Private Foreign Venture were U.S. citizens; nor
- e) the Plaintiff/Beneficiary or the Private Foreign Venture were U.S. taxpayers; nor
- f) the Plaintiff/Beneficiary or the Private Foreign Venture were operating with U.S. currency; nor
- g) that the U.S. or ANY Agency therein had authority to regulate crypto, even within the boundaries of tHE UNITED sTATES - let alone a foreign country; nor
- h) that by attempting to regulate that which they don't have authority, by acting as though they were self-endowed with their own "Worldwide Jurisdiction" and authority, they were in violation of the Separation of Powers Doctrine, among many other crimes, and waged a Fraudulent, Spurious, Willful, Malicious Persecution/Prosecution; and
- i) even though the so-called laws that the enterprise was charging the Plaintiff/Beneficiary under **were NEVER actual valid laws**; and
- j) even though there was never a single true party in interest that had claimed that the Plaintiff/Beneficiary had harmed them or their property in any way; and
- k) even though there was **no contract** between Plaintiff/Beneficiary and tHE UNITED sTATES; and
- l) even though there was **no contract** between Plaintiff/Beneficiary and the sTATE of NEW JERSEY; and
- m) even though there was **no contract** between Plaintiff/Beneficiary and the sTATE of COLORADO; and
- n) even though there was **no contract** between Plaintiff/Beneficiary and the sTATE of FLORIDA; and
- o) even though there was **no contract** between Plaintiff/Beneficiary and the IRS; and
- p) even though there was **no contract** between Plaintiff/Beneficiary and the SEC; and
- q) even though there was **never any jurisdiction** by a single Enterprise Member; and
- r) even though there was never a valid Warrant; and

- s) even though their was never a valid indictment; and
- t) even though their was never even an attempt at due process; and
- u) even though their was never a speedy trial; and
- v) even though their was never a proper extradition; and
- w) even though their was never a verdict; and
- x) even though their was never a “sentence”; and...

this list could continue on for 2 more pages... so where exactly is the defense? Where is the representation? NOT ONE CHALLENGE! NOT ONE ARGUMENT!

15.7 All Enterprise Members/Trustees were following the exact same narrative with the exact same agenda for the exact same goal — neutralize JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and plunder as much of his wealth into their pockets as they could get their hands on through a malicious persecution, using fabricated so-called laws, fabricated so-called jurisdiction and fabricated so-called authority and ADAM P. SCHWARTZ, ANDREW M. HINKES, DAVID RODMAN, DONALD (Mac) MCPHERSON, JOSH LOCKWOOD, MICHAEL L. YAEGER, SIMON A. GAUGUSH could only accomplish the magnitude of their theft by going along, working in concert with, keeping quiet and generally “being in the proverbial bed” with the so-called “public officials” who they themselves were in fact “ impersonating public officials and/or law enforcement agents” for the exact same common interests.

15.8 Given the Enterprise Members/Trustees pervasive entwinement with public officials and their active participation in criminal activity that directly impacted public processes and policies, the Defendants should be considered *de facto* public officials under the legal doctrine of *Pervasive Entwinement*. As detailed in relevant case law (e.g., *Blum v. Yaretsky*, *Nixon v. United States*). Under legal doctrines related to joint activity and pervasive entwinement, an individual who works so closely with public officials, using governmental authority and resources for private gain, functions as a public officials and is subject to the same accountability and standards of conduct as actual government employees.

15.9 The Enterprise Members/Trustees criminal acts, including conspiracy, fraud, unlawful conversion, kidnapping, and human trafficking, and others cannot be treated as isolated acts of a private citizen. These crimes were committed by imbedded individuals who effectively operated within the structure of government, impersonating public officials, and their misconduct

mirrors that of every other so-called public official of the Enterprise, operating without jurisdiction or authority and therefore also impersonating public officials. All members of the enterprise were willfully, jointly engaged in carrying out unlawful policies and procedures of the Agencies, and as such, ALL Enterprise Members/Trustees/Co-conspirators must be held to the highest standards of accountability and justice.

15.10 Joint Activity: The Enterprise Members/Trustees engaged in coordinated and concerted actions with public officials, where both parties shared a common criminal purpose. This refers to situations where the Enterprise Members/Trustees and public officials engaged in coordinated actions, sharing a common goal and taking part in concerted activities that were indistinguishable from those conducted by actual government employees. The Enterprise Members/Trustees participation in illegal activities, such as conspiracy and fraud, the manipulation of government processes, or the misuse of public office for personal gain which could not have been carried out without active involvement from government agents. In some cases, the Defendant was acting under the direction or encouragement of public officials, who provided cover for the Enterprise Members/Trustees unlawful actions.

15.11 Pervasive Entwinement: This occurs when the Enterprise Members/Trustees relationship with public officials is so extensive, the crimes and processes could only be accomplished by exercise of governmental authority, integral, continuous and extensive. In cases of pervasive entwinement, the Enterprise Members/Trustees actions are inextricably linked to the public officials they work with, and their behavior mirrors or reflects public authority, making them akin to a public official in legal and functional terms.

15.12 Because of the Enterprise Members/Trustees pervasive entwinement with the public sector, their actions must be considered as those of a public official subject to the same legal standards. Their unlawful acts, including human trafficking and deprivation of due process, were undertaken with such entwinement that they should be held to the same accountability as government officials.

15.13 Enterprise Members/Trustees unlawful acts were only possible due to all parties acting in concert one with another, doing their part, playing their roll through pervasive entwinement since **no member of the enterprise was lawful in their actions** ALL were

“impersonating public officials” (18 U.S.C. § 912 Impersonation of a federal officer) and participating in joint activity. Some facts of the case are as follows:

15.14 Pervasive Entwinement / De Facto Public Official: The legal doctrine of "pervasive entwinement" suggests that when a private individual or entity is so closely intertwined with government functions or public officials, private individuals acting in close coordination with government officials, and using government authority to further personal or criminal activities, should be treated as "de facto" public officials and held to the same standards of accountability (18 U.S.C. § 912 Impersonation of a federal officer). The Defendant's pervasive entwinement with public officials may render them subject to the same legal and ethical obligations as actual public officials (*Blum v. Yaretsky*; *Nixon v. United States*).

15.15 DEMANDED: Through Information and belief Plaintiff/Beneficiary asserts that Enterprise Members/Trustees are in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 912; and N.J.S.A. 2C:28-8. THERETOFORE Enterprise Members/Trustees are demanded to set forth proof, sworn to under oath, that each and every real party in interest Enterprise Member/Trustee positively complied with 18 U.S.C. § 912; and N.J.S.A. 2C:28-8, and every other demand as set forth herein prior to January 10, 2018 and to present. Willful Disregard or failure to verify required compliance constitutes an action/or inaction under the accepted contract in which you have a duty to properly execute, and that duty was disregarded, refused, or not possible THERETOFORE you are in agreement that you are in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 912; and N.J.S.A. 2C:28-8 and others. That admission constitutes trespass and injury to Beneficiary JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and Enterprise Members/Trustees contractually agree to a consensual lien in favor of Beneficiary for resulting damages. The Enterprises so-called Case is based on numerous FATAL DEFECTS, and, therefore, this instant case and all related matters thereto shall be final in favor of JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS. — the Enterprise Members/Trustees have until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof with evidence they have complied with each and every duty required under your Administrative Law System as demanded herein.

XVI. Deprivation Of Rights — 42 U.S. Code § 1983 and N.J.S.A. 2C:30-6

Enterprise Engaged in Unconscionable Acts with no restraint

16.1 claim/challenge 67: Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs one through 276 as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to Show cause through production of sworn evidence, as the Enterprise Members/Trustees; Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of THE UNITED STATES or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or another proper proceeding for redress.

16.2 The Enterprise Members/Trustees and public officials conspired to deprive the Claimant and others of their constitutionally protected rights. This included a systematic effort to deny access to justice, hinder lawful claims, and interfere, manipulate and usurp the legal processes, Impose criminal punishment without trial or conviction, deny multiple constitutional rights and protections for half a decade against an innocent man in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

16.3 Conspiracy Against Rights (18 U.S.C. § 241 - Conspiracy to Interfere with Civil Rights): This claim refers to the Defendant and public officials conspiring to deprive the Claimant and others of their constitutional rights, including access to justice. Under 18 U.S.C. § 241, it is a crime for two or more individuals to conspire to infringe upon civil rights. This could include interference with due process, access to courts, and other civil rights.

16.4 Conspiracy (18 U.S.C. § 371 / Conspiracy under common law): The Enterprise Members/Trustees/Co-conspirators/so-called Defense Counsels, in collaboration with public officials, engaged in a conspiracy to unlawfully enrich themselves and others, to undermine public processes, and to deprive the Claimant of their lawful rights. This conspiracy could only be undertaken by the involved the use of government resources, influence, and authority to facilitate criminal acts.

16.5 Unlawful Conversion: The Enterprise Members/Trustees/Co-conspirators/so-called Defense Counsels, unlawfully converted Millions worth of JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS private property of for personal gain, using their close association with government officials to access and divert resources to which they were not entitled. This included the conversion of funds, rights, property and other assets **under the color of law** into there private holdings.

16.6 Unjust Enrichment: Through their illegal collaboration, the Defendants unlawfully enriched themselves at the expense of the Enterprise Members/Trustees, diverting funds and resources through fraudulent schemes and unlawful activities. This unjust enrichment was made possible by the Enterprise Members/Trustees access to government power, funds, and assets through their entwinement with public officials.

16.7 Deprivation of Due Process (14th Amendment / 42 U.S.C. § 1983): The Enterprise Members/Trustees, in concert with government officials, engaged in actions that deprived the Claimant of their fundamental right to due process. This included manipulation of legal procedures, wrongful detention, wrongful prosecution, and interference with the Claimant's ability to seek redress through lawful channels.

16.8 Theft: Plaintiff, JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS, brings this action against the Defendants, who, through a series of criminal acts including fraudulent prosecution, unlawful imprisonment, and malicious defamation, perpetrated a monumental theft that cannot be remedied by simple monetary damages. Defendants, members of a criminal enterprise, corrupt public officials, engaged in a coordinated and unlawful scheme to steal not only the Plaintiff's lifetime accumulation of wealth but also five irreplaceable years of his life. The magnitude of this theft, which includes the unlawful conversion of billions of dollars of the Plaintiff's wealth, and the deprivation of more than five years of his freedom and time, represents one of the most significant and irremediable losses a human being can suffer.

16.9 The Defendants executed a deliberate scheme of fraud and exploitation against Plaintiff, Jobadiah Sinclair Weeks, which resulted in the unlawful seizure of the equivalent of billions in wealth—accumulated over his lifetime through lawful means—and the theft of over five years of his life. Plaintiff was falsely accused of criminal conduct by the Defendants, who fabricated criminal charges and manipulated legal processes to imprison him. This unlawful detention was not only based on false accusations but was also a part of an overarching scheme to strip Plaintiff of his substantial wealth. The Defendants, acting in concert, orchestrated Plaintiff's kidnapping, unlawful imprisonment, and subsequent transportation across state lines in a manner that **constituted both human trafficking and cruel and unusual punishment.**

16.10 The unlawful imprisonment, which lasted for over five years, was accompanied by the tortuous and malicious use of "diesel therapy," where Plaintiff was moved from one jail to another over and over again for months, most often in wrist and ankle shackles and subjected to strip searching, extreme physical conditions with no water, food, restrooms for up to 20 hours straight. During this time, the Plaintiff's ability to maintain any normal existence was destroyed, his business operations were decimated, and his personal assets were unlawfully converted by the Defendants. The billions of dollars worth of damages Claimant has suffered represents the cumulative value of his life's work, savings, investments, rights, relationships, reputation and accumulated assets, all of which were unlawfully seized and transferred to the Defendants for their personal gain. This loss is irreplaceable—no amount of money could return the five years stolen from his life, nor could it restore the wealth and reputation that was unlawfully converted and destroyed.

16.11 Theft of Time – Unlawful Imprisonment and Deprivation of Liberty: The central and irreplaceable loss suffered by Plaintiff is the unlawful theft of five years of his life. Time, once lost, cannot be recovered, and the Defendants' actions in unlawfully detaining Plaintiff for this period constitute a theft of his personal freedom and a significant portion of his life. The unlawful seizure and detention of Plaintiff, without due process or a legal basis for his continued imprisonment, caused irreversible harm. This harm goes beyond financial loss; it encompasses the destruction of Plaintiff's ability to engage in any normal personal or professional activities for over five years. In accordance with *County of Sacramento v. Lewis*, 523 U.S. 833 (1998), and other precedents, the deprivation of liberty that Plaintiff endured amounts to a fundamental violation of his constitutional rights under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments, and the damages caused by such an unlawful act cannot be quantified solely in monetary terms.

16.12 The Theft of Property – The Unlawful Conversion of Billions: Equally irreparable is the theft of Plaintiff's wealth, amounting to billions. This wealth was accumulated through years of hard work, business acumen, and lawful means. The unlawful conversion of this property by the Defendants constitutes theft on a monumental scale, far exceeding ordinary financial losses. The magnitude of this theft was not only a violation of Plaintiff's property rights

but also a strategic action to further the Defendants' financial interests at the expense of the Plaintiff's entire life's work. The unlawful conversion of billions of dollars represents not just a financial loss but the complete dismantling of Plaintiff's accumulated legacy and livelihood, leaving him with no recourse to regain what was taken.

16.13 Under the legal principle of unjust enrichment, Defendants are liable for the amount of wealth they unlawfully took, including any direct or indirect gains from that wealth. The Defendants, having stolen Plaintiff's assets under fraudulent pretenses, are not entitled to retain any portion of this ill-gotten wealth. Plaintiff seeks full restitution for the billions that was wrongfully seized, as well as damages to reflect the extraordinary and irreparable loss of his lifetime's savings and accumulated property.

16.14 The Irreparability of Loss: While financial restitution may provide some compensation for the theft of property, it cannot replace the years of Plaintiff's life that were stolen. The unlawful detention of Plaintiff for over five years has caused him emotional distress, loss of reputation, disruption of his personal and professional life, and the irreversible loss of time—time that could have been spent with family, pursuing his career, and enjoying the fruits of his labor. The deprivation of Plaintiff's time is a unique form of harm that cannot be quantified through monetary damages alone. This harm goes beyond mere inconvenience; it is a theft of the most precious resource an individual has—time.

16.15 The primary legal issues presented in this case are:

- 1. The Theft of Time:** The unlawful imprisonment and detention of Plaintiff for over five years, without due process and based on fraudulent charges, constitutes a theft of personal liberty that caused incalculable harm.
- 2. The Theft of Wealth:** The unlawful conversion of Plaintiff's billions is a clear case of fraud, unjust enrichment, and theft. The Defendants' fraudulent activities, including falsification of charges, defamation, and manipulation of legal processes, resulted in the illegal seizure of Plaintiff's lifetime wealth.

- 3. Constitutional Violations:** The Defendants' actions violated Plaintiff's Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment rights, including his rights to be free from unlawful seizure and to enjoy due process under the law.

16.16 The actions of the Defendants have caused irremediable harm to Plaintiff, Jobadiah Sinclair Weeks. The theft of five years of his life, during which time he was unlawfully imprisoned, tortured, and deprived of his freedom, is an unparalleled injury that no amount of monetary compensation can fully rectify. Additionally, the unlawful conversion of billions—the culmination of Plaintiff's life's work—has left Plaintiff with a loss of property so significant that it is impossible to restore. Plaintiff seeks full restitution for his stolen wealth and damages for the profound, irreparable loss of his personal time and liberty. Defendants must be held accountable not only for the wealth they took but also for the years of Plaintiff's life that they destroyed.

Color of Law - the term "color of law", refers to acts done without authority, by a person who is acting as if they obtained authority given to them by a governmental agency, whether or not that agency is local, state, or federal (United States v. Classic, 313 U.S. 299 (1941)).

Violation of Fourth Amendment, 1) the Fourth Amendment of the UNITED STATES Constitution prohibits unreasonable seizures, 2) absent probable cause, (void beyond 72 hours), any seizure of a person is per se unreasonable under the Fourth Amendment (Tennessee v. Garner, 471 U.S. 1 (1985)).

Violation of Due Process, 1) the Fourteenth Amendment of the UNITED STATES Constitution guarantees due process of law, 2) Arrest and detention beyond the "72 hour probable cause window" is outside of this Court's **[and agency's]** jurisdiction and violates fundamental rights (County of Sacramento v. Lewis, 523 U.S. 833 (1998)).

"Where a court [and agency's] failed to observe safeguards, it amounts to denial of due process of law, court is deprived of juris." *Merritt v. Hunter*, C.A. Kansas 170 F2d 739.

"A universal principle as old as the law is that a proceedings of a court **[or agency]** without jurisdiction are a nullity and its judgment therein without effect either on person or property." *Norwood v. Renfield*, 34 C 329; *Ex parte Giambonini*, 49 P. 732.

“A departure by a court [or agency] from those recognized and established requirements of law, however close apparent adherence to mere form in method of procedure, which has the effect of depriving one of a constitutional right, is an excess of jurisdiction.” *Wuest v. Wuest*, 127 P2d 934, 937.

“**Jurisdiction is fundamental** and a judgment rendered by a court that does not have jurisdiction to hear is void *ab initio*.” In Re Application of Wyatt, 300 P. 132; Re Cavitt, 118 P2d 846.

XVII. Defamation — U.S.C. 4101

Enterprise Members Acted with Actual Malice

17.1 claim/challenge 68: Clamant seeks remedy by addressing the issue of defamation against an innocent victim, JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (the “Plaintiff”), whose reputation has been severely damaged by a coordinated, criminal campaign orchestrated by members of a criminal enterprise (the "Enterprise Members"). These individuals, including public officials and other state actors, engaged in a malicious and systematic effort to falsely accuse, slander, and discredit the Plaintiff through false statements and fabricated accusations, in direct violation of his rights. This defamatory campaign also involved acts of fraud, unlawful prosecution, and other criminal conduct that have caused lasting harm to the Plaintiff’s reputation and mental health.

17.2 Legal Framework for Defamation: To establish a successful defamation claim, five essential elements must be proven:

- 1. False Statement:** A defamatory statement must be objectively false.
- 2. Publication:** The statement must be communicated to at least one third party.
- 3. Fault:** The defendant must have acted negligently or with actual malice.
- 4. Identifiability:** The statement must reasonably identify the plaintiff.
- 5. Damage:** The plaintiff must demonstrate that the statement caused reputational harm, financial loss, or emotional distress.

These elements are pivotal to understanding the defamation claim in this context, especially when considering the role of "actual malice" in the context of public officials or individuals engaged in wrongful conduct.

17.3 The False Statements and Malicious Intent: The Enterprise Members intentionally spread false statements about the Plaintiff, falsely accusing him of criminal activity, which were widely published across various platforms, including government and law enforcement channels. The false statements, particularly those related to fabricated criminal accusations, are clearly actionable as they were presented as truths despite being entirely baseless. The falsehoods propagated by the Enterprise Members targeted the Plaintiff's character, integrity, and legal standing.

17.4 Moreover, these statements were designed to not only damage the Plaintiff's reputation but to discredit him entirely, thereby preventing him from receiving justice in an already hostile legal environment. Such statements, which include baseless criminal accusations, are inherently damaging, and have caused substantial harm to the Plaintiff's personal and professional life.

17.5 The Defendants' Knowledge and Actual Malice: The critical element in this case is the evidence of "actual malice," as the defendants, including high-ranking public officials and other Enterprise Members, knew or should have known that the accusations against the Plaintiff were false. These individuals acted with reckless disregard for the truth by fabricating evidence, misusing their positions of authority, and engaging in a calculated campaign to harm the Plaintiff.

17.6 Actual malice, in this context, refers to the intentional and reckless disregard for the truth. The Enterprise Members knowingly and deliberately engaged in a malicious campaign aimed at tarnishing the Plaintiff's reputation. These actions were carried out with the specific intent to discredit and punish an innocent man, particularly in the service of a broader criminal enterprise that sought to manipulate the justice system for their own gain.

17.7 Publication and Identifiability of the Statements: The false statements made about the Plaintiff were published to a broad audience, including various legal and governmental entities, such as the U.S. District Courts, the FBI, and other federal agencies. These institutions, as well as public officials, disseminated these defamatory statements, often in a manner that suggested criminal conduct on the part of the Plaintiff, even though no such criminal acts had occurred.

Additionally, the defamatory statements were directly attributable to the Plaintiff, as they were aimed at his specific identity. These accusations were made in such a way that anyone familiar with the legal proceedings would understand they were referring to Mr. Jobadiah Sinclair Weeks.

17.8 Intentional Infliction of Damages: As a result of the defamatory statements, the Plaintiff has suffered significant harm to his reputation, emotional well-being, and financial stability. The damage to his reputation is substantial and ongoing, particularly as these statements were widely circulated within influential legal, governmental, and social circles. The intentional nature of the Enterprise Members' actions further compounds the severity of the damage, as they were specifically designed to cause harm.

17.9 Furthermore, the emotional distress inflicted upon the Plaintiff cannot be understated. The unlawful and fraudulent prosecution, in combination with the defamatory campaign, has caused severe mental anguish, prolonged isolation, and an enduring stigma of criminality. These actions, particularly given the years of abuse and mistreatment the Plaintiff endured, amount to a violation of his fundamental rights and constitute an ongoing harm.

17.10 The Broader Context: Fraud, Unlawful Prosecution, and Abuse: In addition to the defamation claim, the broader context of fraudulent activities, including the unlawful prosecution and armed abduction of the Plaintiff, must be considered. The Enterprise Members engaged in an orchestrated scheme of fraud, falsification of documents, and manipulation of legal processes to wrongfully imprison and torture the Plaintiff. These actions were not only illegal but aimed at forcing a false confession, further illustrating the depth of the defendants' malice.

17.11 The criminal enterprise behind this campaign also used illegal statutes and unconstitutional legal processes to persecute the Plaintiff, often in violation of his rights under both U.S. law and international human rights standards. The systematic abuse and manipulation of the legal system to fabricate charges, create false narratives, and unjustly harm the Plaintiff is part of a broader pattern of criminal activity designed to protect the interests of the Enterprise Members while harming the Plaintiff and others in similar situations.

17.12 The defamation claim against the Enterprise Members is substantiated by the false statements made, the malicious intent behind these actions, the widespread publication of these defamatory statements, and the significant harm caused to the Plaintiff's reputation and emotional well-being. The Enterprise Members acted with actual malice, knowing that the statements were false, and they did so with the intention of harming the Plaintiff for their own gain. The Plaintiff has suffered not only from defamation but also from an unlawful and fraudulent prosecution, which further underscores the maliciousness of the defendants' actions.

17.13 Given the serious nature of the harm caused, the Plaintiff is entitled to both compensatory and punitive damages for the defamation and other related claims. The defamatory campaign is not merely an isolated act of slander but part of a broader, malicious effort to oppress and dehumanize an innocent individual. Therefore, the Plaintiff seeks justice in the form of appropriate legal remedies to address these violations and to restore his reputation and dignity.

17.14 Prosecuting Under Invalid Statutes: The Enterprise Members/Trustees and public officials knowingly executed a criminal campaign to prosecute known innocent individuals (including the Claimant) under invalid statutes, laws, or ordinances. These statutes were either unconstitutional, improperly enacted, or otherwise void, yet the Enterprise Members/Trustees utilized these illegal mechanisms to wrongfully prosecute/persecute and deem guilty individuals, often as part of a broader scheme to cover up their illegal activities and true objectives.

17.15 Fraud (18 U.S.C. § 1341, § 1343 / Common Law Fraud): The Defendants engaged in fraudulent activities with the assistance of public officials, including falsification of documents, misrepresentation of facts, and manipulation of governmental processes. These fraudulent actions were designed to deceive the Claimant and others, leading to financial harm and loss of rights. Enterprise engaged in fraudulent activities, including falsification of documents and misrepresentation, fall under federal fraud statutes like 18 U.S.C. §§ 1341 (mail fraud) and 1343 (wire fraud). These statutes criminalize schemes to defraud others, particularly when they involve the use of interstate commerce (e.g., the mail or wire communications).

17.16 DEMANDED: Through Information and belief Plaintiff/Beneficiary asserts that Enterprise Members/Trustees are in violation of **Deprivation Of Rights — 42 U.S. Code § 1983**

and N.J.S.A 2C:30-6. THERETOFORE Enterprise Members/Trustees are demanded to set forth proof, sworn to under oath, that each and every real party in interest Enterprise Member/Trustee positively complied with **42 U.S. Code § 1983 and N.J.S.A 2C:30-6,** and every other demand as set forth herein prior to January 10, 2018 and to present. Willful Disregard or failure to verify required compliance constitutes an action/or inaction under the accepted contract in which you have a duty to properly execute, and that duty was disregarded, refused, or not possible THERETOFORE you are in agreement that you are in violation of **Deprivation Of Rights — 42 U.S. Code § 1983 and N.J.S.A 2C:30-6 Deprivation Of Rights — 42 U.S. Code § 1983 and N.J.S.A 2C:30-6** and others. That admission constitutes trespass and injury to Beneficiary JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and Enterprise Members/Trustees contractually agree to a consensual lien in favor of Beneficiary for resulting damages. The Enterprises so-called Case is based on numerous FATAL DEFECTS, and, therefore, this instant case and all related matters thereto shall be final in favor of JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS. — the Enterprise Members/Trustees have until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof with evidence they have complied with each and every duty required under your Administrative Law System as demanded herein.

17.17 claim/challenge 69: Conspiracy to Violate Civil Rights – 42 U.S.C. § 1985 Plaintiff/Beneficiary re-allege and incorporate by reference the preceding allegations as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to Show cause through production of sworn evidence, as the Enterprise Members/Trustees, including the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey, the U.S. District Court for the Districts of Florida and Colorado, the SEC, the IRS, the DOJ, the Federal Reserve, the FBI, U.S. prosecutors, court clerks, and private practice attorneys, and others working together that you in fact have not violated 42 U.S.C. § 1985 – Which provides a civil remedy for conspiracy to deprive a person of their constitutional rights, including property rights, through wrongful, unlawful acts.

17.18 Defendants/Trustees, including private attorneys and court clerks, intentionally misrepresented the facts regarding the jurisdictional reach of U.S. law in relation to cryptocurrency transactions made by foreign nationals. Their fraudulent conduct included filing false legal actions, issuing unlawful search warrants, subpoenas, and misleading True Judicial

Courts of law. These actions were undertaken with the intent to unlawfully seize assets from Plaintiff/Beneficiary and other non-U.S. participants.

17.19 This case represents a shocking and malicious conspiracy of criminal activity designed to rob Plaintiff, JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS, of his constitutional rights, his wealth, and his personal liberty. The Defendants, acting in concert one with another, impersonating lawful public officials and others, engaged in a coordinated series of fraudulent actions, including falsifying information to obtain search warrants, fabricating a fraudulent indictment, manipulating legal processes, and executing a pattern of deceit in order to achieve their unlawful goal of seizing Plaintiff's fortune and unlawfully holding in bondage a living man from another society for over five years. Through this criminal enterprise, Defendants violated Plaintiff's rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1985, engaged in Mail Fraud (18 U.S.C. § 1341), Wire Fraud (18 U.S.C. § 1343), in order to facilitate crimes and conspiracies under both federal and state law. Their actions, calculated and deliberate, resulted in irremediable harm, including the unlawful seizure of his sizable wealth and the theft of five years of Plaintiff's life, a period of time that can never be restored.

17.20 Defendants' actions meet the elements of conspiracy as set forth in federal and state laws, including 42 U.S.C. § 1985, 18 U.S.C. §§ 1341 and 1343, as well as New Jersey conspiracy statutes (N.J.S.A. 2C:5-2) and false swearing (N.J.S.A. 2C:28-3). The systematic fraudulent conduct, spanning years of abuse and manipulation, constitutes a textbook case of conspiracy, fraud, and civil rights violations.

17.21 The conspiracy against Plaintiff commenced when the first conspirator intentionally fabricated false claims to secure what culminated to over a dozen fraudulent search warrants, laying the groundwork for a series of criminal actions aimed at depleting Plaintiff's wealth and infringing upon his rights. This was no isolated error or rogue act; it was part of an orchestrated and ongoing scheme involving multiple parties—both private and public officials—working in concert to carry out unlawful acts.

17.22 From the outset, the conspirators knowingly and intentionally falsified documents, misrepresented facts, and manipulated the legal system to falsely accuse Plaintiff of crimes he did not commit. The fraudulent search warrants, based on fabricated evidence and lies,

allowed the Defendants to seize Plaintiff's property unlawfully. This was merely the beginning of an ongoing conspiracy, one that escalated to the creation of fraudulent charges and fabricated legal filings, including the fraudulent indictment and the sentencing report filled with deliberate misstatements and omissions.

17.23 The Defendants, operating as corrupt, tyrannical public officials, proceeded to mislead law enforcement agencies, judges, and the public by providing falsified evidence and making fraudulent representations throughout the judicial process. These misstatements were strategically designed to deceive law enforcement and the public, creating the illusion of a lawful process while violating Plaintiff's constitutional rights. The conspirators were well aware that the legal process was being manipulated, and they acted with intent to deprive Plaintiff of his rights and property.

17.24 Furthermore, the conspiracy was carried out using interstate communications—both electronic (Wire Fraud, 18 U.S.C. § 1343) and through the U.S. Mail (Mail Fraud, 18 U.S.C. § 1341)—as the conspirators used false documents and misrepresentations to further their fraudulent scheme. This network of deceit extended across state lines and involved the use of fraudulent documents that were mailed or electronically transmitted to various jurisdictions to further secure additional sham or false legal rulings.

17.25 Throughout this entire process, the Defendants knew that their actions violated the law, but they intentionally and repeatedly engaged in fraudulent conduct, with the clear intent to unlawfully enrich themselves and punish Plaintiff for standing in their way.

17.26 42 U.S.C. § 1985 prohibits conspiracies that interfere with an individual's civil rights. The actions of the Defendants here fall squarely within the scope of this statute, which was designed to combat actions that deprive an individual of their constitutional rights through a conspiracy.

17.27 The Defendants conspired to violate Plaintiff's constitutional rights, including the right to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures under the Fourth Amendment, the right to due process under the Fourteenth Amendment, and the right to be free from involuntary servitude. The conspiracy involved multiple illegal acts, including the unlawful seizure of

Plaintiff's property, his wrongful aggravated kidnapping, his wrongful embodgement, and the fraudulent legal filings used to support these actions. Defendants also engaged in a malicious scheme to destroy Plaintiff's reputation and livelihood through defamation, false accusations, and fabricated legal proceedings. These actions were not accidental or merely negligent; they were deliberate, coordinated, and executed with the intent to deprive Plaintiff of his constitutional rights.

17.28 The law is clear: when two or more individuals conspire to deprive a person of their civil rights, those individuals are liable under 42 U.S.C. § 1985. Defendants, through their calculated and willful misconduct, engaged in precisely this sort of conspiracy.

17.29 The conspiracy was not confined to the actions of the Defendants within the courtroom or in state jurisdictions; rather, it was further facilitated through interstate fraudulent communications, constituting violations of the Wire Fraud (18 U.S.C. § 1343) and Mail Fraud (18 U.S.C. § 1341) statutes. These communications, which involved the transmission of fraudulent documents across state lines via mail and electronic means, were used to deceive true law enforcement and the judiciary into believing that Plaintiff was guilty of the fabricated charges against him. The Defendants mailed forged documents, including falsified search warrants, a fraudulent indictment, and deceptive sentencing reports, all of which were part of the scheme to unlawfully imprison Plaintiff and steal his wealth.

17.30 The use of interstate communications to further a fraudulent scheme is a clear violation of federal fraud statutes. By transmitting false information, the conspirators manipulated the judicial process and aided in the unlawful detention and exploitation of Plaintiff.

17.31 In addition to federal statutes, the Defendants' actions also violated state law. Under New Jersey's conspiracy statute (N.J.S.A. 2C:5-2), a conspiracy occurs when two or more people agree to commit an unlawful act, or a lawful act by unlawful means. The Defendants' actions involved precisely this kind of coordination—working together to fabricate evidence, mislead true law enforcement, deceive the public and carry out the unlawful deprivation of Plaintiff's property and liberty.

17.32 Further, the Defendants violated New Jersey's law on false swearing (N.J.S.A. 2C:28-3), which criminalizes the act of knowingly making false statements under oath. The fraudulent search warrants, fabricated sentencing reports, and misleading testimony provided to law enforcement all involved false representations made under the pretense of truth, thereby violating state law and furthering the conspiracy.

17.33 Central legal issues in this case include but are not limited to:

- 1.** Conspiracy to Violate Civil Rights (42 U.S.C. § 1985): The Defendants conspired to deprive Plaintiff of his constitutional rights, including his right to be free from unreasonable search and seizure and his right to due process.
- 2.** Wire Fraud and Mail Fraud (18 U.S.C. §§ 1341, 1343): Defendants used fraudulent communications across state lines to mislead law enforcement, the public, and the judiciary, furthering the conspiracy and resulting in the unlawful deprivation of Plaintiff's property and liberty.
- 3.** New Jersey Conspiracy and False Swearing (N.J.S.A. 2C:5-2, 2C:28-3): The Defendants engaged in a conspiracy to commit unlawful acts under state law and used false swearing to deceive public officials and facilitate their unlawful scheme.

17.34 THEREFORE: The Defendants' actions represent a systematic and deliberate conspiracy to deprive Plaintiff, JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS, of his civil rights, wealth, and freedom. From the very beginning, they engaged in fraudulent conduct, including falsifying search warrants, fabricating indictments, and manipulating legal processes to further their criminal enterprise. Through the use of interstate communications and fraudulent filings, they violated numerous federal and state statutes, including 42 U.S.C. § 1985, 18 U.S.C. §§ 1341 and 1343, N.J.S.A. 2C:5-2, and N.J.S.A. 2C:28-3.

17.35 The seizure of Plaintiffs' assets was carried out without due process of law, violating the Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. Plaintiffs were deprived of their property without due process of law, and the actions taken were in direct violation of constitutional protections against unlawful takings.

U.S. Const. Amend. V – "No person shall... be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

17.36 DEMANDED: Through Information and belief Plaintiff/Beneficiary asserts that Enterprise Members/Trustees are in violation of Title **42 U.S.C. § 1985** THERETOFORE Enterprise Members/Trustees are demanded to set forth proof, sworn to under oath, that each and every real party in interest Enterprise Member/Trustee positively complied with Title **42 U.S.C. § 1985**, and every other demand as set forth herein prior to January 10, 2018 and to present. Willful Disregard or failure to verify required compliance constitutes an action/or inaction under the accepted contract in which you have a duty to properly execute, and that duty was disregarded, refused, or not possible THERETOFORE you are in agreement that you are in violation of Title **42 U.S.C. § 1985**. That admission constitutes trespass and injury to Beneficiary JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and Enterprise Members/Trustees contractually agree to a consensual lien in favor of Beneficiary for resulting damages. The Enterprises so-called Case is based on numerous FATAL DEFECTS, and, therefore, this instant case and all related matters thereto shall be final in favor of JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS. — the Enterprise Members/Trustees have until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof with evidence they have complied with each and every duty required under your Administrative Law System as demanded herein.

XVIII. Aggravated Kidnapping and Slavery and Apartheid of Private American National Diplomat — 18 U.S. Code § 1201 and N.J.S.A 2C:13-1; and Slavery (13th Amendment and 18 U.S.C. §§ 1581-1597; and Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986)

18.1 claim/challenge 70: Plaintiff/Beneficiary re-allege and incorporate by reference the preceding allegations as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to Show cause through production of sworn evidence, as the Enterprise Members/Trustees/Defendants of your unlawful conduct under 18 U.S. Code § 1201 and N.J.R.S 2C:13-1 (Kidnapping) , Fourth Amendment's protection against unreasonable seizures and the Fourteenth Amendment's guarantee of due process, perpetrated under color of law, 18 U.S. Code § 1961 et seq. (RICO), and related tortious actions, resulting in significant damages to the Plaintiff and other affected parties, and violation of the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986 (Apartheid).

18.2 This Counter Suit is based on the violation of fundamental constitutional rights, including the Fourth Amendment's protection against unreasonable seizures and the Fourteenth Amendment's guarantee of due process, perpetrated under color of law and others and violation of the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1983 and others.

18.3 Kidnapping and Human Trafficking: The Defendant, working closely with certain government officials, was involved in the kidnapping (18 U.S.C. § 1201 / N.J.S.A 2C:13-1) and trafficking (18 U.S.C. § 1581) of JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS, including the unlawful bondage, transportation, and exploitation of JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS for profit. These activities were carried out with the active participation, knowledge and tacit approval of multiple public officials, who of their own free will and choice volunteered, participated in or turned a blind eye to the Enterprise Members/Trustees actions. Defendant is accused of kidnapping the Claimant, which would be a violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1201 (federal kidnapping statute), as well as state-level kidnapping statutes. Kidnapping involves unlawfully seizing and carrying a person with the intent to hold them against their will. The involvement of public officials further complicates the case and may involve governmental misuse of power.

18.4 December 10, 2019, U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey, the U.S. District Court for the Districts of Florida and Colorado, the SEC, the IRS, the DOJ, the Federal Reserve, the FBI, U.S. prosecutors, court clerks, and private practice attorneys, and others, committed armed aggravated Kidnapping against JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS without lawful Documentation or Jurisdiction or Authority and have been holding JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS beyond the reach of their jurisdictional authority and has held him in bondage for half a decade (over 5 years) without Due Process of Law, denied him bail many times, a trial, a verdict, a sentence or a ruling.

18.5 Despite lacking jurisdiction, Enterprise Members/Trustees/Defendants continues to unlawfully deprive JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS of his liberty by confining him against his will in violation of Due Process of Law as well as others.

18.6 Plaintiff/Beneficiary is a private American national and diplomat engaged in a Private Membership Venture located outside the jurisdiction of tHE UNITED sTATES. This venture was very valuable. **It would take the equivalent of more than \$50 BILLION**

DOLLARS to fix the damage that they did to over one Million individuals across 100 different foreign countries. These people the members of the conspiracy harmed were from friendly countries who are not our enemies. Im proud to be taking a stand and speaking out against this injustice that has taken place! You had no jurisdiction. All of Bitclub's business transactions for this venture were conducted exclusively in cryptocurrency.

18.7 In furtherance of an unlawful scheme to seize Plaintiff's assets and destroy a foreign private international business venture, a criminal enterprise was formed involving members of the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey, the U.S. District Court for the Districts of Florida and Colorado, the SEC, the IRS, the DOJ, the Federal Reserve, the FBI, U.S. prosecutors, court clerks, and private practice attorneys, and others. These parties conspired to unlawfully exert jurisdiction over the Plaintiff/Beneficiary assets and destroy the venture, despite the venture being located outside of U.S. jurisdiction and was to be operated entirely with foreign nationals and cryptocurrency.

18.8 In order to facilitate the scheme and conceal their unlawful actions, the Enterprise Enterprise Members/Trustees orchestrated the kidnapping of the Plaintiff. The Plaintiff was forcibly condemned to peonage bondage for over 5 years, where he was held in cruel and unusual conditions and subjected to physical and psychological abuse.

18.9 The practice of one individual obtaining and/or executing ownership over the existence of another individual — usually perceived as an inferior or lessor individual — including his physical being, estate, wealth, goods, work, expressions, communications, children, relationships, work products, thought products, intellectual property, soul, spirit and all elements that form the essence of that individual.. constitutes total and complete slavery. The practice of a corporation, regime, government or so-called quasi-legal-fiction entity obtaining and/or executing ownership over the existence of a living man, woman or child, including his physical being, estate, wealth, goods, work, expressions, communications, offspring, relationship, work products, thought products, intellectual property, soul, spirit and all elements of existence that form the essence of that individual — is total and complete Apartheid. Enterprise members are guilty of both Slavery and Apartheid.

18.10 Apartheid refers to the implementation and maintenance of a systematic structure of fabricated rules, policies and statutes (governance) of so-called legalized radical segregation (often times racial), in which one group is deprived of political and civil rights, due

process or protections under “mettre a` part” at the hands of a radical groups self-aggrandizing prominence and self-anointed superiority “Officials” (tyrannical administrative overlords), working in concert one with another, who make a practice of “subjecting” and “separating” or “casting out” from rights, entitlements, due process and protections of those who they deem inferior or unworthy (example: U.S. Citizens), by denying them Due Process, Equal Protections and their God Given Birth Rights and Entitlements. Enterprise members are estopped from denying there is “2 tiered justice system” a “class based administrative [il] legal processes”, “wealth based administrative [il] legal processes” and many cases - NO ACCESS to ANY true legal processes unless you are “deemed worthy of a special grant of rights” bequeathed from a prominent superior tyrannical overlord “Official”. Apartheid is a “CRIME AGAINST HUMANITY” as instituted by the International Criminal Court under the ROME STATUTE and a majority of tHE UNITED sTATES Administrative (Law) Overlords are in willful violation including Enterprise Members as listed herein and others.

18.11 Financial Exploitation and Destruction of Plaintiff’s Assets: The Enterprise Members/Trustees/Defendants have engaged in ongoing efforts to convert the Plaintiff’s physical being, estate, wealth, goods, work, expressions, communications, offspring, relationship, work products, thought products, intellectual property, soul, spirit and all elements of existence that form the essence of that individual, by illegally seizing and diverting assets from the joint venture and the individual person JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS for their personal and professional enrichment. This continued unlawful activity has financially bled the Plaintiff’s estate and left the venture destroyed.

18.12 Impact on the Affected Foreign Nationals: The scheme has also caused significant damage to over 1 million foreign nationals across 100 countries, who were financially harmed by the Enterprise Members/Trustees/Defendants unlawful actions. These individuals, who had no connection to tHE UNITED sTATES, have suffered economic losses and disruption to their livelihoods as a result of the destruction of the joint venture.

18.13 Actions undertaken by the Enterprise Members/Trustees were unlawful and had ill intent from their origins. Enterprise Members/Trustees are liable as to all damages incurred and their sham claim, initiated by fraud is VOID:

18.14 State Law Kidnapping N.J.S.A 2C:13-1: kidnapping as the unlawful taking or confinement of a person, typically by force, threat, or deception, with the intent to hold them for ransom, use them as a shield, or otherwise harm or coerce them.

18.15 Federal Law Kidnapping 18 U.S.C. § 1201, which criminalizes the **abduction** of a person across state or national borders or the detention of a person for ransom, political purposes, or other illegal objectives:

Elements:

- 1. The victim must be forcibly seized or taken against their will:** Armed Enterprise Members targeted and **forcibly seized** JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and took him (a man that has never been found guilty of any crime) against his will, to multiple prison facilities in multiple states for the express purpose of infliction of duress and torture upon him for 11 months (Diesel Therapy)(Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress), and then confined him with frequency emitting leg shackle and kept him in peonage bondage, bombarding his living vessel with harmful frequencies for over half a decade.
- 2. The abduction must involve either transportation of the victim across state lines or foreign borders:** Armed Enterprise Members kidnapped JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS from his foreign jurisdiction, trafficked a living man that had not been found guilty of any crime and there was no evidence there was any crime committed, from prison to prison to prison in multiple sTATES, for the express purpose of intentional infliction of duress and torture upon him for over 11 months (Diesel Therapy), for the express purpose of extorting a confession (plea statement) by the infliction of torture upon him.. in order to “exonerate the perpetrators/enterprise members” of the crimes willfully executed. These unconscionable acts and others constitute **Intentional Infliction Of Emotional Distress.**
- 3. The kidnapping must have the intent to hold the victim for ransom, use them as a hostage, commit a felony, or inflict bodily harm:** Armed Enterprise Members unlawfully removed JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS from his life, liberty and pursuit of happiness and embondaged him with the pre-meditated intent to harm him and exploit and commit theft against him in an amount equivalent to BILLIONS OF DOLLARS, which they accomplished through the commission of multiple felonies.

18.16 Federal Law Slavery/Apartheid (13th Amendment and 18 U.S.C. §§ 1581-1597), While both kidnapping and slavery/apartheid involve a deprivation of personal freedom, **kidnapping** is primarily focused on the unlawful **seizure and transportation of an individual**, often with an intent to hold them for ransom or other illicit purposes, whereas **slavery/apartheid** involves a **prolonged and systemic deprivation of personal liberty** and benefiting from forced labor or varying reasons of financial gains, often under conditions of control, coercion, and exploitation. In light of the fact that the Enterprise members have subjected JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS to aggravated exploitation for in excess of 5 years and in conditions such that deprive him of any self control of a his life or freedom or to escape for an indefinite period, and deprived him of "the exercise of any or all of the powers attaching to the right of ownership over his person”:

Elements:

- 1. Ownership or Control - Slavery/Apartheid involves complete control over the victim, where the person is forced to work against their will or the perpetrators are torturing and extorting the accumulation of “life work” that has been and/or is being performed from the victim, and the victim has no legal recourse or ability to escape:** Armed Enterprise Members have unlawfully held JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS in bondage for over 5 years, systematically and methodically stripping away everything that he has worked for his entire life and where he is under continual force and coercion to assist, agree and enrich the enterprise, to his own detriment and against his will, by forced self harm and harming the individuals that are closest to him, under threat of retaliatory abuse, **with no legal recourse or ability to escape.**
- 2. Coercion or Fraud - Slavery/Apartheid involves coercive tactics, including threats, force, fraud, or deception:** Armed Enterprise Members are unlawfully holding JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS against his will for half a decade (in excess of 5 years) under the constant threat of additional and more severe attacks upon himself and his family, compounded by the overhanging peril of life threatening conditions and decades of torture and abuse.
- 3. Deprivation of Freedom - A key aspect of slavery is the complete or near complete restriction of personal freedom. Victims of slavery/apartheid are often kept in servitude by fear, threats, or physical barriers:** Armed Enterprise Members

have unlawfully imposed bondage and subjugation upon JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS to the point that he is forbidden to use a t.v. remote, he is told who he can talk to, who he cannot talk to, whether he can have a phone and or what kind of phone and or how he can use a phone... he even was threatened and brought into a court proceeding with enterprise members **seeking to have him moved to a maximum security prison because his father bought him a dinner and it was “unauthorized”**. He has remained under constant threat of being sent to peonage hell on earth (maximum security prison) to be accosted by actual rapists and murderers if he speaks out or fails to comply to the degree desired.

4. Exploitation - The primary goal of slavery/apartheid is the economic or personal exploitation of the victim for labor or services: Armed Enterprise Members have physically and financially invaded not just JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS life but have carried out armed home invasions in the lives of family members including his elderly parents home, a home in which they did not purchase until JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS was an adult. They carried out jewelry, watches, keepsakes, personal property and terrorized the occupants, none of which was JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS. What they did manage to do is exploit JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS to the tune of what would be equivalent of billions of dollars worth of crypto. Any Jury in the world would be hard pressed to find a bigger motive to commit the crimes the Enterprise have committed against JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS or a list of crimes more extensive than the crimes they perpetrated against one innocent victim.

a) **Color of Law the term "color of law"**, refers to acts done without authority, by a person who is acting as if they obtained authority given to them by a governmental agency, whether or not that agency is local, state, or federal (United States v. Classic, 313 U.S. 299 (1941)).

b) **Violation of Fourth Amendment**, 1) the Fourth Amendment of tHE UNITED sTATES Constitution prohibits unreasonable seizures, 2) absent probable cause, (void beyond 72 hours), any seizure of a person is per se unreasonable under the Fourth Amendment (Tennessee v. Garner, 471 U.S. 1 (1985)).

c) **Violation of Due Process**, 1) the Fourteenth Amendment of tHE UNITED sTATES Constitution guarantees due process of law, 2) Arrest and detention beyond the “72 hour

probable cause window” is outside of this Court's **[and agency’s]** jurisdiction and violates fundamental rights (*County of Sacramento v. Lewis*, 523 U.S. 833 (1998)).

d) ”Where a court **[and agency’s]** failed to observe safeguards, it amounts to denial of due process of law, court is deprived of juris." *Merritt v. Hunter*, C.A. Kansas 170 F2d 739.

e) ”A universal principle as old as the law is that a proceedings of a court **[or agency]** without jurisdiction are a nullity and its judgment therein without effect either on person or property." *Norwood v. Renfield*, 34 C 329; *Ex parte Giambonini*, 49 P. 732.

f) ”A departure by a court **[or agency]** from those recognized and established requirements of law, however close apparent adherence to mere form in method of procedure, which has the effect of depriving one of a constitutional right, is an excess of jurisdiction." *Wuest v. Wuest*, 127 P2d 934, 937.

g) ”Jurisdiction is fundamental and a judgment rendered by a court that does not have jurisdiction to hear is void ab initio." *In Re Application of Wyatt*, 300 P. 132; *Re Cavitt*, 118 P2d 846.

h) ”Thus, where a judicial tribunal **[or agency]** has no jurisdiction of the subject matter on which it assumes to act, its proceedings are absolutely void in the fullest sense of the term." *Dillon v. Dillon*, 187 P 27.

i) ”A court **[or agency]** has no jurisdiction to determine its own jurisdiction, for a basic issue in any case before a tribunal is its power to act, and a court **[or agency]** must have the authority to decide that question in the first instance." *Rescue Army v. Municipal Court of Los Angeles*, 171 P2d 8; 331 US 549, 91 L. ed. 1666, 67 S. Ct. 1409.

18.17 DEMANDED: Through Information and belief Plaintiff/Beneficiary asserts that Enterprise Members/Trustees are in violation of **N.J.S.A 2C:13-1**, and Title **18 U.S. Code § 1201**, and **13th Amendment**, and **18 U.S.C. §§ 1581-1597**, and others. THERETOFORE Enterprise Members/Trustees are demanded to set forth proof, sworn to under oath, that each and every real party in interest Enterprise Member/Trustee positively complied with **N.J.S.A 2C:13-1**, and Title **18 U.S. Code § 1201**, and **13th Amendment**, and **18 U.S.C. §§ 1581-1597**, **and others**, and every other demand as set forth herein prior to January 10, 2018 and to present. Willful Disregard or failure to verify required compliance constitutes an action/or inaction under the accepted contract in which you have a duty to properly execute, and that duty was

disregarded, refused, or not possible THERETOFORE you are in agreement that you are in violation of **N.J.S.A 2C:13-1**, and Title **18 U.S. Code § 1201**, and **13th Amendment**, and **18 U.S.C. §§ 1581-1597**. That admission constitutes trespass and injury to Beneficiary JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and Enterprise Members/Trustees contractually agree to a consensual lien in favor of Beneficiary for resulting damages. The Enterprises so-called Case is based on numerous FATAL DEFECTS, and, therefore, this instant case and all related matters thereto shall be determined final in favor of JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS. — the Enterprise Members/Trustees/ Defendants have until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof with evidence they have complied with each and every duty required under your Administrative Law System as demanded herein.

XIX. Agency's Policies

19.1 claim/challenge 71: “Official agency’s policy includes the decisions of a government’s lawmakers, the acts of its policymaking officials, and practices as persistent and widespread as to practically have the force of law.” *Connick v. Thompson*, 131 S. Ct. 1350, 1359 (2011). Agencies policies and procedures and training are cause of damages and claimant has rights to recover all losses incurred as a result of Fourth Amendment and other Violations, *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388, 91 S. Ct. 1999, 29 L. Ed. 2d. 619, (1971).

XX. Agency's Customs

20.1 claim/challenge 72: The plaintiff has establish the agency’s liability upon this evidence that the agency's permanent and well-settled practice is what gave rise to the constitutional violation. See *City of St. Louis v. Praprotnik*, 485 U.S. 112, 127 (1988); *Navarro v. Block*, 72 F.3d 712, 714-15 (9th Cir. 1996); *Thompson v. City of Los Angeles*, 885 F.2d 1439, 1444 (9th Cir. 1989), overruled on other grounds by *Bull v. City & County of San Francisco*, 595 F.3d 964 (9th Cir. 2010). Once the plaintiff had demonstrated that a custom existed, the plaintiff need not also prove that “official policymakers had actual knowledge of the practice at issue.” *Navarro*, 72 F.3d at 714-15; *Thompson*, 885 F.2d at 1444. Plaintiff has the right to recover damages against all culpable parties regarding the inherent, unconstitutional policies and customs

executed against innocent claimant in violation of his rights. *Monell v. Department of Social Services of the City of New York*, 436 U.S. 658 (1987); *Pembaur v. City of Cincinnati*, 475 U.S. 469 (1986).

XXI. Acting under Color of State Law

21.1 claim/challenge 73: A factual determination is whether a person who allegedly caused a constitutional injury was acting under the color of state law. See *Brunette v. Humane Soc’y of Ventura County*, 294 F.3d 1205, 1209 (9th Cir. 2002); *Gritchen v. Collier*, 254 F.3d 807, 813 (9th Cir. 2001); *Lopez v. Dep’t of Health Servs.*, 939 F.2d 881, 883 (9th Cir. 1991) (per curiam); *Howerton v. Gabica*, 708 F.2d 380, 383 (9th Cir. 1983). A defendant has acted under color of state law where he or she has “exercised power ‘possessed by state law and made possible only because the wrongdoer is clothed with the authority of state law.’” *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 49 (1988) (quoting *United States v. Classic*, 313 U.S. 299, 326 (1941)); see also *Polk County v. Dodson*, 454 U.S. 312, 317-18 (1981); *Anderson v. Warner*, 451 F.3d 1063, 1068 (9th Cir. 2006); *McDade v. West*, 223 F.3d 1135, 1139-40 (9th Cir. 2000); *Johnson v. Knowles*, 113 F.3d 1114, 1117 (9th Cir. 1997); *Vang v. Xiong*, 944 F.2d 476, 479 (9th Cir. 1991); see also *Florer v. Congregation Pidyon Shevuyim, N.A.*, 639 F.3d 916, 922 (9th Cir. 2011).

21.2 “Actions taken according to an agency’s rules or policies were made ‘under color of state law.’” See *Coral Construction Co. v. King County*, 941 F.2d 910, 926 (9th Cir. 1991). Even if the deprivation represents an abuse of authority or lies outside the official's authority, if the official is acting within the scope of his or her employment, the person still acts under the color of state law. See *Anderson*, 451 F.3d at 1068-69; *McDade*, 223 F.3d at 1140; *Shah v. County of Los Angeles*, 797 F.2d 743, 746 (9th Cir. 1986). However, “[i]f a government officer does not act within [the] scope of employment or under the color of state law, then that government officer acts as a private citizen.” See *Van Ort v. Estate of Stanewich*, 92 F.3d 831, 835 (9th Cir. 1996) (finding no action under color of state law where a police officer returned to a home where a search had taken place the day before, forced his way in, and tortured the two people residing in the house); see also *Gritchen*, 254 F.3d at 812-13; *Huffman v. County of Los Angeles*, 147 F.3d 1054, 1058 (9th Cir. 1998); *Johnson*, 113 F.3d at 1117-18.

XXII. Affirmative Cause Link

22.1 claim/challenge 74: The plaintiff has established an affirmative cause link between the agency's policy or practice and the alleged constitutional violation. See *City of Canton, Ohio v. Harris*, 489 U.S. 378, 385, 391-92 (1989); *Van Ort v. Estate of Stanewich*, 92 F.3d 831, 835 (9th Cir. 1996); *Oviatt v. Pearce*, 954 F.2d 1470, 1473-74 (9th Cir. 1992).

XXIII. Racketeering Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act — 18 U.S. Code § 1961 et seq. (RICO) and Racketeering Conspiracy in violation of N.J.S.A. 2C:41-1 and others

23.1 claim/challenge 75: Plaintiff/Beneficiary re-allege and incorporate by reference the preceding allegations as though fully set out herein; and **You are DEMANDED** to Show cause through production of sworn evidence, as the Enterprise Members/Trustees/Defendants of your unlawful conduct under 18 U.S. Code § 1201 (Kidnapping), Fourth Amendment's protection against unreasonable seizures and the Fourteenth Amendment's guarantee of due process, perpetrated under color of law, 18 U.S. Code § 1961 et seq. (RICO), and related tortious actions, resulting in significant damages to the Plaintiff and other affected parties.

23.2 The allegations contained in paragraphs one through 211 of this Indictment are repeated, re-alleged, and incorporated as if fully set forth herein.

23.3 Enterprise Members/Trustees/Defendants, and other persons whose identities are known and unknown to the Counter-claimant, who are named as co-conspirators and members or associates of the enterprise, but not as defendants herein, between in or about 2018 and the date of this Counter-suit, in the State of New Jersey, and elsewhere, and within the jurisdiction of this Court and elsewhere, with the purpose of promoting and facilitating the commission of the crime of racketeering, did conspire, confederate and agree that:

- a. One or more of them would engage in conduct which would constitute a spree of crimes including but not limited to racketeering; and
- b. One or more of them would aid in the planning, solicitation and commission of the multitude of crimes constituting racketeering, that is the defendants and the unidentified co-conspirators, being persons employed by and associated as to the enterprise, which enterprise was engaged in

and the activities of which affected sTATE, national and international trade and sTATE, national and international commerce, would conduct and participate, directly and indirectly, of their own free will and choice in the conduct of the enterprise's affairs through a pattern of racketeering activity, including the commission of crimes including but not limited to, violation of 18 U.S. Code § 1961 et seq. and N.J.S.A. 2C:41-2(c) and others, as herein described.

XXIV. The Enterprise

24.1 Enterprise Members/Trustees/Defendants, and other persons whose identities are known and unknown to the Counter-claimant and the Court, who are named as co-conspirators and members or associates of the enterprise, some named as defendants herein and others not yet named as defendants, did constitute an "enterprise" within the meaning of 18 U.S. Code § 1961 et seq. and N.J.S.A. 2C:41-1 (c), herein referred to as the "Criminal Agencies Enterprise," that is, a group of Agencies comprised of individuals associated in fact although not a single legal entity, and whose associates thereof engaged in, and the activities of which affected trade and commerce. The Criminal Agencies Enterprise operated in New Jersey and elsewhere and the Enterprise members include but are not limited to:

ADAM P. SCHWARTZ, Attny.; ADAM RUTKOKSKI, IRS; ADAM WEISENSTEIN, IRS; AMJAD QAQISH, FBI; AMY LARSEN, BAR; ANDREW M. HINKES, Attny; ANGELA E. NOBEL, Clerk; ANTHONY P. TORNTORE, U.S. Attny.; ASHLEY THOMPSON, IRS; AURORA FAGAN, U.S. Attny; AVRA RUBIN, FBI; BEN HOPPING, IRS; BRIAN LUKACSY, FBI; CARLOS MORALES, Probation; CAROLINE A. CRENSHAW, SEC; CLAIR C. CECCHI, Judge, N J; CHRISTOPHER ASHER WRAY, FBI; CHRISTY MAGUIRE, FBI; CRAIG CARPENITO, DA; CRAIG WYLY, IRS; DAVID FEDER, Prosecutor; DAVID HERNANDEZ, Probation; DAVID RODMAN, Attny; DAVID W. FEDER, Prosecutor; DANIAL I. WARFEL, IRS; DEAN MANES, IRS; DONALD (Mac) MCPHERSON, Attny; EDWARD S. KEIL, Magistrate; GARY SAMUAL GENSLER, SEC; GREG FLYNN, IRS; HANNA YANG, FBI; HESTER M. PIERCE, SEC.; JAMES B. CLARK III, Magistrate; JAMIE L. HOXIE, Prosecutor; JAMIE LEE. LIZARRAGA, SEC; JARID ERWIN, IRS; JEFFREY P. COLWEL, Clerk; JOHN COOPER, IRS; JOHN MAGLASKI, IRS; JONATHAN HELMSTETTER, FBI; JOSEPH A. DAGROSSA, Probation; JOSEPH A. MANISH U.S. Attny, N.J.; JOSEPH ROBINETTE. BIDEN JR.; JOSH LOCKWOOD, Attny; JULIAN WASHINGTON, IRS; JOHNSON, WILLIAM, IRS; KELLY A. MACIEL, Probation; KEVIN SOPHIA, IRS; LEO ROVENSKI, FBI; MARCEELETTE ELLIS-GOODWIN, IRS; MARK T. UYEDA, SEC; MELISSA E. RHOADS, Clerk; MERRICK BRIAN GARLAND, U.S. (DOJ) Attorney General; MICHAEL A. HAMMER, Magistrate; MICHAEL L. YAEGER, Attny; MINDY WILGUS, IRS; NATALIE SHREVE, Probation; PHILIP RUBNER SELLINGER, U.S. Attny; RACHAEL HONIG, DA; RACHEL DEVLIN, Prosecutor; ROGER DUH, FBI; SETH JUNKER, Probation; SCOTT SMITH, FBI; SCOTT VARHOLAK, Magistrate; SHANNON DASILVA, Probation; SIMON A. GAUGUSH, Attny; STEVE BYRNES, IRS; SUSAN M. SMALLLEY, Probation; SARAH DEVLIN, Prosecutor; VEN KARAVCHUK, FBI; VICTOR RIBEIRO, FBI; VICTOR VANCACORE, IRS; WILLIAM JOHNSON, IRS; WILLIAM T. WALSH, Clerk; WILLIAM MATTHEWMAN, Magistrate; DAVID TONINI Ass US attorney; JOSH DOYLE B.A.R.: ANGELA SCHECK B.A.R.; AMY LARSON B.A.R. Jane/John Doe, IRS Agent 1-200; Jane/John Doe Judge, 1-50; Jane/John Doe Clerk, 1-100; Jane/John Doe Attorney, 1-200; Jane/John Doe Prosecutors, 1-50; Jane/John Doe 1-200 FBI Agent

XXV. Enterprise Members Impeach Their Own So-called Claim (FRE 607) within their own “PRE-SENTENCE INVESTIGATION REPORT”

Referenced in detail in the Writ of Habius Corpus

25.1 claim/challenge 76: Enterprise Members are Operating as Commercial Debt Collectors

The Clamant sets forth this challenge to formally Demand that every member of the Enterprise provide full and complete documentation supporting their claim of ownership and/or benefit as to ANY and ALL alleged debt. Clamant exercises his right to request and receive verification of any alleged debt claimed by a commercial debt collector(s) and the nature of the benefit they intend to derive.

25.2 Enterprise Members,
U.S. District Courts - New Jersey Inc.;
U.S. District Courts - Florida Inc.;
U.S. District Courts - Colorado Inc.;
U.S. Federal Reserve Inc.;
U.S. Department of the Treasury Inc.;
U.S. District Judges, Court Clerks;
Internal Revenue Service Inc. (IRS);
Department Of Justice Inc. (DOJ);
Federal Bureau of Investigation Inc. (FBI);
Securities and Exchange Commission Inc. (SEC);
Private Attorneys
Others

25.3 Since it seems the members are trying to operate as de facto consumer debt collectors. There are certain laws that you need to follow to do so within your own administrative system. To ensure the accuracy and legitimacy of the alleged debt in question, The claimant demands that Enterprise Members Account Manager (EMAM) must validate there claim of debt by providing:

- 1)** A True and certified copy of the complete audit trail of said account. Furthermore, in order for EMAM to validate the debt, please provide:

- 2) Verification through audit certification of debt entry in accordance with g.a.a.p., i.f.r.s., in accordance with Basel 3 accord and u.n.c.i.t.r.a.l. conventions.
- 3) I DEMAND a copy of each entities Tax Registration certificate!
- 4) I DEMAND a copy of my signed contract with EMAM, not 3rd parties.
- 5) Proof that JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS was in New Jersey during the alleged time period you are claiming the alleged act occurred. (mandatory for your claim.)
- 6) Proof your claim is / was not a matter of duress or forgery.
- 7) **Purchase Agreement:** Please provide a copy of the contract agreement and/or payment agreement between the alleged original creditor, and subsequent purchasing member(s) and/or benefitting members of the Enterprise outlining the specific details, amount(s), terms and conditions of the ownership transfer authorizing you to collect a debt and/or promise to pay executed by claimant.
- 8) **Chain of Title:** Present a clear and unbroken chain of title demonstrating the successive transfers of the alleged debt from the original creditor, as billed (including subsequent required monthly statements) to each Enterprise member who had obtained an ownership interest regarding alleged debt and/or promise to pay. This shall include all intermediary assignees or debt purchasers.
- 9) **Complete Account Statements:** Alleged Original Creditor shall supply all relevant account billing statements, from the time of the alleged debt origination to the present date, clearly indicating the outstanding balance, interest, fees, and any other relevant charges, on the statements, as produced each month, from the alleged debt origination until month in which the claim was filed, in part to insure the alleged debt is not just a predatory ambush collection tactic.
- 10) **Validated Proof of Debt:** You are demanded to include any documents that validate:
 - a. the existence of a debt (original documentation verifying debt); and
 - b. amount of the alleged debt (original accounting with specificity); and

- c. original contract signed by claimant (with wet signatures); and
- d. copies from any and all returns or promise to pay; and
- e. copy of all original billings as recorded with dates and amounts; and
- f. schedule of payments received; and
- g. duplicate of all correspondence, emails, letters, texts, demands etc. sent (include date, name and address of recipient regarding each recipient); and
- h. statements, notices or demands.

11) Documents of Debt Acknowledgment: Alleged Original Creditor shall provide original billings creditor believed to be valid accounts receivable in the amount of the alleged debt, as generated per month, per year, and all correspondences referencing any alleged debt as billed and entered into an official ledger and on what date.

13) Verification of Right to Collect: Provide certification of Authority to collect debts including laws, statutes, rules, policies related to any and all alleged debts in all geographical areas including authority to collect per state, domestic or international etc...

25.4 All this must be proven and attested to with a sworn statement.

25.5 DEMANDED: Through Information and belief Plaintiff/Beneficiary asserts that Enterprise Members/Trustees are in violation of Commercial Debt Collection Practices and Laws, THEREFORE Enterprise Members/Trustees are demanded to set forth proof, sworn to under oath, that each and every real party in interest Enterprise Member/Trustee positively complied with all Commercial Debt Collection Practices and Laws in the attempted collection regarding actions executed therein and every other demand as set forth herein prior to January 10, 2018 and to present. Willful Disregard or failure to verify required compliance constitutes an action/or inaction under the accepted contract in which you have a duty to properly execute, and that duty was disregarded, refused, or not possible THEREFORE you are in agreement that you are in violation of Commercial Debt Collection Practices and Laws. That admission constitutes trespass and injury to Beneficiary JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and Enterprise Members/Trustees contractually agree to a consensual lien in favor of Beneficiary for resulting damages. The Enterprises so-called Debt Collection Case is based on numerous FATAL DEFECTS, and,

therefore, this instant case and all related matters thereto shall be final in favor of JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS. — the Enterprise Members/Trustees have until February 20th 2025 at 5 p.m. mst. to place upon the court record, sworn proof with evidence they have complied with each and every duty required under your Administrative Law System as demanded herein.

XXVI. Pattern Of Racketeering Activity

26.1 claim/challenge 77: The pattern of racketeering activity, as defined in 18 U.S. Code § 1952 et seq. and N.J.S.A. 2C:41-1 (d), would consist of at least two incidents of racketeering conduct, including but not limited to:

26.2 "Interference with Commerce by Threats and Violence," in violation of 18 U.S. Code § 1961 et seq. and 18 U.S.C. § 1951, by obstructing, delaying, and affecting commerce and the movement of any article and commodity in commerce, by extortion as it is defined in that section, to wit, by obtaining property from another, without consent, induced by wrongful use of actual and threatened fear and under color of official right, and attempting and conspiring so to do;

26.3 Theft by Extortion, in violation of N.J.S.A. 2C:20-5; c. Financial Facilitation of Criminal Activity, in violation of N.J.S.A. 2C:21-25; and Conspiracy to commit these crimes, in violation of N.J.S.A. 2C:5-2, and others.

26.4 Plaintiff, JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS (beneficiary), has been subjected to egregious and unlawful actions by members of an enterprise that includes federal agencies, prosecutors, and judges (Enterprise Members). These actions, rooted in a conspiracy to manipulate and control the digital asset market, constitute violations of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO) and other federal and state laws.

26.5 From 2014 to the here and now, Enterprise Members initiated a scheme to unlawfully seize what would be the equivalent of BILLIONS OF DOLLARS in assets from a private foreign joint venture. This venture, involving over one million foreign nationals, operated entirely outside U.S. jurisdiction, conducting transactions exclusively in cryptocurrency. The defendants lacked legal authority or jurisdiction to seize these assets, violating principles of international law, including the doctrine of extraterritoriality.

26.6 The Enterprise Members engaged in fraudulent conduct, submitting false claims and invoking non-applicable U.S. laws to justify their actions. Their scheme violated international treaties and U.S. treaty obligations, undermining mutual respect for sovereignty and international agreements on taxation. Federal regulatory agencies, including the SEC, overstepped their statutory authority, fabricating jurisdiction over the crypto industry without explicit Congressional authorization. This overreach represents a misuse of power and a violation of the Major Questions Doctrine, which requires clear Congressional authorization for such transformative actions.

26.7 The SEC's enforcement-only approach, avoiding formal rule-making, has created regulatory uncertainty, stifling innovation in the crypto industry. By targeting legitimate market participants, the SEC and other federal agencies have violated the Hobbs Act, engaging in coercion, extortion, and threats to manipulate the market for their own benefit. This coordinated effort reflects a conspiracy against the administration of justice and established commerce laws, both domestically and internationally.

26.8 The U.S. Federal Reserve, in collaboration with the Bank of England, engaged in the development of Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDCs) to maintain control over the financial system. This effort involved fraudulent misrepresentation and malfeasance by public officials, violating 18 U.S.C. § 1952 (racketeering) and 18 U.S.C. § 1951 (interference with commerce). The defendants' actions also constituted wire fraud under 18 U.S.C. § 1343 and mail fraud under 18 U.S.C. § 1341, as they misled the public and lawmakers about the benefits of CBDCs.

26.9 The narrative that the digital dollar represents an innovation in banking is a fraudulent misrepresentation. The reality is that the majority of banking operations are already digital. The true goal of the CBDC project is to centralize control over financial transactions while bypassing necessary legal frameworks and transparency that blockchain technology offers. The defendants' actions constitute criminal coercion under 2C:13-5 and obstruction of the administration of law under 2C:29-1.

26.10 The criminal enterprise engaged in a sophisticated disinformation campaign to mislead the public about the safety and legitimacy of cryptocurrencies, while simultaneously developing their own digital currencies. This campaign constitutes enticement into slavery/

apartheid under 18 U.S.C. § 1583 and is part of a broader RICO conspiracy involving fraud, obstruction, and coercion under 18 U.S.C. § 1952 and 18 U.S.C. § 1956 (money laundering).

26.11 In 2018, federal agencies were weaponized against U.S. citizens and the economy regarding cryptocurrencies and digital assets. This coordinated action was part of a racketeering enterprise that engaged in the sale into involuntary servitude under 18 U.S.C. § 1584 and human trafficking under 2C:13-8. The creation of fraudulent charges and destruction of legitimate business practices constitute obstruction of justice under 18 U.S.C. § 1503 and criminal coercion under 2C:13-5.

26.12 The enterprise's actions have highlighted the inadequacies and corruption of the existing fiat system, exacerbated by the COVID-19 plandemic. The push for a digital dollar, under the guise of financial reform, involved wire fraud under 18 U.S.C. § 1343 and interference with commerce under 18 U.S.C. § 1951. The central banking system's efforts to prevent blockchain technology from offering transparency and financial autonomy further violated 18 U.S.C. § 1956 (money laundering) and 18 U.S.C. § 1831 (economic espionage).

26.13 The widespread adoption of digital assets has been met with systemic efforts by the defendants to undermine and delegitimize this financial innovation. Their actions violated RICO under 18 U.S.C. § 1962 and interference with commerce under 18 U.S.C. § 1951. By coercing private entities and individuals, the defendants have obstructed international commerce and prevented decentralized financial systems from flourishing.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against defendants, and each of them, jointly and severally, as follows:

XXVII. REITERATION OF STATE CLAIMS:

**78th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
Liability for Conduct of Another (N.J.S.A. 2C:2-6)**

Defendants, through their actions or inactions, are liable for the conduct of their co-conspirators, who engaged in various unlawful activities, thereby aiding and abetting the commission of crimes against the plaintiff.

Paragraphs 8.21

**79th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
Conspiracy (N.J.S.A. 2C:5-2)**

Defendants conspired together to commit multiple crimes against the plaintiff, including but not limited to kidnapping, false imprisonment, and theft by extortion, thereby forming a criminal enterprise aimed at harming the plaintiff.

Paragraphs 7.12, 7.14, 7.22, 8.5, 8.6, 8.8, 8.10, 8.13, 8.16, 8.17, 8.18, 8.21, 8.25, 8.34, 8.35, 8.44, 8.53 8.60, 8.67, 8.73, 9.81, 10.1, 10.2, 11.1, 11.5, 12.1, 12.2, 13.1, 15.2, 15.9, 15.10, 16.3, 16.4, 17.17, 17.19, 17.20, 17.21, 17.22, 17.24, 17.26, 17.27, 17.28, 17.29, 17.31, 17.32, 17.33, 17.34, 18.6, 26.4, 26.7, 26.10

**80th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
Kidnapping (N.J.S.A. 2C:13 - 1)**

Defendants, individually and/or in concert, unlawfully abducted the plaintiff against his will, using force, threat, or deception to remove him from a place where he was found and held him captive and causing severe physical, psychological, and emotional trauma, violating New Jersey’s kidnapping laws.

Paragraphs 8.22,18.1,18.3,18.4,18.7,18.17

**81st Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
False Imprisonment (N.J.S.A. 2C:13 - 3)**

Defendants unlawfully restrained the plaintiff’s freedom of movement without legal justification, causing significant psychological and emotional trauma.

Paragraphs 4.14, 8.22, 8.64, 8.66, 8.70, 16.7, 16.8, 16.10, 16.14

**82nd Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
Criminal Coercion (N.J.S.A. 2C 13 - 5)**

Defendants used threats of physical harm, unlawful accusations, or exposure of secrets to coerce the plaintiff into acting against his will, thereby infringing upon his rights and liberties.

Paragraphs 4.14, 7.13, 8.3, 8.5, 8.7, 8.10, 8.45, 18.6, 18.16, 27.7, 26.9, 26.11

**83rd Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
Human Trafficking (N.J.S.A. 2C:13-8)**

Defendants engaged in the illegal trafficking of the plaintiff for purposes of exploitation, including forced labor, services, or other forms of involuntary servitude.

Paragraphs 8.6, 8.18, 8.21, 8.27, 15.2, 15.9, 15.12, 16.8, 18.3, 26.11

**84th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
Theft by Extortion (N.J.S.A. 2C:20 - 5)**

Defendants extorted money, property, or services from the plaintiff through threats of physical harm, exposing damaging information, or other forms of intimidation.

Paragraphs 7.13, 7.23, 8.3, 8.9, 8.11, 8.12, 8.13, 8.35, 8.43, 8.44, 8.46, 8.52, 8.53, 8.56, 8.64, 8.70, 9.57, 9.58, 13.1, 26.3, 26.7

**85th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
Money Laundering (N.J.S.A. 2C:21-25)**

Defendants were involved in laundering money obtained through criminal activities, thereby concealing the origins of illicit funds and integrating them into the legitimate financial system.

Paragraphs 8.5, 8.7, 8.8, 8.11, 8.16, 8.18, 8.21, 8.23, 8.27, 8.29, 8.31, 8.33, 8.38, 8.46, 8.52, 8.70, 26.1, 26.2, 26.3

**86th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
Civil Action for Treble Damages (N.J.S.A. 2C:21-28)**

Plaintiff seeks treble damages for the financial losses incurred due to the defendants' fraudulent schemes and unlawful actions.

Paragraphs 8.38, 8.46

**87th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
Corruption of Public Resources (N.J.S.A. 2C:27 - 12)**

Defendants unlawfully used public resources for personal gain, undermining the Integrity of public office and trust placed in them by the community.

Paragraphs 8.42, 9.5

**88th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
N.J.S.A. § 2C:28-1 (Defamation)**

Defendants made false and defamatory statements about the plaintiff, damaging his reputation and causing emotional distress, while undermining his personal and professional relationships, all to further their criminal enterprise.

Paragraphs 2.18, 2.23, 2.24, 7.22, 8.50, 8.62, 8.63, 8.64, 8.68, 8.71, 11.5, 16.7, 16.14, 17.1 17.2,

**89th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
Unsworn Falsification to Authorities (N.J.S.A. 2C:28 - 3)**

Defendants provided false statements or documents to authorities, obstructing justice and hindering the investigation of crimes committed against the plaintiff.

Paragraphs 8.15, 8.29, 14.11, 16.14, 17.10, 17.15, 17.2, 17.32, 17.34

**90th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
Impersonating a Public Servant or Law Enforcement Officer (N.J.S.A. 2C:28 - 8)**

Defendants impersonated public servants or law enforcement officers to deceive the plaintiff, the media, the citizens an true law enforcement in order to further their criminal activities.

Paragraphs 4.5, 7.20, 8.50, 10.4, 12.2, 15.2, 15.15, 15.7, 15.9, 15.13, 17.17

**91st Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
Obstructing Administration of Law or Other Governmental Functions (N.J.S.A. 2C:29 - 1)**

Defendant obstructed the administration of law by tampering with evidence, intimidating witnesses, or otherwise interfering with legal processes related to the plaintiff's case.

Paragraphs 2.11, 8.2, 8.10, 8.18, 8.19, 8.20, 8.30, 8.33, 26.2, 26.9

**92nd Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
Official Misconduct (N.J.S.A. 2C:30-2)**

Defendants, as public officials, engaged in actions constituting official misconduct, abusing their positions of power to harm the plaintiff and benefit themselves or their co-conspirators.

Paragraphs 7.23, 7.27, 8.1, 8.2, 8.12, 8.44, 15.9, 17.28

**93rd Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
Deprivation of Civil Rights by Public Officials (N.J.S.A. 2C:30 - 5)**

Defendants deprived the plaintiff of his civil rights through unlawful arrests, searches, or other forms of state-sanctioned misconduct.

Paragraphs 8.7, 15.2, 15.12, 16.2, 16.6, 16.7, 16.10, 16.14, 17.15, 17.16, 18.16, 8.40

**94th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
Official Deprivation of Civil Rights (N.J.S.A. 2C:30-6)**

Defendants' actions led to a systematic deprivation of the plaintiff's civil rights, causing irreparable harm to his personal and professional life and reputation.

Paragraphs 8.7, 8.16, 8.40, 15.2, 15.12, 16.1, 16.6, 16.7, 16.10, 17.14, 17.15, 17.16, 18.16

**95th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
Pattern of Official Misconduct (N.J.S.A. 2C:30-7)**

Defendants engaged in a pattern of official misconduct, repeatedly abusing their authority to perpetrate crimes against the plaintiff.

Paragraphs 8.12

VVIII. REITERATION OF FEDERAL CLAIMS:

**96th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
5 U.S.C. § 551–559 (APA - Administrative Procedure Act)**

Defendants violated the APA by unlawfully influencing federal agency decisions and bypassing required procedures, depriving the plaintiff of due process and transparency, while facilitating their criminal enterprise and suppressing the plaintiff's legal rights.

Paragraphs 8.30, 8.49, 8.53, 8.54, 8.70, 14.5

**97th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
5 U.S.C. § 706 (Judicial Review)**

Defendants obstructed the plaintiff's access to judicial review by illegally influencing legal processes and preventing the court from considering his claims, thus depriving the plaintiff of his right to challenge unlawful government actions.

Paragraphs 8.32, 8.61

**98th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
5 U.S.C. § 801–808 (Congressional Review Act)**

Defendants circumvented the Congressional Review Act by implementing or enforcing rules that were not subject to proper review by Congress, thus enabling their criminal activities and unlawfully harming the plaintiff’s interests and rights.

Paragraphs 8.59

**99th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
15 U.S.C. § 1 (Sherman Antitrust Act)**

Defendants engaged in illegal restraint of trade, forming monopolies or conspiracies that hindered fair competition and violated antitrust laws, causing harm to the plaintiff.

Paragraphs 4.1, 8.35, 9.60, 11.1, 11.2, 11.5, 15.13, 15.14

**100th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
18 U.S.C. § 241 (Conspiracy to Interfere with Civil Rights)**

Defendants unlawfully deprived the plaintiff of his freedom, confining him against his will without legal justification and inflicting severe emotional, psychological, and physical harm, all while violating his constitutional rights under color of law.

Paragraphs
7.12, 7.14, 7.22, 8.5, 8.6, 8.8, 8.11, 8.13, 8.16, 8.17, 8.18, 8.21, 8.35, 8.34, 8.35, 8.60, 8.67, 8.73,
10.1, 11.1, 11.5, 12.1, 12.2, 13.1, 15.2, 15.9, 15.10, 16.3, 17.7, 17.19, 17.20, 17.21, 17.22, 17.24,
17.26, 17.27, 17.28, 17.29, 17.31, 17.32, 17.33, 17.34, 18.6, 26.3, 26.4, 26.7, 26.10

**101st Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
18 U.S.C. § 242 (False Imprisonment)**

Defendants unlawfully deprived the plaintiff of his freedom, confining him against his will without legal justification and inflicting severe emotional, psychological, and physical harm, all while violating his constitutional rights under color of law.

Paragraphs 4.14, 8.22, 8.60, 8.64, 8.66, 8.64, 8.66, 8.70, 16.7, 16.8, 16.9, 16.10, 16.13, 16.14

**102nd Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
18 U.S.C. § 371 (fraudulent charge regarding an invalid law)**

Defendants unlawfully deprived the plaintiff of his freedom, confining him against his will without legal justification and inflicting severe emotional, psychological, and physical harm, all while violating his constitutional rights under color of law for an invalid law.

Paragraphs 9.52

**103rd Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
18 U.S.C. § 912 (Impersonation of A Federal Officer)**

Defendants committed crimes and passed themselves off as though their actions were “official acts under the law”. Defendants abused their office to effectuate unlawful acts at the same time representing they were enforcing the law by deprived the plaintiff of his freedom, confining him against his will without legal justification and inflicting severe emotional, psychological, and physical harm, all while violating his constitutional rights under color of law.

Paragraphs 7.20, 10.4, 11.2, 12.2, 15.2, 15.13, 15.14, 15.15

**104th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
18 U.S.C. § 1201 (Kidnapping)**

Defendants kidnapped the plaintiff, unlawfully detaining him through force, threats, or deception, causing physical, emotional, and psychological trauma, and violating federal laws designed to protect individuals from such heinous acts.

Paragraphs 4.1,
8.22, 8.64, 8.68, 8.70, 9.45, 15.2, 15.9, 16.8, 17.27, 18.1, 18.3, 18.8, 18.14, 18.15, 18.17, 23.1

**105th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
18 U.S.C. § 1341 (Mail Fraud)**

Defendants used the Postal Service to execute schemes to defraud the plaintiff, causing significant financial losses and harm.

Paragraphs 8.4, 8.10, 8.15, 8.20, 8.23, 8.26, 8.31, 8.36, 8.44, 8.45, 8.53,
8.54, 8.56, 8.58, 8.60, 8.64, 8.65, 8.68, 8.70, 17.15, 17.19, 17.20, 17.24, 17.29, 17.33, 17.34, 26.8

**106th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
18 U.S.C. § 1343 (Wire Fraud)**

Defendants used electronic communications, such as telephone, email, or internet, to carry out fraudulent schemes against the plaintiff.

Paragraphs
8.4, 8.9, 8.10, 8.11, 8.15, 8.22, 8.24, 8.26, 8.31, 8.36, 8.44, 8.45, 8.49, 8.53, 8.54, 8.56, 8.58,
8.60, 8.64, 8.65, 8.68, 8.70, 17.15, 17.19, 17.20, 17.24, 17.29, 17.33, 17.34, 26.8, 26.12

**107th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
18 U.S.C. § 1346 (Honest Services Fraud)**

Defendants engaged in schemes to deprive the plaintiff of his right to honest services, manipulating legal and administrative processes for personal gain, undermining public trust and causing harm to both the plaintiff and the public.

Paragraphs 8.34, 8.70

**108th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
18 U.S.C. § 1503 (Obstruction of Justice)**

Defendants obstructed Justice by interfering with the investigation or prosecution of crimes against the plaintiff, including tampering with evidence or intimidating witnesses.

Paragraphs 8.7, 8.20, 8.24, 8.28, 8.3, 8.33, 8.37, 8.44, 8.47, 8.53, 8.55, 8.59, 8.70, 26.11

**109th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
18 U.S.C. § 1519 (Abuse of Public Office, Destruction of Evidence)**

Defendants obstructed justice by destroying or fabricating evidence, intentionally interfering with investigations into their crimes, and preventing the proper legal processes from being carried out, further harming the plaintiff's pursuit of justice.

Paragraphs 8.47, 8.63, 8.67

**110th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
18 U.S.C. § 1581 (Peonage, Slavery, and Trafficking in Persons)**

Defendants engaged in acts of peonage, slavery/apartheid, or trafficking in persons, subjecting the plaintiff to involuntary servitude or forced labor.

Paragraphs 8.4, 8.7, 8.8, 8.17, 8.19, 18.3, 18.6, 18.17

**111th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
18 U.S.C. § 1583 (Enticement into Slavery)**

Defendants enticed, persuaded, or forced the plaintiff into slavery/apartheid, exploiting him for personal or financial gain.

Paragraphs 8.5, 8.12, 8.43, 26.10

**112th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
18 U.S.C. § 1584 (Sale into Involuntary Servitude)**

Defendants sold or otherwise disposed of the plaintiff into conditions of involuntary servitude, depriving him of his liberty.

Paragraphs 8.6, 8.8, 8.12, 8.17, 8.19, 8.26, 8.42, 8.48, 26.11

**113th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
18 U.S.C. § 1590 (Trafficking with Respect to Peonage, Slavery/Apartheid, and Involuntary Servitude, or Forced Labor)**

Defendants trafficked the plaintiff for purposes of peonage, slavery/apartheid, involuntary servitude, or forced labor, causing severe physical and emotional harm.

Paragraphs

**114th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
18 U.S.C. § 1831 & 1832 (Economic Espionage Act and Theft of Trade Secrets)**

Defendants engaged in economic espionage and theft of trade secrets, unlawfully acquiring confidential information from the plaintiff for competitive advantage.

Paragraphs 8.11, 8.14, 8.38, 8.51, 8.68, 26.12

**115th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
18 U.S.C. § 1951 (Hobbs Act 9.6)(Extortion or Attempted Extortion under Non-violent Threat)**

Defendants engaged in extortion and robbery, unlawfully seizing property from the plaintiff under threat of harm or violence, thereby affecting interstate commerce and violating the Hobbs Act by unlawfully interfering with the plaintiff's lawful business and personal assets.

Paragraphs 8.3, 8.7, 8.9, 8.11, 8.13, 8.19, 8.29, 8.31, 8.33, 8.35, 8.43, 8.44, 8.52, 8.53, 8.56, 8.57, 8.61, 8.64, 8.70, 13.9, 26.2, 26.8, 26.12, 26.13

**116th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
18 U.S.C. § 1951 (Hobbs Act 9.7)(Extortion or Attempted Extortion under Color of Official Right)**

Defendants engaged in extortion and robbery, unlawfully seizing property from the plaintiff under threat of harm or violence, thereby affecting interstate commerce and violating the Hobbs Act by unlawfully interfering with the plaintiff's lawful business and personal assets.

Paragraphs 8.3, 8.7, 8.9, 8.11, 8.13, 8.19, 8.29, 8.31, 8.33, 8.35, 8.43, 8.44, 8.52, 8.53, 8.56, 8.57, 8.61, 8.64, 8.70, 12.6, 26.2, 26.8, 26.12, 26.13

117th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:

18 U.S.C. § 1952 (Racketeering)

Defendants participated in a criminal enterprise involving illegal activities such as extortion, bribery, and fraud, using interstate travel and commerce to facilitate their racketeering, thereby causing financial and personal harm to the plaintiff.

Paragraphs 8.1, 8.5, 8.7, 8.12, 8.18, 8.19, 8.24, 8.32, 8.35, 8.46, 26.1, 26.8, 26.10

118th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:

18 U.S.C. § 1956 (Laundering of Monetary Instruments)

Defendants engaged in money laundering schemes to conceal the illicit origins of funds obtained through criminal activities, including theft and extortion, thus integrating stolen assets into the legitimate financial system and furthering their criminal enterprise.

Paragraphs
8.5, 8.7, 8.8, 8.11, 8.16, 8.18, 8.21, 8.23, 8.29, 8.31, 8.33, 8.38, 8.52, 8.70, 26.10, 26.12

119th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:

18 U.S.C. § 1957 (Engaging in Monetary Transactions in Property Derived from Specified Unlawful Activity)

Defendants knowingly engaged in financial transactions involving stolen property or proceeds from unlawful activities, helping to conceal the source of the funds, perpetuating their criminal actions, and causing significant financial harm to the plaintiff.

Paragraphs 8.17, 8.27, 8.32, 8.39

120th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:

18 U.S.C. § 1961 (RICO – Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations)

Defendants participated in a pattern of illegal activities, including extortion, kidnapping, and fraud, as part of a larger racketeering enterprise, violating RICO laws and causing extensive harm to the plaintiff’s life and business.

Paragraphs 4.1, 7.23, 8.34, 8.44, 8.46, 8.53, 8.56, 8.61, 8.63, 8.70, 18.1, 23.1, 23.3, 26.2

121st Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:

18 U.S.C. § 1962 (RICO Conspiracy)

Defendants participated in a pattern of illegal activities, including extortion, kidnapping, and fraud, as part of a larger racketeering enterprise, violating RICO laws and causing extensive harm to the plaintiff’s life and business.

Paragraphs 7.12, 7.14, 8.6, 8.8, 8.13, 8.17, 8.34, 8.35, 8.67, 8.73, 10.1, 11.1, 11.5, 12.1, 12.2, 13.1, 15.2, 15.10, 17.9, 17.21, 17.24, 17.27, 17.34, 18.6, 26.4, 26.7, 26.10, 26.13

122nd Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:

18 U.S.C. § 2331 (Domestic Terrorism)

Defendants engaged in acts of domestic terrorism by kidnapping, extorting, and unlawfully detaining the plaintiff, with the intent to intimidate, coerce, or influence U.S. government policy and financial interests, causing severe harm.

Paragraphs 8.62

**123rd Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
18 U.S.C. § 2510 (Unlawful Surveillance)**

Defendants illegally intercepted and surveilled the plaintiff’s private communications without his consent, violating federal wiretap laws and infringing upon the plaintiff’s privacy rights, which were used to further their criminal enterprise.

Paragraphs 8.64, 8.70, 17.8, 17.27, 17.32, 17.33

**124th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
28 U.S.C. § 1941 (Tuckers Act)**

Defendants unlawfully deprived the plaintiff of his freedom, confining him against his will without legal justification and inflicting severe emotional, psychological, and physical harm, all while violating his constitutional rights under color of law.

Paragraphs2.14, 16.15, 18.16, 21.1

**125th Claim: Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous allegations as though fully set forth herein:
42 U.S.C. § 1983 (Violation of Civil Rights)**

Paragraphs 16.0, 16.2, 16.6, 17.16, 18.2

XXVIII. REITERATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL CLAIMS:

1st AMENDMENT 8.72

4th AMENDMENT 8.70, 16.10, 16.14, 16.15, 17.27, 18.1, 18.16, 19.1, 23.1

5th AMENDMENT 4.1, 8.48, 8.70, 8.72, 10.1, 11.5, 17.35

6th AMENDMENT 9.50

8th AMENDMENT 4.1

13th AMENDMENT 6.2, 18.0, 18.6, 18.17

14th AMENDMENT 6.2, 8.33, 16.6, 16.10, 16.14, 16.15, 17.27, 18.1, 18.16, 23.1

As a direct and proximate result of the afore-mentioned Acts and/or omissions of the defendants, the claimant is entitled to recover damages. The damages for which claimant seeks compensation from the defendants, both jointly and severally, include but are not limited to, the following:

The Claimant seeks the following remedies:

Compensatory Damages:

The Claimant demands full compensation for all economic, reputational, and personal damages suffered as a result of the Defendant's misconduct. This includes:

1. Financial losses, including lost property, assets, and opportunities
2. Lost profits or opportunities
3. Reputational damage and the costs of restoring public trust and credibility
4. Intentional Infliction of Emotional distress and psychological harm
5. Punitive Damages

Punitive Damages:

Given the Defendant's role in perpetrating these criminal acts in collaboration with public officials and their *de facto* status as a public official, claimant requests punitive damages to deter future unlawful behavior and to penalize the Defendant for the egregious and systemic nature of their criminal conduct, which involved but was not limited to conspiracy, fraud, and the exploitation of vulnerable individuals, violation of "Tuckers Act", Hobbs Act's", "Administrative Procedures Act", RICO and others.

Injunctive Relief:

The Claimant requests that the Court issue the following injunctions preventing the Defendant from engaging in further illegal activities or continuing to exert improper influence in concert with public officials. The Claimant may also seek other forms of relief to protect its interests and to prevent future harm.

WHEREFORE, Claimant JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS, request the following Injunctive Relief:

- a. That the court enter an Administrative Law Judgment within your UNITED STATES District Court Administrative Law System that mirrors the Common Law Judgment that shall be determined should Trustees/Defendants fail to answer each and every challenge/claim as Demanded herein on or before February 29, 2024. Said Administrative Law Judgment shall be in favor of JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and against the defendants on all counts of this complaint; and

b. That the court award compensatory damages in USDT, Bitcoin, Free Hold land with allodial title, Gold or Silver to JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and against the defendants jointly and severally, in the amount specified herein; and

c. That the court award punitive damages, jointly and severely to JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS of 10 times actual damages as specified herein, and against the defendants, jointly and severally, in the amount determined herein that such an award will deter similar prescribed conduct by the defendants in the future; and

d. That the court award Treble damages, jointly and severely to JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS for damages in an amount equal to three times the value of all damages involved in the criminal activity as specified herein under N.J.S.A 2C: 30-28, and against the defendants, as to the amount determined herein; and

e. That the court award in favor of JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS, and against the defendants, prejudgment and post judgment interest on all sums awarded in this action, and including reasonable legal fees, pursuant to 42. U.S.C. Sec. 1988; and

f. That the court orders compensatory damages to be paid in USDT, Bitcoin, Gold or Silver.

g. The court award control of the court's corporate charter to JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and order the court to add JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS to there Board of Directors that JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS may "RESTORE THE COURT BACK INTO ORDER".

h. The court cease and desist all operations until such time as JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS can assume the office of Managing Director, implement safeguards, policies and practices that insure court procedures are brought into line with the law and predatory operating agents are removed - that the willful destructive harm against the people and commerce and trade shall be expelled and the Court "RESTORE BACK INTO ORDER".

i. Order the Court Corporation to allow JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS as Managing Director of the charter to have final vote in any manner concerning administrative operations.

j. The court award control of the SECURITY AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION Corporate Charter to JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and order the SECURITY AND EXCHANGE

COMMISSION to add JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS to the Board of Directors that JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS may “RESTORE THE SECURITY AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION BACK INTO ORDER”.

k. The SECURITY AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION cease and desist all operations until such time as JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS can assume the office of Managing Director, implement safeguards, policies and practices that insure SECURITY AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION procedures are brought into line with the law and predatory operating agents are removed - that the willful destructive harm against the people, commerce and trade shall be expelled and the SECURITY AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION is “RESTORE BACK INTO ORDER”.

l. Order the court Corporation to allow JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS as Managing Director of the SECURITY AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION charter to have final vote in any manner concerning administrative operations.

m. The court award control of the INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE Corporate Charter to JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and order the INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE to add JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS to the Board of Directors that JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS may “RESTORE THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE BACK INTO ORDER”.

n. The INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE cease and desist all operations until such time as JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS can assume the office of Managing Director, implement safeguards, policies and practices that insure INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE procedures are brought into line with the law and predatory operating agents are removed - that the willful destructive harm against the people, commerce and trade shall be expelled and the INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE is “RESTORE BACK INTO ORDER”.

o. Order the court Corporation to allow JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS as Managing Director of the INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE charter to have final vote in any manner concerning administrative operations

p. The court award control of the FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIONS Corporate Charter to JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and order the FEDERAL BUREAU OF

INVESTIGATIONS to add JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS to the Board of Directors that JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS may “RESTORE THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIONS BACK INTO ORDER”.

q. The FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIONS cease and desist all operations until such time as JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS can assume the office of Managing Director, implement safeguards, policies and practices that insure FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIONS procedures are brought into line with the law and predatory operating agents are removed - that the willful destructive harm against the people, commerce and trade shall be expelled and the FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIONS is “RESTORE BACK INTO ORDER”.

r. Order the court Corporation to allow JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS as Managing Director of the FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIONS charter to have final vote in any manner concerning administrative operations

s. The court award control of the DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE Corporate Charter to JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS and order the DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE to add JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS to the Board of Directors that JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS may “RESTORE THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE BACK INTO ORDER”.

t. The DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE cease and desist all operations until such time as JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS can assume the office of Managing Director, implement safeguards, policies and practices that insure DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE procedures are brought into line with the law and predatory operating agents are removed - that the willful destructive harm against the people, commerce and trade shall be expelled and the DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE is “RESTORE BACK INTO ORDER”.

u. Order the court Corporation to allow JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS as Managing Director of the DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE charter to have final vote in any manner concerning administrative operations

v. That the court Grant JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS such other Equitable relief as outlined herein.

XXIX. Expanded Damages Calculations:

As a direct and proximate result of the afore-mentioned Acts and/or omissions of the defendants, the claimant is entitled to recover damages. The damages for which claimant seeks compensation from the defendants, both jointly and severally, include but are not limited to, the following:

Direct Financial Damages: Asset Seizure and Losses

Unrealized Mining production lost and BTC Holdings unlawfully Seized: 165,000 Bitcoin @ \$107,576.31 each	\$17,750,091,150.00
Unrealized Mining production lost and ETH Holdings unlawfully Seized: 659,737.5 Ethereum @ \$4,047.82 each.....	\$2,670,498,647.25
Business Infrastructure:	\$396,933,093.00
Contract Breach Loss:	\$1,366,962,047.00
Market Opportunity Loss	\$6,933,690,000.00
Total Business Asset Diminishment as result of unlawful Seizure:	\$ 29,118,174,937.25
Treble Damages \$29,118,174,937.25 X 3 under N.J.R.S. 2C: 30-28	\$87,354,524,811.75

Indirect Financial Damages:

Business Reputational Harm:	\$5,000,000,000.00
Brand Value Diminution:	\$5,000,000,000.00
Market Share Loss:	\$5,000,000,000.00
Vendor Relationship Damage:	\$1,000,000,000.00
Credit Rating Impacts:	\$1,200,000,000.00
Total Business Operations Diminishment as result of unlawful Seizure:	\$17,200,000,000.00

Personal Damage:

Bondage, Peonage: 1830 days @ \$1,800,000.00 / day	\$3,294,000,000.00
Reputational Damage:	\$1,200,000,000.00
Intentional Infliction Of Emotional Distress (torture) Damage:	\$3,500,000,000.00
Career Impact Damage:	\$1,200,000,000.00
Marriage Impact Damage:	\$1,200,000,000.00
Family Impact Damage:	\$1,200,000,000.00
Total Personal Damage Incurred as a direct result of unlawful Seizure:	\$11,594,000,000.00
Punitive Damages \$11,594,000,000.00 X 10	\$115,940,000,000.00

Total Damages Sustained By JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS**\$57,912,174,937.25**

Total including punitive and treble damages..... \$220,494,524,811.75

Legal Fees and Costs:

The Claimant requests reimbursement for all legal fees, court costs, and related expenses incurred, including attorney's fees and any other related expenses in pursuing this claim.

Apple is worth \$3.66 Trillion as of Jan 2025

Nvidia \$3.43 Trillion as of Jan 2025

Google \$2.4 Trillion as of Jan 2025

Bitcoin \$1.9 Trillion as of Jan 2025

Bitclub Network was the biggest Bitcoin mining operation in the world with over 1 million members in over 100 countries when we were illegally shut down. Bitclub hit a billion dollars in sales faster than all those companies listed above.

\$220,494,524,811.75 is fair and just compensation for the damages the government caused by destroying Bitclub and ruining my reputation and life for the last 5+ years.

WHEREFORE, Claimant JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS, request the following:

a. That the court enter a judgment in favor of JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS, and against the defendants on all counts of the complaint; and

b. That the court award compensatory damages in USDT, Bitcoin, Gold or Silver to JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS, and against the defendants jointly and severally, in an amount as listed herein; and

c. That the court award punitive damages to JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS, and against the defendants, jointly and severally, in an amount as listed herein in order that such an award will deter similar prescribed conduct by the defendants in the future; and

d. That the court award JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS, and against the defendants, prejudgment and post judgment interest on all sums awarded in this action, and including reasonable legal fees, pursuant to 42. U.S.C. Sec. 1988; and

- e. That the court orders compensatory damages to be paid in USDT, Bitcoin, XRP, Gold or Silver.
- f. The court order the injunctive relief in order to “RESTORE ORDER” as outlined and listed herein.
- g. Order the court Corporation to allow JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS to have a vote in any manner concerning administrative operations.
- h. That the court Grant JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS such other Equitable relief that the court deems appropriate.

XXX. DEFINITIONS

1. **Abuse of Authority:** Means anyone who denies, withholds, refuses, deprives, limits, inhibits, counteracts, conceals, any right, benefit, protections, or privilege, as protected by the “Constitution for tHE UNITED sTATES”, the “Bill of Rights, and/or the “Constitution of the sTATE of COLORADO”. This includes arrest or detainment without documented evidence that a lawful crime has been committed by the Principle/Secured Party/Settlor (hereafter Secured Party). This includes use of restraint devices on the Secured Party and/or physical abuse that makes any marks, scars, cuts, abrasions, or the like. This also includes denial of lawful Due Process, Habeas Corpus, Excessive Bail, Unlawful Arrest, Unlawful Detention, or the like, as outlined in this Contract.
2. **Abuse of Due Process:** Means any action against the Secured Party, when said action does not abide by all the rights and defenses contained in or represented by the “Constitution for tHE UNITED sTATES”, the “Bill of Rights”, and/or the “Constitution of the sTATE of COLORADO.” This includes any charge, or claim, civil or criminal, or in admiralty, that is alleged or made by any Representative of the “government of tHE UNITED sTATES” or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation”
3. **Agency, Entity, Department, Sub Division, Subsidiary, Contractor, Employee, Inspector, Investigator, Organization, Officer, Official, Agent, Branch of Government, Group, Authorized Representative, Policeman, Police Officer, Participant:** Means any person, Corporation, or entity of any kind, which works for, is compensated all or in part by, receives funds or collects funds for, contracts with, receives any benefit from, receives any privilege from, participates with, has allegiance to, or in any way has a relationship with, the “government of tHE UNITED sTATES” or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation” or any of its subsidiaries, sub-Corporations, departments, or agencies, etc. The word “**Representative**” where used in this Contract, shall have the same meaning.
4. **Aiding and Abetting:** Means the efforts of any Representative of the “government of tHE UNITED sTATES” or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation” or officer of the court to assist another of the same to hinder, coerce, restrict, resist, suppress, or deprive in any way, the Secured Party from receiving any and all rights, benefits, privileges, as provided by the Constitution for tHE UNITED sTATES, the Bill of Rights, and/or the “Constitution of the sTATE of COLORADO **or** that would normally be offered to a citizen of tHE UNITED sTATES or of the sTATE of COLORADO. This also included the provisions as provided in item #68 “Racketeering” and suppression of evidence.

5. **Apartheid:** refers to the implementation and maintenance of a systematic structure of fabricated rules, policies and statutes (governance) of so-called legalized radical segregation (often times racial), in which one group is deprived of political and civil rights, due process or protections under “mettre a` part” at the hands of a radical groups self-aggrandizing prominence and self-anointed superiority “Officials” (tyrannical administrative overlords) who make a practice of “subjecting” and “separating” or “casting out” from rights, entitlements, due process and protections.. those who they deem inferior or unworthy (including U.S. Citizens), by denying them Due Process, Equal Protections and their God Given Birth Rights and Entitlements.
6. **Appellation:** Means a general term that introduces and specifies a particular term which may be used in addressing, greeting, calling out for, and making appeals of a particular living, breathing, fresh-and-blood man or woman.
7. **Artificial Person:** Means a fictitious entity/trust that was created by the “government of tHE UNITED sTATES” and/or parents acting unknowingly in concert or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation" for transacting in commerce. This artificial Man or Strawman is represented by the capital letter name that appears to be spelled the same as the name of the Natural Man or Woman. When the Artificial Person is used in commerce by the Secured Party, it is a transmitting utility.
8. **Assault and Battery with Weapon:** Means any use of, threatened, or perceived use of any weapon, against Secured Party, by any Representative of the “government of tHE UNITED sTATES” or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation" that creates an atmosphere of fear for the Secured Party. This includes non-lethal weapons, such as tazers, stun guns, mace, pepper spray, any chemical used to incapacitate, rubber bullets, shock force weapons, electronic weapons or any other type of weapon that may be used to control or create fear. If a conflict arises about the events, the version told by the Secured Party will become accepted as truth and will not be contested.
9. **Assault and Battery without a Weapon:** Means the verbal abuse or physical contact, of any kind, upon the Secured Party without the express voluntary written consent of Secured Party. If a conflict arises about the facts involving the incident, the version as told by the Secured Party will be accepted as truth, without question, and will not be contested.
10. **Bill of Rights:** Means for the purpose of this contract, the original “Bill of Rights” to the “Constitution of tHE UNITED sTATES” circa 1791.
11. **Born:** Shall only be construed to mean the moment in time when a flesh and blood woman bears offspring from her womb and a new flesh and blood human being as begotten.
12. **Clerk of the Public Record:** Means any clerk who records documents on the public record and is employed by a city, county, state, municipality, the federal government, international, multi-national, multi-jurisdictional Corporation.
13. **Coercion or Attempt to Coerce:** Means any attempt by any Representative of the “government of tHE UNITED sTATES” or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation" and/or their agents, to threaten, intimidate, deprive, conceal, or in any way prevent the Secured Party from receiving and/or enjoying any right, or privilege that is granted, outlined, or secured by the “Constitution for tHE UNITED sTATES” the “Bill of Rights”, “Constitution of the sTATE of COLORADO”, or to knowingly allow or instruct another to do so.
14. **Collateral:** Any and all the property, rights, and every store of value held by THE DEBTOR whether now existing or hereafter acquired including without limitation to: (1) Security Agreement Item No. “#JSW11111981CSA087815225SA” including without limitation to all the related documents therefrom; (2) “SCHEDULE A” along with; (3) any and all of THE DEBTORS property, including THE DEBTORS name, all accounts, tangible and intangible property, chattel papers, and all the products, proceeds and assets that arise therefrom; as well as; (4) all of THE DEBTORS income from every source and (5) all direct and indirect, absolute or contingent, due or to become due, now existing or hereafter arising, presumed or actual, and all parol or expressed indebtedness and liabilities held by THE DEBTOR and all products and proceeds which arise therefrom.

15. **Concealment:** Means withholding or keeping information that should normally be revealed, about the property and/or rights from the Secured Party. This includes keeping evidence or law from a jury that could favorably alter the outcome of a case to the benefit of the Secured Party. No officer of any court or Representative of the "government of tHE UNITED sTATES" or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation" may conceal any law and/or evidence of any kind that is considered relevant by the Secured Party, and/or fail to disclose any law that benefits the Secured Party.
16. **Conduit:** Means for transmitting and distributing energy and the effect/product of labor, such as good and services, via the name" JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS©" and by any and all derivatives and variations in the spelling of said name with exception of "Jobadiah-Sinclair: Weeks".
17. **Conspiracy:** Means the cooperation of two or more persons working together to, restrict, suppress, inhibit, or in any way deprive the Secured Party of any right, benefit, or privilege that would ordinarily be offered by the "Constitution for tHE UNITED sTATES" (circa 1787), the "Bill of Rights" (circa 1791), and/or "Constitution of the sTATE of COLORADO." and/or to a citizen of tHE UNITED sTATES or of the sTATE of COLORADO. This also includes provisions in item #68. "**Racketeering**".
18. **Contract:** Means any agreement in writing that has been offered for review and acceptance by another party, wherein the offering party has ten (10) days or more, or as stipulated in the contract, to review and respond, accept or rebut, any provisions of the contract, as indicated in the contract. Non-Response on the part of the receiving party or agent of the receiving party will be a lawful offer and acceptance of all the terms and conditions contained in the said contract. Rebuttal by the receiving party of any provision of the contract by any means other than those as are indicated in the contract will be non-response. Return of the contract unopened and/or without review will be acceptance of all conditions of said contract. Recording the contract with the clerk of court or any public records officer will be a lawful offer and notification and will be presentment to all officers of the court in that state/State/sTATE/STATE or county or agency or Corporation. Notice to Agent is Notice to Principal and Notice to the Principal is notice to Agent.
19. **Corporate Capacity:** Means acting for, or on behalf of, a Corporation, or government entity, while under law or color of law.
20. **Corporate Fiction:** A Corporation a creation of the law that does not actually exist in nature, like a natural man or woman: a legal entity that is false and not real, but which the law assumes to be true.
21. **Corporation:** Means any Representative, agency, sub-Corporation, contractor, or any person or entity that is employed by, receives or distributes funds for, receives any benefit or privilege from, or has any relationship of any kind with the "government of tHE UNITED sTATES" or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation".
22. **Constitution for tHE UNITED sTATES:** Means for the purpose of this contract. "The King George III Constitution for tHE UNITED sTATES" (circa 1787), as adopted by the CONSORTIUM CHARTER CORPORATION tHE UNITES sTATES, UNITED sTATES Inc. U.S. Inc. etc..
23. **Counterfeiting Statute Staple Securities Instruments:** Means any attempt by any Representative of the "government of tHE UNITED sTATES" or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation" to copy, duplicate, replicate any document that has "Statute Staple Securities Agreement" typed, printed, or handwritten anywhere on the document, without the express written voluntary permission of the document's owner who is the Secured Party who filled said document in the public record, or is in possession of said document, or who is the maker of said document. If a dispute about permission to duplicate arises, the statement of the Secured Party will be accepted as fact without questions and will not be contested.
24. **County or City:** Means any subdivision of any sTATE of "tHE UNITED sTATES." This term excludes any jurisdiction, zone, or territory of "The United States of America" unless described by the Secured Party in all CAPITAL letters. Any dispute over any errors contained in spelling or

grammar will be resolved at the discretion of the Secured Party and will not be challenged by any Representative of tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation".

25. **Cruel and Unusual Punishment:** Means physical violence of any type or form that is used against a Secured Party that causes visible physical injury, i.e. marks, scrapes, scratches, bruises, abrasion, avulsions, fractures, sprains, restraint marks, dislocations, punctures, cuts, loss of blood, loss of body fluids, or any other type of physical damage or diminishment to the body or mind or spirit; or any chemically induced altered mental state of the Secured Party. This also includes any attempt to incarcerate, restrain, question, detain, withholding food when requested, withholding drink when requested, withholding medications as requested, withholding use of bathroom facilities and supplies when requested, withholding reading and writing materials, withholding communication with friends, family, legal counsel, and religious counsel, withholding proper clothing as needed for comfort, withholding blankets when requested, withholding hot and cold water for showers, withholding freedom when requested, forcing any medical procedure or medical mandate. This also includes ridicule, coercion, threats, verbal insults, rude and offensive language, veiled threats, or any other type of mental street or anguish.
25. **Defacing:** Means the changing or altering the appearance of an item. This also includes changing or altering the meaning of laws, rights, property, documents, or any other thing that has value as determined by the Secured Party.
26. **Denial of Due Process:** Means any attempt by any officer of the court and/or the "government of tHE UNITED sTATES" or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation" and/or agents to deny, deprive, restrict, present or in any way inhibit the proper Due Process to any Secured Party outlined in the "Constitution for tHE UNITED sTATES" the "Bill of Rights, and/or the "Constitution of the sTATE OF COLORADO." Any public law, Statute, regulation, ordinance, home rule, etc., that is incompatible with the Constitution for tHE UNITED sTATES", the "Bill of Rights", and/or the "Constitution of the sTATE OF COLORADO, is null and void and will not be used for any action against any Secured Party.
27. **Deprivation of Rights or Property:** Means the concealment, keeping from, hiding, obstructing of any rights, property, privileges or immunities that are outlined or protected by the "Constitution for tHE UNITED sTATES", the "Bill of Rights, and/or the "Constitution of the sTATE OF COLORADO."
28. **Derivative:** Means coming from another: taken from something preceding; secondary; that which has not the origin in itself, but obtains existence from something foregoing or of a more primal and fundamental nature: anything derived from another.
29. **Destruction of Property:** Means any alteration, damage, deprivation, defacing, removing, changing, breaking, separating, removing parts from, erasing of files form, throwing, shooting, kicking, stomping, smashing, crushing, or the like of any property belonging to or in possession of the Secured Party.
30. **Disrespect:** Means anything said or written to the Secured Party that the Secured Party does not like, including body language, or anything that makes Secured Party or any reasonable man uncomfortable, or have fear.
31. **Documents OR Related Documents:** Each every and all every action by which THE DEBTOR may, communicate, convey, impart, transmit, transport, transfer, save and/or store any thought, idea, belief, fact or opinion whether, private or professional, intentional or unintentional, in every manner whatsoever including without limitation to each every and all types of digital, audio, video, written, printed, and/or recorded, property, and any representations and reproductions, of the aforementioned, notwithstanding it being electric, electronic, mechanical, drawings, or sketches, including without limitation to the originals and all copies, non-identical copies, notations, summaries, whether different from the originals by reason of any notation made on such copies or otherwise, along with each every and all conversations and correspondence, including without limitation to, telephone calls, text messages, email messages, online forums, blogs, chats, comments, all computer data including without limitation to, computers, tablet, PCs, cell phones, all peripherals, all files, data, software, file sharing accounts, storage accounts,

storage hard drive, disks, cloud storage, domain registrations, DNSs and VPNs, memories, metadata, social network communications, audiotapes, cassette, disc, videotapes, digital audio recordings, digital video recordings, motion pictures, recordings, and all digital devices which currently exists or may exist as technology develops, in addition to all printed matters, papers, documents, computer printouts, tax records, diaries, books, pamphlets, bulletins, statistics, policies, reports, studies, photographs, charts, graphs, plans, memoranda, letters, notes, contracts, agreements, instruments, including all applications, forms, certificate, licenses, permits, identification cards, security agreements, deeds of trust, mortgages, promissory notes, credit agreements, loan agreements, warranties, guarantees, statements, checks, receipts, returns, invoices, meetings, minutes, transcripts, including without limitation all the aforementioned which may arise from any of THE DEBTORS, accounts, account cards, financial accounts, online financial accounts, digital accounts, utility accounts, reward accounts, benefit accounts, business accounts, business records, investment accounts, insurance accounts, tax preparation service accounts, any other service accounts, website accounts, travel and lodging accounts, membership accounts, subscription accounts, including each every and all copies, replicas, attachments, distributed redistributed and undistributed copies, all drafts, alterations, modifications, changes and amendments of the aforementioned and each every and all means of communication which currently exist or may exist as technology develops and each every and all manner by which THE DEBTOR or its surety may communicate, convey, impart, transmit, transport, or transfer, save and/or store any thought, idea, belief, fact or opinion that may be submitted as evidence in any type of court, tribunal and/or legal proceeding.

32. **Encroachment:** Means to invade, intrude, or in any way present the Secured Party from enjoying the full and complete use of property, including the acts of trespass; impeding ingress or egress to the property of the Secured Party; or limiting the ability of the Secured Party to freely access, claim, hold, possess, use, convey, sell rent, lease, barter, exchange, or in any way make full and unfettered use of property. This includes the pacing or filling of an unlawful lien, levy, burden, charge, liability, garnishment, attachment or encumbrance against any and all property including wages, salaries, stocks, bonds, bank accounts (foreign or domestic), savings accounts, contents of safety deposit boxes, gold, silver, notes, coins, tokens, crypto, insurance funds, annuities, retirement accounts, social security benefits, motor vehicles, automobiles, recreational vehicles, land, real estate, homes, structures, roads, driveways, personal property of any kind that is held by title, deed, contract, agreement (written or verbal), or is in possession of the Secured Party. This includes, but is not limited to, traffic stops, searches of vehicles, home invasion, confiscation of any lawful property owned by, in possession of, or under the control of the Secured Party.
33. **Ens Legis:** The term "*ens legis*" means a creature of the law; an artificial being, such as a Corporation, considered as deriving its existence entirely by the law, as contracted with a natural person/natural man or woman.
34. **Excessive Bail:** Means any amount of bail set at an unreasonable rate as per the 8th amendment of the Constitution for tHE UNITED sTATES. This also means bail in excess of the amount of the file, penalty, or penal sum that is associated with the alleged crime committed. This also means that if the Secured Party has lived in a community or has lived in one community or area for more than one year, provided they have not recently moved within a year, works a regular job, or is a member of or involved with a church group, civic group, community enterprise, or can produce at least two affidavits from members of his community or area stating that he is involved with his community, he cannot be held without bail as a flight risk, or a threat to society. If the Secured Party can produce at least four (4) affidavits stating that he lives, works and is involved in his community, or the prior community in which he lived, he must be released on his own recognizance without any bail required. This provision does not apply to anyone charged with rape, murder, or violent crimes against women, or children.
35. **Failure to Charge within Forty-Eight (48) Hours:** Means any attempt by any Representative of the "government of tHE UNITED sTATES" or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation" to delay, inhibit, prevent, or in any way stop a Secured Party from being lawfully charged by the court within forty-eight (48) hours of arrest.

36. **Failure to Identify:** Means any time Secured Party has interactions with any Representative of the “government of tHE UNITED sTATES” or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation”, the Representative must, upon request of the Secured Party, provide proper identification, written proof of authority, state what his business is with the Secured Party, complete a public servants questions in advance of arrest or detention, provide documentation property identifying the officer or respondents superior’s name and contact information, and any other relevant information as request by the Secured Party. The officer may not detain the Secured Party for more than ten (10) minutes while he obtains this information.
37. **Failure to Respond:** Means any attempt by any Representative of the “government of tHE UNITED sTATES or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation” to ignore, inhibit, withhold, delay, or deny a request for information form a Secured Party.
38. **False Imprisonment:** Means any attempt by any Representative of the “government of tHE UNITED sTATES or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation” to incarcerate any Secured Party against his or her will and/or against any and all protections of the laws and provisions of the “Constitution for tHE UNITED sTATES” (circa 1787), the “Bill of Rights (circa 1791), and/or the “Constitution of the sTATE OF COLORADO.”
39. **Federal Zone:** See- “**Jurisdiction of the “Government of tHE UNITED sTATES” and of tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation**”
40. **Freedom of Speech:** Means the right to speak open and plainly without fear of reprisal. This includes the right of the Secured Party to speak at hearings and trials before magistrates, judges, officers of the court, Representatives, or the like, of the “government of tHE UNITED sTATES” or the “UNITED STATE Corporation”. It also means that no attempt to suppress this right will be made by any officer of the court, Representatives, or the like of the “government of tHE UNITED sTATES” or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation". No judge or officer of any court or tribunal will threaten contempt of the court for free speech by any Secured Party.
41. **Government of “The United States of America”:** The term “The United States of America”, when used in this Contract, means the *De Jure* Republic Nation of America that was organically founded upon the “Declaration of Independence” and “Articles of Confederation”, the true “**The United States of America**”, and does not include any ill conceived characteristics as found within the de facto “imposter government” known by any name whatsoever, no matter how similar in spelling the name of any such “ imposter government” may appear to be to the spelling of the name of the Free, Sovereign Nation “The United States of America”. It is to be noted that the term “UNITED sTATES” as used here is “plural” and not “singular” in number, as is the name “UNITED sTATES” used by the “imposter government” (i.e, “UNITED sTATES Corporation”) now acting as the government of tHE UNITED sTATES.
42. **Government of “tHE UNITED sTATES”:** The term government of “tHE UNITED sTATES”, when used in this Contract, means the *De Facto* Government that was originally established by the King George III “U.S. Constitution” (circa 1787) and “Bill Of Rights” (circa 1791) branded as “tHE UNITED sTATES” — North American CHARTER adopted in 1787, and constitutes the “imposter foreign governance” of the Peonage Indentures that make up the Crown Plantation as subjugated under the 14th Amendment and the Trading with the Enemy Act. It is to be noted that the term “United States” as used here is “plural” and not “singular” in number, as is the name “UNITED sTATES” used by the “imposter government” (i.e, “UNITED sTATES Corporation”) now imposter as “the government of The United States of America”.
43. **Hold-harmless and Indemnity Agreement:** means **Hold-harmless and Indemnity Agreement No. JSW0001HHIA**. This agreement may be amended and modified by the Secured Party.
44. **Ignore:** Means to refuse or in any way to deny a lawful request for an officer to complete legal documents that will provide information requested by Secured Party.
45. **Illegal Arrest:** Means same as below item #84, “**Unlawful Arrest**”
46. **Indebtedness:** the debt which is owed and evidenced by this agreement; or any claim against THE DEBTOR, the collateral, any of DEBTORS present and future property identified in this

agreement; and all public obligations, debts and liabilities ascribed to THE DEBTOR through its contracts and agreements; whether expressed or implied, written or verbal, known or unknown, actual or constructive, that are with tHE UNITED sTATES, any of its subdivisions, agencies, representatives, agents, officers, or affiliates, or any other public entities; and all claims made by Secured Party against THE DEBTOR, whether existing now or in the future, whether they are voluntary or involuntary, due or not due, direct or indirect, absolute or contingent, liquidated or unliquidated, notwithstanding THE DEBTOR is or may be liable singularly or jointly, or is obligated, or is a beneficiary of, a surety or accommodation party for any alleged debts or obligations owed.

47. **Personal Capacity:** Means acting on one's behalf, in one's individual capacity, to do a thing. A Representative acting under law, or color of law and ultra vires of the Representative's official capacity as assigned by the law, or acting in violation of his/her oath(s) of office take on the personal liability
48. **Interpretation:** Means, if any conflict arises concerning the definition of any of the terms and/or conditions of this Contract, the conflict concerning the meaning of the term or condition, will be decided by the Secured Party. The Secured Party's decision will be final and not subject to review or argument. No liability or penalty will be incurred by the Secured Party due to his interpretation of such terms and/conditions
49. **Interstate Detainer:** Means the same as unlawful detainer as when involving the Secured Party and involving more than one Representative, agency or STATE of the "Government of tHE UNITED sTATES" or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation", or any Representative who has any agreement with, contract with, or permission to act on behalf of any municipal Corporation of the "government of tHE UNITED sTATES" or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation" or any subsidiary or sub-Corporation thereof.
50. **Jurisdiction of the "government of tHE UNITED sTATES" and of tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation"** (If indeed the later has any jurisdiction at all): The constitutionally authorized "government of tHE UNITED sTATES" is recognized by the Secured Party as having exclusive legislative jurisdiction only over the following geographic areas: 1. The District of Columbia, as authorized by Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17 of the Constitution for tHE UNITED sTATES; 2. Federal enclaves within the sTATES, such as land, property or buildings which the Government of tHE UNITED sTATES of America has purchased by the consent of the legislatures of the States of purposes of erecting forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards and other needful building as authorized by Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17 of the Constitution for tHE UNITED sTATES of America; and 3. Territories and possessions belonging to the Government of tHE UNITED sTATES, as authorized by Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution for tHE UNITED sTATES. The imposter government – "tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation" – while having no real jurisdiction as no jurisdiction has been lawfully granted, can nevertheless have no claim even under color of law, to exercise jurisdiction except in those areas where the constitutionally authorized "Government of tHE UNITED sTATES" has been granted jurisdiction is also referred to as the "Federal Zone", and all private property held by the Secured Party, which property are located outside of the Federal Zone is therefore outside of the jurisdiction of the "Government of tHE UNITED sTATES" and tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation". Additionally, the constitutionally authorized "Government of tHE UNITED sTATES" is recognized by the Secured Party as having jurisdiction only as to those matter which the sovereign people, through their several State governments have to the "Government of tHE UNITED sTATES", which power are exclusive as to the power not granted by the sovereign people through their several sTATES governments and power severed to the sTATES by the 10th Amendment to the Constitution for tHE UNITED sTATES. These are the facts and maybe presented in any court by affidavit of the Secured Party, where any property or property interest belonging to Secured Party or Trust is involved in any interaction with the "Government of tHE UNITED sTATES" or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation" or any of its Representatives, as outlined in this Contract.

51. **Juristic person:** means an abstract, legal entity, *ens legis*, such as a corporation, created by construct of law and considered as possessing certain legal right and duties of a human being: and imaginary entity such as a TRUST which, on the basic of legal reasoning is legally treated as a human being for the purpose of conducting commercial activity for the benefit of a biological, living being, such as Secured Party/Grantor/Principle. From the earliest of times the law: has enforced rights and exacted liabilities by utilizing a corporate concept – by recognizing that is, juristic persons other than human beings. The theories by which this mode of legal operation has developed, has been justified, qualified and defined as the subject matter of a very sizeable library. The historical roots of a particular society, economic pressures, philosophic notions, all have had their share in the law’s response to way of men in carrying on their affairs through what is now the familiar device of the corporation---Attribution of legal rights and duties to a juristic person other than man is necessarily a metaphorical process. And none the worse for it. No doubt, “Metaphors in law are to be narrowly watched”. Cardozo J. in Bekley v. Third Avenue R. Co., 244 N.Y 84, 94. “But all instruments of thought should be narrowly watched lest they be abused and fail in their service to reason.” See U.S. v SCOPHONY CORP OF AMERCIA. 333 U.S 795; 68 S. Ct. 855; 1948 UTSTI Observation: A person has a property right in the use of his or her name which a person may transfer or assign. Gracy v. Maddin. 769 S.W. 2nd 497 (Tenn. Ct. App. 1989).
52. **Lawful 4th Amendment Warrant:** Means a warrant that follows the provision of the fourth amendment to the original “Constitution for tHE UNITED sTATES of America.” This warrant must not deter from the exact procedures as outlined by the Fourth Amendment.
53. **Legal Counsel:** Means anyone that the Secured Party chooses to have as legal assistance of counsel, whether counsel is licensed or not (since all are welcome to justice and the constitution prohibits any forced licensing requirement therein), or member of the Bar Association. Counsel may assist, represent, speak on behalf of, write cases for, or perform any act in or out of court for the Secured Party without any hindrance, threat, prosecution, charge, repercussion from any officer of the court, or Representative of the “government of tHE UNITED sTATES: or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation”, or any Representative thereof.
54. **Legal Status:** Means the four classes of Men and Women recognized in the King George III Constitution (circa 1787) for tHE UNITED sTATES and the Bill of Rights (circa 1791), Administrative System — “People” and “Persons” and “Sovereign inhabitant” and “Sovereign habitant”. Regarding **the first two:** [II]Legal governance under CHARTER CONSORTIUM CORPORATION Administrative *De facto* [In]Juris-prudence in tHE UNITED sTATES defines the rights, duties, capacities, incapacities, privileges, and immunities assigned to such [II]legally recognized class of person(s), and which “U.S. citizen” as intertwined with the *Ens Legis*, has a duty as to which codes and statutes, therein there “Status” attesting if they are agents of the Crown or Indentures (chattel) of the Crowns Relm, however all reside under U.S. Imperial Rule constituting Consummate Peonage and regarded as the dead corps. Legal Status also determines to a large degree the type of “Citizenship” to which each class legally recognized as a class of persons as assigned. See definition for “People” and “Persons” below. **The Third Class** of man/woman are those alive humans/“people”/“inhabitants” who’s family roots arrived in the Americas subsequent to 1868, and were/are entitled to their inheritance and estate, and that were deceived, kidnapped and made an indenture person under the U.S CORPORATION, and now have taken action to restore themselves as a “people”, back to the Republic Nation of America and obtain control of said *ens legis*, placing it under the jurisdiction of Judicial Common Equity Law and claim their GOD Given Heritage and Estate, and have now exercised a remedy and have regained that which the Father bestowed upon them as an inheritance and Birthright, and have stepped back into that which they are Rightful Stewards of. **The Fourth Class:** of man/woman are the “habitants.” Man/woman whose forefathers/progenitors/ancestors habitated the land prior to 1787 and/or were/are descendants of Polygamists which were “Forever Excluded” since the inception of the King George III *De Facto* Governance established subsequent to the Constitution of tHE UNITED sTATES and BILL OF RIGHTS and Administrative Governance System. Habitants are self governing, sovereign, creators under GOD and Jesus Christ and are beyond all jurisdictions of man and domicile in GOD’s creation only.

55. **Living, breathing, flesh-and-blood man:** means the Secured Party “Jobadiah-Sinclair: Weeks”, a sentient living being, as distinguished from an artificial entity, juristic corporation, partnership, association, and the like. “There every man is independent of all laws, except those prescribed by nature. He is not bound by any institution formed by his fellowmen without his consent.” CRUDEN v NEALE, 2 N.C. 338 (1796) 2 S E 70.
56. **Natural Man or Woman:** Means a sentient, flesh and blood, living, breathing, biological man or woman, created by God, as represented by the Upper and Lower Case name, including “Natural Man or Woman”, or “Real Man” or “Real Woman”, or “Real Man/Woman.” This is not to be confused with the Fictitious Legal Entity that was created by the Government/Parents that is represented by the All-Capital Letter Name.
57. **Natural Man or Woman Secured Party:** Means any flesh and blood, living, breathing, biological man or woman created by God, who notifies any Representative of the “government of tHE UNITED sTATES” or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation”, verbally or in writing, that he is not a Strawman, Vessel in Commerce, Corporate Fiction, Legal Entity, *ens legis*, or Transmitting Utility, of, for, by, to the “UNITED sTATES”, the government of tHE UNITED sTATES”, the “sTATE of COLORADO, i.e., “Republic of Colorado, or to tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation”. This is not to be confused with the Fictitious Legal Entity that was created by Government/ Parents and is represented by JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS©. Any attempt to notify any Representative of the status of the Secured Party will be sufficient notice. Sufficient notice will be determined by oath, statement or affidavit by the Secured Party: and the validity of such will not be challenged by any officer of the court.
58. **Nonobstante:** means words anciently used in public and private instruments with the intent of precluding, in advance, any interpretation other than certain declared objects and/or purposes.
59. **Obstruction of Justice:** Means any attempt by any officer of the court or Representative of any agency that represents the “government of tHE UNITED sTATES” or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation”, or any of its subdivisions, agencies, contractors, etc., to deprive, hinder, conceal, coerce, threaten the Secured Party in an attempt to prevent his/her any and every opportunity to legal/lawfully defend him/herself by attempting to produce or file lawful documents and or testimony, to officers, judges, magistrates the court, clerk of court, or Representatives, in order to settle any legal/lawful controversy. This also includes any attempt by a judge or officer of the court from hindering the Secured Party from filing admitting, presenting, discussing, questioning or using any evidence, document, paper, photographs, audio and/or video recordings, or any other type of evidence that they desire to submit as evidence in any type of court proceeding. The determination of what is evidence and what will be admitted is to be solely determined by the Secured Party. Any evidence will be tried on merits of the lawful content and validity. Any judge or officer of the court who attempts to suppress or dismiss legal or lawful evidence will voluntarily surrender all bonds, insurance, property, CAFR funds, CRIS funds, corporate property, bank accounts and savings accounts of value to the Secured Party upon written demand and surrender all rights to and defenses against said property. This also includes evidence that is supported by case law. This includes attempts by any officer of the court from making motions, order such as Gag Order or any other means of keeping information suppressed from the public or the official record. The determination of whether the acts of the court are an attempt to suppress evidence will be solely determined by the Secured Party. This also includes the provision as indicated in item #68 “**Racketeering**”
60. **Oppressing Government:** Means any Government or Representative thereof that shall have transgressed against Secured Party or any of Secured Party’s property rights, privileges, capacities, or immunities in any respect.
61. **Peers:** Means the same as the definition of a Secured Party
62. **People:** The “People” are those natural men and women who are holders of the sovereignty in The United States of America and the several States by virtue of the Treaty of Peace of 1783, signed by His Most Royal and

Dread Sovereign Majesty, King George III and its two addendums signed by the then Kings of Spain and France. The “People” are those who were the free habitants and inhabitants in the several States and their posterity (pauper, vagabonds and fugitives from justice excepted), reserving unto themselves and their posterity the sovereignty of both The United States of America and the several states. The “People” are not citizens of or subject to the jurisdiction of the “governance of tHE UNITED sTATES”, as created in your “Constitution for tHE UNITED sTATES” (circa 1787), or to your “UNITED sTATES Corporation”, also known as the corporate “UNITED sTATES, “Corp, USA”, “UNITED sTATES Inc” , or by whatever name same may currently be known or be hereafter named, or any of its subdivisions, including but not limited to local, state, federal, and/or international or multinational governments, Corporations, agencies, or sub-Corporations and any de factor compact (Corporate) commercial sTATES contract therein including the “sTATE OF COLORADO”, or by whatever name same may currently be known or be hereafter named, and the like. The “People” are the sovereigns in relation to first, The United States of America republic and second the several sovereign States.

63. **Person:** The word “Person”, when used in this Contract and written in upper and lower case letters shall mean a natural man or woman, and not an incorporeal person. Further, “Persons” derive all of their rights and privileges from the “People”, through the Constitution for tHE UNITED sTATES and the Constitutions of the several States. The “Persons” are identified in the Constitution for tHE UNITED sTATES and the Constitutions of the several States. The “Persons” are identified in the Constitution for tHE UNITED sTATES, first at Article 1, Section 9, Clause 1, their rights and privileges and defenses and protections are defined at Amendment Five of the Bill of Rights , and their duties and citizenship status are defined at Amendment Fourteen of the Constitution for tHE UNITED sTATES.
64. **Presumption:** Means legal assumption or inference that places the burden of proof or burden of production on the other party, but never on the Secured Party. No presumption shall prevail against the Secured Party without lawful, documented evidence that support the presumption which is certified by the officers of the court, on and for the record, under penalty of perjury.
65. **Products And Proceeds:** means any and all Store of Value whether now existing or hereafter acquired which may arise from the disposition of the collateral for any reason purpose or cause whatsoever, whether now existing or hereafter acquired including without limitation to: (1) THE DEBTORS legal name and all derivations thereof including without limitation to any and all rights, property, products, and proceeds, and all related documents that arise therefrom; (2) Any and all of THE DEBTOR’s income from every source; (3) Any and all tangible and/or intangible real and personal property; (4) Any and all goods or services which may be exchanged for a store of value whether cash or noncash, such as rents, digital assets, royalties, guarantees and insurance proceeds and the like; (5) Any and all business, insurance, annuity, stocks, shares, bonds, mortgages, commodities, options, estate, trust, and/or any other beneficiary disbursements, distributions and/or transactions; (6) Any and all deposit accounts, certificates of deposits, brokerage accounts, banking and every account with depository and repository and financial institutions and/or accounts; (7) Any and all encumbrances, claims, litigations, orders, warrants, judgments, demands, rights and/or remedies; and the like which arises out of, or from collateral; (8) The transmission of any goods, services, chattel papers and/or property, and promissory notes in commercial activity; (9) Any and all Digital assets and the products and proceeds arising therefrom; and (10) Any and all products and proceeds that arise from sale, lease, transfer, trade, license, conveyance, exchange, and the like; held by title, deed, contract, agreement, covenants, undertaking (whether expressed, implied, written or verbal) and whatever store of value is collected or distributed which may arise from collateral for any reason whatsoever whether the realization of such products and/or proceeds are voluntary or involuntary.
66. **Public Record:** Means any record or document placed into the public by the Secured Party. For example, when this document is recorded at a Register of Deeds office or Secretary of States, it becomes public record.

67. **Purchase Price:** Means the new replacement cost of items of property at the time of replacement. This includes, packing, shipping, handling, delivery, setup, installation and any other fee associated with total replacement of property.
68. **Racketeering:** Means any attempt by any two or more officers of “government of tHE UNITED sTATES” or the “UNITED sTATES Corporation”, to restrict, suppress, coerce, manipulate, inhibit, or in any way deprive the Secured Party from reviving every right, benefit or privilege or exercising every immunity that is outlined by the Constitution for tHE UNITED sTATES, the “Bill of Rights”, and/or the “Constitution for the sTATE OF COLORADO”. This also includes any effort by the officers of the court or any Representative of “government of tHE UNITED sTATES” or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation", to hinder in any way the introduction of evidence, law, facts, affidavits, statements, witness testimony, or any information that is considered relevant by Secured Party, or any attempt to prevent a jury from hearing this evidence. This also includes any attempt to prevent this evidence from being heard in a public forum and before any and all members of the general public, as many as can be accommodated by the main courtroom. All hearing, tribunals, or trials will be held in a public place and any and all member of the general public will be allowed to attend, without restriction. This also includes questioning and/or interrogation by police officers before, during and after an arrest.
68. **Reckless Endangerment:** Means any attempt by any officer of the court or Representative of “government of tHE UNITED sTATES” or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation", as defined herein, to endanger, attempt, or threaten to attempt to endanger the life or property of the Secured Party. This includes dangerous driving in a car, use or threatened use of lethal or non-lethal weapons or chemicals, improper use of restraint devices, use of restraint devices on a non-combative Secured Party. If a conflict arises as to whether or not reckless endangerment has occurred, the version of the Secured Party will be considered as truth.
69. **Representative:** Means any agent, agency, department, officer, investigator, entity, subsidiary, sub-Corporation, contractor, employee, inspector, individual or Corporation that has any affiliation, association, collects or distributes funds for, does any task for, receives any benefit or privilege from, etc., of or for “government of tHE UNITED sTATES” or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation", or anyone or anything that represents the interest of, or is being funded by, or receives fund from, or has any attachment to “government of tHE UNITED sTATES” or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation", or any of their Representatives, subdivisions or sub-Corporations.
70. **Right and Defenses:** Means Secured Party’s legal and/or lawful right and/or ability to defend himself/herself in any action. Upon agreement, the defendant in an action may give up his right to defend himself/herself in a given action. This includes tacit agreement or agreement by default, and the Secured Party is never the defendant.
71. **Right to Speedy Trial:** Means trial will commence within 90 days of the date of arrest.
72. **Right to Travel:** Means the right to freely move about and/or control any type of craft by whatever means, via land, sea, or air, without any interference by any Representative of “government of tHE UNITED sTATES” or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation", that in any manner willfully causes adverse effects or damages upon the Secured Party by an arrest, inhibition, detainment, restraint, deprivation or prevention.
73. **Secured Party:** In this Contract, the term “Secured Party”, means a “Principle/Secured Party Creditor/Settlor”, which means Jobadiah-Sinclair:Weeks, a natural, living, Breathing flesh-and-blood man or sentient being as against a juristic person created by legal construction and/or the appointment declared under declaration of trust appointing another or additional “Principle/Secured Party Creditor/Settlor” as stated therein.

74. **Sentient, living being** means the Secured Party “Jobadiah-Sinclair:Weeks” a living, breathing, flesh-and-blood man as distinguished from an abstract legal contract such as an artificial entity, juristic person, corporation, partnership, association, and the like.
75. **State:** The word “State” which is distinguished in this Contract by being written in traditional upper and lower case letters, means any of the fifty independent sovereign nation states (republic States) which make up the Union and are commonly referred to and known as State of “The United States of America” (For example: the “State of Arizona”, i.e., “Republic of Texas”), which use of the word “State” is not the same as a “sTATE” of tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation" and any such “State” is not a creation or subdivision hereof, and is not subject to the jurisdiction thereof.
76. **STATE:** The word “STATE”, which is distinguished in this Contract by being written in all upper case letters, designates reference to the name of a CORPORATION - including any of the de facto compact (Corporate) commercial sTATES, franchised from tHE UNITED sTATES CONSORTIUM CHARTER CORPORATION”, also known as the corporate “UNITED sTATES”, “Corp. USA”, “UNITED sTATES, Inc.”, or by whatever name same may currently be known or be hereafter named, by way of example, including, but not limited to the “sTATE OF TEXAS”, or by whatever name same may currently be known by or hereafter named. STATES are a part of and subject to the jurisdiction of tHE UNITED sTATES CORPORATION CONSORTIUM , and are not States of The United States of America. As a condition of this Contract, the Secured Party will determine **1.** Whether or not any State is a part of tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation", and **2.** Whether the alleged offense occurred within the limits of tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation" and such determination will never be challenged by any Representative of tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation". A violation of this provision will be #87 Unlawful Determination and punishable as indicated by this Contract.
77. **Statute Staple Securities Instrument:** Means a registered (by way of the post office registered mail) bond statute, which establishes a procedure for settlement of a commercial debt or obligation of record. This also establishes the law as it relates to the Secured Party.
78. **Store Of Value:** means any and all manner by which any commercial gain or value may be acquired, collected, delivered or transferred to, received, saved, or held by THE DEBTOR including without limitation to any and all of the debtors property, rights, assets, all of the Collateral without limitation to all the products and proceeds therefrom.
79. **Artificial Entity:** In this documentation the term “Artificial Entity” means the Debtor i.e, JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS©, and any and all variations and derivatives of the spelling of said name except Jobadiah-Sinclair:Weeks; a front, a third party who is put up in name only for participating in a transaction. The “strawman” is synonymous with # 83 “Transmitting Utility”
80. **The Placing or Filing of an Unlawful Lien, Levy, Burden, Charge, Liability, Garnishment, Encumbrance, or Attachment:** Means any attempt by any Representative of “government of tHE UNITED sTATES” or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation", to place a lien, levy, garnishment, or attachment on the property or collateral of the Secured Party. Any such Representative must first prove his authority to do so by lawfully documented evidence, furnishing all documents, forms and papers as necessary to prove his authority to do so to a neutral Three (3) Notary Panel, hereinafter referenced as The Panel, selected by the Secured Party. Said Representative must guarantee in writing that the Representative signing said documents will be personally liable for any damages(s) due to his unlawful and/or illegal actions. He must supply bonds or other lawful funds to be held in trust by The Panel until The Panel determines if any action of the Representative have violated any laws or caused damage to the Secured Party. The Panel will have the sole power to determine if any damage(s) has occurred and will release the funds according to The Panel’s adjudication. The decision of The Panel will be final with no recourse. The surety bonds and/or funds held in escrow by The Panel must be at least four (4) times the estimated value of the property that is leaned, levied, garnished, or attached. The assessment of value will be recorded via affidavit by the Secured Party and delivered to The Panel. The Panel’s determination and the assessment thereof will be accepted as truth without

question or recourse. Said Representative agrees to surrender, including, but not limited to, any and all surety bonds, public and/or corporate insurance policies, CAFR funds, CRIS funds or corporate property as needed to satisfy any and all claims and/or assessments as filed against said Representative by the Secured Party. Said Representative agrees that any and all property or collateral with a current or existing lien will remain in the custody and control of the Secured Party until such time as a determination has been made by a jury of twelve of the Secured Party's Peers as defined herein. In the event that a jury of twelve of the Secured Party's Peers cannot be convened or has not been convened within sixty (60) days from the date of the order of the lien, levy, attachment or garnishment, any action against the Secured Party shall be dismissed with prejudice: and every lien, levy, attachment or garnishment shall be released within ten (10) days and all property rights restored, unencumbered. The Representative who has authorized said lien, levy, attachment or garnishment agrees to surrender any and all surety bonds, public and/or corporate insurance policies, CAFR funds, CRIS funds or corporate property as needed to satisfy any and all claims and/or assessments as filed against said Representative.

81. **This Agreement:** Shall mean Commercial Security Agreement #JSW11111981CSA-087815225SA including any and all attachments and related documents therefrom whether now existing or hereafter created, modified, or agreed upon between THE DEBTOR and Secured Party.
82. **Trespassing/Trespass:** Means the entry into, or onto the domain, property, residence, area, location, grounds, dwellings, building, barns, sheds, caves, structures, lands, storage areas, tunnels, automobiles, trucks, safe houses, underground shelters, automobiles, motor vehicles, recreational vehicles, boats, plants, trains, ships, containers, vans, heavy equipment, farm implements, culverts, driveways, trees, yards, real property, real estate, land, etc., of the Secured Party without Secured Party's express written permission, or without a lawfully executed fourth (4th) amendment warrant, and any and all Representatives of "government of the UNITED STATES" or the UNITED STATES Corporation" willfully and completely observe any and all protections as outlined in the Constitution for the UNITED STATES, the "Bill of Rights, and or the "Constitution of the State of Colorado ". Any personal property that is damaged, lost stolen, or misplaced, etc., will be recoverable as indicated in the Legal Notice and Demand document. Secured Party has never had any illegal contraband on or around their property and never will. Secured Party simply does not allow it on Secured Party's property. Any contraband, if it is found on the said property, will have been introduced by the officers or agents during the time of trespass. Contraband or illegal items if they are found in a search do not belong to Secured Party and may not be used in any attempt in any claim against me. Any and all Representatives of the "government of the UNITED STATES" or the UNITED STATES Corporation", will be held individually and personally liable for the full amount of damages as outlined in this Notice and Demand document for trespassing.
83. **Transmitting Utility:** the term "Transmitting Utility" JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS© and all derivatives and variations in the spelling of said name except Jobadiah-Sinclair:Weeks
84. **Trustee:** means Jobadiah-Sinclair:Weeks
85. **U.C.C.:** Herein the term "U.C.C." means Uniform Commercial code
86. **Unalienable Rights (Inalienable Rights)** Means Natural Rights given by God as acknowledge by the Law of Nations and incorporated into the "Bill of Rights" of the Constitution of the State of Colorado such as, but not limited to right of enjoying and defending their lives and liberties; of acquiring, possessing and protecting property; and of seeking and obtaining their safety and happiness
87. **Unfounded Accusations:** Means any accusation, charge, or claim, civil or criminal, or in admiralty that is alleged or made by any Representative of the "government of the UNITED STATES" or the UNITED STATES Corporation" as defined herein, that is not proven by the written documented evidence presented under oath and penalty of perjury by an authorized Representative of the "government of the UNITED STATES" or the UNITED STATES Corporation". The accuser has eight (8) hours to provide said documents to be reviewed and in

possession of the Secured Party; and failure to do so will be unfounded accusations and subject to the penalties contacted herein.

88. **UNITED sTATES Corporation:** “UNITED sTATES Corporation” means the *De facto* foreign controlled CONSORTIUM CHARTER CORPORATION (circa 1871) operated under the name “tHE UNITED sTATES”, “Corp USA”, “UNITED sTATES Inc”, or by whatever name it may currently be known or be hereafter named (exclusive of “The united States of America”) the “governance of tHE UNITED sTATES, as created in the Constitution for tHE UNITED sTATES, (circa 1787), or any of its agencies, or sub-Corporations including but not limited to any de facto compact (Corporate) commercial states contracting therein, including, but not limited to the “sTATE OF COLORADO”, or by whatever name it may currently be known or be hereafter named (Exclusive of the “State of Colorado”, i.e, “Republic of Texas”)
89. **The united States of America:** The term “The united States of America”, when used in this Contract is distinguished by being written in upper and lower case letters, except that the first letter of the first word, i.e :united” is a lower case letter, and means that union of independent sovereign nations , states and republics, which as colonies of Great Britain and having declared their independence from Great Britain in The Declaration of Independence adopted July 4th, 1776, and having won their independence from Great Brain in the American Revolutionary War, and thereafter having gained recognition as an independent sovereign “Republic Nation of America” in international law by the Treaty of Peace of 1783, signed by His Most Royal and Dread Sovereign Majesty, King George the III and its two addendums signed by the then King of Spain and France and which independent sovereign “Republic Nation of America” did adopt the “Articles of Confederation: of 1778. The words “The United States of America”, when used in this Contract, does not include tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation, as that term is defined herein.
90. **Unlawful Arrest:** Means restricting the Secured Party’s right to move about freely without proper use of a lawful 4th amendment warrant signed by a judge of “Competent Jurisdiction” while under oath. This includes unnecessary use of restraint devices, traffic stops, raids, or any other type of interaction, when an officer is presented with and ignores a “Notice and Demand,” “Public Servants Questionnaire,” “Right to Travel” Documents, or other documents notifying the officer of the lawful rights of the Secured Party, created by God, who is not to be confused with the Corporate Fiction “Strawman” which was fraudulently created by the sTATE. This includes arrest when the Secured Party is incarcerated for refusing to sign any citation, arrest due to contempt of court when he or she is not violent or a physical threat to the court, arrest by Internal Revenue Service for failure to produce books, records, or there documents, arrest and refusal of Habeas Corpus arrest for conspiracy of any kind without lawfully documented affidavits from as least two (2) eye witnesses, signed under oath and penalty of perjury.
91. **Unlawful detainer:** Means any attempt by any officer of the court or Representative of the “government of tHE UNITED sTATES” or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation" to arrest, check, hinder, delay, possess hold, keep in custody, restrain, retard, stop, withhold the Secured Party without affording him every protection as outlined by the “Constitution for tHE UNITED sTATES”, the “Bill of Rights, and/or the “Constitution of the sTATE of COLORADO”. Any public law, Statute, regulation, ordinance or the like will be null and void and will not be used in any action in which the Secured Party is involved.
92. **Unlawful Detention:** Means restraining the Secured Party’s freedom of movement, and/or Right to Travel, against his will for more than sixty (60) seconds without a property authorized lawful 4th amendment warrant signed by a judge of competent jurisdiction while under oath. This included routine traffic stops, raids, random, identification checks, security checks, only after Representative has been notified by the Secured Party of his status and after the officer has been given documents to prove said status, along with up to ten (10) minutes for an officer to examine said documents.
93. **Unlawful Determination:** Means any statement, speech, gesture, writing, presentment, or the like that suggests an idea that negatively represents the character, actions, plans, procedures, customs, ways of the Secured Party or group of Secured Parties, that is not proven by documented

authorized certified evidence, on and for the record under penalty of perjury. This includes off-color statements, accusations, or remarks by a judge or other officer of the court and any other Representative of the "government of tHE UNITED sTATES" or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation".

94. **Unlawful Distrain:** Means seizure or taking of any property that is lawfully owned or in possession of the Secured Party without proper probable cause, and/or due process, and lawful 4th amendment warrant. This includes any seizure by any Representative, in any capacity, or relationship with the "government of tHE UNITED sTATES" or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation" or any of its agencies, contractor, subdivisions, subsidiaries, or the like.
95. **Unlawful Restraint:** Means any action by any Representative to prevent, coerce, intimidate, hinder, or in any way limit the right of the Secured Party from any type of freedom of legal/lawful speech, travel, movement, action, gesture, writing, utterance, or enjoyment of any right or privilege that is commonly enjoyed by any citizen of tHE UNITED sTATES or of the sTATE OF COLORADO.
96. **US Dollars:** Means the currently recognized medium of exchange as used by the general public at the time of the offense, at par value, equal to one-ounce silver dollar equivalent per each dollar unit, as represented in a claim. All claims and damages will be paid at par value as indicated. Par value will be established by written law or the value established by the US MINT for purchase of an official one troy ounce 99.999% Pure Silver Coin, whichever is higher at the time of the offense.
97. **Verbal Abuse:** Means the use of offensive, and/or threatening verbal words, body language, and nonverbal gestures or actions by any representative of the "government of tHE UNITED sTATES" or tHE UNITED sTATES Corporation", as defined herein, upon the Secured Party. If a controversy arises about an incident the version told by the Secured Party will be accepted as truth and will not be contested.
98. **Vessel in Commerce:** "vessel in commerce" means the strawman, JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS, and any derivatives and variations in spelling of said name, except for Jobadiah-Sinclair:Weeks, a transmitting utility, an all-capital-letter name representing the Strawman/Beneficiary/Ens Legis for the use in commerce by which the Trustee/Secured Party can participate in commerce and appear in court.
99. **Victim:** Means the Secured Party who has received direct damages to themselves or their property as a result of an unlawful or illegal act by another.
100. **Victimless Laws:** Means any law that is passed or presumed to be passed that creates a violation of law where no Natural Man or Woman has been damaged. This includes any statute, ordinance, regulation, policy, or color of law provision. These types of laws will not be used in any action of any kind against any Natural Man or Woman or the property thereof.
101. **Willingly:** Means that a Secured Party is in full knowledge, understanding, agreement, and full consent, at all time, without fear of reprisal, threat, or coercion, during any interaction in which he is involved with any Representative of any court or Corporation including incorporated Governments.
102. **Written or Verbal Agreement:** Means any agreement entered into by the Secured Party, written or verbal. Any question of any contract will be resolved by an affidavit from the Secured Party. Secured Party's affidavit will be considered fact in any action or dispute, without question of any Representative of any Corporation, including incorporated governments.

Certificate Of Service

I hereby certify that on the _____ th day of January, 2025, the foregoing document was filed in court, and the copy was served on the parties below.

JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS
Without prejudice UCC 1-308

Jobadiah-Sinclair: of the family Weeks (the living man)
On the land of the republic at Large, America
Non-Domestic
c/o 11627 West 74th Way
near Arvada, Colorado Republic [80005]
without tHE UNITED sTATES (28 U.S.C. 1746)

CONCLUSION AND *RECTUM ROGARE*

WHEREAS, the facts and the law contained herein are before this court; and, WHEREAS, the facts and the law contained herein are the Truth; and WHEREAS, we hold said Truths to be self-evident; and, WHEREAS, self-evident Truths are undisputed and incontrovertible, no oral argument is requested, for no words can alter or overcome these Truths; and, WHEREAS, Truth is Sovereign: She comes from God and bears His message, from whatever quarter her great eyes may look down upon you; Psalms 117:2; John 8:32; II Corinthians. 13:8; THEREFORE; this court must perform its duty under the Rule of Law, do Justice, *Rectum Rogare*, without delay for.. “Justice delayed is Justice denied.”

Rectum Rogare - "to do right; to petition the judge to do right." — Black’s Law Dictionary 4th edition.

**NOTICE TO THE AGENT IS NOTICE TO THE PRINCIPLE
NOTICE TO THE PRINCIPLE IS NOTICE TO THE AGENT
WITHOUT PREJUDICE U.C.C. § 1-308
ALL RIGHTS RESERVE**

FURTHER AFFIANT SAITH NOT.

I declare under the penalty of bearing false witness before God and as recognized under the laws in and for The sTATE of COLORADO, the Laws of THE UNITED sTATES, acting with sincere intent and full standing in law, do herewith certify and state that the foregoing contents are true, correct, complete, certain, admissible as evidence, and not intended to mislead anyone, and that JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS executes this document in accordance with best knowledge and understanding without dishonor, without recourse; with All rights reserved, without prejudice.

Done this _____ day of January, in the year 2025, under penalty of perjury under the laws of tHE UNITED sTATES.

JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS - Beneficiary
All Rights Reserved - 1-308

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to this _____ day of, January, 2025.

Notary Public; in and for _____

SEAL