

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Jobadiah of the House of Weeks, aka, Jobadiah Sinclair Weeks,
Petitioner

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, OFFICERS OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY, COLORADO AND FLORIDA, all my previous attorneys, and all “John Does” within ALL Courts and all Public Servants that have Taken an Oath To Uphold the de jure Constitution 1791, "THE RESPONDENTS"

DELIVERED VIA REGISTERED MAIL: **RF 794 044 015 US**

In Re: Federal Court Case Numbers

Case #19-cr-877-nj-cecchi, and cc 019-mj-8526

Notice to Agent is Notice to Principal, Notice to Principal is Notice to Agent,
American Maxim of Law.

\$22.2 BILLION DOLLAR COUNTERCLAIM

FOR VIOLATIONS OF SELF-EXECUTING, UNALIENABLE
CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS, BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY, THEFT,
KIDNAPPING AND OTHER
MATTERS OF LAW

If it please the Court, I, Jobadiah from the House of Weeks, aka Jobadiah Sinclair Weeks, urgently appear herein Sui Juris, reserving all my Rights, as a sovereign living man, humbly come to this **Article III Court** of proper venue as my last bastion of hope and right, in the posture of an outspoken lover of Liberty with strong, deep american roots (S.A.R. and Society of the Cincinnati) and a respect for the rule of law and justice, who despite the fact that my government has failed to protect me and my rights, and have purloined the sovereign living men and women of this great nation, I stand tall and resolute and I irreverently claim my heritage from those that have usurped our rightful Republican form of government, and deceived the American People, thus betraying our trust in them as our trustees and public servants. This American Man **whose ancestors helped build this country from its inception** as Officers, Senators, Congressmen and Secretaries in various Presidential Cabinets, has been egregiously and irreversibly harmed by the Respondents, the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, and others specifically named on my “accused list” filed on the docket of Case #19-cr-877-nj-cecchi.

I seek redress of grievances, and I seek an IMMEDIATE interlocutory injunction.

The judges, prosecutors, lawyers, and agents of the 3 letter agencies named have been colluding with each-other and have committed the following crimes/offenses against myself: **They have failed to uphold the oath they took to the US and State Constitutions and are warring against it; Breach of Trust; Attacking a Beneficiary of a Constructive Trust they were unlawfully administering; Breach of their fiduciary duties; Invalid and unlawful warrants issued, resulting in a false arrest and unlawful searches and seizures absent probable cause not supported by Oath or affirmation, in blatant violation of the Constitution; Fraudulent charges predicated on unsworn petitions by prosecuting attorneys; Deprivation of rights for a trial by jury; Confiscation and theft of property without the due process of law; Physical, mental and psychological torture; Denial of bail for non-capital offense; Denial of a speedy trial; Coercion to make a plea statement under circumstances of torture and 11 months of unlawful incarceration without a trial, and without the right to face my accusers; Cruel and unusual punishment; Crimes against humanity; Unlawful conversion of me into a “person” (fictitious entity); Human Trafficking and treason.**

The coordinated actions of the SEC, FBI, IRS, DOJ, inferior 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 BILLIONS in assets and consolidating control over the digital asset market... **This is the biggest Bitcoin case in the world!** **The government has caused billions of dollars in damages to over a million people. I am coming to you in dire need of your help to right this wrong.**

For supporting evidence please watch my brief whistle blower video at www.JobWeeks.com

They have routinely violated, deprived and trampled my self-executing unalienable Rights; and they have committed breach of fiduciary duty to myself and the American People, who placed certain powers and assets in their hands with the expectation of loyal and sound administration in accordance with the organic Constitution 1791.

Pursuant to the organic Constitution 1791, in Article III, Sections 1 & 2, the supreme Court of the United States has jurisdiction to hear this counterclaim, and to immediately act upon it. *“The judicial Power of the United States shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good Behavior, and shall, at stated Times, receive for their Services, a Compensation, which shall not be diminished during their Continuance in Office.”* *“The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States... to Controversies to which the United States [United States of America; UNITED STATES OF AMERICA] shall be a Party... and in those in which a State [STATE] shall be a party, the supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction.”*

These papers stem from underlying causes of action number cc-19-cr-877-nj-cecchi, and cc 019-mj-8526, in the UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY, presiding **Judge Claire C. Cecchi**... partially entitled United States of America, Plaintiff v.

JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS trust. **This cause of action has been open since December 10, 2019.** The climax of this saga is happening now!

The question often arises as to whether constitutional provisions are to be construed in accordance with evolving modern times, or as originally written. *“On every question of construction [let us] carry ourselves back to the time when the Constitution was adopted, recollect the spirit manifested in the debates, and instead of trying what meaning may be squeezed out of the text or invented against it, conform to the probable one in which it was passed.”* **Thomas Jefferson.**

Our SCOTUS has many times affirmed that the supreme law of the land is to be interpreted as originally written and within the spirit of the Founding Fathers’ debates. *“The answer is the Constitution. And if it’s in the Constitution, and the other two branches are infringing on it, right to exercise, your religion, your right to bear arms, your right to speak freely, [or any other Right], I’m duty bound. I took an oath to uphold the Constitution and you win [the People], even though the government may not like it. When do I stay out? When the Constitution doesn’t say anything about the subject.”* Esteemed SCOTUS Honorable Justice **Neil M. Gorsuch.**

All public servants, including all those within the entire judiciary of this great nation, have been committing acts of treason, fraud and deprivation/violation of the self-executing Rights of the American People. The Sovereign American People are their Masters. These rogue judicial officer public servants have been trespassing upon our God-given, Natural, unalienable, self-executing Rights, since at least the establishment of the organic Constitution 1791 as the Supreme Law of the Land (See Supremacy Clause and affirmed in Marbury v. Madison).

These acts constitute redressable grievances, per the Declaration of Independence, which can only be attained within this Court of Record/Justice/Law, as the only Court which derives its power from the organic Constitution 1791. All other courts, by their very nature, and by constitutional mandate, are congressionally created as artificial constructs, who possess zero authority over any Sovereign, Living American Man or Woman.

I assert the statements made herein to be true and correct, to the best of my knowledge, via this Affidavit, submitted under the penalty of perjury, in the presence of Almighty God, and I further declare that the wonton and malicious acts stated herein constitute a complete defense, and entitlement to damages in accordance with these papers and the lawful remedies sought herein.

These rogue characters/actors, who have been masquerading under the color of law, and under the color of authority (FRAUD), by and through their agents, must immediately cease and desist their wrongdoing, repent, and provide lawful restitution to this aggrieved Sovereign Living Man.

I seek redress of grievances, and I seek an IMMEDIATE interlocutory injunction depriving all named-herein Respondents, all federal district court magistrates, judges, prosecutors in this nation, and all judicial public servants within this nation who have taken an oath or affirmation with bond to uphold the organic Constitution 1791, from proceeding with any actions against me, in their kangaroo courts, pending resolution of this counterclaim. I assert that I have unlawfully been enslaved by the very institution and its actors, to whom the American people, of which I am one, ascribed the judicial power to jealously protect our self-executing unalienable Rights as found and promised in the organic Constitution 1791.

The late Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals **Judge James Alger Fee** stated: *“The privilege against self incrimination [or any of the constitutionally self-executing, protected and secure Rights...] is neither accorded to the passive resistant, nor to the person who is ignorant of his rights, nor to the one indifferent thereto. It is a FIGHTING clause. Its benefits can be retained only by sustained COMBAT. It cannot be claimed by attorney or solicitor. It is valid only when insisted upon by a BELLIGERENT claimant in person.”*

President Trump said to **“FIGHT FIGHT FIGHT!”** And so I am as a “belligerent claimant!”
The above decision begs some constitutional questions:

- 1) By what constitutional authority can I be deprived of my self-executing Right to self-present, with unfettered will, if a BAR-member attorney cannot exercise on my behalf my God-given, Natural self-executing Rights to assert those Rights that are protected and secure within the organic Constitution?
- 2) By what constitutional authority can I be forced to prove to the court, via a rigorous, coercive and intimidating “Faretta hearing,” and denied direct access to the court prior to attending that hearing to prove that I am competent to manage my own affairs, absent probable cause that I am not competent? Do those deprivations not violate at the very least, my First, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth and Seventh Amendment Rights, and my God-given of all Rights, my sacred Right to Liberty absent due process of law and a finding during a trial by jury of guilty with conviction and sentence?
- 3) Is our jurisprudence system of law not based upon “innocent until proven guilty?”
- 4) Is it not true that if one is innocent until proven guilty, then one’s constitutionally protected Rights must remain preserved and protected until I am afforded due process of law and a finding of guilty by a competent jury of my peers, with conviction and sentence has been adjudicated?
- 5) Is it not unlawful to impose any punishment or restriction on a non-capital alleged crime, or to deprive Sovereign Man of Liberty absent due process of law, which includes bail, a trial by jury of my peers, with conviction and sentence?
- 6) Can I be constitutionally and lawfully held/detained/restricted/lose any of my self executing Rights, absent due process of law, which includes bail, trial by jury by my peers, conviction and sentence?
- 7) By what constitutional authority can Sovereign Man be subject to the Doctrine of Parens Patriae without express consent, or by a hearing that proves that I am an infant, that I am indigent, or that I am insane, with no probable cause that would lead the common man to believe that I might be any one of those things?
- 8) Is it not true that judges must exercise judicial power following the common law, as opposed to legislatively created statutes that may not, upon scrutiny, have been constitutionally lawfully enacted? Is it not true that due process of law demands trial by jury, affirmed in the Seventh Amendment?
- 9) Is it not true that denying inalienably protected Rights by citing precedent cases as if they are the law of the land, even if they are intrinsically “bad law” deprives me of unalienable Right to Due Process of Law as found in the Fifth Amendment?
- 10) Is it not true that Due Process of Law includes the Right to have my unique case considered on its own merits, rather than attempting to place a round peg in a square hole by citing precedent cases that inherently do not reflect the salient set of facts found and/or

alleged in my case? Prosecutors routinely use the excuse that a living man might be insane and therefore, not fit to self-present at trial, only because he has elected to exercise his unalienable Right to not have an attorney after having had one for any period during a proceeding.

11) Is that not a stealth way to intimidate and to coerce and to deprive living man of this unalienable Right to self-present? I hereby assert that the real reason to deprive a Sovereign Man of this unalienable and protected Right is to assure that upon conviction or sentencing subsequent to a coerced plea statement is to guarantee the signature required by either the accused or his agent/attorney so that the court and their public officers can then **raid the rightful Beneficiary's Trust Funds**, with no full disclosure to the accused, that his Beneficial trust funds even exist. We have been deceived into believing that courts are governmental agencies and that they are funded by taxes. As a matter of fact, each court is a for-profit corporate construct who raids the funds that rightfully belong to the accused, without any disclosure of that fact, **which are acts of breach of fiduciary duty, as Trustee, and of fraud and of Barratry.**

I assert that pretrial conditions of release that violate God-given Natural, unalienable and constitutionally protected Rights are unlawful and must be prohibited. The Fifth Amendment guarantees due process of law, which includes trial by jury, also found in the Seventh Amendment, conviction and sentence before any Rights can be infringed, and before any punishment can be imposed.

For example, last week I called pretrial services to ask permission to leave my house to file papers at the federal courthouse. The irony is that the paper I was filing was my Notice to the court that I had fired my attorneys for cause, for fraud, for swindle, and for grossly ineffective assistance of counsel. The pretrial services public servant, who has taken an oath or affirmation to uphold the Constitution, **denied me that Right to go to the courthouse.**

He stated that I could not go or file because I had an attorney! As a segue, and worse yet, the reason I had to ask for permission to exercise the unalienable Rights to liberty and to travel and to come and go as I see fit, is because a magistrate "judge," who likes to "wear black robes," borrowing a phrase from the esteemed SCOTUS Honorable Justice Neil M. Gorsuch, issued pretrial conditions of release that deny me the Right to leave my home for any reason other than to visit my attorneys or to attend a court hearing. This has been going on for 5 years with no end in sight.

Magistrate "judges" do not inherently possess any constitutional authority to enter any orders or decisions on the record at all that fundamentally deprive me of any of my unalienable Rights. The organic Constitution mandates the exercise of judicial power to judges that have tenure during "good behavior." Magistrate judges are typically unconstitutionally appointed by federal judges who have no constitutionally delegated authority to appoint these magistrate "judges" and they unconstitutionally grant them some judicial power. Magistrate judges typically have eight-year contracts. They are not tenured. They are also not accountable to the American people because they are appointed by someone other than the American people.

In other words, they are **fake judges** who are masquerading under the color of authority of law, which is fraud upon the court, fraud upon the American people and fraud ab initio, a complete defense, and automatic grounds for dismissal with prejudice. These magistrate public servants take an oath or affirmation to uphold the constitution, which they violate every time

they exercise any judicial power and impose deprivations and violations upon the American people, which is an **act of treason**.

The federal judge, who appoints these magistrate fake judges, is duty-bound to uphold the constitution. By delegating any judicial power to a non-constitutional judge, he is likewise committing an **act of treason**.

As a matter of law, magistrate “judges” are mere paper pushers who can only enforce statutes, which are not the law of the land.

Their decisions and orders are therefore null and void ab initio. Resuming the violations and deprivations I started sharing with you above. My parents home has been commandeered as a Federal Detention facility. I am required to have a 24/7 personal guard at my parents house guaranteeing the court that I not leave their house absent express permission from a third-party, for-profit agency who has unconstitutionally been delegated the authority to violate all my constitutionally protected Rights to unfettered liberty absent due process of law, trial by jury, conviction and sentence.

MAXIM: A delegated power cannot be delegated to a third party, absent express permission to so delegate.

Worse yet,

MAXIM: An un-delegated power cannot be delegated.

Included in those deprivations is my Right to visit a doctor of any kind without express permission. I must not only request permission at least 3 days prior to the doctor’s visit, but the health practitioner must be a M.D.! I cannot visit a chiropractor, naturopath, kinesiologist, acupuncturist, etc.

I cannot go to church! Does that not violate my First Amendment Right to freedom of religion?

I cannot attend a gym for regular exercise. Do those deprivations not violate my Fourth Amendment Right to be secure in my person? Do those deprivations not violate protective provisions under Human Rights treaties?

As a Sovereign Man I have an unalienable Right, protected in the Sixth Amendment, to directly submit papers to the court, and to appear in court with no attorney, and I have an unalienable Right to choose my own non-BAR member attorney of my free will, if I so choose. Courts have oftentimes affirmed this Right. Yet it is routinely violated.

So far, **I have spent approximately \$3 million dollars on compelled BAR-member attorneys.** These attorneys have never disclosed to me why they have neglected to safeguard my constitutionally protected self-executing unalienable Rights.

For example, when the federal court judge blatantly and repeatedly denied my unalienable Right to Bail during the first eleven months of the underlying cause of action and denied me my self-executing unalienable Right to a Speedy Trial, citing some scheme called a “complex litigation,” my BAR-member attorney was duty-bound to demand reconsideration or to submit on my behalf an appeal for such blatant deprivations by the federal judge and magistrate.

Such ineffective assistance of counsel by the BAR-member attorneys and such blatant denial of fundamental Rights by the judge constitute automatic dismissal with prejudice. “...*the*

invocation of constitutional defenses follows from the fact that constitutional rights are “self-executing” prohibitions on governmental action.” City of Boerne v. Flores, 521 U.S. 505, 524 (1997). Quoted in Christopher L. Wilson v. Hawaii on December 9, 2024, cert. denied.

MAXIM: A Right cannot be converted to a privilege.

An incontrovertible Maxim of Law is that the supreme Power of all Time and of all Things rests upon Almighty God as the Supreme Arbiter of the Law. He created Living Man in his own Image and bestowed upon all Living Men, Sovereignty over the Land, the Air, and the Waters... acronym LAW, which no living man or artificial entity can legislate away or deprive/violate. Any such trespasses by any oath-taker constitute a complete defense and demands full dismissal with prejudice in accordance with the papers submitted and their lawful remedies sought therein. Judicial officers who are the perpetrators of violations, encroachments, or deprivations of self-executing unalienable Rights are committing acts of treason, which is Fraud upon the court, fraud upon the American People, and fraud ab initio. See Throckmorton, FRAUD VITIATES ALL.

MAXIM: John 15:20: The servant is not greater than his lord [Sovereign Master].

Chisholm v. Georgia, (US) 2 Dall 419, 454, L. Ed. 440, 455 @ Dall (1793) pp 471-472: “... at the Revolution, the sovereignty devolved on the people; and they are truly the sovereigns of the country, but they are sovereigns without subjects... with none to govern but themselves...”

MAXIM: All political power is inherent in the people by decree of God, thus none can exist except it be derived from them.

Artificial entities, such as the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA [United States of America], are foreclosed from interfacing with Living Man, as they are not of like kind. Thus, Governments being artificial persons, cannot interface/attain parity, with the Tangible/living Man or Woman. See Penhallow v. Doane’s Administraters (3 U.S. 54; 1 L. Ed. 57; 3 Dall. 54). “Supreme Court of the United States 1795, “*Inasmuch as every GOVERNMENT is an ARTIFICIAL PERSON, an abstraction, and a creature of the mind only, a GOVERNMENT can interface only with other ARTIFICIAL PERSONS. The Imaginary, having neither actuality nor substance, is foreclosed from creating and attaining parity with the Tangible. The legal manifestation of this is that no GOVERNMENT, as well as any Law, agency, aspect, Court, etc. can concern itself with anything other than Corporate, ARTIFICIAL PERSONS and the contracts between them [emphasis added]”*

Therefore, since I am a living, breathing/tangible Sovereign Man, neither the government nor the federal court has any jurisdictional authority to bring forth a complaint or to exercise judicial power against me, absent a wet-ink contract in accordance with the eight elements of contract law, which also requires express consent with full disclosure of all the terms of the contract. Tacit procuration is unlawful and renders any assumed or presumed contract null and void ab initio. The underlying cause of action is a controversy/case between an artificial entity as Plaintiff, and a Sovereign Living Man whose home is on the Land of Colorado. Thus, there is no parity between the plaintiff and accused “defendant”. The above matter of law alone is sufficient reason to bar the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA/United States of America, as Plaintiff from bringing forth the underlying cause of action.

Without Standing, a plaintiff cannot proceed in any cause of action, thus entitling me to claim this disparity as a complete defense, and to demand dismissal with prejudice of all charges, in accordance with the law of the land and with the lawful remedies sought.

MAXIM: *Where there is a legal right there is also a legal remedy.*

2 Rolle, 17 C.L.M., Broom Max. 191, 204. I Term 512; Co. Lin. 197 th' 3 Bouv., Inst. n. 2411.

Not only can artificial entities such as our federal government, not interface with tangible/living man or woman, but the only way for a governmental entity to enact “newly created” statutory criminal laws, is through sovereignty. Since the government bodies are not sovereign, they cannot promulgate or enforce criminal laws. They can only create and enforce civil laws, which are duty-bound to comply with the Law of Contracts.

The Law of Contracts requires signed written mutually agreed terms and conditions, with complete transparency, and knowledge beforehand of all its terms and conditions, in accordance with the eight elements that constitute a valid and enforceable contract. In contrast, I am a Sovereign Man, and I have complete authority to accept or to rescission any contract that is not agreeable to me, or that was obtained via deception, torture, under the color of law and under the color of authority. I do not consent to any of the adhesion contracts that have been imposed upon me via deception.

Through lack of education within our federally funded schools, we have been deprived of any education regarding the law and our unalienable Rights. Instead, we have been indoctrinated into obedience of the “laws” which are presented as statutes, which are not the law of the land. Such ambiguity and falsehood constitute outright deception, dereliction and breach of duty, and fraud.

We are taught that the only way to achieve justice is to hire the “best” ... translation ... most expensive BAR-MEMBER attorney money can buy so that he can defend against governmental encroachment and protect constitutional Rights. *“Say...whether peace is best preserved by giving energy to the government, or information to the people. This last is the most certain and the most legitimate engine of government. Educate and inform the whole mass of the people. Enable them to see that it is their interest to preserve peace and order, and they will preserve them. And it doesn't requires a very high degree of education to convince them of this. They are the only sure reliance for the preservation of our liberty.” Thomas Jefferson.*

At no point did I ever agree, with knowledge beforehand of the full terms and conditions and its ramifications, and with no coercion or intimidation, to any contracts with the government or any of its entities. Any contract that I might have signed that is either unconstitutional on its face, or that I signed without full disclosure or knowledge beforehand of the terms and conditions, and their ramifications, I hereby unconditionally rescission, as my lawful Right as Sovereign Man, to rescission any contract that was presumed/assumed under tacit procuration.

Besides, the organic Constitution promises that judges follow the common law and that they exercise judicial power.

MAXIM: *Ignorance of the law is no excuse.*

This Truth of law is even more pronounced when it comes to any judiciary public servant, such as all judges and justices. Judges/justices are constitutionally required to take an oath or affirmation with bond to uphold the organic Constitution 1791.

MAXIM: *The judge is counselor for the prisoner.*

He is duty-bound to safeguard the Rights of the accused from all usurpers, which necessarily includes unconstitutional encroachment from the government, as prosecutorial abuse. When a judge or justice observes a violation or deprivation of the American People's unalienable Rights, or when he observes that any provision found within the organic Constitution 1791 is being breached by any governmental entity who has a fiduciary duty to the American People, he is duty-bound to immediately correct the errors of the perpetrator of the violation. This particularly holds true when a federal judge has first-hand knowledge of said violations as emanating from within his own court system, or when emanating from one of the magistrate "judges" he has taken part in appointing, even if not constitutionally authorized to delegate authority that he himself does not have authority to delegate. But it also holds true when he is turning a blind eye to the unspoken violations that occurred decades ago, and continue to enslave the American people, due to their ignorance of the law.

When a judge/justice allows the government to extract signatures on adhesion contracts from the American People that fundamentally deprive them of their self-executing unalienable Rights, fully knowing that the government is in breach of fiduciary duty to the American people, yet he unconstitutionally enforces statutes against the American people, with impunity, and enforces criminal or any other laws against the American people, **each one is committing acts of treason and committing fraud upon the court**, fraud upon the American people and fraud ab initio. Fraud Vitiates All! See Throckmorton.

As example, and as a matter of fact and of law, the "constitution is clear on matters of monetary integrity and individual rights. Article I, Section 10 prohibits states [governments of any kind] from making *"anything but gold and silver coin a Tender in Payment of Debts."* *"This provision reflects the framers' [Founding Fathers] intent to establish a monetary system grounded in tangible value, ensuring fairness and stability in economic transactions."* Moreover, the Fifth Amendment ... *"safeguard [s] individuals from governmental deprivation of life, liberty, or property without due process of law."* *"The issue of consideration is foundational to the validity of contracts. A valid contract requires mutual exchange of value."* However, fiat currency, by its very nature, is created out of nothing and lacks the tangible backing required by Article I, Section 10. This Court has long recognized the principle that invalid consideration undermines the enforceability of a [presumed/assumed] contract. In *Carpenter v. Longan* (1872), we held that a mortgage is inseparable from the promissory note it secures. If the note is invalid, the mortgage is likewise void." *Zachary Moore v. Alliant Credit Union et al* (2025).

The above decision illustrates that our own federal government has added yet one more breach of fiduciary duty act against the American people by surreptitiously passing the **Federal Reserve Act**, and making it sound as if the Federal Reserve is a lawful governmental agency by using a deceptive name to lead unsuspecting American people into so believing. **This is an act of intentional concealment of material fact, which is fraud upon the Court, fraud upon the American people, and fraud ab initio.** Fraud is a felony which immediately strips plaintiff from any authority to even exist, let alone enforce any presumed laws against the American people. The federal government, as plaintiff has continued to act in treason against the American people for decades as it relates to this one issue. Since the government is Trustee for the American people's Trust indenture (The Constitution) and for the American people's Trust Funds, its actions constitute maladministration, acts of fraud and act of treason. Fraud Vitiates

All! Consequentially, the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, as plaintiff, has no standing in any cause of action, let alone this one.

Similarly, because the several State's governments have ignored this most egregious act against the American people and their public servants are also duty-bound to uphold the organic Constitution 1791, they are complicit, and because they too administer the American people's Trust funds as Trustees for the American people, who are the Beneficiaries, they too are committing the same egregious acts of fraud and treason against the American people by remaining silent on this matter of national significance. They too are stripped of any presumed authority. Therefore, no laws or Orders are enforceable against any one of the unsuspecting American people.

Judges/justices are deemed to know the law, and to extrapolate it from the organic Constitution, especially since they are duty-bound to uphold that instrument. Thus, all judges in each court of this nation are complicit in these crimes against the American people, and they must be removed and held accountable. Their laws and Orders are null and void ab initio. They carry no power of enforcement whatsoever! One cannot be charged at all by any government for anything because the government public servants are all acting in treason and in fraud against the American people, which vitiates all.

As a disclaimer, this SCOTUS Moore/Alliant decision is not publicly available on the Supreme Court website. However, the arguments are constitutionally sound; therefore, I hereby invoke them within these papers. A review of the underlying decision: Carpenter v. Longan (1872) is the precise argument cited in the Zachary Moore v. Alliant Credit Union et al (2025) case, upon which the Moore/Alliant decision that is not visible on the SCOTUS website, relies.

Additionally, one cannot be charged with SEC violation, or with bank or wire fraud without a law that specifically and lawfully charges one with a violation if it is not on the books as a lawfully enacted crime. There is no lawful statute that states that Bitcoin is a security, quite the opposite. Bitcoin is a commodity and a store of wealth. A machine, such as Bitcoin mining computers, that create a store of wealth, therefore cannot be a security.

Back to the fiat currency conundrum, if one cannot lawfully perform, even if he did owe a debt (which is not the case in this instance) due to the government's breach of fiduciary duty to provide lawful money to the American people, which is fraud, there can be no criminal or civil obligation imposed upon the accused, rendering the plea statement invalid, and the entire indictment and bill of information null and void, as a matter of law.

The judges/justices/prosecutors/counsel for the accused have all taken an oath or affirmation to uphold the organic Constitution. They too are all culpable of conspiracy to conceal the breach of fiduciary duty and the fraud of the government/plaintiff in the underlying cause of action.

The mere mention of the unlawful act herein constitutes lawful rescission and claim of self-executing unalienable Right to due process of law found in the Fifth Amendment because **one cannot be held to a plea statement where no crime was committed by the accused**, as operation of law, and where the plaintiff has committed acts of breach of fiduciary duty and of fraud against the Beneficiaries of the Public Trust and of the Public Funds.

As a matter of law, it is the plaintiff who is committing a crime against the American people, along with all the public servants who have taken an oath or affirmation to support the

organic constitution, and then projecting that crime onto the American people, and intentionally concealing this matter of material fact, which is fraud, and fraud vitiates all.

As a matter of law, all constitutionally secure and protected Rights enjoy the same self-executing status. State ex rel RUSSELL v. Bliss No. 32839, Supra Ohio Last paragraph of 150 Pg and page 151 states... "Accordingly, all provisions of the constitution, are now considered self executing . See also City of Boerne v. Flores 521 U.S. 507m 524 (1997).

“A ‘Statute’ is not a Law,” (Flournoy v. First Nat. Bank of Shreveport, 197 La. 1067, 3 Sold 244, 248),

A “Code’ is not a Law,” (In Re Self v Rhay Wn 2d 261),

In point of fact in Law, A concurrent or **‘joint resolution of legislature’ is not “Law,”** (Koenig v. Flynn, 258 N.Y. 292, 179 N. E. 705, 707; Ward v State, 176 Old. 368, 56 P.2d 136, 137; State ex rel. Todd. v. Yelle, 7 Wash.2d 443, 110 P.2d 162, 165).

Judges must follow the common law and exercise judicial power. [Blacks law 4th edition] The written will of the legislature, solemnly expressed according to the forms prescribed in the constitution, an act of the legislature. *“The common law is the real law, the Supreme Law of the land, the code, rules, regulations, policy, and statutes are “not the law”,* [Self v. Rhay, 61 Wn (2d) 261] US. SUPREME COURT DECISION – *“All codes, rules, and regulations are for government authorities only, not human/Creators in accordance with God’s laws. All codes, rules, and regulations are unconstitutional and lacking due process ... ”* [Rodrigues v. Ray Donovan (U.S. Department of Labor) 769 F. 2d 1344, 1348 (1985)” Due Process of Law, found in the Fifth Amendment, is a self-executing, unalienable, protected and secured Right entitling automatic dismissal with prejudice in accordance with the papers and the lawful remedies sought therein.

In criminal acts, Sovereign Man created a system via which to bring forth the accused. This System involved an eyewitness or a harmed Man to bring forth a Complaint in the form of a sworn statement of facts. Each one of the several States independently determined what constituted a crime, and its sanctions.

A Complaint is to be brought to the Sheriff, as the highest judicial officer in the community, for him to seat a common law Grand Jury, which was to operate in complete secrecy with no interference whatsoever or oversight by any Court of Record official.

Thus, when Sovereign Man created the organic Constitution, by tradition and custom, Courts of Record, and Common Law Grand Juries were incorporated into our judiciary. The organic Constitution established a three-branch form of government, with checks and balances. Each branch was to “stay in its own lane.”

In creating the organic Constitution, Sovereign Man did not relinquish his Sovereignty, which was ordained for posterity from Almighty God. Thus, governments inherently have no sovereignty. However, in the united States, they do have the power to exclusively provide certain, limited services for the benefit of the Beneficiaries of the Trust indenture, we call our organic Constitution.

Within that arrangement, we the Sovereign American people are the “masters”, and our judiciary officers are our servants. They are also the Trustees of the Trust indenture/the organic Constitution. Through the enumerated powers we the American people have entrusted to Governments the power of the Purse, therefore they possess a fiduciary responsibility to protect

the Trust Funds, as Trustees, for the benefit of the Sovereign American people as the Beneficiaries.

Sovereign Man, in the organic Constitution, via the Supremacy Clause declared that instrument to be the supreme law of the land, affirmed in *Marbury v. Madison*.

When a constitutional judge/justice seeks to enforce a statute, by accepting the specific language within the charging papers on their face that only recite violations of statutes, he is exercising legislative power; he is not following the common law; he is acting in violation of his oath or affirmation; and he is violating my Due Process of Law self-executing Rights found in the Fifth Amendment, or ordained by Almighty God.

I am not only a Sovereign Man, I am also a living, breathing man, who is only subject to the laws of Nature, and to the laws of Almighty God, governmental alleged “laws” do not apply to me, but by express contract.

Since judges and justices are mandated to take an oath or affirmation with bond to uphold the organic Constitution 1791, they are not only duty-bound to jealously safeguard the unalienable Rights of the American people, but they must also jealously protect the provisions and their intent within the very instrument to whom they have taken an oath to preserve.

Our Founding Fathers provided a road map for future generations. They left words for us to understand how the provisions within the constitution should be interpreted. *“On every question of construction [let us] carry ourselves back to the time when the Constitution was adopted, recollect the spirit manifested in the debates, and instead of trying what meaning may be squeezed out of the text or invented against it, conform to the probable one in which it was passed.”* **Thomas Jefferson.**

For the record of this common law Court of Record, and for purposes of these papers, I rely upon the following definitions, Maxims of Law, and Supreme Court decisions:

1) - **Court of Record:** *“A Court of Record is a judicial tribunal having attributes and exercising functions independently of the person of the magistrate designated generally to hold it, and proceeding according to the course of common law, its acts and proceedings being enrolled for a perpetual memorial.”*

Jones v. Jones, 188 Mo. App. 220, 175 S. W. 227, 229; *Ex Parte Gladhill*, 8 Metc. Mass., 171, per Shaw, C.J. See, also *Ledwith v. Rosalsky*, 244 N.Y. 406, 155 N.E. 688, 689 ... 7 Cal Jur 571 California Jurisprudence, Bancroft Whitney (1922), Pge 580-581 Courts of Record.

2 - **Due Process of Law:** 3 Story, Const.264, 661. *“Due process of law in each particular case means such an exercise of the powers of the government as the settled maxims of law permit and sanction, and under such safeguards for the protection of individual rights as those maxims prescribe for the class of cases to which the one in question belongs.”*

Cooley, Const. Lira. 441.

“Whatever difficulty may be experienced in giving to those terms a definition which will embrace every permissible exertion of power affecting private rights, and exclude such as is forbidden, there can be no doubt of their meaning when applied to judicial proceedings. They then mean a course of legal proceedings according to those rules and principles which have been established in our systems of jurisprudence for the enforcement and protection of private rights. To give such proceedings any validity, there must be a tribunal competent by its constitution.”

3 - **Competen[t]**: Black's Law 1st Edition: 1. A basic or minimal ability to do something; qualification, esp. to testify. 2. The capacity of an official body to do something. 3. Authenticity. Competent. Adj.

4 - The Supreme Court case, *Trust v. United States*, 318, US 363-371 demonstrates an example of breach of fiduciary duty to the People. "*Governments descend to the level of a mere private corporation, and take on the characteristics of a mere private citizen... where private corporate commercial paper [Federal Reserve Notes] and securities [checks] is concerned... For purposes of suit, such corporations and individuals are regarded as entities entirely separate from government.*"

In other words, when private commercial paper is used by corporate government, the government loses its limited power status and becomes no different than a mere private corporation. As such, government then becomes bound by the rules and laws that govern private corporations, which means that if they intend to compel an individual to some specific performance based upon its corporate statutes or corporation rules (codes, regulations, statutes, etc.) then the government, like any private corporation, must be the holder-in-due-course of a valid and enforceable contract or other commercial agreement between it and the one upon who demands specific performance is made. And, further, the government must be willing to enter the contract or commercial agreement into evidence before trying to get the court to enforce its demands, called statutes, codes, regulations, rules, etc.

The private currency, the Federal Reserve Note, is still in use today. By what authority can the federal government bring forth this cause of action when it is in breach of fiduciary duty to the Sovereign American People by becoming a foreign corporation, with no authority from the American People, and it has lost its limited power to act?

This case, likewise, affirms that the government has no standing. It is instead in breach of fiduciary duty to the American people.

Hale v. Henkel, 201 U.S. 43 (1906) "*... There is a distinction ... between an individual and a corporation... The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights as a citizen. He is entitled to carry on his private business in his own way... He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights. Upon the other hand, the corporation is a creature of the state [federal government] ... its powers are limited by law.*"

Marbury v. Madison (1 Cranch 170) 5 US 137 (1803) "*... a legislative act contrary to the constitution is not law... an act of the legislature repugnant to the constitution is void.*"

United States v. Jackson 390 US 570 (1968) "*If a law [order] has 'no other purpose...' than to chill the assertion of constitutional rights by penalizing those who choose to exercise them, then it [is] patently unconstitutional.*"

These justices have been called "originalists" as they endeavor to carry on the intent of the Founding Fathers. But, when a "long line of usurpations" ... threatens the very fiber of what has made our nation the great bastion of liberty, it becomes the American people's duty, and Right to call these bad actors back into line, reminding them that it is the American people who are Sovereign, and not the governments. The governments exist at our pleasure, and they can likewise be brought back in line by us, the American people or removed for treason and for maladministration.

MAXIM: Individual liberties are all antecedent to all government.

This maxim affirms that liberty is the most sacred of all self-executing unalienable Rights. While the organic Constitution 1791 does not specifically state that the judiciary must follow the common law, the Seventh Amendment does explicitly state that: The Seventh Amendment states that *“In suits at common law where the value of in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right to trial by jury shall be preserved...”*

Traditionally and by custom, all cases prior to the establishment of the organic Constitution followed the common law, which is what all judges must follow when exercising their constitutionally mandated judicial Power. *“The common law is the real law, the Supreme Law of the land, the code, rules, regulations, policy, and statutes are “not the law”, [Self v. Rhay, 61 Wn (2d) 261] “Because the penalty the [federal government] seeks “deprive[s][me] of [property and liberty],” Amdt. 5, due process demands nothing less than “the process and proceedings of the common law.” 3 Story Section 1783 at 661. That means the regular course of trial by jury proceedings, with their protections. See Murray’s Lessee, 18 How, st. 280, not the use of ad hoc adjudication procedures before the same agency [federal government] responsible for prosecuting the law, subject only to hands-off judicial review, see supra, 1t 10-11. Therefore, the plea statement is unconstitutional and unlawful.*

The Supreme Court case, *Clearfield Trust v. United States*, 318, US 363 -371 demonstrates an example of breach of fiduciary duty to the People. *“Governments descend to the level of a mere private corporation, and take on the characteristics of a mere private citizen... where private corporate commercial paper [Federal Reserve Notes] and securities [checks] is concerned... For purposes of suit, such corporations and individuals are regarded as entities entirely separate from government.”* In other words, when private commercial paper is used by corporate government, then government loses its sovereignty status and becomes no different than a mere private corporation. As such, government then becomes bound by the rules and laws that govern private corporations, which means that if they intend to compel an individual to some specific performance based upon its corporate statutes or corporation rules (codes, regulations, statutes, etc.) then the government, like any private corporation, must be the holder-in-due-course of a valid and enforceable contract or other commercial agreement between it and the one upon who demands specific performance is made. And, further, the government must be willing to enter the contract or commercial agreement into evidence before trying to get the court to enforce its demands, called “statutes”, “codes”, “rules”, “regulations,” etc. I am not a corporate construct; I am a Sovereign living man. By what authority can the federal government bring forth this cause of action when it is in breach of fiduciary duty to the People by becoming a foreign corporation, with no authority from the People, and it has lost its limited power to act?

B.A.R.-member attorneys, government servant/prosecutors cannot admit evidence into this court on behalf of the plaintiff, as stated in *Trinsey v. Pagliaro* D.C. Pa. 1964229 F. Supp. 647 *“An attorney for the plaintiff cannot admit evidence into the court. He is either an attorney or a witness.” He cannot wear both hats.* Any testimony submitted by the prosecutor/attorney for the plaintiff is hearsay and the prosecutor exposes himself to cross-examination. *United States v. Lovasco* (06/09077) 431 U.S. 783, 97 S. Ct 2044, 52 L. *“Manifestly, [such statements] cannot be properly considered by us in the disposition of [a]case.”* In other words, there must be a competent first-hand witness (a body, a corpus delicti). There must be a real man or woman making the complaint, thereby having standing, and directly bringing evidence before the court.

Corporations, such as the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, are paper and can't testify. Therefore, **the plaintiff federal government has no standing.**

As required at common law, corpus delicti must appear on the record. The government has never produced any evidence of corpus delicti to provide lawful evidence from the corpus delicti. The government never produced the identity of the corpus delicti (men/women) that I allegedly and knowingly harmed. These failures to provide fundamental elements of what constitutes a crime, following the common law, represent violation and deprivation of my unalienable, natural rights, and my protected rights under the organic Constitution in the Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh Amendments. The Sixth Amendment guarantees me the right to confront or cross-examine witnesses. Deprivation of protected rights entitles me to dismissal with prejudice in accordance with the lawful remedies sought. *Cruden v. Neale*, 2 N.C. 338 2 S.E. 70 "*Corpus delicti consists of a showing of "1) the occurrence of the specific kind of injury and 2) someone's criminal act as the cause of the injury.*" As stated herein, at common law, the de facto federal government fails to show either 1 or 2 above... these unconstitutional concocted crimes, or "crime against the state" [federal government], with no valid injured or harmed plaintiff on the record.

Johnson v. State, 653, N.E. 2d 478, 479 (In. 1995) "*State [federal government] must produce corroborating evidence of "corpus delicti," showing that injury or harm constituting crime and that injury or harm caused by someone's criminal activity.*"

Gonzalez v. Buist (04/01/12) 224 U.S. 126, 56 L. Ed. 693, 32 S. CT 463 "*Under no possible view, however, of the findings we are considering can they be held to constitute a compliance with the statute [common law], since they merely embody conflicting statements of counsel concerning the facts as they suppose them to be and their appreciation of the law which they deem applicable, there being, therefore, no attempt whatever to state the ultimate facts by a consideration of which we would be able to conclude whether or not the judgment was warranted.*" *Holt v. United States*, (10/31/10) 218 U.S. 245, 54 L. Ed. 1021, 31 S. Ct. 2 "*No instruction was asked, but, as we have said, the judge told the jury that they were to regard only the evidence admitted by him, not the statements of counsel.*" **Since no "real" man or woman has come forth as plaintiff, with firsthand valid testimony alleging harm perpetrated upon him/her from me, at common law, there is no crime.** *Porter v. Porter*, (N.D., 1979) 274 N.W. 2d 235 "*The practice of an attorney [prosecutor] filing an affidavit on behalf of his client asserting the status of that client is not approved, inasmuch as not only does the affidavit become hearsay, but it places the attorney [prosecutor] in a position of witness thus compromising his role as advocate.*" *Frunzar v. Allied Property and Casualty Ins. Co.*, (Iowa 1996) 548 N.W. 2d 880 "*Professional statements of litigants attorney [prosecutor] are treated as affidavits, and attorney [prosecutor] making statements may be cross-examined regarding substance of statement.*" (Therefore, unless the prosecutor has first-hand knowledge, his testimony in brief or in argument is hearsay and inadmissible.) Oklahoma Court Rules and Procedure, Federal local rule 7.1(h) "*Factual statements or documents appearing only in briefs shall not be deemed to be part of the record in the case, unless specifically permitted by the Court.*" In other words, there must be testimony from a man or a woman who suffered a harm and is available to depose, confront, and cross-examine, pursuant to the Sixth Amendment. At common law, for a cause of action to be actionable, a man or woman (corpus delicti) must bring forth an affidavit/statement

alleging injury in fact perpetrated by the accused. Jorgensen v. State, 567 N.E.2d 113, 121. *"To establish the corpus delecti, independent evidence must be presented showing the occurrence of a specific kind of injury and that a criminal act was the cause of the injury."* Sherer v. Cullen 481 F. 945 *"For a crime to exist, there must be an injured party (Corpus Delecti). There can be no sanction or penalty imposed on one because of this Constitutional right."* People v. Lopez, 62 Ca. Rptr.47, 254 C.A. 2d 185. Supreme court ruled *"Without Corpus Delecti there can be no crime"* *"In every prosecution for crime it is necessary to establish the "corpus delecti". i.e. the body or elements of the crime."* Johnson v. State, 653 N.E.2d 478, 479 (Ind. 1995). *"State [federal government] must produce corroborating evidence of "corpus delecti," showing that injury or harm constituting."* By what authority can the federal government bring forth a criminal action when it has no constitutional mandate to adjudicate common law crimes; it has no power to create crimes against the federal government, See U.S. v. Hudson and Goodwin; it is in breach of fiduciary duty; and it has committed fraud against the People and treason against the organic Constitution!

As a matter of law, when judges are enforcing mere statutes, they are not acting judicially, as stated in Owen v. City, 445 U.S. 662; Bothke v. Terry, 713 F2d 1404 ***"When enforcing mere statutes, judges of all courts do not act judicially (and thus are not protected by "qualified" or "limited immunity,") - but merely act as an extension as an agent for the involved agency but only in a "ministerial" and not a "discretionary capacity..."*** Thompson v. Smith, 154 S.E. 579, 583; Keller v. P.E., 261 US 428; F.R.C. v. G.E., 281, U.S. 464. Therefore, this tribunal would not be a Court of Justice, or Court of Record following the common law, as required in Article III, and in the Seventh Amendment, thus violating my right to a court of record and court of justice that follows the common law. A court of record is a judicial tribunal having attributes and exercising functions independently of the person of the magistrate/judge designated generally to hold it, and proceeding according to the course of common law, its acts and proceedings being enrolled for a perpetual memorial. Jones v. Jones, 188, Mo. App. 220, 175 S.W. 227, 229; Ex Parte Gladhill, 8 Metc. Mass. 171, per Shaw, C. J. See Ledwith v. Rosalsky, 244 N.Y. 406 155 N. E, 688, 689.

When the court is not following the common law, it is in breach of fiduciary duty to protect my rights as one of the People, thus entitling me to dismissal with prejudice. In point of fact and at law governments are artificial manifestations. Codes, statutes, regulations etc. that do not apply to Sovereign Man. Flournoy v. First National Bank of Shreveport, 197 LA 1057-3 So. 2d 244,248. **A "Statute is not a Law ... A "code" is not Law."** – In Re Self v. Rhay, Wn. 2d 261, In point of fact ... *"The common law is the real law, the Supreme Law of the land, the codes, rules, regulations, policy and statutes are "not the law". They are the law of government for internal regulations, not the law of man, in his separate but equ[e]al station and natural state, a sovereign foreign with respect to government generally;"* Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. (2 Cranch) 137, 180 (1803) *"...Once again, we are not of like kind, precluding any jurisdictional authority."* This fact and truth is affirmed in (Rodriques v. Ray Donovan, U.S. Department of Labor, 769 F.2d 1344,1348 (1985) *"No provision of the Constitution is designed to be without effect."* *"Anything that is in conflict is null and void of law."* *"Clearly, for a secondary law to come in conflict with the supreme Law was illogical, for certainly, the supreme Law would prevail over all other laws and certain our forefathers had intended that the supreme Law would be the basis*

of all law and for any law to come in conflict would be null and void of law, it would bare [bear] no power to enforce, it would bare [bear] no obligation to obey, it would purport to settle as if it had never existed, for unconstitutionality would date from the enactment of such a law, not from the date so branded in an open court of law, no courts are bound to uphold it, and no Citizens are bound to obey it. It operates as a near nullity or a fiction of law” ... “All codes, rules, and regulations are for government authorities only, not human/Creators in accord with God’s Laws. All codes, rules, and regulations are unconstitutional and lacking due process of law...” “lacking due process of law, in that they are “void for ambiguity” in their failure to specify the statutes applicability to “natural persons”, otherwise depriving the same of fair notice, as their constitution by definition of terms aptly identifies the applicability of such statutes to “artificial or fictional corporate entities or “persons”, creatures of statute, or those by contract employed as agents or representatives, departmental subdivisions, offices, and property of the government, but not the “Natural Person” or American citizen Immune from such jurisdiction of legalism.”

As stated in the Telephone Cases, *Dolbear v. American Bell Telephone Company*, *Molecular Telephone Company v. American Bell Telephone Company*, *American Bell Telephone Company v. Molecular Telephone Company*, *Clay Commercial Telephone Company v. American Bell Telephone Company*, *People’s Telephone Company v. American Bell Telephone Company*, *Overland Telephone Company v. American Bell Telephone Company*, (PART TWO OF THREE) (03/19/88) 126 U.S. 1, 31 L. Ed 863, 8 S. Ct. 778 *“Care has been taken, however, in summoning witnesses to testify, to call no man whose character or whose word could be successfully impeached by any methods to the law. And it is remarkable, we submit, that in a case of this magnitude, with every means of resource at their command, the complainants [plaintiff federal government], after years of effort and search in near and in the most remote paths, and in every collateral by-way, now rest the charges of conspiracy and of gullibility against these witnesses only upon the **bare statements of counsel**. The lives of all the witnesses are clean, their characters for truth and veracity un-assailed, and the evidence of any attempt to influence the memory or the impressions of any man called, cannot be pointed out in this record.”*

On what authority does the government presume to bring forth this action against me with no man or woman with firsthand testimony that he/she has been harmed by my alleged criminal activities? The federal government cannot speak, it cannot testify, it cannot bring forth any testimony because it is an artificial entity with no ability for me to depose, confront or cross-examine, pursuant to my due process rights and my Sixth Amendment protected rights. **The federal judge is duty-bound to protect my constitutional Rights and to not accept a frivolous case against a Sovereign living man from an artificial corporate construct, even if it is the federal government!**

Therefore, all information that has been submitted into the record that has not come from the plaintiff via affidavit, as firsthand witness, and the individual party alleging concrete and particularized injury, as having sustained injury in fact, is inadmissible as it is all hearsay.

MAXIM: Truth is expressed in the form of an affidavit.

MAXIM: An un rebutted affidavit stands as truth in the matter.

United States v. Hudson and Goodwin, 11 U.S. (7 Cranch) 32 (1812), *“Certain implied powers must necessarily result to our courts of justice from the nature of their institution. But*

jurisdiction of crimes against the state [federal government] is not among those powers ... all exercise of criminal jurisdiction in common law cases we are of opinion is not within their implied powers.” By what authority does the federal government presume and assume jurisdiction when it has not presented one iota of firsthand testimony directly from the plaintiff and it has no jurisdictional authority to prosecute common law crimes, and it has no power to assume jurisdiction of crimes against the state [federal government] and the prosecutor is barred from presenting evidence as it would be hearsay?

Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232, 94 S. ct 1683, 1687 (1974) Note: By law, a judge is a state [federal] officer [servant]. The judge then acts not as a judge, but as a private individual (in his person). When a judge acts as a trespasser of the law, when a judge does not follow the law, the Judge loses subject-matter jurisdiction and the judges’ orders are not voidable, but VOID, and of no legal force or effect. The U.S. Supreme court states that *“when a state [federal] officer acts under a state [federal] law in a manner violative of the Federal Constitution, he comes into conflict with the superior authority of that Constitution, and he is in that case stripped of his official or representative character and is subjected in his person to the consequences of his individual conduct. The State [federal government] has no power to impart to him any immunity from responsibility to the supreme authority of the United States.”*

U.S. Supreme Court TransUnion v. Ramirez June 25, 2021, clarified what injury-in-fact plaintiffs must show to have standing to assert statutory rights in federal court. This follows the Court’s 2016 decision in Spokeo v. Robins, in which it held “concrete harm” was required to pursue claims under the Fair Credit Reporting Act and other privacy statutes in federal court, but left open how to determine if a harm was sufficiently concrete. Justice Kavanaugh wrote for the majority that Article III standing, a prerequisite for federal court jurisdiction, is rooted in the separation of powers doctrine, “woven into” the Constitution.

Without an individual injury, the Court held, it is within the Executive Branch’s discretion to decide how aggressively to pursue legal action against “regulatory” defendants. *“Private plaintiffs are not accountable to the people and are not charged with pursuing the public interest in enforcing a defendant’s general compliance with regulatory law.” “Statutory [privacy] claims, and Article III requires a “concrete and particularized injury” that is not satisfied.”* In Spokeo, the Court made clear that mere procedural violations are not enough to support *“whenever a statute grants a person a statutory right and purports to authorize that person to sue to vindicate that right.”* Five years after Spokeo, the TransUnion decision clarified that a concrete injury necessary for standing is one with a close relationship to harms traditionally recognized as providing a basis for lawsuits in American courts. The Court recognized that Congress’s views *“may be instructive”* on this question of fact, when Congress decides to elevate de facto harms that were not previously cognizable at law into legal harms, but Congress cannot simply *“enact an injury into existence”* that did not exist in fact prior to the law. Therefore, where does the federal government, at common law derive its authority to create crimes against the government?

United States v. Texas, 599 U.S_2023 Citing common law and Article III as opposed to statutory rules and regulations, *“Texas and Louisiana lack Article III standing to challenge the Guidelines. To establish standing, a plaintiff must show an injury in fact caused by the defendant and redressable by a court order. The alleged injury must “be legally and judicially cognizable.”*

There is no precedent, history, or tradition of federal courts entertaining lawsuits of this kind; a plaintiff lacks standing to bring such a suit “when he himself is neither prosecuted nor threatened with prosecution.” Since the federal government cannot be prosecuted of a crime, it has no standing; it has no threat, and it can act mercilessly and ruthlessly against the People if it so chooses, depriving me of my right to due process and of my natural rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness from a dead, artificial entity with no standing and who is in fiduciary breach to the People.

For the federal government to have authority to bring forth an action against me, plaintiff must have Standing in Federal Court. Federal courts only have constitutional authority to resolve actual disputes or controversies as stated in the Seventh Amendment. In *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife* (90-1424), 504 U.S. 555 (1992), the Supreme Court created a three-part test to determine whether a party has standing to sue. The first of the three-part test is that: “The plaintiff must have suffered an **“injury in fact,”** meaning that the injury is of a legally protected interest which is (a) concrete and particularized and (b) actual or imminent.

Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins, 578 U.S. 330 (2016), was a United States Supreme Court case in which the Court vacated and remanded a ruling by United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit on the basis that the Ninth Circuit had not properly determined whether the plaintiff has suffered an **“injury-in-fact”** when analyzing whether he had standing to bring his case in federal court. The standard for an injury-in-fact is found in *United States v. Texas*, 599 U.S. 2023 Citing common law and Article III as opposed to statutory rules and regulations, “Texas and Louisiana lack Article III standing to challenge the Guidelines. To establish standing, a plaintiff must show an injury in fact caused by the defendant and redressable by a court order... “a plaintiff lacks standing to bring such a suit “when he himself is neither prosecuted nor threatened with prosecution.”

In 1819 the “missing” 13th Amendment, prohibiting public servants from receiving foreign titles of nobility or any other emolument from a foreign power was passed, in harmony with the organic Constitution at “Article 1, Section 9, Clause 8, No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State. The letter of the law is self-explanatory. While the current versions of the de facto Constitution does not reflect the original 13th Amendment, it is still the law of the land because it was indeed passed by 13 Union states by the year 1819, as reflected in numerous official publications, and **it has never been repealed**. The 13th Amendment’s validity was affirmed as having been authentically passed and ratified in 2004, by the Nevada state court, superior court common law venue original jurisdiction united States of America Nevada Republic (organic) “Findings of Fact” and in “MILITARY LAWS of the UNITED STATES authorized by Secretary of War, John C. Calhoun, which decision cannot be reviewed by any other court of the land, published in Washington, D.C”. See **EXHIBIT 1**.

As further proof of its existence and its validity as still being the law of the land, on or about March 20, 2013, the New Hampshire Legislature passed HB 638, recognizing the Article XIII, known by a few as: “The Missing 13th Amendment,” missing from the organic Constitution. The fact and Truth is that the organic Constitution was treasonously altered to reflect a fraudulent copy of the original organic Constitution. 16 Am Jur 2nd Section 178 “*The*

general rule is that an unconstitutional act of the Legislature protects no one. It is said that all persons are presumed to know the law, meaning that ignorance of the law excuses no one; if any person acts under an unconstitutional statute, he does so at his peril and must suffer the consequences.” Therefore, ignorance of this fact does not excuse him from said knowledge. Public servants in this setting are compelled to follow the letter of the law, or be held in breach of fiduciary duty to the People, or worse.

This valid law of the land, 13th Amendment reads: *“If any citizen of the United States shall accept, claim, receive, or retain any title of nobility or honor, or shall, without the consent of congress, accept and retain any present, pension, office, or emolument of any kind whatever, from any emperor, king, prince, or foreign power such person shall cease to be a citizen of the United States, and shall be incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under them, or either of them.”*

Ignorance of this fact does not excuse our public servants, especially judges and attorneys from said knowledge. Public servants in this setting are compelled to follow the letter of the law or be held in breach of fiduciary duty to the People, or worse. *Owen vs. City of Independence, 100 S. Ct. 1398; Maine vs. Thiboutot, 100 S. Ct. 2502; and Hafer vs. Melo, 502 U.S. 21: “officials and judges are deemed to know the law and sworn to uphold the law; officials and judges cannot claim to act in good faith in willful deprivation of law, they certainly cannot plead ignorance of the law, even the Citizen cannot plead ignorance of the law, the courts have ruled there is no such thing as ignorance of the law, it is ludicrous for learned officials and judges to plead ignorance of the law therefore is no immunity, judicial or otherwise, in matters of rights secured by the Constitution for the United States of America.”*

The ramifications of this matter of fact, and law are vast. The legitimacy of the original 13th Amendment invalidates any laws whatsoever that have been passed by any seated congressmen/legislators since the date it was ratified because most of the congressmen are B.A.R.-member attorneys, **who have been granted the acronym, Esq. or Esquire, as a title of nobility by the Crowne of England as an emolument and to whom they surreptitiously swear their allegiance.** Since B.A. R. attorneys swear allegiance to a foreign entity, they are then foreign agents, and they are required to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA) as foreign agents. By what authority can the federal government presume to have jurisdiction when the public servants are in fiduciary breach of duty to the People, and committing acts of treason?

The organic Constitution requires all public servants take an oath to the organic Constitution.

MAXIM: A servant cannot serve two masters.

As a matter of law, accepting a title of nobility is a treasonous act. Any laws, statutes, codes, regulations “enacted” by congress or by any one of the several states’ legislatures are therefore void ab initio, irrespective of whether those “laws” can be construed as being in harmony with the organic Constitution because the legislators, judges, attorneys etc. violate the law of the land, thus supplanting the “laws” conformity to the organic Constitution. I remind the court of *Scheuer v. Rhodes; Merritt v. Hunter, C.A. Kansas 170 F2d 739 “Where a court failed to observe safeguards, it amounts to denial of due process of law, court is deprived of juris.”* *Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U.S. 1, 78 S. Ct. 140137 (1958). “No state legislator or executive or*

judicial officer can war against the Constitution without violating his undertaking to support it.” Williamson v. U.S. Department of Agriculture, 815 F. 2d 369, ACLU Foundation v. Barr, 952 F. 2d, 457, 293 U.S. App. D.C. 101, (CA De 1991) *“It is the duty of all officials whether legislative, judicial, executive, administrative, or ministerial to so perform every official act as not to violate constitutional provisions.”*

Schwartz v. Board of Examiners of NM 353 U.S. 232, 239 (1957) held that *“Attorneys cannot represent any private citizen nor any business as the State [federal government] cannot license the practice of law”* Equal protection under the law of the 14th Amendment allows that anyone may practice law.... On what authority do B.A.R.-member attorneys assume the right to defend or to prosecute any private citizen?

See also 7 Corpus Juris Secundum Section 4. The defense attorneys that I fired for cause, fraud, swindle, and ineffective assistance of counsel violated my natural rights, my due process rights, and other rights under the organic Constitution, especially, but not limited to the Fifth and Sixth Amendments, as well as my protected right to valid contract under the Contract Clause of the organic Constitution. Attorneys have a fiduciary duty to provide lawful assistance of counsel.

Being officers of the court, supervisory responsibility inures to the court to hold them accountable. An attorney who holds himself out to be a licensed attorney to the public is committing fraud via intentional concealment of this material fact, a fraud, entitling me to recover attorney’s fees paid to him via Order from the court for immediate reimbursement. Violation of Constitutional and unalienable rights constitute the right to dismissal with prejudice in accordance with the papers and with the remedies sought herein.

7 Corpus Juris Secundum Section 4: Attorney & Client defines the duty of B.A.R.-member attorneys, and **it does not include a primary duty of the client (me)**, as we are all led to believe, thus intentionally concealing a material fact, a fraud. *“His first duty is to the courts and the public, not to the client, and wherever the duties to his client conflict with those he owes to an officer of the court in the administration of justice, the former must yield to the latter.”* ... *“A client is one who applies to a lawyer or counselor for advice and direction in a question of law or commits his cause to his management in prosecuting a claim or defending against a suit in a court of justice, one who retains the attorney, is responsible to him for the management of the suit; one who communicates facts to an attorney expecting professional advice. Clients are also called “wards of the court” in regard to their relationship with their attorneys.”*

“Wards of court: Infants and persons of unsound mind placed by the court under the care of a guardian.” Sims v. Aherns 271 S.W. 720 (1925) *“The practice of law is an occupation of common right.”* Brotherhood of Trainmen v. Virginia State Bar (377 U.S. 1); Gideon v. Wainwright 372 U.S. 335; Argersinger v. Hamlin, Sheriff 407 U.S. 425 *“Litigants may be assisted by unlicensed layman during judicial proceedings.”* NAACP v. Button (371 U.S. 415), United Mineworkers of America v. Gibbs (383 U.S. 715); Johnson v. Avery 89 S. Ct. 747 (1969) *“Members of groups who are competent non lawyers can assist other members of the group achieve the goals of the group in court without being charged with “unauthorized practice of law.”* Given that the legislators and the B.A.R.-member attorneys in the District Court of New Jersey, Florida and Colorado are warring against the organic Constitution, thus committing acts of treason, that fact makes the court itself non-constitutional.

State v. Batson, 17 S.E. 2D 511, 512, 513 “No action can be taken against a sovereign [man or woman] in the non-constitutional courts of either the united states or the state [federal] courts and any such action is considered the crime of Barratry. Barratry is an offense at common law and a RICO violation, and human trafficking.” Thus, the federal government has been in breach of fiduciary duty to the People since at least 1819, therefore losing its sovereignty, and rendering all laws passed and enforced by the federal government null and void ab *initio*.

The B.A.R. associations have no legislative authority to have been created. **They are private corporations.** There is no Statute-at-Large creating any B.A.R. association. Yet, they deceive the People into believing that attorneys are licensed, and they are to be trusted. Where in the Statutes-at-Large were attorneys/lawyers, most especially Crown Temple B.A.R. Attorneys ever given the constitutional authority to practice law in the courtroom? Yet, I am made to believe that I can be deprived of “representation” by anyone other than a B.A.R. member in this tribunal, constituting prima facie evidence of a violation of my Sixth Amendment right to assistance of counsel.

These are intentional concealments of material facts, or fraud “*And that the agency [attorneys, courts, federal courts] committed fraud, deceit, coercion, willful intent to injure another [via unlawful indictments], malicious acts [to deprive me of natural and protected rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness] , RICO [via Barratry] activity and conspired by; Unconscionable "contract" - "One which no sensible man not under delusion, or duress, or in distress would make, and such as no honest and fair man would accept."*; Franklin Fire Ins. Co. v. Noll, 115 Ind. App. 289, 58 N.E.2d 947,949,950.

Fraud by government servants is a breach of fiduciary duty to the People, and constitutes a deprivation of constitutionally protected rights, thus entitling me to dismissal with prejudice in accordance with the remedies sought herein.

The fraudulently "presumed" quasi-contracts that attempt to bind me with the de facto federal government, its de facto courts and its unconstitutional B.A.R.-member attorneys, is void for fraud ab initio since the de facto federal government cannot produce the material fact whereby I knowingly and voluntarily agreed to enter this unconscionable contract, which was unlawfully presumed by the federal government via tacit acquiescence or tacit procuration. Pursuant to the organic Constitution, I am free to contract and to rescission contract upon knowledge of fraudulent inducement.

Berry v. Stevens, 1934 OK 167 31 P. 2D 950 “*Fraud in the procurement of any written instrument [and/or via tacit acquiescence or tacit procuration] vitiates it in the hands of one seeking to benefit thereby, Fraud destroys the validity of everything into which it enters. It vitiates the most solemn contracts, documents, and even judgments. Fraud, as it is sometimes said, vitiates every act.*” See also Throckmorton, 98 US 61 “*Fraud vitiates all.*” Fraud entitles me to dismissal with prejudice. A valid contract includes consideration. Where is the consideration for this adhesion contract? Where is the jurisdictional authority upon which it has presumed and assumed jurisdiction authority?

(SEE: Master I Servant [Employee]Relationship -- C.J.S.)

"Personal, Private, Liberty" By what authority can the federal government via its public servants that are B.A.R.-member attorneys, in violation of the original 13th Amendment, be afforded standing to bring forth this cause of action?

Let the record reflect that I hereby rescission ALL contracts (written or presumed tacit acquiescence, tacit procuration) upon which this tribunal may have attempted to assume personal or subject matter jurisdiction. It is my right under the organic Constitution to enter contracts, and to rescission an unconscionable or an unlawfully obtained contract upon my knowledge of said fraudulent act having been taken against me.

In 1913 in a secret meeting at Jekyll Island off the coast of Georgia a group of American bankers and foreign dignitaries convened and created the Federal Reserve, which Act was unlawfully and treasonously ratified while congress was on Christmas recess, on December 23, 1913. Despite what most people believe, the Federal Reserve is not a federal agency. It is a foreign for-profit corporation owned and operated by foreign dignitaries with its own Federal Reserve Board of Governors and a Duns number of 001959410.

The Federal Reserve effectively took over the organic federal government's mandate to coin and regulate the monetary instruments for use by the several states, by the People and by the federal government as the instrument of monetary exchange to make debt payments. The paper money (fiat) changed names from United States Notes to Federal Reserve Notes or FRNs. From that moment forward the monetary mandate for the federal government to coin and regulate the monetary instruments of the federal government was surreptitiously delegated to a foreign corporation, once again, rendering the federal government in breach of fiduciary duty to the People, and in treason. With no authority or knowledge provided to the People, In Senate Report 93-549 it reads (The United States has been under dictatorial control since March 9, 1933). Report of the Special Committee on the Termination of the National Emergency Senate Report 93-549, War and Emergency Powers Act, November 19, 1973. Since March 9, 1933, the United States has been in a state of declared national emergency... These proclamations give force to 470 provisions of Federal Law. These hundreds of statutes delegate to the President extraordinary powers, ordinarily exercised by Congress, which affect the lives of American citizens in a host of all-encompassing manners.

The vast range of powers, taken together, confer enough authority to rule the country without reference to normal Constitutional processes. Under the powers delegated by these statutes, the President may: seize property; organize and control the means of production' seize commodities; assign military forces abroad; institute martial law; seize and control all transportation and communication; regulate the operation of private enterprise; restrict travel; and, in a plethora of particular ways, control the lives of all Americans. This treasonous act constitutes breach of fiduciary duty to the People. By what authority can the federal government assume powers normally delegated to the congress and deprive the People of our protected rights?

On March 17, 1993, Vol. 33, page H-303 the United States Congressional Record reflects Speaker-Rep. James Traficant, Jr (Ohio) addressing the House wherein he speaks about the Emergency Banking Act March 9, 1933, 48 Stat. 1, Public Law 89- 719. *"Mr. Speaker, we are here now in Chapter 11 ... Members of Congress are official trustees presiding over the greatest reorganization of any Bankrupt entity in world history, the U.S. Government. We are setting forth hopefully, a blueprint for our future. There are some who say it is a coroner's report that will lead to our demise."* In that same speech, James Traficant confirms that HJR 192, 73rd Congress in session June 5, 1933, suspended the Gold Standard and abrogated the Gold Clause

which dissolved the Sovereign Authority of the United States and the official capacities of all United States Government Offices, Officers, and Departments and is further evidence that the United States Federal Government exists today in name only. He stated that the receivers of the United States Bankruptcy are the International Bankers, via the United Nations, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. He stated that all Officers, Officials and Departments are now operating within a de facto status in name only under the Emergency War Powers.

With the Constitutional Republican form of Government now dissolved, the receivers of the Bankruptcy have adopted a new form of government for the United States. This new form of government is known as a “Democracy”, being an established Socialist/Communist order under the new governor for America. The Act was instituted by transferring and/or placing the office of the Secretary of Treasury to that of the Governor of the International Monetary Fund... Mr. Traficant continued by stating that We the People no longer have any “money”. Most Americans have not been paid any “money” for a very long time, perhaps not in my entire life. If this is not a breach or fiduciary duty to the People, I don’t know what is!

Yet, we have never been told any of this due to intentional concealment of material facts, fraud, and treason for not upholding the organic Constitution, and an unconscionable and egregious act against the People, thus making my “money” nothing more than a debt instrument, worthless, depriving me of my constitutional right to gold and silver asset backed monetary instruments.

On May 23, 1933, Congressman, Louis T. McFadden brought forth formal charges against the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Bank system (private corporation) The Comptroller of the Currency and the Secretary of United States Treasury for numerous criminal acts, including but not limited to, CONSPIRACY, FRAUD, UNLAWFUL CONVERSION, AND TREASON. The petition for Articles of Impeachment was thereafter referred to the Judiciary Committee and has YET TO BE ACTED ON!!! **By what authority does the government believe it has standing to bring forth any causes of action whatsoever against me when it has breached the most solemn of fiduciary duties by committing treason and doing whatever it can to continue to conceal it to this very day, and it attempts to deprive me of my natural rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and my protected rights under the organic Constitution as well as its Amendments!!!**

More recently, the federal government is in breach of fiduciary duty by not protecting the southern border of our Republic, pursuant to its duty to protect against invasion under the Article 4 Section 4 of the organic Constitution, and allowing foreign invaders to breach the borders of the several states, such as Arizona, California, and Texas, and facilitating the invaders by paying them monthly stipends, providing free housing and medical care, and free transportation anywhere within the 50 states where these invaders seek to go. This breach of fiduciary duty is unconscionable because it places the American people of the several states in harm’s way and it unlawfully allocates American tax dollars to foreign invaders! By what authority does this treasonous federal government believe it can bring charges against me, an American, one of the people of the Republic of Colorado, when it is committing treasonous acts against the People, and is in breach of fiduciary duty?

HJR 192 outlaws the simple act of us “paying with real money” in favor of debt instruments known as Federal Reserve Notes, from a foreign, private for-profit corporation, a

felony by submitting the lawyer's parlor trick of "discharging" debts. By what authority did the federal government abrogate its organic Constitution's mandate under Article 1 Section 8, Clause 5 to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix standard weights and measures?

I hereby assert and affirm that the agencies that investigated me for more than two years, with no Miranda rights, and no admission that they were on a witch hunt for potential violations of statutory criminal acts, as opposed to injury to a man or woman (*corpus delicti*), are unconstitutional. These huge agencies with layer upon layer of unconstitutionally delegated police power to unmercifully investigate, with power of subpoena, and search and seizure, under threat of contempt, have no authority at law within the enumerated powers granted to them in the organic Constitution by the Sovereign People. *Perry v. United States*, 294 U.S. 330, 353 (1935)

"Sovereignty itself is, of course, not subject to law, for it is the author and source of law; but in our system, while sovereign powers are delegated to the agencies of government [while not in breach of fiduciary duty to the People], sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all government exists and acts. And the law is the definition and limitation of power. "...The Congress cannot revoke the Sovereign power of the people to override their will as thus declared." As a matter of law, one cannot confer on another a power that they did not have in the first place.

MAXIM: A delegated power cannot be again delegated. 2 Inst. 597; Black's, 2d. 347; 2 Bouv. Inst. n. 1300. A deputy cannot have [or appoint] a deputy. Story, Ag. S. 13; 9m Coke, 77; 2, Bouv. Inst. n. 1936. Magistrate "judges", having been appointed by federal judges who have no constitutional authority to appoint them, are non-constitutional, and they are not qualified or authorized to exercise any judicial Power, or to enter any decision whatsoever against Sovereign Man/Woman. As a matter of law, ALL decisions that have been entered against me by magistrate judges, are, null and void ab initio.

These decisions have numerous times violated my God-given, Natural, unalienable and self-executing Rights, which are acts of treason, since magistrate judges are also duty-bound to uphold the constitution. Federal judges, having abrogated the organic Constitution by appointing magistrate "judges" and conferring upon them adjudicatory functions that affect my liberty and deprive me of any one of my unalienable Rights, have committed acts of treason.

Both the federal district judges and the magistrate "judges" have therefore violated my constitutional Rights by intentionally concealing these matters of material fact, which is fraud. Judges are not above the law; they are presumed to know the law.

MAXIM: Ignorance of the law is no excuse.

Their wonton fraud constitutes fraud upon the court, fraud upon the American people, and fraud ab initio. And FRAUD VITIATES ALL See Throckmorton. When judicial officers who have taken an oath to uphold the organic Constitution commit acts of fraud, that is cause for automatic dismissal with prejudice and for the kind of remedy I seek herein for maliciously and with malice aforethought, violating and depriving me of my unalienable Rights.

The constitutional self-executing Right to a trial by jury is not subject to innovation of the procedures via coercion and/or intimidation, while also being under extreme duress. In my case, the government routinely denied me bail bouncing me all over the country. From State to State to State to Jail to jail to jail... for 11 months! I finally relented, under the fear of death, and

admitted that 2+2=5. i.e. a coerced and fraudulent plea statement so that I could finally be released on bail. **The judge allowed that fundamental deprivation of an unalienable Right, in violation of duty-bound obligation to uphold the constitution.** Also in violation of duty-bound *Maxim: The judge is the counselor for the prisoner.*

The federal judge also allowed the entry of a plea statement on a non-crime as mentioned beforehand. Judges are duty-bound to know the law, and to adhere to it even if countless precedent cases have abrogated the law of the land. Judges are also duty-bound to know that an amendment cannot reverse the law of the land within the body of the organic Constitution.

The promise within the plea statement was that I would get a co-operation letter and “time served” if I made the false plea statement, which occurred after the judge had, along with denying me bail, also denied me my unalienable self-executing Right to Six Amendment Right to Speedy Trial defense by acquiescing to the government’s contrived scheme that this was a “complex litigation” case, making it somehow ok make an “ends of justice” announcement to deprive me of a constitutionally protected self-executing Right. These violations occurred in 2019. Today, 5+ years later, I still sit here under the same unconstitutional deprivations of my fundamental, God-given, Natural, unalienable, self-executing Rights.

These violations entitle me to automatic dismissal with prejudice in accordance with the defenses I presented. As a matter of law, I am also entitled to remedy, and where there is none stipulated at common law, I have a constitutional Right to create my own lawful remedy.

MAXIM: Where there is a legal right there is also a remedy.

2 Rolle, 17, C.L.M; Broom, Max. 191, 204; 1 Term. 512; Co. Lin. 197th; 3 Bouv. Inst. n. 2411.

MAXIM: When the law gives anything, it gives the means of obtaining it.

(all incidents are tacitly given). 2 Inst. 326; 5 Coke, 47, 3 Kent, Comm. 421; Hob. 234.

As a matter of common law, and by tradition, indictments were obtained via common law grand juries. The sheriff would receive a verified complaint either from a citizen or from a prosecutor. The sheriff would then seat a common law grand jury, in the utmost of privacy, with the only intervention from the judiciary being the giving of the oath by the judge. See United States v. Williams, 504 U.S. 36 (1992).

In the underlying cause of action, I was coerced via intimidation, fraud and undue distress to make a plea statement on a separate but related alleged civil statutory code violation. That new action was obtained by Bill of Information, with no verified complaint, which is prohibited per the common law, and unconstitutional because I am entitled to a common law grand jury indictment on all felonies.

The combination of the violations stated above violate numerous self-executing Rights found in the various Bill of Rights... Right to common law grand jury indictment (and not statutory grand jury indictment), Right to bail and a Trial by Jury etc.

The FBI was the agency that “investigated” the “unlawful” act that I allegedly committed. The organic constitution is silent on investigatory “agencies” to assist the sheriff’s office in investigating criminal acts at the direction of the common law grand jury. What is not within the enumerated powers, is reserved either to the several states or to the people pursuant to the Ninth and Tenth Amendments. **Can anyone show me the charter/enabling act from Congress for the FBI to even exist? There isn’t one!** When it was brought to Congress, it was NOT approved because spying on Americans and assassinating sitting Presidents is

unconstitutional! After being denied a charter, The Attorney General, Bonaparte, did an end run and created the FBI himself in 1908 (United States Government Manual 347-8) with limited powers. 28 U.S.C. 533 and 535(a) only authorizes the FBI to investigate GOVERNMENT and crimes involving government officers and employees, **not private people like me**. “Bureaus” like the FBI are created by regulation. They are not an agency created by Congress. They operate internally within the government. They shouldn’t even be involved in this case to begin with because I’m NOT an officer or employee of the Federal government and I didn’t damage or misuse any government property. **It’s true with the IRS as well**. In fact, the IRS/Plaintiff wasn’t even created by regulation! There is NO STATUTE or REGULATION expressly creating “The Internal Revenue Service”. It’s a private debt collection agency for the PRIVATE **Federal Reserve Bank. (Duns & Bradstreet # 001959410)**.

The Congress is barred from delegating powers to an agency that it does not itself possess. **MAXIM: A delegated power cannot be again delegated.** 2 Inst. 597; Black’s 2d. 347; Bouv. Inst. n. 1300. A deputy cannot have [or appoint] a deputy. Story, Ag. S. 13; 9 Coke, 77; 2 Bouv. Inst. 1936.

In the case of the FBI, Congress does not possess the power at all to create an entity outside of the Sheriff to investigate crimes. Let alone delegating that non-power via the creation of an agency such as the FBI. And, even if it did have that power, the FBI would have to exist pursuant to a properly and constitutionally enacted law and the creation of its charter. Therefore, any evidence they may presume having collected against me, is inadmissible.

Similarly, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Federal Rules of Criminal Procedures have never been properly enacted into law in accordance with the procedures prescribed in the organic Constitution. These “rules” which are not the law of the land are created by the supreme Court justices, who then submit them to the Congress for them to rubber-stamp. Not only does Congress not have an enumerated power to create these rules of procedure, they also do not have the authority to delegate a power they do not have to the supreme Court.

MAXIM: A deputy cannot have (or appoint) a deputy. Story, Ag. S. 13; 9 Coke, 77; 2 Bouv. Inst. n. 1936.

The supreme Court belongs to the judiciary, as stated in Article III of the organic Constitution. It has no power or authority to encroach upon legislative power. Therefore, both sets of rules have been non-constitutionally created and they are routinely imposed on the American people contrary to the law of the land, rendering them unconstitutional. Those rules abrogate our unalienable Rights to due process of law, which is a secure Right in the Fifth Amendment.

Judges are presumed to know the law and **MAXIM: Ignorance of the law is no excuse** applies to judicial officers as well. They are duty-bound to protect the American people against usurpers of the law which violate the unalienable Rights of the American people.

Trinsey v. Pagliaro, D.C. Pa. 1964, 229 Supp. 647 “An attorney [prosecutor] for the plaintiff cannot admit evidence into the court. He is either an attorney [prosecutor] or a witness.” “Statements of counsel [prosecutor] in brief or in argument are not sufficient for motion to dismiss or for summary judgment [conviction]” “Where there are no depositions, admissions, or affidavits the court has no facts to rely on for summary determination.”

Porter v. Porter, (N.D. 1979) 274 N.W. 2d 235 “*The practice of an attorney [prosecutor] filing an affidavit [unverified statement] on behalf of his client asserting the status of that client is not approved, inasmuch as not only does the affidavit become hearsay, but it places the attorney [prosecutor] in a position of witness thus compromising his role as advocate.*”

The organic Constitution 1791 delineates the precise procedures for Congress to enact new laws. Deviation from those procedures or from the customary and traditional procedures that existed to enact laws prior to the establishment of the instrument, would not be the law of the land. While the organic Constitution 1791 does not specifically include the requirement of an enactment clause, as a matter of tradition and custom, enactment clauses were always included at the beginning of any new law, for the purpose of providing the people with due process of law in the form of Notice.

Many causes of action have been ruled invalid by supreme Courts of the several States due to there not having been an enactment clause on the face of the statute/code/etc. and the attempt for enforcement without that traditional and customary requirement.

Before Washington became one of the several states, while still a territory out west, and therefore, not yet subject to conforming to the organic Constitution 1791 procedures for enactment of a judiciable “law,” a statute was ruled invalid, citing the enactment requirement as being a customary and traditional compulsory requirement.

Title 18 of the United States Code does not have an enactment clause for each one of the Statutes within that Title, as required by tradition and custom. It also lacks the precise process of enactment found within the organic Constitution. The organic Constitution states that for a bill to become a law, each proposed statute must be brought before Congress for debate. It must then be brought before Congress assembled for a vote and then sent to the president for signature. The constitution does not state that a compilation of presumed and assumed newly created crimes can be passed in mass, under the cover of one title, (Title 18) and provide enforceability under the pretense and under the color of law and authority, as if it was the law of the land. If the precise form and style does is not adhered to, it fundamentally lacks force of law.

As ruled in *United States v Hudson & Goodwin*, where there is no [lawfully and specific] passed statute by Congress, there is no judicable act. It also affirmed that federal courts could not recognize and punish common-law crimes in the absence of a specific federal statute. It affirmed that “United States courts do not have common law jurisdiction in criminal cases. The authorities not granted to the federal government by the states are reserved to the states. The only constitutionally created court is the Supreme Court. All other federal courts only possess the jurisdiction given to them by the legislature/Congress. The federal government must first make an act [in contrast to a grouping of newly created statutes] a crime, determine the punishment, and grant federal jurisdiction to hear the crime.”

Since Title 18 is a compilation of alleged newly created statutory crimes by Congress, all grouped under the blanket heading of United States Code, with no specific enactment of each statute within that umbrella title, it lacks both the enactment clause for each “crime” and the specificity of that statute as a standalone crime. **MAXIM: form and style**... Title 18 therefore violates Due Process of Law found in the Fifth Amendment, because it is ambiguous and does not provide proper Notice to the American people, as a fundamental element of due process of law.

Like I mentioned above, the FBI does not have a legislatively granted Charter to even exist, that has ever been enacted into law. In fact, there has been an open Bill that was introduced in the mid 1980's that has never been acted upon to date. **The FBI not only has no constitutional authority to exist**, it also has no constitutionally proper form of enactment that has ever been promulgated to give lawful "birth" to that agency. Thus, not only does the organic Constitution not afford the federal government an enumerated Right to create that agency, but even if it did have that constitutional power, it could not lawfully delegate it to a for-profit, corporate subagency, such as the FBI, and it lacks proper form and style for the creation of a lawful governmental agency. **Again the FBI has no lawful Charter to even exist.**

Yet, the FBI was the agency that investigated the artificially created crime I allegedly committed, in violation of Due Process of Law found in the Fifth Amendment, and in violation for not having received an indictment from a common law Grand Jury, which grand jury would have been seated by a Sheriff, and would have relied upon verified testimony from an injury in fact living man or woman, who also pointed directly to me as the perpetrator of said injury.

As a matter of law, the only crime that was to be investigated by an agency other than the sheriff was the Secret Service's power to investigate counterfeiting because the organic Constitution conferred the power to create our coinage to the federal government. Yet, this power has been unconstitutionally expanded to include all aspects of banking.

The FBI has also become an institution, with no Congressional Charter, to likewise investigate not just alleged violation regarding financial issues, but generally all newly created allegedly non-common law crimes. Therefore, any evidence the FBI may have acquired that allegedly implicates me in the statutory code violations to which I am unconstitutionally being held to answer, is inadmissible, as a matter of law. Again, judges are presumed to know the law, and they are duty-bound to safeguard the accused from prosecutorial abuse. They have discretionary power to dismiss a case at any time due to constitutional violations and deprivations.

MAXIM: A delegated power cannot be again delegated. 2 Inst. 597; Black's, 2d, 347. 2 Bouv. Inst. n. 1300. *A deputy cannot have (or appoint) a deputy.* Story, Ag. S. 13; 9 Coke, 77; 2 Bouv. Inst. n. 1936.52

MAXIM: The derivative power cannot be greater than the original from which it is derived. Noy, Max; Wing, Max. 66; Finch, Law, b.1, c. 3

MAXIM: Nothing is so becoming to authority as to live in accordance with the laws. Fleta, lib. 1, c. 17, s. 11.

MAXIM: In the greatest power there is the least freedom. Hob.159

As a Sovereign living Man, the government, known as the artificially created under the color of law and under the color of authority, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, cannot attain parity with the living man. They must only entertain contracts between other artificial persons and the contracts between them. Pursuant to Penhallow, their only authority is to adjudicate controversies between their corporations, and their contracts, not any presumed tacit acquiescence/procuration to contract they may have assumed, because contract law has eight elements, and each one must be present for a valid contract. **Therefore, the plaintiff has no standing in this cause of action.**

STATUTE. [Blacks law 4th edition] The written will of the legislature, solemnly expressed according to the forms prescribed in the constitution, an act of the legislature.

I hereby assert that the Plaintiff/Respondent, by and through actors, masquerading under the color of law and under the color of authority, have continuously violated my self-executing Rights since December 10, 2019. They now seek further enslavement by incarcerating me again for alleged violation of unconstitutionally imposed conditions of release pending trial/sentencing before this kangaroo court, that are actually constitutionally protected Rights. *Miller v. US (5thCircuit) 230 F. 2d. 486 (1956).* **MAXIM: “The claim and exercise of a constitutional right cannot be converted into a crime.”**

Furthermore, all constitutional Rights are self-executing. State exrel *RUSSELL v. Bliss* No. 32839, Supra Ohio Last paragraph of 150 Pg and page 151 states... **“Accordingly, all provisions of the constitution, are now considered self-executing.”** Therefore, any violations or deprivations of self-executing unalienable Rights require no further input from opposing party, as their proceedings are null and void as a matter of law.

According to the Maxim which states, **“The judge is counselor for the prisoner”** and the fact that judges have taken an oath or affirmation to uphold the organic Constitution, as a matter of law, judges are duty-bound to jealously safeguard the Rights of the accused, and to act upon any encroachment thereof from bad actors, such as the government.

The Second Amendment is a self-executing Right that shall not be infringed, as affirmed numerous times by the SCOTUS. In *Christopher L. Wilson v. Hawaii*, although the cert. was denied, **Honorable Justice Clarence Thomas** stressed that SCOTUS would take a case again that infringes upon that amendment. And he cites that “...the invocation of constitutional defenses follows from the fact that constitutional rights are “self-executing” prohibitions on governmental action.” *City of Boerne v. Flores*, 521 U.S. 505, 524 (1997). Quoted in *Christopher L. Wilson v. Hawaii* on December 9, 2024, cert. denied.

MAXIM: A Right cannot be converted to a privilege.

Thus, my self-executing Second Amendment unalienable Right to bear arms, with no probable cause to deprive me of such Right, has been violated for the last five plus years, as an unlawful pretrial condition of release on an unlawfully obtained plea statement, under extreme duress and with coercion and intimidation. The government extracted this plea statement from me after holding me in jail with no opportunity to post bail for eleven months.

“A free people ought not only be armed and disciplined, but they should have sufficient arms and ammunition to maintain a status of independence from and who might attempt to abuse them, which would include their own government.” **George Washington.**

My self-executing unalienable Right to a Speedy Trial defense was unlawfully stripped from me by the government in collusion with the federal judge who turned a blind eye to the law of the land and acquiesced to the government’s unconstitutionally created scheme to deprive me of that Right by claiming an unlawful exception... i.e. “complex litigation.”

MAXIM: The law is not subject to innovation. Whatever is subject to the authority of a judge is not subject to innovation.

My self-executing unalienable Right to Liberty and to a Trial by Jury, was denied to me via coercion and intimidation and cruel and unusual punishment when I was forced to remain in jail,

and to be held in absolute solitude for up to 72 hours per day, until I succumbed to the pressures of signing a plea statement.

This coercive technique was imposed upon me for the sole purpose of intimidating me into accepting an unconstitutionally obtained plea statement. I was promised the granting of bail, in exchange for signing a plea statement, to which I have an unalienable Right immediately upon being arraigned. I was coerced into giving up my self-executing unalienable Right to a Trial by Jury just so that I could be granted bail. Shame on Judge Cecchi for doing this to me. When I was then immediately granted bail, I soon learned that the unconstitutionally imposed pretrial conditions of release were nothing more than a transfer of jail into my parents home. I was shackled by a GPS monitor, to which I also was compelled to pay for each and every month or be held in violation of said condition of release. I was compelled to remain within the confines of my home for the last five years and was only allowed to leave my home at the discretion of my handler, the pretrial services officer, who is employed by a for profit, unlawfully created agency known as the pretrial services board. This all constitutes involuntary servitude, which is unlawful. And, it constitutes a complete defense against the plea statement I was illegally coerced into signing. ***MAXIM: No Sovereign “freeman shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property but by the lawful judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land – that is by the common law.*** C.L.M.

1- Self-executing Second Amendment violation is automatic grounds for dismissal with prejudice in accordance with papers submitted and lawful remedies sought.

2- Self-executing Eighth Amendment violation is automatic grounds for dismissal with prejudice, for not allowing bail until after I was coerced, under extreme duress, intimidation, and false promises.

3- Fifth Amendment Due Process of Law violation for not protecting my unalienable Rights and instead conspiring with the government to deprive me of self-executing unalienable Rights is automatic grounds for dismissal with prejudice. The federal judge is duty-bound to protect my constitutionally protected Rights. The federal judge has full authority to ex parte, dismiss a case for violation of unalienable Rights.

4- When the federal judge saw that my unalienable Right to bear arms was violated by the magistrate judge when he issued pretrial conditions of release denying my right to bear arms, she was duty-bound to correct the errors of this rogue magistrate “judge”.

This federal judge is duty-bound to remove any administrative “judge”, who is enforcing statutes, that are not the law of the land, from these proceedings as he has no constitutional authority to even exist in the presumed capacity of a tenured judge, with the obligation to follow the common law, within the Article III, Court of Record which is promised to Sovereign Americans.

I assert that my God-given, Natural, unalienable, self-executing Rights have been trampled, deprived and violated by rogue bad actors calling themselves magistrate judges for the purpose of self-aggrandizement, and as a stealth scheme to intentionally conceal matters of material fact, FRAUD. Contract law contains eight elements. The government is compelled to prove that I willingly and knowingly consented to each one of those elements, with no duress or coercion or intimidation of any kind. The government must produce on the record, as holder in due course, the presumed contract it obtained from me, wherein, with full knowledge and full disclosure

aforehand of all its terms and conditions I willingly consented and wet-inked it.

It must also show proof on the record that I fully understood that I was essentially waiving my unalienable constitutionally protected and secure self-executing Rights in favor of corporate privileges of which I would never do.

Notwithstanding the above regarding contract provisions, the fact that the magistrate “judge” has taken an oath or affirmation with bond to uphold the organic Constitution 1791, and intentionally concealed matters of material fact, is cause enough for mandatory sanction. The fact that he is masquerading as a constitutionally qualified judge, and operating under the color of law, and under the color of authority, is cause enough to render his decisions Void for fraud upon the court, fraud upon the people and fraud ab initio. See Throckmorton FRAUD VITIATES ALL.

The organic Constitution 1791 mandates that judges follow the common law when conducting their affairs at bar. It also mandates that all constitutional judges take an oath or affirmation with bond to uphold the organic Constitution 1791. Yet, this magistrate “judge” who does not qualify as a constitutional judge, as stated above, fraudulently, routinely and unconstitutionally continues to wield the judicial Power when he issues decisions that pertain to any matter that can result in a fundamental deprivation or violation of one of my unalienable Rights.

He, too, is duty-bound to safeguard my unalienable Rights. Therefore, by enforcing statutes on this Sovereign Living Man, which statutes are not the law, and by acting as an administrative law “judge” under Articles I & IV and deceiving me via intentional concealment of matters of material facts, my unalienable Rights have likewise been violated and/or deprived. Administrative judges can only exercise legislative enforcement, by express contract. Contracts obtain via presumption/assumption or tacit procurement are void ab initio, upon rescission for fraudulent presumption of acquiescence.

The federal judge is duty-bound to safeguard all my Rights, which includes correcting the errors of the magistrate “judge” whom he unconstitutionally appointed. Attorneys, who have also taken oaths or affirmations with bond to uphold the organic Constitution 1791 are likewise complicit in this grand scheme to deceive the American people into us believing they are duly licensed and that their singular and primary fiduciary duty is to the client, this living Sovereign Man.

According to 7 Corpus Juris Secundum, BAR-member attorneys owe their first allegiance to the court, and not to their client. If the court is imposing statutes upon the American people, he is required to act against the constitutional Rights of the American people. He does this with no full disclosure, rendering his actions acts of treason since he too has taken an oath or affirmation to uphold the organic Constitution 1791. He is thus acting in a conspiratorial posture, which is unlawful.

This cause of action extends to my attorneys (past and present) named herein, who have committed Barratry to the tune of almost \$3 million dollars USD in attorneys’ fees. They have been fired for cause, for fraud, for swindles, and for ineffective assistance of counsel, as a self-executing unalienable Right found in the Sixth Amendment.

I also assert and allege that these bad actors have conspired to deprive me of my God-given, Natural, unalienable, self-executing Rights with the judges and the prosecutors, by not jealously defending me likewise intentionally concealing matters of material fact, FRAUD. They

have breached their fiduciary duty to vigorously defend my constitutional Rights throughout these proceedings, or to immediately notify me and voluntarily withdraw from representation for their inability or unwillingness to do so, despite them having taken oaths or affirmations with bond to uphold the organic Constitution 1791, and millions of dollars from me, that I gave them in good faith.

When judges/justices violate the plain letter of the law, attempting to interpret what the statute might mean that has been recited on the face of the complaint, they are exercising legislative fiat, by endeavoring to place round pegs into square holes. The statute itself is void for ambiguity in violation of a most fundamental element of Due Process of Law found in the Fifth Amendment. **A fundamental element of Due Process of Law is NOTICE...** of the specific common law I have violated. The organic Constitution does not enumerate the interpretation of a legislative enactment/statute/code/etc. as one of the government's powers.

The laws of our land were not written to befuddle or to obfuscate; they were written in clear and simple language for your "average Joe" to understand. Due Process of Law demands NOTICE, which is found in the Maxims of Law and their sanctions therein. Anything short of that constitutes expansion of the written law of the land. Since statutes are not the law of the land, and they are legislatively enacted, they cannot be the basis under which a complaint is submitted because judges/justices are duty-bound to follow the common law, and to exercise only judicial Power.

CONCLUSION AND REMEDIES SOUGHT

For all the reasons stated herein, I assert that the government has no standing to have brought forth the underlying cause of action. In so doing, it violated and deprived me of God-given, Natural, unalienable and self-executing Rights. The government is also in breach of fiduciary duty to the American people, rendering all of its presumed and assumed laws null and void for over two centuries! Among the non-exhaustive violations and deprivations I state the following:

A) **First and Fourth Amendment:** – Have violated my unalienable rights by imposing unconstitutional conditions of release that impede my unalienable Right to speak with whomever I please, whenever I please when it prohibited me from using a smart phone or a private App such as Signal.

B) **Sixth Amendment:** - Have violated my rights by not allowing me to speak with anyone other than foreign agent, BAR-member attorneys to seek assistance with my Sui Juris counsel with privacy.

C) **Sixth Amendment:** – Have violated my unalienable Right to confront and to cross-examine witnesses, as they have not brought forth any verified complaints from a competent witness, and prosecutors cannot speak on behalf of the government or admit evidence on behalf of the government as they are hearsay, third-party unverified statements. Also, prosecutors must provide a witness who has sworn a statement claiming injury in fact and that I was the party to cause that injury.

D) **Sixth Amendment:** – Have violated my unalienable self-executing Right to a Speedy Trial by acquiescing to the government’s argument that this is somehow a “complex litigation” thus depriving me of my self-executing speedy trial violation as automatic grounds for immediate dismissal. Erlinger v. United States, June 21, 2024, “*The Sixth Amendment promises that in “all criminal prosecutions the accused” has “the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury.”* Trump v. United States

E) **Second Amendment:** – Have violated my unalienable self-executing Right to bear arms, with no probable cause or history on my part of ever having committed a violent offense against anyone.

F) **Fifth Due Process of Law:** – Have violated my unalienable and most sacred Right to Liberty, as innocent until proven guilty, which includes trial by jury, conviction and sentencing before I can be constitutionally deprived of any of my unalienable Rights. My Right to unfettered travel to wherever I want whenever I want has been completely denied violating my most sacred Right to liberty.

G) **My Eighth Amendment:** Have violated my unalienable self-executing Right to Bail during arraignment.

H) **Fifth Amendment:** have violated my constitutional Right to a common law Grand Jury indictment, in contrast to a rubber-stamp statutory, unconstitutional version of a grand jury has been deprived. It also unlawfully brought forth a Bill of Information on a felony charge and I was not afforded full disclosure by either my attorneys or by the court of my self-executing Right to a common law grand jury indictment.

I) The common law requires a verified complaint from a living man or woman for it to be a judiciable complaint. None has ever been produced.

J) With no constitutional probable cause from a common law Grand Jury in the form of an indictment, a search and seizure warrant unlawfully issued, by a magistrate administrator, who is not a constitutionally qualified judge, and my parents’ home was raided. I did not even live in that home at the time. Many personal items were confiscated, which have never been returned.

K) Among the many violations of Fifth Amendment Due Process of Law, my sacred unalienable Right to Liberty was violated when the magistrate “judge” imposed upon me a GPS monitor, and at my expense, tracking me as if I was a caged wild animal.

L) Seventh Amendment: Have violated my unalienable self- executing Right to Trial by Jury by coercing and intimidating me, while under extreme duress, to make a plea statement to an unconstitutional crime. **MAXIM: “An amendment [to the original instrument] is not a repeal. [Fundamental principles are no annulled by amendment.]**

Mass. Bond & Ins. Co. v. U.S. , 352 U.S. 128, 139.

M) Fifth Amendment: Has been violated by imposing statutes upon me that are null and void on their face for failure to observe traditional and customary enactment form, such as Title 15, Title 26 and Title 18 of the U.S. Code, and for deprivation of Due Process of Law due to not being enacted into positive law, ambiguity and vagueness...

MAXIM: When the form is not observed, it is inferred that the act is annulled. 12 Coke. 7.

MAXIM: That which is null produces no effect. Tray. Leg. Max. 519.

MAXIM: An act of legislature to have full force of law must be intelligibly expressed and when too vague is a nullity. Larkin v. Consolidated telegraph, 85 N.Y.S. (2d) 631.

N) **First Amendment:** Have violated my unalienable self-executing Right to practice my religion by imposing conditions of release that deprive me of leaving my home for any reason other than to visit with unconstitutional BAR-Member attorneys, with no lawful licenses, who are foreign agents and are not registered as such, thus intentionally concealing matters of material fact.

O) **Fourth Amendment:** Have infringed upon and violated my my self-executing Right to be secure in my person, papers and personal effects via the pretrial conditions of release that deprive me any access to my bank accounts, crypto accounts, computer, smart phone, and to unfettered access to healthcare.

P) **Fourth Amendment** violation for requiring me to be supervised 24/7 by someone living within my home. Whatever happened to innocent until proven guilty before our Rights to liberty can be taken from us?

Q) My unalienable Right to seek medical care as I see fit or necessary absent permission from the pretrial services officer, within 3 days of an appointment, infringes upon and violates the human rights treaties, and it violates my right to liberty. Not only are my unalienable Rights violated via the above, but I am prohibited from seeking medical/physical care from any practitioner that is not an Medical Doctor/MD/AMA certified, violating my unalienable Right to contract with whomever I see fit for my physical/emotional/etc. needs and desires.

For all the above reasons I seek immediate redress and BLANKET interlocutory injunction against ALL governmental agencies, and against all judiciary public servants in any and all courts of this great nation.

1- I seek the immediate dismissal of the underlying charges with prejudice in accordance with these papers and the lawful remedies sought herein.

2- I seek this court immediately order the inferior court to return all my personal items that were unlawfully confiscated.

3- I seek the immediate removal of the GPS monitor.

4- I seek immediate payment in full as reimbursement of all fees paid to my past attorneys plus the sum of 20% as restitution for their fraudulent/treasonous deeds and for their wonton violation of my unalienable Rights by intentionally concealing the true relationship between them and me and for their grossly ineffective assistance of counsel.

5- I seek the sum of Twenty-Two point Two Billion Dollars (\$22.2 Billion dollars or 200,000 Bitcoins) payable to me, from the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, within four business days of winning this case as my constitutionally lawful Right. I reserve the unconditional Right to further be granted lawful funds from each and every DOE within the Federal District Court in the New Jersey District, as fiduciary Trustees of the Public Trust and of the Public Funds, and in their own names for wonton acts of treason and for wonton deprivation and violation of my unalienable self-executing Rights as one of the We the [American] People to whom they are duty-bound to protect our Rights. I seek these funds as a reminder to these treasonous bad actors that it is each one of the American people that is SOVEREIGN, AND NOT governmental public servants.

MAXIM: When the law gives anything, it gives the means of obtaining it (all incidents are tacitly given) 2 Inst. 326; 5 Coke 47; 3 Kent, Comm. 421 , Hob. 234.

6- I demand that these papers be made public on the official SCOTUS website for all American people to see and to freely access for their own use.

7- I demand that NO BAR-member attorney past or present, be allowed to profit in any manner from these defenses while representing the American people as punishment for the Barratry they committed against the people while duty-bound to protect the American people. In other words, they must provide their services Pro Bono if they are to choose to use these defenses.

8- I demand that only Sui Juris defendants or petitioners be allowed to profit in any manner from the use of these defenses, in accordance with the late Judge James Alger Fee's Doctrine of the Belligerent Claimant, which requires that each one of We the [American] People assert our individual unalienable Rights in person/via affidavit.

9- I demand that each judge, magistrate, prosecutor, clerk of the court who touched this case in any manner be compelled to provide FREE and readily available education to We the [American] People about our constitutional Rights as restitution for their egregious deeds and treasonous acts. This education shall include admission to We the [American] people that they individually wronged us and that this is their way of repenting.

I extend a personal thank you to the esteemed SCOTUS Honorable Justice Neil M. Gorsuch for having the courage, dignity and honor to stand up against the fierce treasonous federal "government" and educate We the [American] People during his tour promoting your book in 2024, Overruled! I enjoyed reading it immensely!

Thank you to the esteemed SCOTUS **Honorable Justice Clarence Thomas** for having endured the slings and arrows for decades and standing with We the (American) People in your decisions.

Thank you to the esteemed SCOTUS **Honorable Justice Alito** for having the courage to likewise issue the SCOTUS ruling on the Federal Reserve's unconstitutionality.

In Memoriam thank you to the late SCOTUS **Honorable Justice Antonin Scalia** for his originalist decisions during my lifetime that paved the way for the above-mentioned Justices. Respectfully submitted, in the year of our Lord and Savior, this 2nd day of January 2025, by one of the injured members of the Sovereign We the[American] People.

And The Truth Shall Set Us Free

All RIGHTS RESERVED,

Jobadiah from the House of Weeks

Notary on next page

Verification

I affirm, certify and state that all of the above and foregoing representations are true and correct, to the best of my knowledge, information and belief, under the pains and penalties of perjury, pursuant to the penalties of perjury under the laws of the United States, and by the provisions of 28 USC 1746, so help me God.

Executed in _____, Colorado on this _____ day of _____ in the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand and Twenty Five (2025).

Affiant: Beneficiary & Holder in due course of
JOBADIAH SINCLAIR WEEKS Social security
Cestui que Trust, and one of the people as seen in the
Constitution.

Colorado Notary as Jurat Certificate (Oath or Affirmation)

State of **Colorado** } For verification purposes only
} ss.
County of **Jefferson** }

Signed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me on _____, 2025
by Jobadiah-Sinclair :Weeks d/b/a Jobadiah Sinclair Weeks (name of individual).

Notary's official signature: _____

Title of Office: _____

My commission expires on: _____

Title of Document:

Supreme Court of the United States

Case: #19-cr-877-nj-cecchi, and cc 019-mj-8526 Counterclaim.

Jobadiah of the House of Weeks, aka, Jobadiah Sinclair Weeks, Petitioner v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY, all my previous attorneys, And all
DOES within ALL Courts and all Judicial Public Servants that have Taken an
Oath To Uphold the de jure Constitution 1791, RESPONDENTS.

Registered Mail No. RF 794 044 015 US.