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Notice of Vexatious Litigation by Embassy of Tribal Nations Diplomatic Officers and or Employees

**CUSIP #:** \*123456789\*

Re: NAME OF STATE SUPREME / SUPERIOR COURT CASE/DOCKET/INDEX #: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

To: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, Doing Business As: U.S. Secretary of State; Holds Command Responsibility

To: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, Doing Business As: U.S. State Governor & State Constitutional Officer

**THIS IS TO INFORM YOU THAT YOUR NAME HAS BEEN ADDED TO A DEMAND FOR INQUEST AND FORENSIC AUDIT OF THE LOCAL STATE LAND BANKS TO THE U.S. CONGRESS DUE TO ELEMENTS OF TRESPASS, DEFALCATION and or EMBEZZLEMENT OF TRIBAL TRUST FUNDS BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE TRUST LANDS.**

**Maxim**: Equity will not suffer a statute to be used as a cloak for fraud. For example, the Hague Securities Convention; has been granted the status of a statute of the United States, via a statutory instrument, which authorizes it to domesticate foreign judgments by preempting the choice-of-law rules in the United States Uniform Commercial Code (UCC).

**Note:** A General Security Agreement or GSA is a voluntary, consensual or statutory lien which may cover a broad range of assets except real property, i.e., land, buildings, etc..

**Note:** The Bureau of Indian Affair’s (BIA’s) authority is statutorily derived, and all statutory law is consensual or voluntary law. BIA’s use of “Forced assimilation” is a violation of said authority and thus, unenforceable. In short, citizenship cannot be compelled or forced. The United States is not a land or a place: ‘It is a corporation, a legal fiction that existed well before the Revolutionary War.’ See: Republica v. Sween, 1 Dallas 43 and **28 U. S. Code 3002 (15**). **C**ompulsory “citizenship” via civil conscription or otherwise, does not exist.

A Citizen is defined by law as a“corporate fiction.” The people were bound to the Corporate State and the States were bound to the Corporate United States and fraudulently obligated all Americans to pay the debts of the Federal Government owed to the King. This was necessary because the United States was officially bankrupt on January 1, 1788, and the politician’s, i.e., the so-called Founding Fathers who benefitted the most by these Revolutionary loans, required a guarantee to present to the King. Absent that guarantee, they were personally obligated to repay the debts.

**Federal citizenship is a municipal franchise domiciled in the District of Columbia;** [**Murphy v. Ramsey,**](http://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/114/15/) **114 U.S. 15 (1885).** The U.S. citizens [citizens of the District of Columbia] residing in one of the states of the union are classified as property and franchises of the federal government as an “individual entity”. Wheeling Steel Corporation v. Fox, 298 U.S. 193, 80 L. Ed. 1143, 56 S.Ct. 773.

**Coterminous or Conterminous**

TAKE NOTICE, coterminous or conterminous means sharing a common boundary, bordering or contiguous. For example, the northern border of the United States is conterminous with the southern border of Canada. It also means enclosed within a common boundary, e.g.,the coterminous U.S. states are coterminous with the union of States.

In the United States, when the boundaries of a township are coterminous with the boundaries of a city, borough or village, the township ceases to exist as a separate government. Also take notice that the **contiguous United States**, officially the **conterminous United States** consists of the 48 adjoining U.S. states and the Federal District of the United States of America. The term excludes the only two non-contiguous states, Alaska and Hawaii. The related but distinct term **continental United States** includes Alaska, which is also on the continent of North America but separated from the 48 states by British Columbia and Yukon of Canada; however, it excludes the Hawaiian Islands and all Territories of the United States in the Caribbean and the Pacific.

In the United States, because the boundaries of a township are coterminous with the boundaries of a city or village, the area administratively falls under the control of the United States government, and it becomes the fiduciary responsibility of the local Sheriffs and their lawfully authorized deputies to protect and defend the borders between the contiguous / coterminous jurisdictions and protect the living men and women, along with their assets; from being subjected to the intentional torts being perpetrated by licensed United States diplomatic officers and its employees.

**The United States of America**

The United States of America (U.S.A. or USA), commonly known as the United States (U.S. or US) or simply America, is a country primarily located in North America. It consists of 50 states, a federal district, five major unincorporated territories, nine Minor Outlying Islands, and as of 19 February 2020, there are approximately 574 Indian tribes, 231 of which are located in Alaska, and **326 reservations**, i.e., native American lands legally recognized by the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). However, **the United States corporate government does not have the authority to unilaterally assume title, legal or otherwise, over Native-American lands, including via any form of civil conscription, rendition, municipal transfer and or corporate assignment, termed land registration.**

**Pursuant to Title 6 Part 9, 72 Del. Laws, c. 401, §1: § 9-307(h), United States is located in the District of Columbia.** Any purported immunities, indemnifications and or limited liability being alleged by the involved parties via licensing and or registration, is strictly limited to the ten (10) mile square territory of United States, D.C., where the U.S. Congress exercises plenary legislative authority and as you are all aware, the United States is not a land or a place: ‘It is a corporation, a legal fiction that existed well before the Revolutionary War.’ See: Republica v. Sween, 1 Dallas 43 and **28 U. S. Code 3002 (15**). **C**ompulsory “citizenship” via civil conscription or otherwise, does not exist.

A Citizen is defined by law as a“corporate fiction.” The people were bound to the Corporate State and the States were bound to the Corporate United States and fraudulently obligated all Americans to pay the debts of the Federal Government owed to the King. This was necessary because the United States was officially bankrupt on January 1, 1788, and the politician’s, i.e., the so-called Founding Fathers who benefitted the most by these Revolutionary loans, required a guarantee to present to the King. Absent that guarantee, they were personally obligated to repay the debts.

F**ederal citizenship is a municipal franchise domiciled in the District of Columbia;** [**Murphy v. Ramsey,**](http://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/114/15/) **114 U.S. 15 (1885).** The U.S. citizens [citizens of the District of Columbia] residing in one of the states of the union are classified as property and franchises of the federal government as an “individual entity”. Wheeling Steel Corporation v. Fox, 298 U.S. 193, 80 L. Ed. 1143, 56 S.Ct. 773.

**Indian Reservations**

Section 1163 of Title 18 makes embezzlement, theft, criminal conversion, and willful misapplication of funds belonging to a tribal organization a crime. For example, it is a felony if the amount taken exceeds $100 and is subject to imprisonment for a maximum of 5 years, a fine pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3571, or both. Hence, transfer of title for quit-claim deeds, such as, sheriff deeds and referee deeds, in most US jurisdictions are maxed out at $100.00. It is also why all EVICTIONS are handled by local small claims courts, with the local government retaining possession of any amount in excess of the statutorily mandated limit.

**State-owned Trust Lands**

The 326 reservations are administered via LAND TRUSTS, e.g., t**he National Association of State Trust Lands (NASTL) to benefit federal and state recognized Indian tribes.**

Information harvested from the **National Association of State Trust Lands website, NASTL is a non-profit consortium of Administrators of State-owned Trust Lands; that is privately owned; totaling more than 500 million acres of public and school trust lands in 21 western states. The combined holdings of the NASTL member states represent the second largest owner of land and minerals in the United States, second only to the federal government.**

NASTL adopted an Affiliate Membership Program to provide public and private entities and individuals who share common interests in the NASTL's objectives with an opportunity to formally communicate and cooperate with NASTL members.

The Program offers Affiliate members the opportunity to participate in the Association's biannual conferences and to talk directly with other members on issues important to both.  Applicants must be a corporation, non-profit entity, or an individual that has been recommended by a member state, approved by the NASTL Executive Committee and has paid at least one year of annual   ​dues.

**Affiliate Membership is designed to:**

* Enhance and extend NASTL, its educational missions, institutional impacts, influence and **positive** public image
* Develop or strengthen relationships with organizations that complement our mission
* Share intellectual & social capital

**Desired Outcomes:**

* Expand diversity of NASTL members and audiences
* Enhance distribution of NASTL outputs to new, relevant markets
* Augment opportunities to develop, share & evaluate information regarding land, water and other resource management policies and practices
* Help member states maximize the earnings and preserve the assets of educational trusts

According to the public records, NASTL member state trust lands total over 500 million surface and mineral acres that is spread across 20 of the lower 48 U.S. states and Alaska, primarily west of the Mississippi River.They are:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| AlaskaArizonaArkansasCaliforniaColoradoIdahoLouisiana | Minnesota​MississippiMontanaNew MexicoNevadaNorth DakotaOklahoma | ​Oregon​South DakotaTexasUtahWashingtonWisconsinWyoming |

The Board of Commissioners of Public Lands for the State of Wisconsin’s website clearly state the following in party:

The **Board of Com​missioners of Public Lands** (BCPL), Wisconsin’s oldest state agency, is comprised of Secretary of State Sarah Godlewski​, State Treasurer John Leiber​, and Attorney General Josh Kaul. ​We proudly carry on the pioneering commitment of our state’s early leaders to a constitutionally protected form of public education financing that originated with millions of acres of land granted by the federal government.

The School Trust Lands provide revenue through sustainable timber management and are used for hunting, fishing, trapping, protection of water quality and biological diversity, aesthetics and outdoor recreation.

The legislature voted unanimously in 2006 to grant "**Land Bank**" authority to the Board of Commissioners of Public Lands (BCPL).  With this powerful new tool, the agency has the ability to increase its productive timberland, ensure protection of unique natural areas, and enhance public access to Trust Lands.

The website also states that nearly all of the **School Trust Lands** were sold over 100 years ago and the proceeds were used to establish the **School Trust Funds**.

BCPL manages four School Trust Funds for its **beneficiaries**, the largest and most important of which is the **Common School Fund**. The Fund is purportedly as old as Wisconsin. The framers of the state Constitution allegedly established this **permanent “school fund”** and required that its income be applied exclusively “to the support and maintenance of common [public K-12] schools … and the purchase of suitable libraries and apparatus therefor.” --- Is it being used for this exclusively intended purpose. Ultimately, a forensic audit will be able to determine that.

The **Common School Fund** is financed with revenue from:

1. unclaimed property,
2. clear proceeds of civil and
3. criminal f​ees,
4. fines and
5. forfeitures.

The**Normal School Fund** continues to grow thr​ough revenue from timber production on School Trust Lands. Wisconsin became a state in 1848. Wisconsin’s newly adopted constitution contained a clause which established a “school fund” for the support and maintenance of “common” (public K-12) schools and “normal” schools (the French name for teacher colleges). The constitution provided that any fund income that was not needed for common schools would be used for normal schools. At that time, common schools were just being started and there were no normal schools in the state. It was quite a bit of foresight to establish a funding mechanism in the Constitution for the normal schools that did not yet exist.

The Principal used to establish the “Normal School Fund” originated when Wisconsin received title to more than 3 million acres of land pursuant to the Swamp Land Act of 1850, which directed that the land be sold and the proceeds be used to the extent necessary for the purpose of drainage and reclamation of “swamp and overflowed lands.” In 1865, the state legislature decided that Wisconsin did not need half of the swamp land for drainage purposes. The legislature further decided that the common schools were already adequately funded so a law was passed which placed half of the swamp lands and half of the proceeds from swamp land sales into the school fund for the benefit of the normal schools. This established the trust fund principal for the Normal School Fund.  Since then, the Fund has grown from the sale of Normal School Lands and from revenue on timber harvested from those lands.  Today, the remaining Normal School Trust Lands are approximately 70,000 acres but the Trust Fund principal has grown to almost $30 million.​​​

In 1866, Wisconsin established its first state normal school in Platteville providing two years of post high school training for aspiring teachers. This normal school in Platteville was the first beneficiary of the Normal School Fund. Over the years, more normal schools were added and the curriculum was broadened to include an additional two years of liberal arts and science classes. The names were also changed from “**normal schools**” to “**state teacher colleges**” and then to “**Wisconsin State Colleges**.”

In 1964, they became the Wisconsin State Universities and in the early 1970s, they were merged into the University of Wisconsin System. Today, the University of Wisconsin System is the successor to the normal schools of years ago and is the beneficiary of the Normal School Fund earnings. The UW is directed to use the **Normal School Fund** distributions for scholarships and programs in accordance with Wisconsin Statute 36.49.

* ​BCPL is targeting a distribution of $1,070,000 this year which would be an all-time record.
* BCPL is targeting a distribution of $1,070,000 this year, to its beneficiaries, which would be an all-time record
* BCPL manages these Funds and the remaining School Trust Lands for the benefit of public school libraries, the University of Wisconsin, and the state’s **citizens**.

BCPL also maintains a rich archive of **historical records** related to the agency’s past and present land holdings. **The Land Records Archive is maintained to preserve and provide access to records of the agency’s past and present land holdings. In short,** The BCPL maintains an archive of records relating to lands granted to the State of Wisconsin. This archive documents the surveys of State lands, the State’s receipt of the granted lands, the appraisal and management of such lands and finally the subsequent land sales. The records cover land transaction activity since statehood and provide legal documentation of the original land transfers. The archive is a rich source of historical information concerning the settlement of Wisconsin. The majority of these records date from 1848 to 1900. **BCPL manages over $1.4​ billion in Trust Fund assets and 77,000 acres of School Trust Lands.**

### The principal for theFund was established with proceeds from the sale of the 16th Section of each township—nearly 1 million acres of land granted by the federal government to Wisconsin when it became a state.  Except for the​ ~7,018​​ acres that remain in trust, all of the lands from these 16th section original grants were sold to establish the Fund.  Like other states joining the union at that time, Wisconsin received another grant from Congress of 500,000 acres of land for the purpose of making “internal improvements.” Wisconsin’s early leaders petitioned Congress for permission to dedicate these lands for public education, as well.

### The principal continues to grow, however, because the state’s constitution provides that the Fund receives clear proceeds of all fees, fines and forfeitures (including unclaimed and escheated property) that accrue to the state.  What was for over 100 years a rich source of principal growth and public education support is being eroded as “clear proceeds” is redefined and governing bodies impose “surcharges” in lieu of fines. Today, the Common School Fund receives less than 10% of the revenue from a typical speeding ticket, for example.

### Investments in the Fund is diversified across a number of different asset classes designed to produce a steady stream of distributable income as well as growth for the principal balance of the fund.  The Fund has also invested hundreds of millions of dollars to direct loans to Wisconsin municipalities through the**State Trust Fund Loan Program.**

One investment vehicle is the **BCPL State Trust Fund Loan Program,** which lends money to school districts and municipalities for a wide variety of public purposes.

Since **1871**, BCPL has invested in loans to municipalities and school districts for public purpose projects including economic development, local infrastructure, capital equipment and vehicles, building repairs and improvements, and refinancing existing liabilities to reduce future borrowing costs.

Today BCPL is among the largest public investors in economic development projects and local infrastructure projects within the State of Wisconsin.  Over the past 10 years, we have invested over $1 billion in communities throughout Wisconsin.

The fund is now seeing additional growth from capital gains on some of its investments.  The growth from fines, forfeitures, unclaimed property and capital gains have now pushed the total principal to over $1.4 billion!

In April of each year, net earnings of the Fund are forwarded to the Department of Public Instruction for distribution to every Wisconsin school district, which are designated as the beneficiaries, in the form of **library aid​**. These monies are the sole source of state funding for public school libraries and for many school districts is the only money available to them for library books, newspapers and periodicals, web-based resources, and computer hardware and software.

BCPL offers fixed rate loans with interest rates that are competitive with the bond market and other financial institutions. The contact is **Richard Sneider** at (608) 261-8001 (office), **(608) 572-1611**(cell) or richard.sneider@wi.gov​.

The website further states:

This small state agency is an integral part of Wisconsin’s history and economy. Our financial investments, land management practices, and archive benefit every citizen of the state.

Note: As stated above:

* We **loan money** to municipalities and school districts for **p**ublic **p**urpose **p**rojects (PPP).
* We contribute to Wisconsin’s **sustainable timber economy,** combat forest fragmentation, and secure public access to large blocks of northern forests.
* We manage an **extensive archive** consulted by land owners, surveyors, researchers, and others interested in this rich source of historical information about the state’s land and early settlers.​

**The National Association of State Trust Lands (NASTL)**

**The National Association of State Trust Lands is a non-profit consortium of Administrators of State-owned Trust Lands; that is privately owned; totaling more than 500 million acres of public and school trust lands in 21 western states. The combined holdings of the NASTL member states represent the second largest owner of land and minerals in the United States, second only to the federal government. The** NASTL governing board oversee the State (tribal) trust lands in the capacity of “Trustees de son tort”.

**Trustee de son tort**

A trustee de son tort is a person who may be regarded as owing fiduciary duties by a course of conduct that amounts to a wrong, or a tort. Accordingly, a trustee de son tort is not a person who is formally appointed as a trustee, but one who assumes such a role, and then cannot be heard to argue that he did not owe fiduciary duties.

The courts may hold a person a constructive trustee instead of prosecuting and, thereby, impose the liabilities of an actual trustee in accounting for his or her acts. - *Lewin on Trusts*  says at 42-74. If a person by mistake or otherwise assumes the character of trustee when it does not really belong to him, he becomes a trustee de son tort and he may be called to account by the beneficiaries for the money he has received under the “**color of the trust**”.

A trustee de son tort closely resembles an express trustee. The principle is that a person who assumes an office ought not to be in a better position than if he were what he pretends; he is accountable as if he had the authority which he has assumed. While it is essential, if a person is to become a trustee de son tort, that he consciously takes the office of trustee, it does not matter whether he knows all the trusts or the extent of his powers. - Thomas and Hudson's *The Law on Trusts* says at para 30.03:

... trustees de son tort are not expressly declared by the settlor to be trustees but rather are deemed to be constructive trustees by operation of law, due to their meddling with trust affairs, they are therefore constructive trustees.

A trustee de son tort is to be contrasted with a delegate who is appointed by a trustee to undertake certain functions: such a person derives his authority from the trustee and is entitled to act in accordance with the delegated authority without himself becoming a trustee. A delegate, in such circumstance, has done no "wrong" and is not intermeddling in the trust and so does not become a “trustee de son tort”.

The court also considered the concept of a trustee de son tort and whether an agent, appointed by a duly constituted trustee, could itself be a trustee de son tort in circumstances where the agent's actions caused loss to the trust fund.

It was argued that it was commonplace in the trust industry for the administration of a trust to be carried out largely by another company (other than the trustee) within the same group of companies as the corporate trustee. It would cause considerable surprise in the industry if such a company was to find itself designated a trustee de son tort. Because it was common practice it was important that an authoritative decision be given as to whether such an administrative company should be treated as a trustee de son tort.

In the United States, a "**person**" is defined as a "foreign state" and owner of a vessel, and an “**individual**” is defined as an artificial “federally-chartered entity”, meaning a federal (but not state) chartered corporation or partnership or trust.  Such an entity is a citizen of **the** United States because it has a physical presence in the District of Columbia (US), to be subject to the exclusive legislative or territorial jurisdiction of the United States under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17 of the U.S. Constitution.

**Jurisdiction**

In the US the word "jurisdiction" is used, especially in informal writing, to refer to a state or political subdivision generally, or to its government, rather than to its legal authority. In the history of English common law, a jurisdiction could be held as a form of property or more precisely an incorporeal hereditament called a franchise.

**The National Debt**

The United States government has brainwashed the general population into believing that the National Debt is our responsibility, and that we have an obligation to pay our fair share. Here’s the Truth about that subject.

The National Debt is a Federal Debt, and always has been. It is a debt owed **by** the Federal Government. It is not a debt owed **to** the Federal Government. The name change was the clever use of “propaganda” intended to invoke our civil patriotic pride.

The foreign Agents in charge of our government; have been borrowing funds to line their pockets with, to buy influence, make business deals and seal Treaties with communist Third World Countries and Dictators, which will never benefit “We the People.” They have lied to us, enslaved us, imprisoned us and sold our gold to the Vatican in 1933 and invested the proceeds for themselves. The money they have been borrowing since 1933; is not real money but, “negotiable debt instruments,” which is the same thing as monopoly money.

**This means that in order to pay off the Federal/National Debt, when the bankruptcy ended on or about November 2, 1999, all they had to do was print a money order, without any account numbers on it, for the entire debt, sign it and present it to the lender, i.e., The Federal Reserve Bank, and the debt would have been PAID IN FULL.**

Instead, the entire administratively uncollectible debt portfolio was transferred to the individual U.S. Attorneys, who in turn delegated it to the United States regional state Attorney, who repackaged these administratively uncollectible obligations of the Government of the United States, that were and are essentially “**junk bonds**”, and converted them into municipal (Estreature) bonds which they then sold in bulk to authorized land banking associations as “secured transactions”.

**United States District Courts**

In the United States, all courts are privately owned trading companies and UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS arearticle one legislative tribunals. **They're not judicial courts.** They are inferior courts that are all owned by the U.S. Attorney's executive offices out of Washington DC, United States, which is a privately owned corporation.

ALL banks are (were) registered with the United States Postmaster General (USPMG) who holds (held) ALL bank charters. The banks have a depository agreement, a security agreement and an escrow agreement, and are registered with a Federal Reserve bank, for example, The Federal Reserve Bank of New York City.

**Small-claims courts vs. Small Claims Court**

Small-claims courts have limited jurisdiction to hear civil cases between **private litigants**. Because some courts have both a civil and criminal jurisdiction, civil proceedings cannot be defined as those taken in civil courts. In the United States, the expression "civil courts" is used as a shorthand for "trial courts in civil cases".

Take for example the Special Civil Part is a unit of the New Jersey Superior Court, Law Division that was created in 1983 by the New Jersey Supreme Court as the successor to the County District Courts that had been established by the Legislature in each of the 21 counties in 1948. The County District Court was itself the product of a consolidation of various courts, some of which date back to 1675, and was realized by the adoption of the State's new constitution in 1947. The creation of the Special Civil Part was a continuation of this consolidation process.

When the statute abolishing the County District Courts took effect in 1983, the Supreme Court, acting on a joint recommendation of its Civil Practice Committee and County District Court Committee, issued an order transferring all of the old court's cases, judges and staff to the newly created Special Civil Part in the Law Division of the Superior Court in each county. The three primary kinds of cases filed in the Special Civil Part included the following:

**Civil actions ("DC" docket)**, such as unpaid credit card debt, medical bills, unpaid rent or damage to automobiles or property, where the amount involved is $20,000 or less. There are about 250,000 of these cases filed per year in New Jersey. If you believe you are entitled to damages greater than $20,000, but still wish to sue in Special Civil, you give up the right to recover any money over $20,000. **The additional money cannot be claimed later in a separate lawsuit**.

**Small claims ("SC" docket)**, are civil cases involving $5,000 or less in claimed damages and about 40,000 of these cases are filed in New Jersey per year. Although lawyers can appear, most of these cases involve *pro se* litigants only. Note, a claim for $5,000 or less can be filed in the Small Claims Section of the Special Civil Part if it includes an action for the return all or part of a security deposit.

**Landlord/tenant actions ("LT" docket)**, in which the landlord seeks possession of the leased premises because the tenant has allegedly broken the lease by failing to pay the rent, violated other lease provisions, alleged habitual lateness in the payment of rent, disturbing other tenants, etc. About 173,000 of these cases are filed each year in New Jersey by housing authorities, specialized law firms or *pro se* landlords.

**U.S Attorneys**

The public records states that each U.S. attorney serves as the United States' chief federal criminal prosecutor in their judicial district and represents the U.S. federal government in civil litigation in federal and state court within their geographic jurisdiction.

This is being forwarded to your personal attention, as the chief federal law enforcement officer for the U.S. federal judicial district of New Jersey, and also pursuant to Title 28, Section 547 of the United States Code; which states in part that U.S. Attorneys have three statutory responsibilities:

1. the prosecution of criminal cases brought by the Federal Government;
2. the prosecution and defense of civil cases in which the United States is a party; and
3. **the collection of debts owed the Federal Government which are administratively uncollectible.**

It does not and cannot authorize any U.S. Attorney, their successors and or assigns to engage in the business of selling these administratively uncollectible debt as municipal stock, bonds or securities, via mail fraud, via USPS “Franchise Fraud”; confiscation of private property, via “Civil Conscription”; defalcation, via legals schemes, such as, “Bond for Title”, “Bond for Deed”, “Bond for Contract”; land titling, via “Bond for Land”, via “Bond Conversion”, or “Bond Estreature”.

Further, 28 U.S. Code § 2712, states that;

Upon an order of a judge of a court, or, in his absence and upon **the clerk’s (?) own initiative**, the clerk shall issue a warrant (of attorney) for the attachment of the property belonging to the person specified in the affidavit. The marshal shall execute the warrant (of attorney) forthwith and take the property attached, if personal, in his custody, subject to the interlocutory or final orders of the court.

The mandatory remedy is; the party whose property is attached, on notice to the U.S. Attorney, may file a plea in abatement, denying the allegations of the affidavit, or **denying ownership in the defendant** (*the defendant is the creation of the Government of the United States*) of the property attached. The court, upon application of either party, shall order a trial by jury of the issues. Where the parties, by consent, waive a trial by jury, the court (the judge) shall decide the issues. A party claiming ownership of the property attached and seeking its return is limited to the remedy afforded by this section, but his right to **an action of trespass**, or other action for damages, is not impaired. **Jane Doe or John Doe, do not consent to waive their right to a lawful trial by jury.**

Natural persons may act *pro se,* in a self-represented capacity. Corporations and other business entities must hire an attorney except for cases cognizable in small claims, where an authorized nonlawyer officer or employee may generally appear. In the US, *pro se* does not mean self-represented.

**A Private Inquest**

In general US usage, an *inquest* is used to mean any investigation or inquiry. It uses witnesses, but suspects are not permitted to defend themselves. The suspects are deemed ***pro se*** and flagged as a vexatious litigant and thus, denied due process. In short, they are placed under a civil disability because their civil rights have been legislatively removed. This is a violation of the U.S. Constitution and the American Bill of Rights.

**Pro se deemed Vexatious Litigants in the US**

Vexatious litigation is legal action which is brought solely to harass or subdue an adversary. It may take the form of a primary frivolous lawsuit or may be the repetitive, burdensome, and unwarranted filing of meritless motions in a matter which is otherwise a meritorious cause of action. Filing a vexatious litigation is considered an abuse of the judicial process and may result in sanctions against the offender.

A single action, even a frivolous one, is usually not enough to raise a litigant to the level of being declared vexatious. Rather, a pattern of frivolous legal actions is typically required to rise to the level of vexatious. Repeated and severe instances by a single lawyer or firm can result in eventual disbarment or liquidation.

Intentionally delegating the collection of administratively uncollectible debts via the process of estreature, is the very definition of vexatious litigation. Estreature is the action and change of status involved in converting a surety bond asset forfeiture into a civil action. Liberal democratic jurisdictions, such as the US, continue to pay “lip-service” pertaining to their reluctance in declaring someone a vexatious litigant.

Vexatious litigations occur primarily in some countries of the former British Empire, where the common law, ie., precedent or judge-made law system still remains; eg., Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand, UK, and US.

**In the US, anyone who is self-represented is designated as pro se. However, a *pro se* designation identifies a party to a civil cause of action as a vexatious litigant**.

The civil or codified / continental law legal system does not have such a prohibition.The first vexatious litigant law in the United States was enacted in California in 1963. By 2007 four more US states had passed similar legislation., ie., Florida, Hawaii, Ohio, Texas and now New York. See attachment example.

**Vexatious Litigant Listing**

As required by California law, the Judicial Council of California maintains an online Vexatious Litigant List containing the names of several thousand individuals and companies who have been deemed vexatious. Publication of this list began in 1991 and only orders filed from 1991 to the present are included on the list. Unless they are represented by an attorney, persons named on the list are prohibited from filing any new litigation in California without first obtaining permission from the presiding justice or presiding judge of the court where the filing is proposed.

Under California Code of Civil Procedure § 391.7(a), any vexatious litigant who disobeys such a prefiling order may be punished for contempt of court. Additionally, under California law, a vexatious litigant is someone who does any of the following, most of which require that the litigant be proceeding ***pro se***, i.e., be representing himself or herself:

1. In the immediately preceding seven-year period has commenced, prosecuted, or maintained *in propria persona* at least five litigations other than in a small claims court that have been; (i) finally determined adversely to the person, or (ii) unjustifiably permitted to remain pending at least two years without having been brought to trial or hearing.
2. After a litigation has been finally determined against the person, repeatedly relitigates or attempts to relitigate, *in propria persona*, either (i) the validity of the determination against the same defendant or defendants as to whom the litigation was finally determined or (ii) the cause of action, claim, controversy, or any of the issues of fact or law, determined or concluded by the final determination against the same defendant or defendants as to whom the litigation was finally determined.
3. In any litigation while acting *in propria persona*, repeatedly files unmeritorious motions, pleadings, or other papers, conducts unnecessary discovery, or engages in other tactics that are frivolous or solely intended to cause unnecessary delay.
4. Has previously been declared to be a vexatious litigant by any state or federal court of record in any action or proceeding based upon the same or substantially similar facts, transaction, or occurrence.

The threshold for "repeated" frivolous motions or litigations is quite high. "While there is no bright line rule as to what constitutes 'repeatedly', most cases affirming the vexatious litigant designation involve situations where litigants have filed dozens of motions either during the pendency of an action or relating to the same judgment."

Repeated motions must be "so devoid of merit and be so frivolous that they can be described as a flagrant abuse of the system, have no reasonable probability of success, lack reasonable or probable cause or excuse, and are clearly meant to abuse the processes of the courts and to harass the adverse party than other litigants."

Evidence that a litigant is a frequent plaintiff or defendant alone is insufficient to support a vexatious litigant designation. The moving party, in addition to demonstrating that the plaintiff is vexatious, must make an affirmative showing based on evidence that the case has little chance of prevailing on the merits. If the plaintiff is so determined, a bond may be required, and if the bond requirement is not met within a specified time period, a judgment of dismissal is ordered. **A finding of vexatiousness is not an appealable order, but a dismissal for failure to post a bond requirement based on a judgment of vexatiousness is appealable.**

**Writs of Habeas Corpus is NOT vexatious**

Habeas petitions do not count towards vexatious litigant determination. Vexatiousness in Probate Actions have a lower standard.

***Habeas corpus*** means 'that you have the body'. It is a legal recourse in law through which a person can report an unlawful detention or imprisonment to a court and request that the court order the custodian of the person, usually a prison official, to bring the prisoner to court, to determine whether the detention is lawful.

The writ of *habeas corpus* was described in the eighteenth century by William Blackstone as a "great and efficacious writ in all manner of illegal confinement". **It is a summons with the force of a court order**, that is addressed to the custodian, eg., a prison official, demanding that a prisoner be brought before the court, and that the custodian present proof of authority, allowing the court to determine whether the custodian has lawful authority to detain the prisoner.

If the custodian is acting beyond their authority, then the prisoner must be released. **Any prisoner, or another person acting on their behalf, may petition the court, or a judge, for a writ of *habeas corpus*.**

***amparo de libertad* - "protection of freedom"**

One reason for the writ to be sought by a person other than the prisoner is that the detainee might be held incommunicado. Most civil law jurisdictions provide a similar remedy for those unlawfully detained, but this is not always called *habeas corpus*. For example, in some Spanish-speaking nations, the equivalent remedy for unlawful imprisonment is the *amparo de Libertad*: "protection of freedom".

*Habeas corpus* has certain limitations. Though a writ of right, it is not a writ of course. It is technically only a procedural remedy; it is a guarantee against any detention that is forbidden by law, but it does not necessarily protect other rights, such as the entitlement to a fair trial. In short, if an imposition such as internment without trial is permitted by the law, then *habeas corpus* may not be a useful remedy.

In some countries, the writ has been temporarily or permanently suspended under the pretext of a war or state of emergency, martial law or national emergency, for example by Abraham Lincoln during the American Civil War signed the Habeas Corpus Suspension Act (1863), and in England in 1795.

**In the US:** The Habeas Corpus Suspension Act, 12 Stat. 755 (1863), entitled *An Act relating to Habeas Corpus, and regulating Judicial Proceedings in Certain Cases,* was an Act of Congress that authorized the **p**resident of the United States to suspend the right of habeas corpus in response to the American Civil War and provided for the release of political prisoners. A political prisoner is someone imprisoned for their political activity; eg., seeking to establish and defend their political status and standing as an American citizen, such as a New Yorker, New Jerseyan, Californian, etc.. In US civil actions, the political offense is not always the official reason for the prisoner's detention.

**Note:** A state of emergency is a situation in which a government is empowered to be able to put through policies that it would normally not be permitted to do, for the safety and protection of its citizens. A government can declare such a state during a; (1) natural disaster; (2) **civil unrest**; (3)  armed conflict; (4) **medical pandemic** or (5) epidemic or other biosecurity risk.

**In the UK:** Habeas Corpus Suspension Act 1794,(34 Geo. III, c. 54) was an Act passed by the British Parliament. The Act's long title was *An act to empower his Majesty to secure and detain such persons as his Majesty shall suspect are conspiring against his person and government*.

The writ of *habeas corpus* is one of what are called the "extraordinary", "common law", or "prerogative writs", which were historically issued by the English courts in the name of the monarch to control inferior courts and public authorities within the kingdom. The most common of the other such prerogative writs are *quo warranto*, *prohibito*, *mandamus*, *procedendo*, and *certiorari*. **The due process for such petitions is not simply civil or criminal, because they incorporate the presumption of non-authority**.

The official who is the respondent must prove their authority to do or not do something. Failing this, the court must decide for the petitioner, who may be any person, not just an interested party. This differs from a motion in a civil process in which the movant must have standing and bear the burden of proof.

Your failure of duty of care and breach of fiduciary responsibility have subjected many innocent Americans to a slew of “Vexatious Litigations” by morally, financially and spiritually bankrupt private persons, i.e., Non-State actors for their own self-enrichment, while deeming themselves to be judgment-proof due to the fact that federal, state and U.S. Constitution only apply to corporate entities.

**Demand for Disclosure**

Subpoenas can and will be issued if necessary against the local USPS franchises (mail fraud), American Municipal Bond Assurance Corporation (AMBAC), and to review the original Franchise Disclosure Documents (FDD), for the involved federal and state franchises. A typical franchise agreement contains:

1. Franchise Disclosure Document (FDD); Disclosures required by state laws; Parties defined in the agreement; Recitals, such as Ownership of System, and Objectives of Parties; Definitions, such as: Agreement, Territory Area, Area Licensee, Authorized deductions, Gross Receipts, License Network, The System Manual, Trademarks, Start Date, Trade name, Termination, Transfer of license.
2. Licensed Rights, such as: Territory, Rights Reserved, Term and Renewal, Minimum Performance Standard.
3. Franchisors Services, such as: Administration, Collections and Billing, Consultation, Marketing, Manual, Training and Vendor Negotiation.
4. Franchisee Payments, such as: Initial Franchise Fee, Training Fees, Marketing Fund, Royalties, Renewal fee, and Transfer fee.
5. Franchisee Obligations, such as: Use of Trademarks, Financial Information, Insurance, Financial and Legal responsibility.
6. Relationship of Parties, such as: Confidentiality, Indemnification, Non-Compete clauses.
7. Transfer of License, such as: Consent of franchisor, Termination of license, Termination by licensee.

Note: AMBAC is a subsidiary of the MGIC Investment Corporation which provides insurance policies guaranteeing the prompt payment of both principal and interest on qualified new issues of municipal bonds.

Rendition between states is required by Article Four, Section Two of the United States Constitution; this section is often termed the *rendition clause*. Each state has a presumptive duty to render suspects on the request of another state, as under the full faith and credit clause. **However, under the 2005** **Uniform Foreign-Country Money Judgments Recognition Act (UFCMJRA) -** *Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107;* (1)makes it clear that a judgment entitled to full faith and credit under the U.S. Constitution is not enforceable under this Act.

Under Federal law, which is applicable to all states, the U.S. Supreme Court stated that if a court is “without authority, its judgments and orders are regarded as nullities. They are not voidable, but simply void; and form no bar to a recovery sought, even prior to a reversal in opposition to them. They constitute no justification; and all persons concerned in executing such judgments or sentences, are considered, in law, as trespassers.” Elliot v. Piersol, 1 Pet. 328, 340, 26 U.S. 328, 340 (1828).

Further, the use of private bounty hunters and bondsmen who once held unlimited authority to capture fugitives, even outside the state where they were wanted by the courts was considered rendition, as it did not involve the intervention of the justice system in the state of capture. Under more recent law, bounty hunters are not legally permitted to act outside of the state, ie., extraterritorially, where the offense took place, but cases of rendition still take place due to the financial interest the bondsmen have in returning a fugitive and recovering from the bail bond forfeiture.

**Extradition v. Rendition**

Rendition, in law, is a transfer of persons from one jurisdiction to another, and the act of handing over, both after legal proceedings and according to law. "Extraordinary rendition," however, is a rendition that is extralegal, i.e. outside the law, such as involving kidnapping.

Rendition refers to the transfer; the apprehension, detention, interrogation, and any other practices occurring before and after the movement and exchange of extrajudicial prisoners do not fall into the strict definition of *extraordinary rendition*. In practice, the term is widely used to describe such practices, particularly the initial apprehension. This latter usage extends to the transfer of suspected terrorists by the US to countries known to torture prisoners or employ harsh interrogation techniques that may rise to the level of torture. The United States has since increasingly used rendition as a tool in the "war on terror", ignoring the normal extradition processes outlined in international law. Suspects taken into United States custody are delivered to third-party states, often without ever having been on United States soil, and without involving the rendering countries.

**Fugitive Slave Law of 1850**

Rendition was infamously used to recapture **fugitive slaves**, who under the Constitution and various federal laws had virtually no human rights. As the movement for **abolition** grew, Northern states increasingly refused to comply or cooperate with rendition of escaped slaves, leading to the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850. This non-cooperation was behind the longstanding principle of refusal, only reverted in the 1987 decision.

The United States use of “irregular rendition” is a familiar alternative to extradition, and it is the same process as extraordinary rendition. It involves kidnapping or deceit. In the view of the United States, kidnapping a defendant overseas and returning him to the United States for trial does not remove jurisdiction from American courts unless an applicable extradition treaty explicitly calls for that result.

**Extraordinary rendition or Extraterritorial Abduction**

**Extraordinary rendition** is a euphemism for state-sponsored forcible abduction in another jurisdiction and transfer to a third state. The phrase usually refers to a United States-led program used during the War on Terror, which has the purpose of circumventing the source country's laws on interrogation, detention, extradition and/or torture. Extraordinary rendition is a type of extraterritorial abduction, but not all extraterritorial abductions include transfer to a third country.

The CIA was granted permission to use rendition of indicted terrorists to American soil in a 1995 presidential directive signed by President Bill Clinton, following an administrative procedure established by George H. W. Bush in January 1993.

Following the 11 September 2001 attacks the United States, in particular the CIA, has been accused of rendering hundreds of people suspected by the government of being terrorists—or of aiding and abetting terrorist organizations—to third-party states.

Such "ghost detainees" are kept outside judicial oversight, often without ever entering US territory, and may or may not ultimately be transferred to the custody of The United States. In the event the presumed terrorist is an American citizen, their passports are confiscated those they are deemed to remain indefinitely within the foreign US jurisdiction to be subject to their rules and regulations.

**The USA PATRIOT Act**

The USA PATRIOT Act (commonly known as “The Patriot Act”) is a legislative Act of the United States Congress that was signed into law by U.S. President [George W. Bush](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_W._Bush) on October 26, 2001. USA PATRIOT is a backronym that stands for **U**niting and **S**trengthening **A**merica by **P**roviding **A**ppropriate **T**ools **R**equired **to I**nterceptand **O**bstruct **T**errorism.

* Section 802 of The Patriot Act:Defines the American People as terrorists, and “terrorism” as a maritime event. It excludes private meetings on the land from terrorism: “the term ‘domestic terrorism’ means activities that; (A) involve acts dangerous to human life that are a violation of the criminal laws of the United States or of any State; (B) appear to be intended – (i) to intimidate or coerce a civilian population; (ii) to influence the policy of a government by intimation or coercion; or (iii) to affect the conduct of a government by mass destruction, assassination, or kidnapping; and (C) occur primarily within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

ALSO, Section 802 of The Patriot Act allegedly grants “this State” legal authority to proceed IN REM/*in rem* (admiralty jurisdiction) by [re]defining terrorism as a maritime event and the Americans, : Clemence Agbre and Yves Agbre, et alia, as a terrorist. The so-called USA PATRIOT Act is limited in jurisdiction to the territory of District of Columbia.

**The ‘*in rem’* Scam via the (USA) PATRIOT ACT**

As was established by Republican Party US Senator Lindsey Graham at the November 2018 confirmation hearing(s) of US Federal Associate Judge Brett Kavanaugh:

The United States is still in an active “State of War”; (2) All US citizens are now under the jurisdiction of both US Criminal Law and US Military Law; (3) US citizens attempting to overthrow the US Constitution can be charged with sedition and/or treason and (4) US citizens committing sedition and/or treason fall under the jurisdiction of US Military Law—the ultimate penalty of which is death.

**Internal Revenue Service / IRS**

IRS’ “agency” and “delegate” capacity is limited by operation of law*.* See the statement of IRS organization at 39 Fed. Reg. 11572, 1974-1 Cum. Bul. 440, 37 Fed. Reg. 20960, and the Internal Revenue Manual 1100 through the 1997 edition. All underlying IRS authority presumes admiralty and maritime jurisdiction, however, convictions in these cases might all be vacated as void judgments, assuming a maritime nexus cannot be affirmatively established in record. This in rem annexation was established in the United States via USA Patriot Act Sec. 802, which defines the People as terrorist and terrorism as a maritime event.

 In the event you are (were) not aware of the in-land piracy that Americans are being subjected to, (via *in rem* proceedings “authorized” by Section 802 of the of the USA PATRIOT ACT) within your designated area of responsibility, then please take administrative and due process notice and facilitate the immediate release of all Americans so detained.

**U.S. Postal Strike of 1970 and the Postal Reorganization Act**

On March 18, 1970, postal workers in New York City—upset over low wages and poor working conditions and emboldened by the Civil Rights Movement—organized a strike against the United States government. The strike initially involved postal workers in only New York City, but it eventually gained support of over 210,000 United States Post Office Department workers across the nation.

While the strike ended without any concessions from the Federal government, it did ultimately allow for postal worker unions and the government to negotiate a contract which gave the unions most of what they wanted, as well as the signing of the Postal Reorganization Act by President Richard Nixon on August 12, 1970. The act replaced the cabinet-level Post Office Department with a new federal agency, the United States Postal Service, and took effect on July 1, 1971. **In other words, the Postal Reorganization Act privatized the Post Office**.

The USPS has been “renting” post office boxes, e.g., PO BOX or PO Box, from the Federal Post Offices, and in the capacity as “Landlord”, has been “leasing” them out to local franchises in order to facilitate an elaborate confidence scheme against the Native-American people via conscription, in order to legally steal their “Native or Aboriginal Titles”. This scheme is being executed on behalf of the United States corporate government via licensing of private Americans, also known as, non-state actors, who systematically “mug” the General Public upon entry into or own courthouses, which were all legislatively converted into private unionized trading houses via **Title XXXVI of the Crime Control Act of 1990**”.

The fact is that all United States regional state district courts are run as private corporate tribunals under the auspices of the British Crown Corp and they have no power to address anyone or anything but British Crown Corp officers, employees, dependents, and franchisees, and the “judges” that administer these tribunals are mere “Jurists”, who are hired under contract to render their **opinions** about law without having any public office or power at all. In the United States, the judiciary,also known as the judicial system, judicature, judicial branch, judiciative branch, and court or judiciary system, is the system of courts that adjudicates legal disputes/disagreements and interprets, defends, and applies the law in the name of the state.

The modern creation of specialized Business Courts in the United States began in the early 1990s with the enactment of the Federal Debt Collections Practices Act. See PUBLIC LAW 101-647-NOV. 29, 1990; a/k/a SEC. 3601. …….. the “Federal Debt Collection Procedures Act of 1990 (FDCPA) — **Title XXXVI of the Crime Control Act of 1990**”; a/k/a Subtitle A-Debt Collection Procedures; a/k/a “CHAPTER 176 — FEDERAL DEBT COLLECTION PROCEDURE; a/k/a 104 STAT. 4933; Federal Debt Collection Procedures Act of 1990. Courts. 28 USC 1 note.

**At issue are the following facts:**

A perfected security interest termed “a lien”, is merely a “registered” interest against the collateral property which is located within the Federal Reserve District of New York United States, and pursuant to U.S. Code Title 28, 3002 Definitions; (15) "United States" means — (A) a Federal corporation; (B) an agency, department, commission, board, or other entity of the United States; or (C) an instrumentality of the United States, and pursuant to 11 U.S. Code § 1502(1) “**debtor**” is defined as an entity that is the subject of a foreign proceeding.

*Idem sonnan* is a legal doctrine whereby a person's identity is presumed known despite the misspelling of his or her name. The presumption lies in the similarity between the phonology or sounds of the correct name and the name as written. For example:

* W.H.O. (White House Office) is not the same legal entity as WHO (World Health Organization)
* USPS (Private mail service) is not the same legal entity as the U.S. Mail (public mail service).
* US-OAS Bogata´ DC, Columbia United States, is not the same legal entity as Washington, D.C. United States.
* B.L.M. (Bureau of Land Management) is not BLM (Black Lives Matter).
* D.W.I (Dying Without Issue (childless) is not the same as DWI (Driving While Intoxicated).
* Puebla-Panama Plan (PPP), is not the same legal entity as, Public-Private-Partnership (PPP).
* Off Balance Sheet Bookkeeping is not the same type of bookkeeping principle as, Off-balance sheet (OBS), or incognito leverage bookkeeping.
* Incorporation via The Doctrine of Incorporation is not the same type of legal entity as one that is conventionally incorporated. The Doctrine of Incorporation is the process of “incorporating” the Bill of Rights. Prior to the ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment and the development of the incorporation doctrine, the Supreme Court in 1833 held in *Barron v. Baltimore* that the Bill of Rights applied only to the federal, but not any state, governments.

A quasi-contract or implied-in-law contract or constructive contract is a legal fiction contract that is recognized in some foreign tribunals. The notion of a quasi-contract can be traced to Roman Municipal law and it is still a concept used in some special legal systems.

**Shared Service Delivery in the US a/k/a “PPP”**

Public-Private-Partnerships (PPPs, 3Ps or P3s) are closely related to concepts such as privatization and the contracting out of government services. The lack of a shared understanding of what a PPP is and the secrecy surrounding their financial details makes the process of evaluating their effect on the General Public. P3 advocates highlight the sharing of risk and the development of innovation, while critics decry their higher costs and issues of accountability, or transparency.

PPP is an arrangement between two or more public and private sectors of a long-term nature. Typically, it involves private capital financing government projects and services up-front, and then drawing profits from **taxpayers** and/or users over the course of the PPP contract. A more general term for PPP agreements is "shared service delivery", in which public-sector entities join together with private firms or non-profit organizations to provide services to citizens, wherein **a citizen is defined as an inhabitant of a city or town and or a member of state**.

PPPs were associated with neoliberal policies to increase the private sector's involvement in public administration. Originally, they were seen by governments around the world as a method of financing new or refurbished public-sector assets outside their balance sheet or Off-balance-sheet.

Off-balance sheet (OBS), or incognito leverage, usually means an asset or debt or financing activity is not displayed on the company's balance sheet. It is often referred to as off-balance sheet bookkeeping or double-balance sheet bookkeeping. Financial institutions may report off-balance sheet items in their accounting statements formally and may also refer to "assets under management", a figure that may include on and off-balance sheet items.

Under previous accounting rules both in the United States (U.S. GAAP) and internationally (IFRS), operating leases were off-balance-sheet financing. Under current accounting rules, such as, ASC 842, IFRS 16, operating leases are on the balance sheet.

**Model Law on Cross Border Insolvency**

New York and California do not use the Federal Law Model (“FRCP”). Both jurisdictions follow the “Model Law on Cross Border Insolvency”. They co-mingled their local trial court systems into one “unified system”. This legislative co-mingling of U.S. state Superior and Municipal Courts pursuant to for example California Superior and Municipal Court Consolidation via their Legislative Constitutional Amendment, known as “**Proposition 220**”. See Courts. Superior and Municipal Court Consolidation. California Proposition 220 (1998).

This legislative co-mingling encourages title theft and title fraud by unscrupulous morally and financially bankrupt entities, while denying lawful remedies to the General Public. Juries do not exist in *municipal court*s. In municipal courts, there is no right to a jury trial.

The judge alone determines the sentence of guilty or not guilty as opposed to innocent.  In contrast, a defendant has a right to a jury in criminal matters in County courts, also known as Superior Courts. **The bottom line is that municipal courts are for corporations only.**

The American people are now fully aware that the United States government has been managed as an incorporated public trust by the Territorial United States since 1868 and we have repeatedly been subsumed in the bankruptcies of the “presumed” trustees, and since circa 1946, it has been managed in a similar fashion by the Municipal United States, and again, was dragged into the bankruptcies of the purported trustees. See UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT MANUAL 1945 First Edition. Division of Public Inquiries. Office of War Information. Appendix A – Executive Agencies and Functions of the Federal Government Abolished, Transferred, or Terminated Subsequent to March 4, 1933.

**There is no authorization in existence for the Territorial United States to assume trusteeship over the Federal United States and no provision for the Municipal United States to function in such a capacity either, and the bankruptcies of both the territorial and municipal government services corporations should have initiated equitable set-off via “Insolvency set-off(s)” of all debts**.

**Statutory Removal by Legislation of a Civil Right**

A statute is a formal written enactment of a legislative authority that governs the legal entities of a city, state, or country by way of consent. Typically, statutes command or prohibit something, or declare policy. Statutes are rules made by legislative bodies; they are distinguished from case law or precedent, which is decided by courts, and regulations issued by government agencies.

Civil and political rights are a class of rights that protect an individual’s freedom from infringement by governments, social organizations, and other private individuals. They ensure one's entitlement to participate in the civil and political life of society and the state without discrimination or repression. In law, the removal by legislation of a civil right constitutes a "**civil disability**" and within the United States, Americans are persecuted in accordance with this “civil disability” under guise of the Americans with Disability Act (ADA).

This blatant and egregious denial of remedy should suffice as grounds for impeachment and or imprisonment, for the enactment of **PROPOSITION 220**, appears to be the enabling act that is the root cause of the continued legal harassment, legal abuse and blatant theft of the real and or personal property of Native-Americans, e.g., Californians, New Yorkers and Pennsylvanians, etc., by US legal service network providers.

According to publicly available information, in the United States, the Superior Court is the U.S. state trial court with statewide trial and appellate jurisdiction. On June 2, 1998, under **PROPOSITION 220** the JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA / Judicial Council of California, purportedly amended the U.S. state of California’s Constitution to permit the superior and municipal court judges within a county to merge and create a “unified” or single, superior court if a majority of both the superior and the municipal court judges so voted. The JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA / Judicial Council of California lacked Constitutional authority to promulgate and or authorize said “unification / merger”. See enclosed copy of “Special Report” Proclamation 220.

“**Where rights as secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation which will abrogate them.” Miranda v. Ariz., 384 U.S. 436 at 491 (1966). Under Federal law, which is applicable to all states, the U.S. Supreme Court stated that if a court is “without authority, its judgments and orders are regarded as nullities. They are not voidable, but simply void; and form no bar to a recovery sought, even prior to a reversal in opposition to them. They constitute no justification; and all persons concerned in executing such judgments or sentences, are considered, in law, as trespassers**.” Elliot v. Piersol, 1 Pet. 328, 340, 26 U.S. 328, 340 (1828).

**Quasi-judicial trial-like Proceedings by a Quasi-judicial body**

A quasi-judicial body is a non-judicial body which can interpret law. It is an entity such as an arbitration panel or tribunal board, that can be a public administrative agency but also a contract or private law entity, which has been given powers and procedures resembling those of a court of law or judge, and which is obliged to objectively determine facts and draw conclusions from them so as to provide the basis of an official action. Such actions are able to remedy a situation or impose legal penalties, and they may affect the legal rights, duties or privileges of specific parties.

All United States Superior Courts, formerly municipal, county or district court, adjudicates quasi-judicial trial-like proceedings by a quasi-judicial body.It is a trial that adopts the form of a judicial process without a formal basis in law.

The word 'quasi' connotes the meaning – ‘similar to but not exactly the same as.’ Thus, quasi-judicial proceedings are similar to but are not exactly court proceedings. The term also implies that these authorities are not routinely responsible for holding such proceedings and often may have other duties. In short, an administrative function is called ‘**quasi-judicial’** when there is an obligation to assume a judicial approach and to comply with the basic requirements of natural justice. In short, the fundamental purpose of a quasi-judicial hearing is to provide the affected parties the appearance of due process. In municipal courts, due process merely requires notice of the proceedings and the offer of an opportunity to be heard.

The elements of a quasi-judicial proceeding requires; (1) Adequate Notice; (2) Impartial Hearing Officer; (3) Right to be represented by or through counsel; (4) Right to Confront Parties and Witnesses; (5) Right to Compel production of Evidences; (6) Right to have findings of facts and law, and explicit reasons for the decision (**speaking order**) and (7) Right to Judicial Review.

In general, decisions of a quasi-judicial body require findings of facts to reach conclusions of law that justify the decision. They usually depend on a pre-determined set of guidelines (precedents) or criteria to assess the nature and gravity of the permission or relief sought, or of the offense committed. Decisions of a quasi-judicial body are often legally enforceable under the laws of a jurisdiction; they can be challenged in a court of law, which is the final decisive authority.

# Note: Judicial review is a process under which executive, legislative and administrative actions are subject to review by the judiciary. A court with authority for judicial review, such as, the U.S. Supreme Court, may invalidate laws, acts and governmental actions that are incompatible with a higher authority, e.g., the U.S. Constitution, and an executive decision may be invalidated for being unlawful or a statute may be invalidated for violating the terms of the U.S. Constitution.

# Judicial review is one of the checks and balances in the separation of powers: the power of the judiciary to supervise the legislative and executive branches when the latter exceed their authority, sometimes called “judicial over-reach”. The doctrine varies between jurisdictions, so the procedure and scope of judicial review may differ between and within countries or member states.

**Masters, Special Masters and Rule 53**

Several state courts in the United States utilize masters or similar officers and also make extensive use of special masters. In the federal judiciary of the United States, a special master is an adjunct to a federal court. Rule 53 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (FRCP) allows a federal court to appoint a special master, **with the consent of the parties**, to conduct proceedings and report to the Court.

A master is a judge of limited jurisdiction in the superior courts of England and Wales and in numerous other jurisdictions based on the common law tradition. A master's jurisdiction is generally confined to civil proceedings and is a subset of that of a superior court judge or justice. Masters are typically involved in hearing specialized types of trials, case management, and in some jurisdictions dispute resolution or adjudication of specific issues referred by judges. **Masters commonly also sit as Registrars in Bankruptcy.**

The special master should not be confused with the traditional common law concept of a master, a judge of the High Court entrusted to deal with summary and administrative matters falling short of a full trial. The role of the special master, who is frequently but not necessarily an attorney, is to supervise those falling under the order of the court to ensure that the court order is being followed and to report on the activities of the entity being supervised in a timely matter to the judge or the judge's designated representatives.

In the law of the United States, a special master is generally a subordinate official appointed by a judge to make sure that judicial orders (court orders) are actually followed or in the alternative, to hear evidence on behalf of the judge and make recommendations to the judge as to the disposition of a matter. In United States federal courts, special masters are appointed under **Rule 53** of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (FRCP).

Rule 53 allows for a special master to be appointed only if one of the following exists: (1) the parties consent to the appointment, (2) to hold a trial without a jury or make recommended findings of fact where there is some exceptional condition or accounting or difficult computation of damages, or (3) address pre-trial or post-trial matters that cannot be effectively and timely addressed by a judge or magistrate judge.

Cases involving special masters often involve situations in which it has been shown that governmental entities are violating **civil rights**. High-profile cases in recent years in which special masters have been used include some in which states have been ordered to upgrade their prison facilities, which were held to violate the US Constitution, which bars cruel and unusual punishment and certain state mental hospitals, which have been found so substandard as to violate the rights of their inmates. Summaries of cases involving special masters are published at *Cohen's Special Master Case Reporter*.

**Special masters have been controversial in some cases and are cited by critics as an example of judicial overreach.** The US Supreme Court will normally assign original jurisdiction disputes, i.e., cases such as disputes

between states that are first heard at the Supreme Court level, to a special master to conduct what amounts to a trial: the taking of evidence and a ruling. The Supreme Court can then assess the master's ruling much as a normal appeals court would, rather than conduct the trial itself. That is necessary as trials in the US almost always involve live testimony, and it would be too unwieldy for nine justices to rule on evidentiary objections in real time.

**Special Masters in the Vaccine Court**

The United States Court of Federal Claims operates an Office of Special Masters to resolve claims under the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act, which is informally known as the vaccine court.

**On May 20, 2020, the United States Government declared a national emergency and enacted the “Emergency / Military Constitution”, and the “Logan Act”, which placed the United States under military law.**

The law is, any incorporated entity that does anything unlawful against an unincorporated, that is, sovereign entity is guilty of a crime and subject to immediate liquidation and in the event of a death prosecution, because when -- ANY -- corporate entity attacks an unincorporated or sovereign entity, a crime occurs; and no one can profit from a crime. ALL municipalities and their affiliates are incorporated entities. See Territorial Government’s Executive Orders 13818 & 13848.

A demand is herein being made for the immediate release of any and all **unlawful attachments** to the real physical properties belonging to Native American, Clemence Agbre, along with a demand for **FULL** restitution of their misappropriated assets by the Government of the United States and or the United States Government.

***Lex semper dabit remedium***: "*The law always gives a remedy*"

**A Political Status Hearing**

The bottom line is thatI amexempt from all Municipal duty and service, and my exemption found at Title 50, Section 7 (c) and (e) of the 2012 Edition of the Federal Code.

I am a Foreign Sovereign, that is, an unincorporated living (wo)man and enclosed is IRS Form 8822 with certified mailing receipt. I herein claim my exemption under the Supremacy Clause of Article VI of The Constitution of the United States of America and Amendment XI thereof, which provides that no American is subject to foreign law. I owe no duty to any U.S. or US court.

I am in fact a living American, a New Yorker, a non-combatant and peaceful civilian, who has been grossly presumed upon by your diplomatic officers and or employees and am being subjected to unconscionable contracting processes via vexatious litigations.

This NOTICE is also being presented to the U.S. Secretary of State, because ultimately, mis-addressing and importuning an American civilian as if they were Territorial or Municipal persons, by Embassy of Tribal Nations licensed officers and or employees is a diplomatic issue requiring his prompt action.

A Political Status Hearing is also herein being demanded; along with a demand to return to me my assets and my freedom without debt or encumbrance".

LEX JUSTICE IS HEREIN BEING DEMANDED

**Notice to Principals is Notice to Agents. Notice to Agents is Notice to Principals.** *Applicable to all Successors and or Assigns*

See: Article I, Section 10, Constitution for the United States of America. Any alleged (*ens legis*) privilege*s* and/or benefits are hereby rejected and waived. This is my free will, voluntary act and deed true and lawful attorney-in-fact to make, execute, seal, acknowledge and deliver under my sign and seal. Any attempt to circumvent or deny my divine right not to contract will immediately be held personally liable at the highest level. Explicitly reserving all rights. Without prejudice.

Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/2023

By: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_©; sui juris An American without any Legislative or Civil Disability