



### Specialized court

Specialized court is a type of court with limited subject-matter jurisdiction concerning particular fields of law, compared to 'ordinary court' with general subject-matter jurisdiction, e.g., family courts or administrative courts.

An ordinary court or judicial court is a type of court with comprehensive subject-matter jurisdiction compared to a 'specialized court' with limited jurisdiction over a specific filed of matters, such as intellectual property court. Due to its comprehensive feature, ordinary courts usually deal with civil case and criminal case, and treated as core part of conventional judiciary.

In common law countries, the term **superior court** is used for courts with general jurisdiction, regardless of instance level in chain of appellate procedure, compared to courts with limited jurisdiction over minor, petty cases such as **small claims court**.

In France, ordinary courts are specialized courts under TITLE VIII of Constitution of France. They are separated from administrative courts and constitutional courts. These ordinary courts mainly deals with civil and criminal cases, and are composed of judges called magistrates educated from French National School for the Judiciary, while judges composing administrative court and constitutional court are usually not trained in French National School for the Judiciary. Chain of ordinary court's hierarchy inside French judiciary has Court of Cassation as their highest court.

Sometimes, the term ordinary court is referred to courts with regular procedure or composition, compared to an extraordinary court with irregular procedure or composition. An extraordinary court, or special court, is a type of court that is established outside of ordinary judiciary, composed of irregularly selected judges or applies irregular procedure for judgment. **Since extraordinary court can be abused to infringe fundamental rights of individuals, contemporarily most of countries ban such courts by constitution or statutes. Usually, modern military courts judged by court-martials are regarded as examples of extraordinary courts.**

In the United States, 'specialized courts', or 'specialty courts' are courts that aim to rehabilitate generally non-violent and low-rate offenders by including specifically trained professionals pertaining to the field of specialty court. The purpose of these specialized courts is to acknowledge and handle criminal activity at the source.

Specialized courts focus on reducing future rearrests and rehabilitation. These specialized courts usually involve the help of the prosecutor, judge, probation, law enforcement, mental health professionals, social service agencies, and relevant treatment. Some examples of different specialized courts include Adult DWI Court, Adult Drug Court, Juvenile Drug Court, Mental Health Court, Sex Trafficking Court, Domestic Violence Court, Truancy Court, and Veterans Treatment Court.

Special courts in United States can handle both civil and criminal disputes. In 2008, the first Veterans' Court was created. Of the older such courts, which are usually Article I tribunals, is the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces founded in 1951 which functions as an appeal court for military and economic offences.

Drug Court generally involves evaluating risk level and accommodating with proportionate supervision, drug testing, therapy, inpatient drug rehabilitation, and outpatient drug rehabilitation. Some examples of general proportionate accommodation for offenders convicted under Drug Court would be mandated treatment under Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous, Addiction Treatment Centers, and specialized therapy by a substance abuse therapist. The criteria that must be met for Drug Court includes: being over 18 at the time of the offense, United States citizen, guilty plea to a non-violent felony offense, no prior violent offenses, diagnosed chemical dependency, and willingness to comply with Drug Court.



The purpose of drug court is to advance public safety and healthy communities by creating collaborative responses to crimes committed by individuals who suffer from chemical dependency. The argued reason for using drug court for drug offenders is that this method addresses some of the root causes of their criminal activity.

A **veterans' court** is a "special court" which is charged with trying cases of minor offenses which involve veterans, particularly those diagnosed with service-related illnesses. **The first veterans' court was established in 2008 in Buffalo, New York, and has been used as a model for establishments of other veterans' courts in other parts of the United States.**

There are questions, however, about the judicial system allowing a "special class." Although the court only deals with misdemeanors, the prosecutors and judges can choose to allow defendants to agree to plead guilty to a misdemeanor, thus reducing the charges. The system was created to address those veterans who are consistently facing various charges associated with addiction, homelessness, etc.

This special allowance, however, often enables veterans who aren't in that group to take advantage of avoiding prison. Also, violent felonies are specifically precluded from consideration.

In January 2011, a Veterans' Court pilot program was established in California Republic, San Diego. Both veterans and active duty service members have been accepted as participants. To be accepted into the program the individual must meet certain criteria:

- The applicant must be a veteran of the **United States military**.
- The charges that are brought against the applicant must have some relation to their military service.
- The applicant must be accepted into the program by the Veterans' Court Judge.

There are certain charges that will preclude an applicant from being accepted in the program. Those are the more violent charges that include murder, manslaughter, homicide, rape or gang-affiliated crimes.

Once an applicant is accepted they are considered **a participant**. Participation in the program consists of intensive supervision from probation, the VA and the court. Each participant must meet several goals in order to move to the next phase of the program, 4 in total. There is no set timeframe in which the program must be completed. While in the program each veteran must attend weekly therapy and, more often than not, counseling for Post Traumatic Stress. **Bi-monthly urinalysis** must be conducted at random either in a treatment facility or at the Veterans Health Administration hospital.

The goal of veterans' court is to allow the veteran to be rehabilitated to the law-abiding citizen they were before their experience in the military and combat. There are no guaranteed incentives for any participant who satisfactorily completes the program. Typical incentives do include taking years off of probation and moving from formal to summarized probation. At the completion, fees can be waived, and felonies can be commuted, and under a new addition to **California Penal Code 1170.9**, judges may expunge charges completely.

The court process is aided by Veterans Justice Outreach representatives from the Veterans Administration. Representatives of the District Attorney's office, the Public Defender's office, treatment facilities and probation are also in attendance at every hearing. Each participant is also given a mentor to work one on one with throughout the process.

### **Municipal Courts**

Juries do not exist in municipal courts. In municipal courts, there is no right to a jury trial. Municipal courts are for corporations only. The judge alone, e.g., Steven V. Wilson, 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.

**Pursuant to 46 U.S. Code § 51701, The U.S. Maritime Service, falls under the authority of the Maritime Administration of the U.S. Department of Transportation and is authorized to appoint warrant officers. And;**

42 U.S.C. § 204, 42 U.S.C. § 207 and 42 U.S.C. § 209 of the U.S. Code of law establishes the use of warrant officers (W-1 to W-4) with specific specialties to the Public Health Service Commissioned Corps., (Welfare) for the purpose of providing support to the health and delivery systems maintained by the service.

In 1950 the United States as a corporate body politic (artificial), declared Bankruptcy and "Reorganization." The Reorganization is located in [T]itle 5 of United States Codes Annotated. The "Explanation" at the beginning of 5 U.S.C.A. clearly state that the **"Secretary of Treasury" was appointed as the "Receiver" in Bankruptcy.** [See: Reorganization Plan No. 26, 5U.S.C.A. 903, Public Law 94-564. Legislative History, pg. 5967.] And;

In 1954, the **Warrant Officer Act**, Pub.L. 83-379, created separate ranks for each pay grade, W-1 through W-4, and regardless of rank, Army warrant officers are officially addressed as Mister (Mrs., Miss, Ms.) and depending on the unit, Chief Warrant Officers (W-2s to W-5s) can be, and have been, informally addressed by the title "Chief". For example the rank of "Chief Clerk" is used in the Admiralty (British Equity) courts/tribunals forums. British forces who work with the U.S. Army often call chief warrant officers "CWO", as British forces usually abbreviate ranks.

I am a non-combatant civilian. I never knowingly nor willingly enlisted in any branch of the military and I do not consent to any assumptions or presumptions to the contrary. I am now formerly requesting that you in your capacity as Secretary of the Department of Transportation release my tradename, trademark and copyright from all presumption(s) of enlistment.

The bankruptcy ended November 2, 1999 and all the assets of the priority creditors were released and a demand was previously made by me to Mr. Mnuchin for the immediate release of my assets from the bankruptcy he is administering. I do not consent to the IMF representing me or my interest in any form or fashion.

**Unless a valid maritime lien can be presented into the public records, the matter must be dismissed with prejudice.** My intellectual property (IP) and my private and personal properties including my copyright, trademark and tradename are neither abandoned nor unclaimed.

"US Citizens" have no access to the Constitutions nor to their guarantees and never have had. The political status of a "United States Citizen" (Territorial) and also that of "Citizen of the United States" (Municipal) was created by the Constitutions, and therefore, obviously, by definition, people adopting either one or both of these political status obligations are NOT Parties to the Constitutions.

All U.S. citizens are stateless Persons and stateless Persons are vulnerable to being attacked, salvaged, and plundered under the Laws of the Sea or Civil [Municipal or Roman] Law, because they are classified as Federal Citizens or British subjects and Federal Citizens have no Natural and Unalienable rights and their inchoate States (properly called "States of States") are not Parties to our Constitutions and other Treaties with Great Britain. Only the actual geographically-defined States and physical People have access to the constitutional guarantees as intended. States of States and Incorporated Persons are not generally "covered" by these agreements.

The most "US Citizens" have is a promise of "Equal Civil Rights" which gets suspended during "National Emergencies"--- and so far as the corporations in DC are concerned, they are in a near constant "state of emergency" as a result of their own gross mismanagement.



Some specific rights, like the right to Habeas Corpus, have even been suspended by Executive Order of the Commander in Chief since 1863. So there are numerous exceptions where even when there isn't a "national emergency", US Citizens are denied truly Equal Civil Rights.

The point is --- what Congress gives, the Congress --- or the President --- can take away. Why?

Because "Civil Rights" are privileges conferred by the "Civil Government" --- that is, the Municipal Government of the United States. They have nothing to do with the "Natural and Unalienable Rights" that Americans are heir to.

US Citizens cannot own land in this country, with the result that they are considered tenants not landlords, and in all cases where US Citizens have homes or land in this country, they have only tenant rights.

If they are Territorial Citizens, the Municipal Government acts as landlord. If they are Municipal Citizens, the Territorial Government acts as landlord. And in no case do the US Citizens actually own anything. They are "presumed" to be "residing" here on a temporary basis, providing governmental services to us, the "missing" Americans. House-sitters, in other words.

United States Citizens are subject to statutory law and function as Legal Fiction Persons. They cannot access the Public Law or even The Law of Peace which the military is obligated to give us (AR 27-1611).

Municipal Citizens of the United States and their slaves known as "citizens of the United States" are also taxpayers by definition. They, too, are all legal fiction PERSONS. There is no reason that any American in their right mind would ever knowingly or willingly choose to be considered a "US Citizen".

#### *trustees de son tort*

ALL United States Attorneys operating as *trustees de son tort* are in rebellion against the U.S. Constitution and will be held answerable at the very highest level and to the American People. 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. See enclosed United States Department of State Notice.

No private (by)law and or legislative ruling termed treaty agreement can grant anyone an immunity or authority that the drafters do not themselves possess. For example, within certain "limited" United States jurisdiction(s), such as, THE CITY OF NEW YORK, under the Restatement (Second) of Torts, Ch. 25, Topic 2, §§ 585-592A, absolute privilege (allegedly) extends to:

Judicial officers (**licensed officials with honorary titles**), attorneys (**esquires**), jurors (**private club members**), witnesses in legislative proceedings (**relators and qui tam whistle-blowers**), legally required publications (**libelers**), and statements made by a party during trial (**slanderers**) or in a pleading (**libelers**).

Ultimately, they are not binding authority. They are merely useful guidelines to lawyers and judges "*insofar as they help to clarify the current state of the law*". Even a non-lawyer is fully aware that any US regional state or U.S. state rule termed "law" that violates the U.S. Constitution is null, and void and despite the fact that in this instance, the U.S. State(s) of California and U.S. State(s) of New York are not involved in the "interstate trafficking" of American civilians, i.e., the international (interstate) buying and selling (trading) of American men and women and their stolen personal property", since the Organic Act of 1871 which created the capitol district was repealed. Meanwhile the real estate mules (esquires) operating in the US, who have been merrily stealing the land from hard working Americans, to benefit morally and financially bankrupt private foreign interests, are now being called upon to tender restitutions that are not fiat in nature.

The documents being referenced contain elements of defalcation of private assets by United States network service providers, as well as the embezzlement and rampant theft from tribal organizations. It is the sole responsibility of the



U.S. Attorney General via his or her delegates, to prosecute on behalf of and or to defend the national security and or national interest of the Government of the United States or United States Government. However, one must remain cognizant of the fact that one cannot grant an authority that one does not possess.

### **Non-lawyer or Private Ownership of Law Firms**

On November 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1999, the third (3<sup>rd</sup>) and final bankruptcy of the United States ended, thus, there is no longer any authority, whether legal or otherwise, for any U.S. state and or U.S. District officer or employee to administer any “tax matters” and all U.S. states no longer have usufruct authority.

Following the ending of the 1933 bankruptcy on November 2, 1999, the Attorney Rule of Professional Conduct 5.4, a/k/a Rule 5.4 which gave judges and lawyers their plenary license or immunity has been terminated. No more BAR association, whether American or International. With the repeal of Model Rules of Professional Conduct (MRPC), United States legal service representatives no longer have any **immunities** and or **limited liability** for their commercial and individual defamatory acts, i.e., intentional torts.

### **Private or Non-state actors**

Non-state actors, i.e., private individuals or civilians, may create private legal orderings, in the form of "soft law". The term "soft law" refers to quasi-legal instruments, like recommendations, guidelines, mandates, directives or executive orders, **which do not have any lawfully binding** force. The term "soft law" initially emerged in the context of international law, although more recently it has been transferred to other branches of United States “domestic law” as well as within their quasi-state administrative proceedings.

The filing of “Petitions / Claims” by private citizens circumvents the Constitution of the United States because, the constitutional right of due process protects people only from violations of their civil rights by state, i.e., government actors, not from civilian or non-state actors. This of course is a violation of both the Constitution of the United States of America, as well as the Constitution of the United States, and renders all Principles liable for tort actions in both their personal and commercial capacities. See *Tindal v. Wesley* (167 U.S. 204 (1897)).

A U.S. state is a centralized political organization that imposes and enforces rules over its citizen population within a specific territory, and the regional US states do not hold any usufruct authority, perpetual or otherwise to license out the tradename and or copyright of any American civilian without specific authorization, to any of its private network service providers. Due to the insolvency / bankruptcy status of the United States, the unauthorized taking of trust assets for private use is unlawful. It is called defalcation.

Defalcation occurs when a debtor commits a bad act while acting in a fiduciary capacity. The classic example of defalcation is when a trustee recklessly invests trust funds and loses the money. If the beneficiary wins a judgment against the trustee, and the trustee files for bankruptcy, the debt (the judgment) cannot be discharged in bankruptcy because the debt was the result of a defalcation.

In accounting terminology, especially with respect to the area of audit, defalcation means a misappropriation of assets or theft of assets by employees or officers of a corporation. Diplomatic Immunity is NOT Sovereign Immunity and corporations do not have sovereign immunity.

**The bottom line is, the US government does not have the authority to unilaterally assume dominion over sovereign American lands, native or otherwise, including via any form of conscription, transfer or assignment, termed registration.**



## Specialized Business Courts / Commercial Courts

In New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Massachusetts, North Carolina, South Carolina and New Jersey, among other states with business courts, the original programs have expanded by adding judges and/or by expanding into additional cities and counties.

Business Courts, a/k/a, Commercial Courts, are state trial courts that hear business disputes primarily or exclusively. Specialized "business courts" or "commercial courts" within state trial court systems 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.

Business courts or more accurately business programs or divisions within existing trial level courts are operating in New York City and 10 other jurisdictions throughout New York State as the New York Supreme Court Commercial Division, with the most recent addition being; the Bronx Commercial Division, in addition to Chicago, North Carolina, New Jersey, Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Reno and Las Vegas, Nevada, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Maryland, Orlando, Miami, Ft. Lauderdale, and Tampa, Florida, Michigan, Cleveland and Toledo, Ohio, Iowa, Maine, New Hampshire, Atlanta and Gwinnett County, Georgia, Delaware's Superior Court and Court of Chancery, Nashville, Tennessee, Wisconsin, Indiana, Arizona, Kentucky and South Carolina. These business courts (business programs) conduct what are essentially quasi-judicial trial-like proceedings by quasi-judicial bodies.

### 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. 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.

### **A Corporation Sole**

A corporation sole is a legal entity consisting of a single ("sole") incorporated office, occupied by a single ("sole") natural person. This structure allows corporations, such as, religious corporations or Commonwealth governments to pass without interruption from one officeholder to the next, giving positions legal continuity with subsequent officeholders having identical powers and possessions to their predecessors.

A corporation sole is one of two types of corporation; (1) an organization—usually a group of people or a company—authorized by the state to act as a single entity; (2) a legal entity recognized by private and public law "**born out of statute**", i.e., a legal person in legal context and recognized as such in law for certain purposes, the other being a *corporation aggregate*. Early incorporated entities were established by charter, i.e., by an *ad hoc* act granted by a monarch or passed by a parliament or legislature.

### **Corporation aggregate**

Corporations come in many different types but are usually divided by the law of the jurisdiction where they are chartered based on two aspects: by whether they can issue stock, or by whether they are formed to make a profit. One of the attractive early advantages business corporations offered to their investors, compared to earlier business entities like sole proprietorships and joint partnerships, was limited liability.

**Limited liability means that a passive shareholder in a corporation will not be personally liable either for contractually agreed obligations of the corporation, or for torts (harms) committed by the corporation against a third party.** Limited liability in a contract is uncontroversial because the parties to the contract could have agreed to it and could agree to waive it by contract. However, limited liability in tort remains controversial because third parties do not agree to waive the right to pursue shareholders. There is significant evidence that limited liability in tort may lead to excessive corporate risk taking and more harm by corporations to third parties.

Where local law distinguishes corporations by their ability to issue stock, corporations allowed to do so are referred to as *stock corporations*; one type of investment in the corporation is through stock, and owners of stock are referred to as *stockholders* or *shareholders*.

Corporations not allowed to issue stock are referred to as non-stock corporations; i.e. those who are considered the owners of a non-stock corporation are "persons", or other entities who have obtained membership in the corporation and are referred to as a **member of the corporation**. Corporations chartered in regions where they are distinguished by whether they are allowed to be for-profit are referred to as *for-profit* and *not-for-profit* corporations, respectively. There is some overlap between stock/non-stock and for-profit/not-for-profit in that not-for-profit corporations are nearly always non-stock as well. A for-profit corporation is almost always a stock corporation, but some for-profit corporations may choose to be non-stock. Registered corporations have legal personality recognized by local authorities and their shares are owned by shareholders whose liability is generally limited to their investment.

Shareholders do not typically actively manage a corporation; shareholders instead elect or appoint a board of directors to control the corporation in a fiduciary capacity. In most circumstances, a shareholder may also serve as a director or



officer of a corporation. **Countries (states) with co-determination employ the practice of workers of an enterprise having the right to vote for representatives on the board of directors in a company.**

It also refers to staff having binding rights in work councils on issues in their workplace. The first laws requiring worker voting rights include the Oxford University Act 1854 and the Port of London Act 1908 in the United Kingdom, the Act on Manufacturing Companies of 1919 in Massachusetts in the United States, although the act's provisions were completely voluntary, and the Supervisory Board Act 1922 (*Aufsichtsratgesetz 1922*) in Germany, which codified collective agreement from 1918.

### LLCs

In American English, the word *corporation* is most often used to describe large business corporations. In British English and in the Commonwealth countries, the term *company* is more widely used to describe the same sort of entity while the word *corporation* encompasses all incorporated entities. In American English, the word *company* can include entities such as partnerships that would not be referred to as companies in British English as they are not a separate legal entity. Late in the 19th century, a new form of the company having the limited liability protections of a corporation, and the more favorable tax treatment of either a sole proprietorship or partnership was developed.

While not a corporation, this new type of entity became very attractive as an alternative for corporations not needing to issue stock. In Germany, the organization was referred to as *Gesellschaft mit beschränkter Haftung* or *GmbH*. This new form of non-corporate organization became available in the United States, in the last quarter of the 20th century, and was known as a *limited liability company* or *LLC*. **The GmbH and LLC forms of organization are technically not corporations, even though they have many of the same features.**