Registered Mail #RE050093362US — Dated: January 22, 2025 1 Steven MacArthur-Brooks, sui juris, In Propria Persona. Kevin: Walker, sui juris, In Propria Persona. C/o 15822 North West 87th Court 3 Miami Lakes, Florida [33018] non-domestic without the United States Email: team@walkernovagroup.com 5 Attorney-In-Fact, Executor, Authorized Representative, TMSTEVEN MACARTHUR-BROOKS© ESTATE. TMSTEVEN MACARTHUR-BROOKS© IRR TRUST 7 ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR MIAMI-DADE 8 COUNTY, FLORIDA 9 TMSTEVEN MACARTHUR-Case No. 2024-020644-CA-01 10 BROOKS© ESTATE, TMSTEVEN MACARTHUR-BROOKS© IRR PLAINTIFFS' CONDITIONAL 11 **TRUST** ACCEPTANCE TO DEFENDANTS' 12 *Plaintiff(s),* **MOTION TO COMPEL** ARBITRATION AND STAY 13 PROCEEDINGS, AND PLAINTIFFS' ALEJANDRO MORENO, et al, 14 **DEMAND FOR CRIMINAL** *Defendant(s).* REFERRAL AND PROSECUTION 15 OF DEFENDANTS, SANCTIONS, 16 AND DEFAULT AND SUMMARY **JUDGMENT, AS A MATTER OF** 17 LAW, WITHOUT HEARING. 18 19 20 PLAINTIFFS' CONDITIONAL ACCEPTANCE TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO 21 COMPEL ARBITRATION AND STAY PROCEEDINGS, AND PLAINTIFFS' 22 DEMAND FOR CRIMINAL REFERRAL AND PROSECUTION OF 23 DEFENDANTS, SANCTIONS, AND DEFAULT AND SUMMARY JUDGMENT, 24 AS A MATTER OF LAW, WITHOUT HEARING **COMES NOW**, Plaintiffs TMSTEVEN MACARTHUR-BROOKS© ESTATE, 25 26 TMSTEVEN MACARTHUR-BROOKS© IRR TRUST, (hereinafter "Plaintiffs"), by and through their Attorney-in-Fact, Steven: MacArthur-Brooks and Kevin: 27 Walker, who are both proceeding sui juris, In Propria Persona, and by Special 28

-1 of 41-

Limited Appearance. Steven and Kevin are natural *freeborn* Sovereigns and state Citizens of California **the republic** in its **De'jure** capacity as one of the several states of the Union 1789. This incidentally makes them both a national American 3 Citizen of the republic as per the **De'Jure Constitution for the United States** 1777/1789. 5 Plaintiffs, acting through their Attorney(s)-in-Fact, assert their *unalienable* right to **contract**, as secured by **Article I**, **Section 10** of the **Constitution**, which states: "No **State** shall... pass any Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts." and thus which prohibits states from impairing the obligation of **contracts**. This clause **unequivocally** prohibits 10 states from impairing the obligation of contracts, including but not limited to, a trust and contract agreement as an 'Attorney-In-Fact,' and any private contract existing between 12 Plaintiffs and Defendants. A true and correct copy of the 'Affidavit: Power of Attorney In 13 *Fact,* (Exhibit D and incorporated herein by reference). Plaintiffs further rely on their inherent rights under the Constitution and the 14 common law - rights that predate the formation of the state and remain 15 safeguarded by due process of law **Constitutional Basis:** 17 Plaintiffs assert that their private rights are secured and protected under the 18

Plaintiffs assert that their private rights are secured and protected under the **Constitution**, **common law**, and **exclusive equity**, which govern their ability to freely contract and protect their property and interests..

Plaintiffs respectfully assert and affirm:

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

"The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights as a citizen. He is entitled to carry on his **private** business in his own way. **His power to contract is** *unlimited*. He owes no such duty [to submit his books and papers for an examination] to the State, since he receives nothing therefrom, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land [Common Law] long antecedent to the organization of the State, and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. Among his rights are a

7

10

11 12

13

1415

1617

18

19

2021

2223

24

25

2627

28

refusal to incriminate himself, and the immunity of himself and his property from arrest or seizure except under a warrant of the law. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights." (*Hale v. Henkel*, 201 U.S. 43, 47 [1905]).

- "The claim and exercise of a constitutional right cannot be converted into a crime." Miller v. U.S., 230 F 2d 486, 489.
- "Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule
 making or legislation which would abrogate them." Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S.
- "There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of this exercise of constitutional rights." —Sherar v. Cullen, 481 F. 945.
- "A law repugnant to the Constitution is void." Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. (1
 Cranch) 137, 177 (1803).
- "It is not the duty of the citizen to surrender his rights, liberties, and immunities under the guise of police power or any other governmental power." *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436, 491 (1966).
- "An unconstitutional act is not law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties; affords no protection; it creates no office; it is, in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed." *Norton v. Shelby County*, 118 U.S. 425, 442 (1886).
- "No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law, and no courts are bound to enforce it." 16 Am. Jur. 2d, Sec. 177, Late Am. Jur. 2d, Sec. 256.
 - "Sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all government exists and acts." *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356, 370 (1886).

Supremacy Clause

- Plaintiffs respectfully assert and affirm that:
 - The Supremacy Clause of the Constitution of the <u>U</u>nited <u>S</u>tates (Article VI,
 Clause 2) establishes that the Constitution, federal laws made pursuant to
 it, and treaties made under its authority, constitute the "supreme Law of the

Land", and thus take priority over any conflicting state laws. It provides that state courts are bound by, and state constitutions subordinate to, the supreme law. However, federal statutes and treaties must be within the parameters of the Constitution; that is, they must be pursuant to the federal government's enumerated powers, and not violate other constitutional limits on federal power ... As a constitutional provision identifying the supremacy of federal law, the Supremacy Clause assumes the underlying priority of federal authority, albeit only when that authority is expressed in the Constitution itself; no matter what the federal or state governments might wish to do, they must stay within the boundaries of the Constitution.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY: Notice of *Void* Orders and Proceedings Due to Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction

Plaintiffs hereby provide notice that *any and all* orders, rulings, or proceedings issued or conducted by a court that lacked subject matter jurisdiction are **moot and** *void ab initio*. This includes any rulings or orders by Judge Roy K Altman and/or UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA MIAMI DIVISION. A court without subject matter jurisdiction has no lawful authority to adjudicate the matter, and any such actions taken in the absence of jurisdiction are rendered **null and** *void ab initio*. It is **well-established** that subject matter jurisdiction is a foundational requirement for the

1. All orders and judgments issued are legally void and cannot be enforced.

validity of any court proceeding. In the absence of such jurisdiction:

- 2. All subsequent proceedings are inherently defective and cannot be used to legitimize or ratify unlawful actions taken by the court.
- **3.** The doctrine of judicial immunity does not apply to actions taken in excess of jurisdiction.

Plaintiffs reserve all rights to seek appropriate remedies and sanctions for actions taken under color of authority in the absence of jurisdiction, as such actions constitute a willful disregard for the rule of law.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

'Standing'

- 1. Plaintiffs are **undisputedly** the Real Party(ies) in Interest, holder(s) in due 2 course, Creditor(s), and hold allodial tittle to any and all assets, registered or 3 unregistered, tangible or intangible, in accordance with contract law, principles, 4 common law, exicusive equity, the right to equitable subrogation, and the 5 U.C.C. (Uniform Commercial Code). This is further evidenced by the following 6 UCC filings, all duly filed in the Office of the Secretary of State, State of Nevada: 7 UCC1 filing #2024400157-3 and UCC3 filing #2024405802-2 and 2024403283-5 8 (Exhibits A, B, and C), and in accordance with UCC §§ 3-302, 9-105, and 9-509. 9 2. Plaintiffs maintain exclusive and sole standing in relation to said assets and 10 their interests, as duly recorded and affirmed by these filing. 11 12 3. Plaintiff(s) alone possess(es) exclusive equity. 13 4. Defendants do **NOT** have **any** valid interest or standing.
 - 5. Defendants do **NOT** have a valid claim to the **'Property**' (2018 GMC SIERRA 1500 with VIN # 3GTP1NEC0JG447243), or any of the respective goods or assets, registered and unregistered, tangible and intangible, and have stolen and unlawfully disposed of the private trust property.

6.As considered, agreed, and stipulated by Defendant(s) in the unrebutted verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and/or self-executing contract security agreement(s) (Exhibits I, J, K, L, N, P, R, and T), the 'Affidavit of WALKER TODD,' a professional Witnesses and former Federal Reserve Attorney, further evidences that Plaintiffs are the TRUE Creditors. The signed copy of the 'Affidavit of WALKER TODD,' attached hereto as **Exhibit S** and incorporated herein by reference.

Defendants' Actions as Acts of War Against the Constitution

The defendants' conduct constitutes an outright war against the Constitution of the United States, its *principles*, and the rule of law. By their *bad faith* and deplorable actions, the defendants have demonstrated willful and intentional disregard and contempt for the

supreme law of the land, as set forth in Article VI, Clause 2 of the Constitution, which

declares that the Constitution, federal laws, and treaties are the supreme law of the land,

3

4

6

7

5

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

A. Violations of Constitutional Protections

binding upon all states, courts, and officers.

The defendants have intentionally and systematically engaged in acts that directly violate the protections guaranteed to the plaintiffs and the people under the Constitution, including but not limited to:

1. Violation of the Plaintiffs' Unalienable Rights: The defendants have deprived the plaintiffs of life, liberty, and property without due process of law, as guaranteed

under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments.

- **Subversion of the Rule of Law:** Through their actions, the defendants have 2. undermined the separation of powers and checks and balances established by the Constitution. They have disregarded the judiciary's duty to uphold the Constitution by attempting to operate outside the confines of lawful authority, rendering themselves effectively unaccountable.
- **Treasonous Conduct**: Pursuant to Article III, Section 3, treason against the United **3.** States is defined as levying war against them or adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort. The defendants' conduct in subverting the constitutional order, depriving citizens of their lawful rights, and unlawfully exercising power without jurisdiction constitutes a form of domestic treason against the Constitution and the people it protects.

B. Acts of Aggression and Tyranny

The defendants' actions amount to a usurpation of authority and a direct attack on the sovereignty of the people, who are the true source of all government power under the Constitution. As stated in the Declaration of Independence, whenever any form of government becomes destructive of the unalienable rights of the people, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it. The defendants, through their actions, have positioned themselves as adversaries to this principle, attempting to replace the rule of law with arbitrary and unlawful dictates.

C. Weaponizing Authority to Oppress

- The defendants' intentional misuse of their authority to act against the interests of the Constitution and its <u>Citizens</u> is a clear manifestation of tyranny. Rather than serving their constitutional mandate to protect and defend the Constitution, they have actively waged war on it by:
 - Suppressing lawful claims and evidence presented by the plaintiffs to protect their property and rights.
 - Engaging in acts of fraud, coercion, and racketeering that strip plaintiffs of their constitutional protections.
 - **Dismissing the jurisdictional authority of constitutional mandates**, including but not limited to rights to due process and equal protection under the law.

The defendants' actions are not merely breaches of law; they are acts of *insurrection and rebellion* against the very foundation of the nation's constitutional framework. Such acts must not go unchallenged, as they jeopardize the constitutional order, the rights of the people, and the rule of law that ensures justice and equality. Plaintiffs call upon the court and relevant authorities to enforce the Constitution, compel accountability, and halt the defendants' treasonous war against the supreme law of the land.

'Bare Statutes' as Confirmation of Guilt and the Necessity of Prosecution by an Enforcer

Plaintiffs' incorporation of "bare statutes" does <u>NOT</u> exonerate Defendants; rather, it serves as evidence of Defendants' guilt, which they have already *undisputedly* admitted through their actions and lack of rebuttal to any affidavits, which they have a duty to respond to. The invocation of bare statutes merely underscores the necessity for Plaintiffs to compel a formal enforcer, such as a District Attorney or Attorney General, to prosecute the criminal violations. This requirement for enforcement does <u>NOT</u> negate the Defendants' culpability but, instead, affirms the gravity of their admitted violations.

In this matter, Plaintiffs have thoroughly detailed the Defendants' willful and intentional breaches of multiple federal statutes under Title 18, and Plaintiff's **private right(s)** of

 $2 \| \mathbf{C}$

U

' |

COMPLAINT. Defendants' actions constitute **treasonous** conduct against the **Constitution** and the American people. Their behavior, alongside that of their counsel, reflects an attitude of being above the law, further solidifying their guilt.

Plaintiffs maintain that the Defendants' reliance on procedural defenses or technicalities does not absolve them of their criminal conduct. Instead, their actions are an unequivocal admission of guilt that necessitates legal action by the appropriate prosecutorial authority. Plaintiffs reserve all rights to compel such enforcement to ensure that the Defendants are held fully accountable for their crimes.

'state Citizen' vs 'citizen of the United States'

"The fourteenth amendment creates and defines citizenship of the United

- States. It had long been contended, and had been held by many learned authorities, and had never been judicially decided to the contrary, that there was no such thing as a citizen of the United States, except as that condition arose from citizenship of some state. No mode existed, it was said, of obtaining a citizenship of the United States, except by first becoming a citizen of some state. This question is now at rest. The fourteenth amendment defines and declares who shall be citizens of the United States, to wit, "all persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof." The latter qualification was intended to exclude the children of foreign representatives and the like. With this qualification, every person born in the United States or naturalized is declared to be a citizen of the United States and of the state wherein he resides." UNITED STATES V. ANTHONY. [11]

 Blatchf. 200; 5 Chi. Leg. News. 462, 493; 17 Int. Rev. Rec. 197; 30 Leg. Int. 266; 5

 Leg. Op. 63; 20 Pittsb. Leg. J. 199.] Circuit Court, N. D. New York. June 18, 1873.
- 2. "It is quite clear, then, that there is a citizenship of the <u>U</u>nited <u>States**</u> and a citizenship of a State, which are distinct from each other and which depend upon different characteristics or circumstances in the individual." <u>Slaughter House Cases</u>, 83 U.S. 36 (1872).

3. "We have in our political system a Government of the <u>U</u>nited <u>S</u>tates and a government of each of the several <u>S</u>tates. Each one of these governments is distinct from the others, and each has citizens of its own who owe it allegiance, and whose rights, within its jurisdiction, it must protect. The same person may be at the same time a <u>c</u>itizen of the <u>U</u>nited <u>S</u>tates and a <u>C</u>itizen of a <u>S</u>tate, but his rights of citizenship under one of these governments will be different from those he has under the other." — Slaughter House Cases <u>United States vs.</u>

Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542 (1875).

- 4. "One may be a citizen of a State and yet not a citizen of the United States." Thomasson v. State, 15 Ind. 449; Cory v. Carter, 48 Ind. 327 (17 Am. R. 738); McCarthy v. Froelke, 63 Ind. 507; *In Re* Wehlitz, 16 Wis. 443. [McDonel v. State, 90 Ind. 320, 323 (1883)] [underlines added].
- 5. "The first clause of the <u>fourteenth amendment</u> of the federal Constitution made negroes citizens of the <u>United States**</u>, and citizens of the <u>state</u> in which they reside, and thereby created **two classes** of citizens, one of the <u>United States**</u> and the other of the state." [4 Dec. Dig. '06, p. 1197, sec. 11] ["Citizens" (1906), emphasis added].
- 6. "That there is a citizenship of the United States and a citizenship of a state, and the privileges and immunities of one are not the same as the other is well established by the decisions of the courts of this country." [Tashiro v. Jordan, 201 Cal. 236 (1927)].
- 7. "... both before and after the Fourteenth Amendment to the federal Constitution, it has not been necessary for a person to be a citizen of the United States in order to be a citizen of his state." [Crosse v. Board of Supervisors of Elections] [221 A.2d 431 (1966)].
- 8. "The privileges and immunities clause of the <u>Fourteenth Amendment protects</u> very few rights because it neither incorporates any of the Bill of Rights nor protects all rights of individual citizens. See Slaughter-House Cases, 83 U.S. (16

- Wall.) 36, 21 L.Ed. 394 (<u>1873</u>). Instead, this provision protects only those rights peculiar to being a citizen of the federal government; it does not protect those rights which relate to state citizenship." [<u>Jones v. Temmer</u>, 829 F.Supp. 1226 (USDC/DCO 1993)]
- 9. The 1st clause of the <u>fourteenth Amendment</u> states: "All persons born or naturalized in the <u>U</u>nited <u>S</u>tates, **and** subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the <u>U</u>nited <u>S</u>tates and the state wherein they reside."
- 10. The 1st clause of the f<u>ourteenth Amendment</u> does <u>not</u> say: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, **are** subject to the jurisdiction thereof"
- 11. The 1st clause of the <u>fourteenth Amendment</u> contains two <u>requirements</u> for <u>U</u>nited <u>S</u>tates citizenship: (a) that a person be born or naturalized in the <u>U</u>nited <u>S</u>tates **and** (b) that a person be subject to the jurisdiction of the <u>U</u>nited <u>S</u>tates.

national/non-citizen national aka state Citizen

- 1. The 'Department of State' document, "Certificates of Non-Citizen Nationality," located at https://travel.state.gov/content/travel/en/legal/travel-legal-considerations/us-citizenship/Certificates-Non-Citizen-Nationality.html says in part in the 3rd paragraph: "Section 101(a)(21) of the INA defines the term 'national' as 'a person owing permanent allegiance to a state.' Section 101(a)(22) of the INA provides that the term 'national of the United States' includes all U.S. citizens as well as persons who, though not citizens of the United States, owe permanent allegiance to the United States (non-citizen nationals)."
- 2. <u>Title 8 U.S. Code 1101(a)(22) Definition</u>, expressly stipulates, " (22)The term "national of the United States" means (A) a citizen of the United States, or (B) a person who, though not a citizen of the United States, owes permanent allegiance to the United States."
- 3. **22** CFR § 51.2 Passport issued to nationals only, stipulates: (a) A passport may be issued only to a U.S. national.

instrument, as evidenced by Certified Mail Number

9589071052701733216000 (Exhibit K).

27

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

2. Defendant(s) individually and collectively, **fully agree** that if said tender of payment is/was "refused" there is/was discharge, to the extent of the amount of the tender, as stipulated by <u>U.C.C. § 3-603</u>. Given the clear indication of tender of payment contained a statement to the effect that the instrument was tendered as **full satisfaction** of the claim, as stipulated by <u>U.C.C.</u> § 3-311, there is again **discharge**.

- As considered, agreed, and stipulated by Defendant(s) in the unrebutted verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and/or self-executing contract security agreement(s) (Exhibits E, F, and H), Defendants individually and collectively, fully agree, that House Joint Resolution 192 of June 5, 1933, Public Law 73-10 expressly stipulates, 'every provision contained in or made with respect to any obligation which purports to give the obligee a right to require payment in gold or a particular kind of coin or currency, or in an amount in money of the United States measured thereby, is declared to be against public policy; and no such provision shall be contained in or made with respect to any obligation hereafter incurred. Every obligation, heretofore of hereafter incurred, whether or not any such provision is contained therein or made with respect thereto, shall be discharged upon payment, dollar for dollar, in any coin or currency which at the time of payment is legal tender for public and private debts.
- A Library of Congress Certified Copy of The Public Statutes at Large of the United States of America from March 1933 to June 1934: House Joint Resolution 192 of June 5, 1933, Public Law 73-10, is attached hereto as **Exhibit R**.

Gold Reserve Act of 1934, Public Law 73-87, Title III, Section 3 As *considered*, *agreed*, and *stipulated* by Defendant(s) in the <u>unrebutted</u> verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and/or self-executing contract security agreement(s) (Exhibits E, F, and H), Defendants individually and collectively, fully agree that Gold Reserve Act of 1934, Public Law 73-87, Title III, Section 3, stipulates: "(a) every provision contained in or made with respect to any obligation which purports to give the obligee a right to require

11 12

14

13

15 16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

payment in gold or a particular kind of coin or currency of the United States, or in an amount in money of the United States measured thereby, is declared to be against public policy. (b) **Every** obligation, heretofore or hereafter incurred, shall be discharged upon payment, dollar for dollar, in any coin or currency which at the time of payment is legal tender for public and private debts.

GENERALLY ACCEPTED AUDITING STANDARDS (GAAS) and 12 U.S. Code §§ 83, 411, and 412

- 1. As *considered*, *agreed*, and *stipulated* by Defendant(s) in the <u>unrebutted</u> verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and/or self-executing contract security agreement(s) (Exhibits E, F, and H), Defendants never at any time risked any of their/ its assets and truly only exchanged the GENUINE ORIGINAL PROMISSORY NOTE for "credit" according to the Federal Reserve Generally Accepted Auditing Standards (GAAS) with the FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM, and the applicable provisions under the Federal Reserve System and Title 12 U.S. Code §§ 83, 411, and 412.
- As considered, agreed, and stipulated by Defendant(s) in the unrebutted verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and/or self-executing contract security agreement(s) (attached hereto as Exhibits E, F, and H), Defendants never, at any time, risked any of their own assets in the transaction. Instead, Defendants merely exchanged the GENUINE ORIGINAL PROMISSORY NOTE provided by Plaintiffs for "credit," in accordance with the Federal Reserve's Generally Accepted Auditing Standards (GAAS), and the applicable provisions under the **Federal Reserve System** and Title 12 U.S. Code §§ 83, 411, and 412. Specifically:
 - 1. Prohibition Against Lending Bank Funds:

Pursuant to 12 U.S.C. § 83 - 'Loans by bank on its own stock', a national bank is expressly prohibited from lending its own capital, including its funds or assets, for any purpose. This statutory restriction ensures that banks do not

risk their depositors' money or their reserve capital in loan transactions. Instead, banks act as *intermediaries*, aka *money changers*, exchanging currency and issuing "credit" based on MONETARY INSTRUMENTS of value provided by borrowers. The Plaintiffs' promissory note served as such an MONETARY INSTRUMENT of value, enabling the Defendants to *purchase and acquire* Plaintiffs' MONETARY INSTRUMENT and then extend "credit" without utilizing their own funds.

12 U.S.C. § 83 provides:

"No national bank shall make any loan or discount on the security of the shares of its own capital stock. Nor shall any such association be the purchaser or holder of any such shares unless such security or purchase shall be necessary to prevent loss upon a debt previously contracted in good faith..."

While the statute focuses on preventing national banks from engaging in self-dealing with their capital stock, it also establishes the general **principle** that banks *cannot* loan their own assets or funds directly. This underscores the fact that the Plaintiffs' promissory note, not the Defendants' capital, initiated and facilitated the transaction.

2. The PROMISSORY NOTE as Collateral:

Plaintiffs' promissory note was a **negotiable instrument** under the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC), representing real value. Defendants monetized this NOTE to create "credit," rather than lending any pre-existing funds or risking their own assets. The note became **collateral** for the credit issued by Defendants, effectively making the Plaintiffs' own MONETARY INSTRUMENT/PROMISSORY NOTE the originating instrument and asset of the transaction.

3. Exchange of Equivalent Value, Not a Loan:

The transaction constituted an exchange of currency, whereby Plaintiffs

provided the asset (the promissory note) that Defendants used to generate credit. Defendants then issued this credit to Plaintiffs, demonstrating that no traditional loan of pre-existing money occurred. Plaintiffs' promissory note became the basis for the issuance of credit in compliance with 12 U.S.C. § 411, which governs the issuance of Federal Reserve Notes as obligations of the United States, backed by collateral.

4. Unjust Enrichment and Fraudulent Misrepresentation:

By accepting and monetizing Plaintiffs' promissory note, Defendants obtained the full value of the alleged loan at the outset, while failing to disclose that no actual funds of their own were provided. Defendants' retention of the note without returning equivalent collateral or funds constitutes **unjust enrichment**. Furthermore, their failure to disclose the true nature of the transaction represents **fraudulent misrepresentation**, as Plaintiffs were led to believe that Defendants provided a traditional loan.

5. Legal and Financial Implications:

The Plaintiffs' promissory note created the very credit extended to them, meaning that Plaintiffs have already provided the full value of the alleged loan. Consequently, no genuine debt exists between Plaintiffs and Defendants. Under the principles of equity and commercial law, the transaction must be treated as satisfied by the Plaintiffs' provision of the promissory note.

Defendants' reliance on the Plaintiffs' note as the originating asset further establishes that Plaintiffs are the rightful creators of the credit and should not be subjected to repayment obligations on funds that originated from their own instrument.

12 U.S.C. 1813(L)(1): The term 'Deposit' Defined

3. As considered, agreed, and stipulated by Defendant(s) in the <u>unrebutted</u> verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and/or self-executing contract

25

26

27

28

security agreement(s) (Exhibits E, F, and H), as under 12 U.S.C. 1813(L)(1), ["]the term 'deposit' means - the unpaid balance of money or its equivalent received or held by a bank or savings association in the usual course of business and for which it has given or is obligated to give credit, either conditionally or unconditionally, to a commercial, checking, savings, time, or thrift account, or which is evidenced by its certificate of deposit, thrift certificate, investment certificate, certificate of indebtedness, or other similar name, or a check or draft drawn against a deposit account and certified by the bank or savings association, or a letter of credit or a traveler's check on which the bank or savings association is primarily liable: Provided, That, without limiting the generality of the term "money or its equivalent", any such account or instrument must be regarded as evidencing the receipt of the equivalent of money when credited or issued in exchange for checks or drafts or for a promissory note upon which the person obtaining any such credit or instrument is primarily or secondarily liable, or for a charge against a deposit account, or in settlement of checks, drafts, or other instruments forwarded to such bank or savings association for collection.["]

As considered, agreed, and stipulated by Defendant(s) in the <u>unrebutted</u> verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and/or self-executing contract security agreement(s) (Exhibits E, F, and H), Defendants individually and collectively, <u>fully agree</u> that <u>Under Title 12 U.S.C. 1813(L)(1)</u> when the purported borrower gives, deposits, or surrenders or the subsequent <u>supposed</u> loan owner obtains the PROMISSORY NOTE, it becomes a CASH ITEM and Defendant(s), and/or their Corporation, parent Corporation and other subsidiaries are required to give the <u>purported</u> borrower <u>a CASH RECEIPT</u>. The deposit of Plaintifft's promissory note was made to a demand deposit account Defendant(s), and/or their Corporation, parent Corporation and other subsidiaries are required to show it on THEIR books, but <u>instead YOU/THEY do an offset</u> entry and

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

intentionally fail to give the purported borrower and/or Affiant a CASH RECEIPT.

- 5. As considered, agreed, and stipulated by Defendant(s) in the <u>unrebutted</u> verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and/or self-executing contract security agreement(s) (Exhibits E, F, and H), Defendants individually and collectively, **fully agree** that Plaintiff(s) is/are the Creditor(s) and the source of all equity used for the acquisition of the Property, and the holder in due course of all assets, as evidenced by UCC1 filing #2024400157-3, and UCC3 filing and NOTICE #2024405802-2 and 2024403283-5 (Exhibits A, B, and C).
- As considered, agreed, and stipulated by Defendant(s) in the <u>unrebutted</u> verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and/or self-executing contract security agreement(s) (Exhibits E, F, and H), the forms 1099-A, 1099-C, and 1099-OID have been filed and Accepted by the Internal Revenue Service, correctly and appropriately listing Plaintiff(s) as "LENDER" and "PAYER," and Defendant(s) as BORROWER and "RECIPIENT," indicating discharge, settlement and satisfaction of any **purported** obligation. Each form is attached hereto as **Exhibits M and N** respectively, as follows:
 - **Exhibit M**: 2024 form 1099-OID, for \$24,000.00
 - **Exhibit N**: 2024 form 1099-A, for \$24,000.00
- 7. As considered, agreed, and stipulated by Defendant(s) in the <u>unrebutted</u> verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and/or self-executing contract security agreement(s) (Exhibits E, F, and H), Defendant(s) has/have been paid in **<u>full</u>** for **any purported** "contract" and/or obligation.
- 8. As considered, agreed, and stipulated by Defendant(s) in the unrebutted verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and/or self-executing contract security agreement(s) (Exhibits E, F, and H), the unrebutted affidavits themselves serve as prima facie evidence of fraud, embezzlement, fraud, larceny, intensity theft, conspiracy, deprivation of rights under the color of law,

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

extortion. coercion, injury and damage to Affiant and proof of claim. See *United* States v. Kis, 658 F.2d, 526 (7th Cir. 1981)., "Appellee had the burden of first proving its prima facie case and could do so by affidavit or other evidence."

9. As considered, agreed, and stipulated by Defendant(s) in the unrebutted verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and/or self-executing contract security agreement(s) (Exhibits E, F, and H), Defendants have individually and collectively admitted the statements and claims by TACIT PROCURATION, all issues are deemed settled RES JUDICATA, STARE DECISIS and by COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL.

GENERALLY ACCEPTED ACCOUNTING PRINCIPLES (GAAP)

- 10. As considered, agreed, and stipulated by Defendant(s) in the unrebutted verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and/or self-executing contract security agreement(s) (Exhibits E, F, and H), Defendants never at any time risked any of its assets and truly only exchanged the GENUINE ORIGINAL PROMISSORY NOTE for "credit" according to the Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP). 'Banks' are required to adhere Generally Accepted Accounting Principles and as evidenced by, 12 U.S.C 1831n -'Accounting objectives, standards, and requirements': ["](2) Standards (A)Uniform accounting principles consistent with GAAP Subject to the requirements of this chapter and any other provision of Federal law, the accounting principles applicable to reports or statements required to be filed with Federal banking agencies by all insured depository institutions shall be uniform and consistent with generally accepted accounting principles.["]
- 11. As *considered*, *agreed*, and *stipulated* by Defendant(s) in the *unrebutted* verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and/or self-executing contract security agreement(s) (Exhibits E, F, and H), GAAP follows an accounting convention that lies at the heart of the double-entry bookkeeping system called the Matching Principle. This principle works

are follows: when a bank accepts bullion, coin, currency, drafts, promissory notes, or any other similar instruments (hereinafter "instruments") from customers and deposits or records the instruments as assets, it must record offsetting liabilities that match the assets that it accepted from customers. The liabilities represent the amounts that the bank owes the customers, funds accepted from customers. If a fractional reserve banking system like the United States banking system, most of the funds advanced to borrowers (assets held by banks) are created by the banks, once they purchase/acquire the TRUE Creditor's Asset (NOTE, ORDER, DRAFT, LETTER OF CREDIT, MONEY ORDER, SECURITY, ETC.) and are not merely transferred from one set of depositors to another set of borrowers. Said Asset remains an Asset to Plaintiffs.

12. As *considered*, *agreed*, and *stipulated* by Defendant(s) in the *unrebutted* verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and/or self-executing contract security agreement(s) (Exhibits E, F, and H), GAAP is <u>intended</u> to <u>ensure</u> consistency among financial records, financial transparency, and protection from fraud or misleading company reports.

CONDITIONAL ACCEPTANCE

- Plaintiffs hereby **CONDITIONALLY ACCEPT** the Defendants' motions and claims, I accordance with Uniform Commercial Code, legal maxims, principles, and contract law upon proof of the following:
- 1. Upon proof from Defendants that that a valid arbitration agreement exists, that Plaintiffs agreed to willingly, intentionally, and with full and completed disclosure.
- 2. Upon proof from Defendants that the <u>unrebutted verified</u> commercial affidavits and/ or self-executing Contract Security Agreement (Exhibits E, F, and H) did NOT alter, change, or negate the terms of any purported contract in accordance with the Uniform Commercial Code, Contract Law principles, the law merchant, legal maxims, and/or Law.

3. Upon proof from Defendants that they are above the Law, the Constitution, the Uniform Commercial Code (U.C.C.), and above contract law and legal maxims.

- 4. Upon proof that Defendants did **NOT** received, consider, and agree to ALL contract terms stated in each <u>unrebutted verified</u> commercial affidavit and/or self-executing security agreement (Exhibits E, F, and H), as evidenced by Exhibits A through P.
 - 5. Upon proof from Defendants that the <u>unrebutted verified</u> commercial affidavits (Exhibits E, F, and H), which do **NOT** have an arbitration agreement, actually do have an arbitration agreement.
 - 6. Upon proof from Defendants that the original contract was **NOT** 'void ab initio' [void from the beginning], as received, considered, agreed, and stipulated by Defendants in the the unrebutted verified commercial affidavits (Exhibits E, F, and H), due to Defendants **knowingly** and **intentionally creating 'fraud** in the factum' and withhold from "Affiant" vital information concerning said debt and all of the matrix involved in making the loan" See Deutsche Bank v. Peabody, 866 N.Y.S.2d 91 (2008).
 - 7. Upon proof from Defendants that the original contract was **NOT** 'void ab initio' [void from the beginning], as considered, agreed and stipulated by Defendants in the the <u>unrebutted verified</u> commercial affidavits (Exhibits E, F, and H), due to Defendants **willful** and **intentional** fraud, racketeering, bad faith actions, theft, robbery, extortion, coercion, embezzlement, deprivation of rights under the color of law, as consider, **as** <u>fully</u> <u>admitted by Defendants</u> in each unrebutted verified commercial affidavit and/or self-executing security agreement (Exhibits E, F, and H), and as articulated in the original verified complaint.
 - 8. Upon proof from Defendants that summary judgment is **NOT** appropriate, as evidenced by **Contract** Law, *principles*, **legal maxims**, **Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.510(a)**, **California Code of Civil Procedure § 437c(c)**, *and* Federal **Rule of Civil Procedure 56(a)**.
 - 9. Upon proof that summary judgment is **NOT** due as **'a matter of law**.'

further confirmed by the, 'AFFIDAVIT CERTIFICATE of DISHONOR, NON-RESPONSE,

The failure of Defendants to rebut or provide any valid evidence of their performance is

27

- DEFAULT, JUDGEMENT, and LIEN AUTHORIZATION"/Self-Executing Contract Security Agreement #RF204463888US' (Exhibit E), which is duly notarized and complies 3 with the requirements of U.C.C. § 3-505. Under U.C.C. § 3-505, a document regular in form, such as the notarized Affidavit Certificate serves as evidence of dishonor and creates a **presumption** of dishonor. 5 U.C.C. § 3-505. Evidence of Dishonor: (a) The following are admissible as evidence and create a presumption of 7 dishonor and of any notice of dishonor stated: 8 (1) A document regular in form as provided in subsection (b) which purports to 9 be a protest; 10 (2) A purported stamp or writing of the drawee, payor bank, or presenting bank 11 on or accompanying the instrument stating that acceptance or payment has 12 been refused unless reasons for the refusal are stated and the reasons are not 13 consistent with dishonor; 14 (3) A book or record of the drawee, payor bank, or collecting bank, kept in the 15 usual course of business which shows dishonor, even if there is no evidence of 16 who made the entry. 17 (b) A protest is a certificate of dishonor made by a United States consul or 18 vice consul, or a notary public or other person authorized to administer oaths 19 by the law of the place where dishonor occurs. It may be made upon 20 information satisfactory to that person. The protest must identify the instrument 21 and certify either that presentment has been made or, if not made, the reason 22 why it was not made, and that the instrument has been dishonored by 23 nonacceptance or nonpayment. The protest may also certify that notice of 24 dishonor has been given to some or all parties. 25 The <u>notarized</u> 'AFFIDAVIT CERTIFICATE of DISHONOR, NON-RESPONSE, 26 DEFAULT, JUDGEMENT, and LIEN AUTHORIZATION"/Self-Executing Contract
 - -22 of 41-

Security Agreement #RF204463888US', complies with these requirements and serves

27

1	as a formal protest and evidence of dishonor under U.C.C. § 3-505, as it clearly
2	documents Defendants' refusal to respond or provide the necessary rebuttal to
3	Plaintiffs' claims.
4	III. <u>DEFENDANTS' ERRONEOUS</u> FOCUS ON "PRO SE" IS
5	IRRELEVANT given 'IN PROPRIA PERSONA' AKA 'PRO PER' FILINGS
6	Defendants' reliance on the "pro se" designation is a baseless
7	mischaracterization. Plaintiffs are trusts lawfully represented by their
8	'Attorney(ies) In Fact' under the Constitution's protection of the right to
9	contract. Plaintiffs proceed 'In Propria Persona' (pro per), 'Sui Juris,' not 'pro
10	se,' as clearly evidenced in the record.
11	Defendants' repeated reference to irrelevant case law and incorrect legal
12	interpretations is an attempt to distract from their own failure to rebut or
13	perform.
14	IV. <u>DEFENDANTS HAVE FAILED TO REBUT OR PROVIDE EVIDENCE</u>
15	Defendants were required to rebut Plaintiffs' claims and Conditional Acceptance
16	with specific, factual evidence and proof, as dictated by the <u>principles</u> of contract
17	law and Uniform Commercial Code (U.C.C.) provisions:
18	• U.C.C. § 1-103, 'Construction of Uniform Commercial Code to Promote its
19	Purposes and Policies: Applicability of Supplemental Principles of Law':
20	Requires actions to conform to good faith and fundamental fairness, which
21	Defendants have failed to demonstrate.
22	• U.C.C. § 2-206, 'Offer and Acceptance in Formation of Contract': A valid
23	response or performance requires clear acceptance or adequate rebuttal,
24	neither of which Defendants have provided.
25	Defendants' filing instead relied on mischaracterizations, general denials, and
26	irrelevant citations, failing to directly address Plaintiffs' specific claims and
27	terms. This failure to perform or provide any valid rebuttal or evidence
28	serves as conclusive evidence of dishonor, establishing Defendants'

continued dishonor and default under the principles of contract law and legal maxims

V. FULL ADMISSION BY DEFENDANTS

- 1. Defendants, through their collective "Response in Opposition" (Docket No. 15), have failed to provide any valid rebuttal to Plaintiff's Motion to Expedite Summary Judgment as a Matter of Law Without a Hearing. Instead, their response constitutes an admission of Plaintiff's arguments and material facts as a matter of law.
- 2. Defendants now have **literally admitted** to **receiving**, reading, and **considering** all of Plaintiff's <u>verified</u> commercial affidavits. By acknowledging receipt and **consideration** of these affidavits, while willfully and intentionally failing to respond or rebut them, Defendants have demonstrated:
 - Full knowledge of receiving the affidavits and comprehension of the affidavits' content;
 - Agreement with the affidavits' material facts as true and correct by their individual and collective silence acquiesce, tacit agreement, tacit procuration, and inaction;
 - Voluntary waiver of any opportunity to dispute or contest the claims made therein.
- 3. In their motion and filings Defendants have gone so far as to collectively characterize laws, *principles*, and **longstanding legal maxims** cited by Plaintiffs as "meritless" and "baseless." This disgraceful rhetoric not only reveals their ignorance of the law but also demonstrates their outright contempt for the foundational doctrines of justice and equity that underpin this nation's legal system.
- 4. Such statements, dismissing the **bedrock principles of law, legal maxims**, and commercial remedies, are unbecoming of any party to these proceedings and represent an affront to the integrity of this Court and the rule of law itself.
- VI. <u>DEFENDANTS' WILLFUL AND INTENTIONAL FAILURE TO</u>
 REBUT IS CONSENT BY SILENCE: SILENT ACQUIESCENCE,
 TACIT AGREEMENT, AND TACIT PROCURATION

-24 of 41-

7

8

9

11

12

13 14

15

16

18 19

17

20

21

24

25

26

27

28

1. Defendants' self-admitted collective acknowledgment of receipt, **consideration**, **and agreement** to Plaintiff's affidavits, coupled with their willful and blatant failure to rebut, dispute, or respond to the affidavits in any manner, constitutes:

- A binding agreement to the facts and claims asserted therein;
- A demonstration of Defendants' legal incapacity and incompetence as 'wards of the court;
- Material facts supporting Plaintiff's entitlement to all relief sought and Summary Judgment.
- In accordance with longstanding principles of law, silence is acquiescence, and
 unrebutted affidavits stand as <u>T</u>ruth in commerce and in <u>L</u>aw. Defendants' willful and
 intentional failure to respond constitutes tacit agreement to all claims and statements
 set forth in the affidavits.
- 3. Ignorance of the law is no excuse. Defendants' collective failure to rebut or properly respond cannot be dismissed as mere oversight or negligence. It is a clear, willful, and intentional act that affirms the validity of all Plaintiff's claims.
- 4. Under U.C.C. § 2-206, 'Offer and Acceptance in Formation of Contract,' Defendants' actions further evidence an acceptance of Plaintiff's offer, contract, and claims as they fail to counter the presented affidavits, which constitute clear and unequivocal offers to establish material facts. Defendants' self-admitted willful and intentional silence and inaction are recognized under this provision as valid acceptance in the course of dealings.

VII. PLAINTIFFS'S ATTEMPTS TO SETTLE AND DEFENDANTS'

23 VIOLATIONS OF RIGHTS

- 1. Plaintiffs made several good-faith attempts to settle this matter with Defendants by formally requesting restitution and the return of private trust property: a **2018 GMC**.
- 2. Instead of doing the right thing returning the private trust Property as legally and lawfully requested, Defendants:

- Willfully violated Plaintiff's rights;
- Unlawfully seized and withheld the Property, effectively stealing it;
- Demonstrated their bad faith and disregard for Plaintiff's rights, further evidencing their inability or refusal to act in good faith.
- 3. Defendants' **failure to address or rebut these violations** in their Response constitutes further tacit admission of the truth of Plaintiff's claims. Their silence on this matter confirms their acknowledgment of wrongdoing and liability.

VIII. PLAINTIFFS' ENTITLEMENT TO SANCTIONS, DEFAULT

JUDGEMENT, AND SUMMARY JUDGMENT, AS A MATTER OF LAW

A. Entry of **Default Judgment**

- 1. Defendants' *willful* and continued **non-response**, **dishonor**, **default**, and procedural violations leave no genuine dispute of material fact. Plaintiffs are entitled to default judgment under **FRCP 55(b)**, as Defendants have failed to provide any substantive defense or rebuttal.
- 2. Under Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.510(a), summary judgment is appropriate where there is no genuine issue as to any material fact, and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. The three (3) unrebutted affidavits submitted by Plaintiff(s), which the Defendants have now on the record admitted to receiving and ignoring, establish that there are no genuine issues of material fact in dispute, and Plaintiffs are entitled to judgment based on the evidence presented and as a matter of law.

B. Imposition of Sanctions

- 1. Plaintiffs respectfully request the Court impose severe sanctions against Defendants, including:
 - Reimbursement of Plaintiffs' costs and attorney's fees under 28
 U.S.C. § 1927, which totals to the said sum of Three Hundred
 Million U.S. Dollars (\$300,000,000.00 USD).

Sanctions for the willful misapplication of law, disregard for due
process, and violations of the United States Code, the Uniform
Commercial Code law, and contract law, which have materially
harmed Plaintiffs' rights and caused undue financial and emotional
distress. Plaintiffs demand that the Court impose punitive measures
commensurate with the severity of Defendants' actions to deter
further abuse of legal processes.

C. Fraud, Breach of Contract, and Other Violations

1. Defendants' actions constitute fraud, breach of contract, and dishonor under U.C.C. and federal law. Plaintiffs reaffirm their claims of fraud, embezzlement, breach of trust, and deprivation of rights, as stated in the Verified Complaint and incorporated affidavits.

IX. LEGAL PRINCIPLES SUPPORTING PLAINTIFFS' CLAIMS

In support of this DEMAND as **a matter of law**, Plaintiffs cite the following established legal standards, legal maxims, precedent, and principles:

- Unrebutted Affidavits as Judgment in Commerce: Plaintiffs' unrebutted affidavits are binding truth under the maxim, "An unrebutted affidavit becomes the judgment in commerce."
- Res Judicata and Collateral Estoppel: Defendants are <u>barred</u> from contesting
 the finality of Plaintiffs' claims under the doctrines of res
 judicata and collateral estoppel, as all material facts and claims have been
 resolved conclusively.
- dishonor and default are evidenced by their failure to fulfill obligations defined by U.C.C. § 3-505 and other applicable statutes <u>ALL ARE EQUAL</u>

 <u>UNDER THE LAW.</u> (God's Law Moral and Natural Law). Exodus 21:23-25;
 Lev. 24: 17-21; Deut. 1; 17, 19:21; Mat. 22:36-40; Luke 10:17; Col. 3:25. 'No one is above the law.'

- IN COMMERCE FOR ANY MATTER TO BE RESOLVED MUST BE

 EXPRESSED. (Heb. 4:16; Phil. 4:6; Eph. 6:19-21). -- Legal maxim: 'To lie is to go against the mind.'
- TRUTH IS EXPRESSED IN THE FORM OF AN AFFIDAVIT. (Lev. 5:4-5; Lev. 6:3-5; Lev. 19:11-13: Num. 30:2; Mat. 5:33; James 5: 12).
- IN COMMERCE TRUTH IS SOVEREIGN. (Exodus 20:16; Ps. 117:2; John 8:32; II Cor. 13:8) Truth is sovereign -- and the Sovereign tells only the truth.
- AN UNREBUTTED AFFIDAVIT STANDS AS TRUTH IN COMMERCE. (12 Pet. 1:25; Heb. 6:13-15;). 'He who does not deny, admits.'
- "Statements of fact contained in affidavits which are not rebutted by the opposing party's affidavit or pleadings may be accepted as true by the trial court." --Winsett v. Donaldson, 244 N.W.2d 355 (Mich. 1976).
 - See, *Sieb's Hatcheries, Inc. v. Lindley,* 13 F.R.D. 113 (1952)., "Defendant(s) made no request for an extension of time in which to answer the request for admission of facts and filed only an unsworn response within the time permitted," thus, under the specific provisions of Ark. and *Fed. R. Civ. P.* 36, the facts in question were **deemed admitted as true. Failure to answer is well established in the court**. *Beasley v. U. S.,* 81 F. Supp. 518 (1948)., "I, therefore, hold that the requests **will be considered as having been admitted**." Also as previously referenced, "Statements of **fact** contained in affidavits which are **not** rebutted by the opposing party's **affidavit or pleadings may**[must] be accepted as **true** by the trial court." --Winsett v. Donaldson, 244 N.W.2d 355 (Mich. 1976).
- 'The state cannot diminish Rights of the people." Hurtado vs. California,
 110 US 516.
- "Public officials are not immune from suit when they transcend their lawful authority by invading constitutional rights." AFLCIO v. Woodward, 406
 F2d 137 t.

- "Immunity **fosters neglect and breeds irresponsibility** while liability promotes care and caution, which caution and care is owed by the government to its people." (Civil Rights) **Rabon vs Rowen Memorial Hospital, Inc.** 269 N.S. 1, 13, 152 SE 1 d 485, 493.
- "When enforcing mere statutes, judges of all courts do not act judicially (and thus are not protected by "qualified" or "limited immunity," SEE: Owen v. City, 445 U.S. 662; Bothke v. Terry, 713 F2d 1404) - "but merely act as an extension as an agent for the involved agency -- but only in a "ministerial" and not a "discretionary capacity..." Thompson v. Smith, 154 S.E. 579, 583; Keller v. P.E., 261 US 428; F.R.C. v. G.E., 281, U.S. 464.
- "Judges not only can be sued over their official acts, but could be held liable for injunctive and declaratory relief and attorney's fees."
 Lezama v. Justice Court, A025829.
- "Ignorance of the law does **not** excuse misconduct in anyone, least of all in a sworn officer of the law." In re McCowan (1917), 177 C. 93, 170 P. 1100.
- "All are presumed to know the law." San Francisco Gas Co. v.
 Brickwedel (1882), 62 C. 641; Dore v. Southern Pacific Co. (1912), 163 C.
 182, 124 P. 817; People v. Flanagan (1924), 65 C.A. 268, 223 P. 1014;
 Lincoln v. Superior Court (1928), 95 C.A. 35, 271 P. 1107; San Francisco
 Realty Co. v. Linnard (1929), 98 C.A. 33, 276 P. 368.
- "It is one of the fundamental maxims of the common law that **ignorance of the law excuses no one**." Daniels v. Dean (1905), 2 C.A. 421, 84 P. 332.
- "the people, not the States, are sovereign." Chisholm v. Georgia, 2 Dall. 419, 2 U.S. 419, 1 L.Ed. 440 (1793).
- HE WHO LEAVES THE BATTLEFIELD FIRST LOSES BY DEFAULT.

 (Book of Job; Mat. 10:22) -- Legal maxim: 'He who does not repel a wrong when he can occasions it.'

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

AN UNREBUTTED AFFIDAVIT BECOMES THE JUDGEMENT IN **COMMERCE.** (Heb. 6:16-17;). 'There is nothing left to resolve.'

X. Summary Judgment as a Matter of Law Without Hearing

- 1. Pursuant to Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.510(a), California Code of Civil Procedure § 437c(c), and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56(a), summary judgment is appropriate when there is no genuine issue of material fact, and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.
- 2. In this case, the three (3) *unrebutted* verified commercial affidavits (Exhibits E, F, and H) and the VERIFIED COMPLAINT submitted by the Plaintiffs indisputably establish that there are no genuine issues of material fact in dispute, thus entitling the Plaintiffs to immediate summary judgment.
- 3. Defendants make frivolous arguments lacking and foundation or legal backing, and have caused Plaintiffs injury and harm. Each unrebutted affidavit serves as prima facie evidence of these facts.
 - "Ignorance of the law does **not** excuse misconduct in anyone, least of all in a sworn officer of the law." In re McCowan (1917), 177 C. 93, 170 P. 1100.
 - "All are presumed to know the law." San Francisco Gas Co. v. Brickwedel (1882), 62 C. 641; Dore v. Southern Pacific Co. (1912), 163 C. 182, 124 P. 817; People v. Flanagan (1924), 65 C.A. 268, 223 P. 1014; Lincoln v. Superior Court (1928), 95 C.A. 35, 271 P. 1107; San Francisco Realty Co. v. Linnard (1929), 98 C.A. 33, 276 P. 368.
 - "It is one of the fundamental maxims of the common law that **ignorance** of the law excuses no one." Daniels v. Dean (1905), 2 C.A. 421, 84 P. 332.
 - "the people, not the States, are sovereign." Chisholm v. Georgia, 2 Dall. 419, 2 U.S. 419, 1 L.Ed. 440 (1793)

1	4. Since the Defendants have failed to rebut the contents of the various
2	affidavits, the Plaintiffs are entitled to judgment as a matter of law.
3	5. As such, the Court should <u>sua sponte</u> recognize the validity of the
4	Plaintiffs' position and grant summary judgment in their favor, without
5	the need for a hearing.
6	VI. Res Judicata, Stare Decisis, and Collateral Estoppel
7	Res Judicata, Stare Decisis, and Collateral Estoppel: The doctrines of res
8	judicata, stare decisis, and collateral estoppel are applicable to the
9	<i>unrebutted</i> affidavits, thereby establishing that all matters have been resolved
10	and cannot be challenged further. These doctrines underscore the finality of
11	the administrative findings and provide an undisputable foundation for the
12	granting of summary judgement, as a matter of law without the need for a
13	hearing.
14	//
15	//
16	//
17	//
18	WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Honorable Court grant this
19	Demand for Summary Judgement as a matter of law, without hearing, in favor of
20	the Plaintiffs, unless the Court intends to act contrary to the Uniform Commercial
21	Code, the United States Code, contract law, legal maxims, principles, and the
22	Constitution.?
23	COMMERCIAL OATH AND VERIFICATION:
24	County of Miami-Dade)
25) Commercial Oath and Verification
26	The State of Florida)
27	I, STEVEN MACARTHUR-BROOKS, under my unlimited liability and Commercial
28	Oath proceeding in good faith being of sound mind states that the facts contained

PLAINTIFFS (CONDITIONAL ACCEPTANCE TO DEFENDANTS MOTION TO COMPEL ARBITRATION AND STAY PROCEEDINGS, AND PLAINTIFFS DEMAND FOR CRIMINAL REFERRAL AND PROSECUTION OF DEFENDANTS, SANCTIONS, AND DEFAULT AND SIMMARRY JUDGMENT, AS AMATTER OF LAW, WITHOUT HEARIN

1	herein are true, correct, complete and not misleading to the best of Affiant's
2	knowledge and belief under penalty of International Commercial Law and state
3	this to be HIS Affidavit of Truth regarding same signed and sealed this <u>21ST</u> day of
4	IANUARY in the year of Our Lord two thousand and twenty five:
5	proceeding <i>sui juris</i> , In Propria Persona , by <i>Special Limited Appearance</i> , All rights reserved without prejudice or recourse, U.C.C. §§ 1-308, 3-402.
7	By: Ath Madut But
8	Steven MacArthur-Brooks , Attorney In Fact, Secured Party, Executor, national, private bank(er) EIN # 9x-xxxxxxx
9	//
10	COMMERCIAL OATH AND VERIFICATION:
11	County of Miami-Dade)
12) Commercial Oath and Verification
13	The State of Florida)
14	I, KEVIN WALKER, under my unlimited liability and Commercial Oath proceeding
15	in good faith being of sound mind states that the facts contained herein are true,
16	correct, complete and not misleading to the best of Affiant's knowledge and belief
17	under penalty of International Commercial Law and state this to be HIS Affidavit of
18	Truth regarding same signed and sealed this 21ST day of JANUARY in the year of
19	Our Lord two thousand and twenty five:
20	proceeding sui juris, In Propria Persona, by Special Limited Appearance, All rights reserved without prejudice or recourse, U.C.C. §§ 1-308, 3-402.
21	
22	By: Malker, Attorney In Fact, Secured Party,
23	Executor, national, private bank(er) EIN # 9x-xxxxxxx
24	
25	
26	Let this document stand as truth before the Almighty Supreme Creator and let it be
27	established before men according as the scriptures saith: "But if they will not listen,
28	take one or two others along, so that every matter may be established by the testimony of two

-32 of 41-

or three witnesses." Matthew 18:16. "In the mouth of two or three witnesses, shall every word be established" 2 Corinthians 13:1.

Sui juris, By Special Limited Appearance, All rights reserved without prejudice or recourse, U.C.C. §§ 1-308, 3-402.

By: Olivia Jones (WITNESS)

Sui juris, By *Special Limited* Appearance, All rights reserved without prejudice or recourse, U.C.C. §§ 1-308, 3-402.

By:

Brittany Cabral (WITNESS)

WORDS DEFINED GLOSSARY OF TERMS:

As used in this Affidavit, the following words and terms are as defined in this section, non-obstante:

- 1. Attorney: Strictly, one who is designated to transact business for another; a legal agent. Also termed attorney-in-fact; private attorney. 2. A person who practices law; LAWYER. Also termed (in sense 2) attorney-at-law; public attorney. A person who is appointed by another and has authority to act on behalf of another. *See also* POWER OF ATTORNEY. See, Black's Law Dictionary 8th Edition, pages 392-393, Oxford Dictionary or Law, 5th Edition, page 38, American Bar Association's website.
 - 2. Attorney-in-fact: A private attorney authorized by another to act in his place and stead, either for some particular purpose, as to do a particular act, or for the transaction of business in general, not of a legal character. This authority is conferred by an instrument in writing, called a "letter of attorney," or more commonly a "power of attorney." A person to whom the authority of another, who is called the constituent, is by him lawfully delegated. The term is employed to designate persons who are under special agency, or a special letter of attorney, so that they are appointed in

factum, for the deed, or special act to be performed; but in a more extended sense it includes all other agents employed in any business, or to do any act or acts in pais for another. Bacon, Abr. Attorney; Story, Ag. § 25. All persons who are capable of acting for themselves, and even those who are disqualified from acting in their own capacity, if they have sufficient understanding, as infants of proper age, and femes coverts, may act as attorney of other. The person named in a power of attorney to act on your behalf is commonly referred to as your "agent" or "attorney-infact." With a valid power of attorney, your agent can take any action permitted in the document. — See Bouvier's Law Dictionary, volumes 1,2, and 3, page 282, Blacks Law Dictionary 1, 2nd, 8th, pages 105, 103, and 392 respectively, and the American Bar Association's website on 'Power of Attorney' and 'Attorney-In-Fact'

financial institution: a person, an individual, a private banker, a business engaged in vehicle sales, including automobile, airplane, and boat sales, persons involved in real estate closings and settlements, the United States Postal Service, a commercial bank or trust company, any credit union, an agency of the United States Government or of a State or local government carrying out a duty or power of a business described in this paragraph, a broker or dealer in securities or commodities, a currency exchange, or a business engaged in the exchange of currency, funds, or value that substitutes for currency or funds, financial agency, a loan or finance company, an issuer, redeemer, or cashier of travelers' checks, checks, money orders, or similar instruments, an operator of a credit card system, an insurance company, a licensed sender of money or any other person who engages as a business in the transmission of currency, funds, or value that substitutes for currency, including any person who engages as a business in an informal money transfer system or any network of people who engage as a business in facilitating the transfer of

5 6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

institutions system. Ref. 31 U.S. Code § 5312 - Definitions and application. individual: As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a

money domestically or internationally outside of the conventional financial

- 4. group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons. As an adjective: Existing as an indivisible entity. Of or relating to a single person or thing, as opposed to a group. - See Black's Law Dictionary 4th, 7th, and 8th Edition pages 913, 777, and 2263 respectively.
- 5. person: Term may include artificial beings, as corporations. The term means an individual, corporation, business trust, estate, trust, partnership, limited liability company, association, joint venture, government, governmental subdivision, agency, or instrumentality, public corporation, or any other legal or commercial entity. The term "person" shall be construed to mean and include an individual, a trust, estate, partnership, association, company or corporation. The term "person" means a natural person or an organization. -Artificial persons. Such as are created and devised by law for the purposes of society and government, called "corporations" or bodies politic." -Natural persons. Such as are formed by nature, as distinguished from artificial persons, or corporations. -Private person. An individual who is not the incumbent of an office. Persons are divided by law into natural and artificial. Natural persons are such as the God of nature formed us; artificial are such as are created and devised by human laws, for the purposes of society and government, which are called "corporations" or "bodies politic." - See Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) § 1-201, Black's Law Dictionary 1st, 2nd, and 4th edition pages 892, 895, and 1299, respectively, 27 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 72.11 - Meaning of terms, and 26 United States Code (U.S. Code) § 7701 - Definitions.
- 6. bank: a person engaged in the business of banking and includes a savings bank, savings and loan association, credit union, and trust company. The terms "banks", "national bank", "national banking association", "member bank", "board", "district", and "reserve bank" shall

have the meanings assigned to them in section 221 of this title. An institution, of great value in the commercial world, empowered to receive deposits of money, to make loans. and to issue its promissory notes, (designed to circulate as money, and commonly called "bank-notes" or "bank-bills") or to perform any one or more of these functions. The term "bank" is usually restricted in its application to an incorporated body; while a **private individual** making it his business to conduct banking operations is denominated a "banker." Banks in a commercial sense are of three kinds, to wit; (1) Of deposit; (2) of discount; (3) of circulation. Strictly speaking, the term "bank" implies a place for the deposit of money, as that is the most obvious purpose of such an institution. — See, UCC 1-201, 4-105, 12 U.S. Code § 221a, Black's Law Dictionary 1st, 2nd, 4th, 7th, and 8th, pages 117-118, 116-117, 183-184, 139-140, and 437-439.

- 7. **discharge:** To cancel or unloose the obligation of a contract; to make an agreement or contract null and inoperative. Its principal species are rescission, release, accord and satisfaction, performance, judgement, composition, bankruptcy, merger. As applied to demands claims, right of action, incumbrances, etc., to discharge the debt or claim is to extinguish it, to annul its obligatory force, to satisfy it. And here also the term is generic; thus a dent, a mortgage. As a noun, the word means the act or instrument by which the binding force of a contract is terminated, irrespective of whether the contract is carried out to the full extent contemplated (in which case the discharge is the result of performance) or is broken off before complete execution. See, Blacks Law Dictionary 1st, page.
- 8. **pay:** To discharge a debt; to deliver to a creditor the value of a debt, either in money or in goods, for his acceptance. To pay is to deliver to a creditor the value of a debt, either in money or In goods, for his acceptance, by which the debt is discharged. See Blacks Law Dictionary 1st, 2nd, and 3rd edition, pages 880, 883, and 1339 respectively.
- 9. payment: The performance of a duty, promise, or obligation, or discharge of a debt or liability. by the delivery of money or other value. Also the money or thing so delivered. Performance of an obligation by the delivery of money or some other valuable thing accepted in partial or full discharge of the obligation. [Cases: Payment 1. C.J.S. Payment § 2.] 2. The money or other valuable thing so delivered in satisfaction

of an obligation. See Blacks Law Dictionary 1st and 8th edition, pages 880-811 and

3576-3577, respectively.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

10. may: An auxiliary verb qualifying the meaning of another verb by expressing ability, competency, liberty, permission, probability or contingency. - Regardless of the instrument, however, whether constitution, statute, deed, contract or whatnot, courts not infrequently

construe "may" as "shall" or "must". – See Black's :aw Dictionary, 4th Edition page 1131.

- extortion: The term "extortion" means the obtaining of property from another, with his consent, induced by wrongful use of actual or threatened force, violence, or fear, or under color of official right. - See 18 U.S. Code § 1951 - Interference with commerce by threats or violence.
- 12. national: "foreign government", "foreign official", "internationally protected person", "international organization", "national of the United States", "official guest," and/or "noncitizen national." They all have the same meaning. See Title 18 U.S. Code § 112 - Protection of foreign officials, official guests, and internationally protected persons.
- 13. **United States:** For the purposes of this Affidavit, the terms "United States" and "U.S." mean only the Federal Legislative Democracy of the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and any other Territory within the "United States," which entity has its origin and jurisdiction from Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17-18 and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution for the United States of America. The terms "United States" and "U.S." are NOT to be construed to mean or include the sovereign, united 50 states of America.
- 14. **fraud:** deceitful practice or Willful device, resorted to with intent to deprive another of his right, or in some manner to do him an injury. As distinguished from negligence, it is always positive, intentional. as applied to contracts is the cause of an error bearing on material part of the contract, created or continued by artifice, with design to obtain some unjust advantage to the one party, or to cause an inconvenience or loss to the other. in the sense of court of equity, properly includes all acts, omissions, and concealments which involved a breach of legal or equitable duty, trust, or confidence justly reposed, and are injurious to another, or by which an undue and

unconscientious advantage is taken of another. See Black's Law Dictionary, 1st and 1 2 2nd Edition, pages 521-522 and 517 respectively. 3 15. color: appearance, semblance. or simulacrum, as distinguished from that which is real. A 4 prima facie or apparent right. Hence, a deceptive appearance; a plausible, assumed exterior, 5 concealing a lack of reality; a a disguise or pretext. See, Black's Law Dictionary 1st Edition, page 222. 7 16. **colorable:** That which is in appearance only, and not in reality, what it purports to be. See, 8 Black's Law Dictionary 1st Edition, page 2223 9 **LIST OF EXHIBITS / EVIDENCE:** 10 **Supporting Evidence:** 11 Exhibits "A" through "P," which include the unrebutted commercial affidavits and 12 13 related documentation establishing Defendants' tacit agreement and the undisputed merit and validity of Plaintiffs' claims. 14 1.Exhibit A: UCC1 filing #2024400157-3. 15 16 2. Exhibit B: UCC3 filing #2024405802-2. 3. Exhibit C: UCC3 filing #2024403283-5. 17 18 4. Exhibit D: Affidavit: Power of Attorney in Fact. 19 5. Exhibit E: Contract Security Agreement #RF204463888US 6. Exhibit F: Contract Security Agreement #9589071052701733216000. 21 7. Exhibit G: Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit F 22 8. Exhibit H: Contract Security Agreement #9589071052701733216123. 23 9. **Exhibit I**: Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit H 24 10.**Exhibit J**: Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit E. 25 11. **Exhibit K**: BILL OF EXCHANGE, Certified # 9589071052701733216000. 26 12. Exhibit L: Private Post Registered (with U.S. Treasury) \$200,000,000,000.00 USD 27 'MASTER DISCHARGE AND INDEMNITY BOND,' #RF372320890US.

-38 of 41-

13. **Exhibit M:** 2024 form 1099-OID, for \$24,000.00.

1	14. Exhibit N: 2024 form 1099-A, for \$24,000.00
2	15. Exhibit O: national/non-citizen national/internationally protected person PASSPORT
3	BOOK #A45202697.
4	16. Exhibit P: national/non-citizen national/internationally protected person PASSPORT
5	CARD #C34494678.
6	17. Exhibit Q: Copy of 4 ATTORNEY & CLIENT 7 C.J.S. and 2-3 ATTORNEY & CLIENT 7
7	C.J.S.
8	18. Exhibit R: Library of Congress Certified Copy of <i>The Public Statutes at Large of the</i>
9	United States of America from March 1933 to June 1934: House Joint Resolution 192 of
10	June 5, 1933, Public Law 73-10
11	19. Exhibit S: Signed copy of the 'Affidavit" in support of Plaintiffs, by professional
12	Witnesses and former Federal Reserve Attorney, WALKER TODD.
13	//
14	PROOF OF SERVICE
15	STATE OF FLORIDA)
16) ss.
17	COUNTY OF MIAMI-DADE)
18	I competent, over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within
19	action. My mailing address is the Koda's World, 15476 North West 77th Court,
20	suite #613, Miami Lakes, California [33018]. On January 22, 2025, I served the
21	within documents:
22	1. PLAINTIFFS' CONDITIONAL ACCEPTANCE TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION
23	TO COMPEL ARBITRATION AND STAY PROCEEDINGS, AND
24	PLAINTIFFS' DEMAND FOR CRIMINAL REFERRAL AND PROSECUTION
25	OF DEFENDANTS, SANCTIONS, AND DEFAULT AND SUMMARY
26	JUDGMENT, AS <u>A MATTER OF LAW</u> , WITHOUT HEARING.
27	2. Exhibits Q through S
28	By Electronic Service on January 21, 2025. Based on a court order or an
	20 of 41

1	agreement of the parties to accept service by electronic transmission, I caused the
2	documents to be sent to the persons at the electronic notification addresses listed
3456	below. Michael D. Starks C/o ANDREW KEMP-GERSTEL and LIEBLER, GONZALEZ, PORTUONDO. 44 West Flagler Street Miami Florida, [33130] mds2@lgplaw.com sck@lgplaw.com
7 8	service@lgplaw.com akg@lgplaw.com mkv@lgplaw.com
9 .0 .11	Shannon: Peterson, Alejandro: Moreno C/o SheppardMullin 12275 El Camino Real, Suite 100 San Diego, California [92130-4092] spetersen@sheppardmullin.com amoreno@sheppardmullin.com
.3	Teresa H. Campbell, Shirley Jackson, Sheryl Flaugher SAN DEIGO COUNTY CREDIT UNION 6545 Sequence Drive San Diego, California [92121] sflaugher@sdccu.com
.5 .6	Edwyn: Martinez C/o SOUTH FLORIDA AUTO RECOVERY CORP PO BOX 226185 Miami, Florida [33222] sfar@southfloridaautorecovery.com
8	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Florida that
9	the above is true and correct. Executed on January 22, 2025 at Miami Lakes,
20	Florida.
21	<u>/s/Brittany Cabral/</u> Brittany Cabral
22	//
23	//
24	//
25	NOTICE:
26	Using a notary on this document does <i>not</i> constitute any adhesion, <i>nor does it alter</i>
27	<i>my status in any manner.</i> The purpose for notary is verification and identification
28	only and not for entrance into any foreign jurisdiction.
	-40 of 41-

Registered Mail #RE050093362US — Dated: January 22, 2025

1	ANKNOWLEDGEMENT:
2	State of Florida)
3) ss.
4	County of Miami-Dade)
5	On this <u>22nd</u> day of <u>January</u> , <u>2025</u> , before me, <u>()</u> ULT <u>SOMOS</u> , a
6	Notary Public, personally appeared Steven MacArthur-Brooks, who proved to me
7	on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are
8	subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they
9	executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/
0	their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of
11	which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.
2	
3	I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of Florida that
4	the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.
5	*
6	WITNESS my hand and official seal.
7	QUETI BANOS Notary Public - State of Florida
8	Signature (Seal) Commission # HH 150933 My Comm. Expires Jul 8, 2025 Bonged through National Notary Assn.
9	
20	
1	
22	
23	
24	
25	
6	
7	
8	

PLANTIFFS CONSIDERAL ACCEPTANCE TO DEFENDANTS MOTIFOR TO COMPEL ABBITICATION AND STAN PREVEDENCE AND PLANTIFFS DEMAND FOR CUBBINAL REFERRAL AND PROSPECTION OF DEFENDANTS, SANCTIONS, AND DEFAULT AND SEMBARY RESONANTS AN ARTERIZABLE OF LAW, HITHER THAT AREASON.

- Exhibit Q-

§ 4 ATTORNEY & CLIENT

7 C. J. S.

His first duty is to the courts and the public, not to the client, 55 and wherever the duties to his client conflict with those he owes as an officer of the court in the administration of justice, the former must yield to the latter, 56

The office of attorney is indispensable to the administration of justice and is intimate and

peculiar in its relation to, and vital to the wellbeing of, the court.⁵⁷ An attorney has a duty to aid the court in seeing that actions and proceedings in which he is engaged as counsel are conducted in a dignified and orderly manner, free from passion and personal animosities, and that all causes brought to an issue are tried and decided on their merits only;⁵⁸ to aid the court

§§ 2-3 ATTORNEY & CLIENT

7 C. J. S.

and the term is synonymous with "attorney." ¹⁴ Therefore, anyone advertising himself as a lawyer holds himself out to be an attorney, an attorney at law, or counselor at law. ¹⁵

If one appears before any court in the interest of another and moves the court to action with respect to any matter before it of a legal nature, such person appears as an "advocate", as that term is generally understood. The phrase "as an advocate in a representative capacity," as used in the statute regulating the practice of law, implies a representation distinct from officer or other regular administrative corporate employee representation. 17

In England and her colonies a "barrister" is a person entitled to practice as an advocate or counsel in the superior courts. A "solicitor" is a person whose business it is to be employed in the care and management of suits depending in courts of chancery. In the great majority of the states of the Union, where law and equity are both administered by the same court, it has naturally come about that the two offices of attorney at law and solicitor in chancery have practically been consolidated, although in the federal equity practice the term "solicitor" is in

general use; but in some states the office of solicitor in chancery is a distinct and separate office from that of attorney at law.²⁰

A client is one who applies to a lawyer or counselor for advice and direction in a question of law, or commits his cause to his management in prosecuting a claim or defending against a suit in a court of justice;²¹ one who retains the attorney, is responsible to him for his fees, and to whom the attorney is responsible for the management of the suit;²² one who communicates facts to an attorney expecting professional advice.²³ Clients are also called "wards of the court" in regard to their relationship with their attorneys.²⁴

wand of court

§ 3. Nature of Right to Practice

While it has been broadly stated that the right to practice law is not a natural or constitutional right, but is in the nature of a privilege or franchise, the practice of law is not a matter of grace but of right for one who is qualified by his learning and moral character.

Library References

Attorney and Client @14.

The right to practice law is not a natural or constitutional right.²⁵ Nor is the right to practice

Wards of court. Infants and persons of unsound mind placed by the court under the care of a guardian. Davis' Committee v. Loney, 290 Ky. 644, 162 S.W.2d 189, 190. Their rights must be guarded jealously. Montgomery v. Erie R. Co., C.C.A.N.J., 97 F.2d 289, 292. See Guardianship.

- Exhibit R-



Office of Business Enterprises Duplication Services Section

THIS IS TO CERTIFY that the collections of the Library of Congress contain a publication entitled THE PUBLIC STATUTES AT LARGE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA from March 1933 to June 1934, and that the attached photocopies from Volume XLVIII – the title page, the publisher's page, and pages 112 to 112 on which appears the JOINT RESOLUTION *To assure uniform value to the coins and curthe United States*, June 5, 1933 – are a true representation from that work.

THIS IS TO CERTIFY FURTHER, that the publisher's page and d with a Library of Congress Order Division stamp that bears the date Jan 28 1991.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the seal of the Library of Congress i ixed hereto on October 1, 2014.

Gregory 7. Cooper

Duplication Services, Section Head Office of Business Enterprises Library of Congress

STATUTES AT LARGE

OF THE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

FROM

MARCH 1933 to JUNE 1934

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

RECENT TREATIES AND CONVENTIONS, EXECUTIVE PROCLAMATIONS

AND AGREEMENTS, TWENTY-FIRST AMENDMENT

TO THE CONSTITUTION

EDITED, PRINTED, AND PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY OF CONGRESS UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

VOL. XLVIII

IN TWO PARTS

PART 1-Public Acts and Resolutions.

Part 2—Private Acts and Resolutions, Concurrent Resolutions
Treaties and Conventions, Executive Proclamations
and Agreements, Twenty-first Amendment to the
Constitution.

PART 1

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON: 1934



KF50 .U5 vol 48, pt 1 Set 2 LLRR

The original of every act and joint resolution printed in this volume from page 1 to page 311, inclusive, has the following heading:

SEVENTY-THIRD CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA;

AT THE FIRST SESSION,

Begun and held at the city of Washington on Thursday, the ninth day of March, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-three

The original of every act and joint resolution printed in this volume from page 313 to page 1291, inclusive, has the following heading:

SEVENTY-THIRD CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA;

AT THE SECOND SESSION,

BEGUN AND HELD AT THE CITY OF WASHINGTON ON WEDNESDAY, THE THIRD DAY OF JANUARY, ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FOUR

All bills and joint resolutions presented to the President of the United States bear the signatures of the Speaker (or of the Speaker pro tempore) of the House of Representatives and of the Vice President and President of the Senate (or of the President of the Senate pro tempore); those signatures accordingly appear on the originals of all acts and joint

The signature of the President of the United States appears on the originals of all approved acts and joint resolutions.

The original of every act and joint resolution has endorsed thereon a certificate of origin, signed, as the case may be, by the Clerk of the House of Representatives or by the Secretary of the Senate and reading "I certify that this Act (or Joint Resolution) originated in the House of Representatives (or Senate)." The origin of each act and resolution contained in this volume is indicated in the margin at the beginning of each enactment; thus, for example, H.R. 1491 or H.J.Res. 75 indicates origin in the House of Representatives; and S. 598 or S.J.Res. 14 indicates origin in the Senate.



This volume is printed on acid free paper by WILLIAM S. HEIN & CO., INC.

[CHAPTER 46.]

AN ACT

June 3, 1933. [H.R. 4494.] [Public, No. 29]

Authorizing a per capita payment of \$100 to the members of the Menominee Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin from funds on deposit to their credit in the Treasury of the United States.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Menominee Indians United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secreof Wisconsin.

Per capita payments tary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to withdraw to, from tribal funds.

from the fund in the Treasury of the United States on deposit to the credit of the Menominee Indians in the State of Wisconsin a sufficient sum to make therefrom a per capita payment or distribution of \$100, in three installments, \$50 immediately upon passage of this Act, \$25 on or about October 15, 1933, and \$25 on or about January 15, 1934, to each of the living members on the tribal roll of the Menominee Tribe of Indians of the State of Wisconsin, under such rules and regulations as the said Secretary may prescribe.

Approved, June 3, 1933.

[CHAPTER 47.]

JOINT RESOLUTION

June 5, 1933. [S.J.Res. 48.]

Authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point, Posheng Yen, a citizen of China.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United

Posheng Yen, a citi States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of War Posheng 1en, a curpressor.

Admitted to be, and he is hereby, authorized to permit Posheng Yen to receive
tary Academy.

Profess.

No Federal expense.

Conditions.

To expense shall be caused to the United States thereby, and that no expense shall be caused to the United States thereby, and that Posheng Yen shall agree to comply with all regulations for the police and discipline of the Academy, to be studious, and to give his utmost efforts to accomplish the courses in the various departments of instruction, and that said Posheng Yen shall not be admitted to the Academy until he shall have passed the mental and physical examinations prescribed for candidates from the United States, and that he shall be immediately withdrawn if deficient in studies or in Osth and service, conduct and so recommended by the Academic Board: Provided R8, secs. 1320. 1321, further, That in the case of said Posheng Yen the provisions of sections 1320 and 1321 of the Revised Statutes shall be suspended: Existing lawrepealed. Provided further, That S.J.Res. 179, approved March 3, 1933, be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

Approved, June 5, 1933.

[CHAPTER 48.]

JOINT RESOLUTION

June 5, 1933. [H.J.Res. 192.] [Pub. Res., No. 10]

To assure uniform value to the coins and currencies of the United States.

Uniform value of coins and currencies.
Preamble.

Whereas the holding of or dealing in gold affect the public interest, and are therefore subject to proper regulation and restriction; and Whereas the existing emergency has disclosed that provisions of obligations which purport to give the obliged a right to require payment in gold or a particular kind of coin or currency of the United States, or in an amount in money of the United States measured thereby, obstruct the power of the Congress to regulate the value of the money of the United States, and are inconsistent with the declared policy of the Congress to maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar, coined or issued by the United States, in the markets and in the payment of debts. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Clauses in obliga-United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) every etc., payments declared provision contained in or made with respect to any obligation which purports to give the obligee a right to require payment in gold or a particular kind of coin or currency, or in an amount in money of the United States measured thereby, is declared to be against public to be so expressed.

No future obligation policy; and no such provision shall be contained in or made with respect to any obligation hereafter incurred. Every obligation, heretofore or hereafter incurred, whether or not any such provision is contained therein or made with respect thereto, shall be discharged upon payment, dollar for dollar, in any coin or currency which at Any such provision contained in any law authorizing obligations to be issued by or under authority of the United States, is hereby invalidated. Conflicting provisions not invalidate any other provision or authority contained in such law.

any other provision or authority contained in such law.

(b) As used in this resolution, the term "obligation" means an obligation (including every obligation of and to the United States, obligation (including every obligation of and to the United States, excepting currency) payable in money of the United States; and the term "coin or currency" means coin or currency of the United States, including Federal Reserve notes and circulating notes of Federal Reserve banks and national banking associations.

SEC. 2. The last sentence of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of section 43 of the Act entitled "An Act to relieve the existing national mergancy by increasing agricultural purchasing power, Ante, p. 62.

economic emergency by increasing agricultural purchasing power, economic emergency by increasing agricultural purchasing power, to raise revenue for extraordinary expenses incurred by reason of such emergency, to provide emergency relief with respect to agricultural indebtedness, to provide for the orderly liquidation of joint-stock land banks, and for other purposes", approved May 12, 1933, is amended to read as follows:

"All coins and currencies of the United States (including Federal Reserve notes and circulating notes of Federal Reserve banks and national banking associations) heretofore or hereafter coined and national banking associations) neretolore or nerealter coined or issued, shall be legal tender for all debts, public and private, public charges, taxes, duties, and dues, except that gold coins, when below the standard weight and limit of tolerance provided by law for the single piece, shall be legal tender only at valuation in proportion to their actual weight."

Approved, June 5, 1933, 4.40 p.m.

[CHAPTER 49.]

AN ACT

To provide for the establishment of a national employment system and for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such system, and for other

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) in order employment service. to promote the establishment and maintenance of a national system of public employment offices there is hereby created in the Department of Labor a bureau to be known as the United States Employ- Labor. ment Service, at the head of which shall be a director. The director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive a salary at the rate of \$8,500 per annum.

(b) Upon the expiration of three months after the enactment of be abolished; personthis Act the employment service now existing in the Department per and property transferred. (including office equipment) of the existing employment service

Payments to be made in legal tender.

June 6, 1933. [8. 510:] [Public, No. 30.]

United States Em-loyment Service creat-

83637 -- 34-