COURT
EASTERN DIVISION
AND MISREPRESENTATION H OF CONTRACT EMBEZZLEMENT, AND ULENT MISAPPLICATION OF AND ASSETS , FORGERY, AND UNAUTHORIZED TIDENTITY POLIZATION OF TRADE AND ERCE, AND UNFAIR BUSINESS ICES ATION OF RIGHTS UNDER OF LAW VING EXTORTION PROCEEDS PRETENSES AND FRAUD TS AND EXTORTION TEERING FRAUD ULENT TRANSPORTATION AND FER OF STOLEN GOODS AND ITIES RE PPING D PEONAGE VFUL INTERFERENCE, DATION, EXTORTION, AND ONAL DISTRESS RATORY JUDGEMENT & RELIEF ID FOR SUMMARY JUDGEMENT ATTER OF LAW - CONSIDERED,

28 Party in Interest"), who is proceeding *sui juris*, *In Propria Persona*, and by *Special* 

Limited Appearance (NOT generally). Kevin is natural freeborn sovereign and state <u>Citizen</u> of California **the republic** in its **De'jure** capacity as one of the several <u>s</u>tates of the Union 1789. This incidentally makes him a non-citizen national/national 3 American Citizen of the republic as per the De'Jure Constitution for the United States 1777/1789. 5 Plaintiff, appearing by Special Limited Appearance, sui juris, and In Propria *Persona*, asserts his *unalienable* right to <u>contract</u>, 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**. 10 This clause unequivocally prohibits states from impairing the obligation of contracts, including but not limited to, a trust and contract agreement as an 12 13 'Attorney-In-Fact,' and any private contract existing between Plaintiff and Defendants. A copy of the 'Affidavit: Power of Attorney In Fact,' is attached hereto 14 as **Exhibits A** and incorporated herein by reference. 15 Plaintiff further invokes his inherent unalienable rights under the Constitution and the **common law** – rights that **predate** the formation of the tatse and remain 17 safeguarded by due process of law. 18 **Constitutional Basis:** 19 Plaintiff asserts that their private rights are secured and protected under the 20 Constitution, common law, and exclusive equity, which govern their ability to 21 freely contract and protect their property and interests.. 22

Plaintiff respectfully asserts and affirms:

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 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:**

3

4

7

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

> 18 19

20

22

23 24

25

28

26

27

Plaintiff respectfully asserts and affirms that:

The Supremacy Clause of the Constitution of the United States (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.

**Plaintiff** sues Defendant(s) and assert as **established**, *considered*, *agreed* and admitted by Defendants:

- 1. Plaintiff, Kevin Walker, proceeding, sui juris, In Propria Person, by Special Limited Appearance, is undisputedly the holder in due course' of <u>all</u> assets, intangible and tangible, hold allodial title to all assets, in accordance with UCC § 3-302, and security interest and title has been perfected.
- 2. Plaintiff is foreign to the 'United States', which is a federal corporation, as evidenced by 28 U.S. Code § 3002.
  - **3.** Plaintiff is **undisputedly** the Creditor.
- **4.** Plaintiff has explicitly reserved <u>all</u> of his inherent unalienable rights, also in accordance with U.C.C. § 1-308, and have waives none.

1	<b>5.</b> Plaintiff alone <u>undisputedly</u> has exclusive, sole, and <b>complete standing.</b>
2	<u>Defendants</u>
3	6. Defendant(s), Chad Bianco, Steven Arthur Sherman,
4	Gregory D Eastwood, Robert C V Bowman, George Reyes, William Pratt, Robert Gell,
5	Nicholas Gruwell, Joseph Sinz, Michael Hestrin, Miranda Thomson, RIVERSIDE
6	COUNTY SHERIFF, THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, MENIFEE
7	JUSTICE CENTER, FERGUSON PRAET & SHERMAN A PROFESSIONAL
8	CORPORATION, Does 1-100 Inclusive, Does 1-100 Inclusive, according to Law and Statute,
9	are each a 'person,' and/or 'trust' and/or 'individual,' and/or 'bank' as defined by 26
10	U.S. Code § 7701(a)(1), U.C.C. §§ 1-201 and 4-105, 26 U.S. Code § 581, and 12 U.S. Code §
11	221a, and/or a 'financial institution,' as defined by 18 U.S. Code § 20 - Financial institution
12	defined, and Defendants are engaged in interstate commerce, and/or doing business in
13	Riverside, California.
14	7. Defendants are <b>undisputedly</b> the <u><b>DEBTORS</b></u> in this matter.
15	<b>8.</b> Defendants are <b>undisputedly NOT</b> the CREDITOR(S), or an ASSIGNEE(S) of
16	the CREDITOR(S), in this matter.
17	<b>9.</b> Defendants do <u>NOT</u> have power of attorney in any way.
18	<b>10.</b> Defendants do <u><b>NOT</b></u> have <u><b>any</b></u> standing.
19	11. Defendants are <u>presumed</u> to be in <u>dishonor</u> , in accordance with U.C.C. §
20	3-505, as evidenced by the attached 'Affidavit Certificate of Dishonor, Non-
21	response, <b>DEFAULT</b> , JUDGEMENT, and <b>LIEN AUTHORIZATION</b> '. A copy is
22	attached hereto as <b>Exhibit H</b> and incorporated herein by reference.
23	<u>Unknown Defendants (Does 1-100)</u>
24	12. Plaintiff does not know the true names of <b>Defendants Does 1 through 100</b> ,
25	inclusive, and therefore sues them by those fictitious names. Their true names and
26	capacities are unknown to Plaintiff. When their true names and capacities are ascertained,
27	Plaintiff will amend this complaint by inserting their true names and capacities herein.

Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of these unknown and

4

5

10

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

26

27

28

fictitiously named Defendant(s) claim some right, title, estate, lien, or interest in the hereinafter-described real property adverse to Plaintiff's title, and that their claims, and each of them, constitute a cloud on Plaintiff's title to that real property.

### **Description of Affected Private Trust Property:**

13. This action affects title to the private Trust property (herein referred to as "private property" and/or "subject property"), a Lamborghini Urus, VIN #ZPBUA1ZL9KLA02762, including all ownership, title, interest, and authority over said private property, as well as all bonds, securities, Federal Reserve Notes, assets, both tangible and intangible, registered and unregistered, and all assets held in trust, as more particularly described in the authentic UCC1 filing and NOTICE #2024385925-4 and UCC3 filing and NOTICE #2024402990-2, all filed in the Office of the Secretary of State, State of Nevada, and attached hereto as Exhibits C and D, respectively, and incorporated herein by reference.

14. This action also affected any titles, investments, interests, principal amounts, credits, funds, assets, bonds, Federal Reserve Notes, notes, bills of exchange, entitlements, negotiable instruments, or similar collateralized, hypothecated, and/ or securitized items in any manner tied to Plaintiff's signature, promise to pay, order to pay, endorsement, credits, authorization, or comparable actions (collectively referred to hereinafter as "Assets").

## **Standing:**

15. Plaintiff is **undisputedly** the Real Party in Interest, holder in due course, Creditor(s), and hold allodial tittle to any and all assets, registered or unregistered, tangible or intangible, in accordance with contract law, principles, common law, exlcusive equity, the right to equitable subrogation, and the UCC (Uniform Commercial Code). This is further evidenced by the following UCC filings, all duly filed in the Office of the Secretary of State, State of Nevada: UCC1 filing NOTICE #2024385925-4 and UCC3 filing and NOTICE #2024402990-2 (Exhibits C and D), and in accordance with UCC §§ 3-302, 9-105, and 9-509.

16. While this action arises out of private trust contracts and fiduciary injuries,

the sole Plaintiff is Kevin Walker, sui juris, individually and not as trustee or agent

17. Although this matter involves **trust property** and **contractual claims** related to **private trust arrangements**, this action is brought solely by Kevin Walker, proceeding *sui juris*, *In Propria Persona*, as the **Real Party in Interest** and Secured

Party Creditor. No party other than Kevin Walker is named as plaintiff herein.

- 18.Plaintiff maintains **exclusive and sole standing** in relation to said assets and their interests, as duly recorded and affirmed by these filing.
  - 19. Plaintiff (not Defendants) possesses exclusive equity.
  - 20. Defendants do **NOT** have **any** valid interest or standing.
- 21. Defendants do <u>NOT</u> have a valid claim to Plaintiff's 'private property', or 'subject property', or any of the respective 'Assets', registered *and* unregistered, tangible *and* intangible.

## **Unrebutted Facts and Presumptions Established**

- 22. You, as the Defendant(s) and/or Respondent(s), individually and collectively, are deemed to have accepted and agreed to the following established facts, all of which remain unrebutted and stand as truth in commerce, law, and equity:
  - 1. I, Kevin, proceeding sui juris, reserve my natural common law right not to be compelled to perform under any contract that I did not enter into knowingly, voluntarily, and intentionally, and with complete and full disclosure, and without misrepresentation, duress, or coercion. And furthermore, I do not accept the liability associated with the compelled and pretended "benefit" of any hidden or unrevealed contract or commercial agreement. As such, the hidden or unrevealed contracts that supposedly create obligations to perform, for persons of subject status, are inapplicable to me, and are null and void. If I have participated in any of the supposed

"benefits" associated with these hidden contracts, I have done so under

"benefits" but I have not accepted them in a manner that binds me to anything.
I, Kevin, proceeding sui juris, by Special Limited Appearance, hereby declare and affirm that, consistent with the eternal tradition of natural common law

duress, for lack of any other practical alternative. I may have received such

- and affirm that, consistent with the eternal tradition of natural common law, unless I have harmed or violated someone or their property, I have committed no crime; and I am therefore not subject to any penalty. I act in accordance with the following U.S. Supreme Court case: "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 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 at 47 (1905).
- 3. I, Kevin, proceeding sui juris, by Special Limited Appearance, herby assert, affirm, state, and verify for the record that the 'commercial' and 'for hire' Driver's License/Contract/Bond # B6735991 has been canceled, revoked, terminated, and liquidated, as evidenced by instructions and notice accepted by Steven Gordon, with the California Department of Motor Vehicles," as evidenced by AFFIDAVIT RIGHT TO TRAVEL CANCELLATION, TERMINATION, AND REVOCATION of COMMERCIAL "For Hire" DRIVER'S LICENSE CONTRACT and AGREEMENT LICENSE/BOND

#B6735991 (#RF661447751US), attached hereto as **Exhibit D** and incorporated herein by reference.

- 4. I, **Kevin: Walker**, *sui juris*, am **not** a "person" when such term is defined in statutes of the United States or statutes of the several states when such definition includes artificial entities. **I refuse to be treated as** a federally or state created entity which is only capable of exercising certain rights, privileges, or immunities as specifically granted by federal or state governments.
- 5. I voluntarily choose to comply with the man-made laws which serve to bring harmony to society, but no such laws, nor their enforcers, have any authority over me. I am not in any jurisdiction, for I am not of subject status.
- 6. Consistent with the **eternal tradition of natural common law**, unless I have harmed or violated someone or their property, I have committed no crime; and am therefore not subject to any penalty.
- 7. I, Kevin, *sui juris*, *proceeding sui juris*, hereby declare and re-affirm that, no valid contract exists compelling my performance by Defendants.
- 8. I, Kevin, *sui juris*, reserve my natural common law right not to be compelled to perform under any contract that I did not enter into knowingly, voluntarily, and intentionally. And furthermore, I do not accept the liability associated with the compelled and pretended "benefit" of any hidden or unrevealed contract or commercial agreement.
- 9. As such, any **hidden** or **unrevealed** contracts that supposedly create obligations to perform, for persons of subject status, are inapplicable to me, and are null and void. If I have participated in any of the supposed "benefits" associated with these hidden contracts, I have done so under **duress** and/or for lack of any other practical alternative. I may have received such "benefits" but I have not accepted them in a manner that binds me to anything.

- 10. Any such participation does not constitute "acceptance" in contract law, because of the absence of <u>full disclosure</u> of any valid "OFFER," and voluntary consent *without* misrepresentation or coercion, under contract law. Without a valid voluntary 'offer and acceptance', knowingly entered into by both parties, there is no "meeting of the minds," and therefore no valid contract. Any supposed "contract" is therefore void, *ab initio*
- 11. I, Kevin, *proceeding sui juris*, **state for the record**, that it is a long-standing legal principle that jurisdiction must be proven on the record and cannot be assumed.
- 12. I, Kevin, *proceeding sui juris*, hereby declare and affirm that, I do no consent to any of the **retaliatory** and **fraudulent** proceedings being conducts by Defendants, including but not limited to, the fraudulent Trust action/CASE NO.: SWM2303376.
- 13. I, Kevin, *proceeding sui juris*, affirm that, I have NOT injured any man or woman nor have I damaged any property.

## **Revocation** of 'Power of Attorney':

- 14. Furthermore, I, Kevin, proceeding sui juris, by Special Limited Appearance, hereby revoke, rescind, and make void ab initio, all powers of attorney, in fact or otherwise, implied in law or otherwise, signed either by me or anyone else, as it pertains to the Social Security Number assigned to, WALKER, KEVIN LEWIS, as it pertains to any BIRTH CERTIFICATE/BANK NOTE, BOND, TRUST, DEPOSIT ACCOUNT, SECURITY, SECURITY ACCOUNT, INVESTMENT, marriage or business licenses, or any other licenses or certificates issued by any and all government or quasi-governmental entities, due to the use of various elements of fraud by said agencies to attempt to deprive me of my Sovereignty and/or property.
- 15. I, Kevin, *proceeding sui juris*, by *Special Limited Appearance*, hereby waive, cancel, repudiate, and refuse to knowingly accept any alleged "benefit" or

gratuity associated with any of the aforementioned licenses, numbers, or certificates. I do hereby revoke and rescind all powers of attorney, in fact or otherwise, signed by me or otherwise, implied in law or otherwise, with or without my consent or knowledge, as it pertains to any and all property, real or personal, corporeal or incorporeal, obtained in the past, present, or future. I am the sole and absolute legal owner and possess *allodial* title to any and all such property.

16. I, Kevin, *proceeding sui juris*, by *Special Limited Appearance*, also revoke, cancel, and make **void** *ab initio* all powers of attorney, in fact, in **presumption**, **or otherwise**, signed either by me or **anyone** else, claiming to act on my behalf, with or without my consent, as such power of attorney pertains to me or any property owned by me, by, but not limited to, any and all quasi/colorable, public, governmental entities or corporations on the grounds of constructive fraud, concealment, and nondisclosure of pertinent facts.

## **Claim of Entire ESTATE:**

- 17. I, Kevin, *proceeding sui juris*, by *Special Limited Appearance*, having attained the age of majority and reason under divine law competent first-hand witness to the truth and facts recited herein, hereby makes a claim against the corpus, all property whether real or personal, *tangible or intangible*, *all deposit accounts* blocked by reason of presumption of death of Claimant, cash, credit lines, Credit default swap, all federal funds, collateralized debt obligation, options, derivates, and futures received by the said court in the said county, state and federal for the administration of the named estate, and all estates in agency, including but not limited to KEVIN LEWIS WALKER, or by whatsoever name the said ESTATE shall be called or *charged*.
- 18.ACTUAL CONSTRUCTIVE NOTIVE HAS BEEN GIVEN *and* THIS IS AGAIN ACTUAL AND CONSTRUCTIVE NOTICE BY SPECIAL

DEPOSIT FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE SECURED PARTY/GRANTEE BENEFICIARY/CLAIMANT IN THIS TRUST ACTION FOR THE CLAIMANT'S CLAIM: Notice of absolute claim of all investment, commodity and trust deposit account contract with attached collateral and proceeds to secure collateral, along with claim of TRADENAME/TRADEMARK, COPYRIGHT/PATENT of the Name KEVIN LEWIS WALKER, my mind, body, soul of infants, spirit, and Live Borne Record, and reject and rebuke all assumptions and presumptions of being Property of any Cestui Que Vie Trust/ESTATE as mentioned under CANON 2055-2056, and assignment of all debt obligations to the Office of Secretary of the Treasury. Discharge all tax matters in accordance with but not limited to, U.C.C. 1-103, 2-202, 2-204, 2-206, 3-104, 3-311, 3-601, 3-603, 9-104, 9-105, 9-150, 9-509, and House Joint Resolution 192 of June 5 1933, public law 73-10, and 31 U.S.C. §§ 3123, 5118, and 18 U.S.C. 8.

- 19. Defendants, are undisputedly the  $\underline{DEBTORS}$  in this matter.
- 20. Defendants are **undisputedly NOT** the CREDITOR(S), or an ASSIGNEE(S) of the CREDITOR(S), in this matter.
- 21. Defendants do  $\underline{NOT}$  have power of attorney in any way.
- 22. Defendants do  $\underline{NOT}$  have  $\underline{any}$  standing
- 23. The actions of Defendant undermine the fundamental **principles** of fairness and justice enshrined in the Constitution, denying Plaintiffs and/or Affiant the opportunity to be heard and to defend against the allegations. These due process violations not only infringe upon constitutional protections but also **erode public trust in the judicial system**
- 24. Defendants actions violate various U.S. Code sections including but not limited to the following:

- 25. **42 U.S.C. § 1983** which provides a civil remedy for individuals deprived of constitutional rights under the color of law. The lack of notice and due process constitutes a clear deprivation of rights under both the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments.
- 26. **18 U.S.C. § 241** which criminalizes conspiracies to deprive individuals of their constitutional rights. Any coordinated effort or negligence leading to this denial of due process is punishable under this statute.
- 27.**18 U.S.C. § 242** which prohibits willful deprivation of constitutional rights under the color of law. By advancing legal proceedings without proper notice, Defendants have knowingly violated this protection.
- 28. All Affidavits Notices and Self-Executing Contract and Security Agreements (Exhibits E, F, G, and H) are *prima facie* evidence of fraud, racketeering, indentity theft, treason, breach of trust and fiduciary duties, extortion, coercion, deprivation of rights under the color of law, conspiracy to deprive of rights under the color of law, monopolization of trade and commerce, forced peonage, obstruction of enforcement, extortion of a national/internationally protected person, false imprisonment, torture, creating trusts in restraint of trade dereliction of fiduciary duties, bank fraud, breach of trust, treason, tax evasion, bad faith actions, dishonor, 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."

### UNLAWFUL ARREST, IMPRISONMENT, AND TORTURE

29. On **December 31, 2024**, at approximately 9:32am I, **Kevin: Walker**, *sui juris*, was **traveling <u>privately</u>** in a <u>private</u> conveyance/automobile, displaying a '**PRIVATE'** plate, indicating I was 'not for hire' or operating commercially, and the private automobile was not displaying a STATE plate of any sort .

This clearly established that the <u>private</u> automobile was 'not for hire' or 'commercial' use and, therefore explicitly classifying the automobile as <u>private property</u>, and <u>NOT</u> within any statutory and/or commercial jurisdiction.

- 30. On **December 31, 2024**, I, Kevin: Walker, *sui juris*, was **not** in violation of any law, nor was I speeding, infringing, or trespassing upon the rights of any man or woman. I was peacefully minding my own business and traveling to obtain groceries for my family.
- 31. I, Kevin: Walker, *sui juris*, simply wish to be left alone in peace and **not** be harassed, stalked, robbed, deprived under color of law, coerced into commercial contracts, extorted, and forced into peonage and/or involuntary servitude.

### THERE IS NO 'CORPUS DELICTI'

- 32. I, Kevin: Walker, *sui juris*, state for the record, that regarding Fraudulent Trust action/CASE NO.: SWM2303376, there is no corpus delicti—no injured party, no damaged property, and no sworn affidavit of harm from any living man or woman. Therefore, this matter is *without* merit, lacks standing, and constitutes an improper attempt to impose authority without lawful jurisdiction. Any further action absent evidence of a valid cause of action is a violation of due process and a deprivation of rights under color of law.
- 33. As a direct result of egregious due process violations and the initiation of a fraudulent CASE/trust action #SWM2303376 by Defendants, against Plaintiff, Plaintiff was subjected to an unlawful arrest, physical restraint in the form of handcuffs, and acts constituting torture. These actions inflicted severe mental trauma, undue stress, and significant mental anguish upon Affiant, all in blatant violation of constitutional protections and fundamental principles of justice.

government registration or stickers, and was displaying a PRIVATE plate.

35. Upon being unlawfully stopped and arrested by Gregory D Eastwood,

34. The <u>private</u> automobile and <u>trust property</u> was **not** in *any* way displaying STATE or

- Robert C V Bowman, William Pratt, and George Reyes, Affiant, informed all **Defendants** who willfully **conspired** on the scene in violation of **18 U.S.C. §§ 241 and 242**, that Affiant was a American national of the republic, non-citizen national/national/internationally protected person, **privately traveling** in a **private** automobile/conveyance, as articulated by Affiant and as also clearly evidenced by the '**PRIVATE**' plate on the **private** automobile.
- 36. The <u>private</u> automobile is duly reflected on Private UCC Contract Trust/ UCC1 filing #2024385925-4 (Exhibit C).
- 37. **Under threat, duress, and coercion, and at gunpoint,** Gregory D Eastwood and Robert C V Bowman were *presented* with American *national/non-citizen national* PASSPORT CARD #C35510079 and PASSPORT BOOK #A39235161 (Exhibits X and Y).
- 38. Defendants, *willfully and intentionally* acted against the Bill of Rights, State Constitution, and Constitution of the United States, even when reminded of their duties to support and uphold the Constitution.

### FRUIT OF THE POISONOUS TREE DOCTRINE

39. I, Kevin, proceeding sui juris, by Special Limited Appearance, further asserts and establishes on the record that the undisputedly unlawful and unconstitutional stop, arrest, and subsequent actions of the Defendants/
Respondents are in violation of the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution of the united States of America and constitute an unlawful arrest and seizure.

The "fruit of the poisonous tree" doctrine, as articulated by the U.S.

Supreme Court, establishes that any evidence obtained as a result of an unlawful stop or detainment is tainted and inadmissible in any subsequent proceedings. The unlawful actions of Gregory D. Eastwood, Robert C. V.

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27 28

Bowman, George Reyes, William Pratt, and Robert Gell including but not limited to the issuance of fraudulent citations/contracts under threat, duress, and coercion, render all actions and evidence derived therefrom void ab initio. See Wong Sun v. United States, 371 U.S. 471 (1963).

- 40. I, Kevin, proceeding sui juris, hereby re-affirm, re-asset, declare, and assert that all actions, evidence, and instruments obtained in connection with the unlawful stop and arrest are inadmissible and void as fruits of the *poisonous tree*. This includes, but is not limited to, Trust action/CASE/ CONTRACT #SWM2303376 and/or Trust action/CASE/CONTRACT #B038555 (Exhibit J) and/or Trust action/CASE/CONTRACT #MISW2501134, which was executed under duress, threat, and coercion, while Affiant was unlawfully deprived of liberty and imprisoned against his will, without Affiant's consent.
- 41. Again, for the record, I, Kevin, proceeding sui juris, by Special Limited Appearance, I simply wish to be left alone in peace and not be harassed, stalked, robbed, deprived under color of law, coerced into commercial contracts, extorted, and/or forced into peonage and/or involuntary servitude. I have NOT injured any man or woman nor have I damaged any property. FAILURE TO PROVIDE PROOF AND EVIDENCE
- 42. Defendants are deemed to have unequivocally agreed by tacit acquiescence that any further attempt to prosecute, proceed, or interfere in these matters shall constitute fraud, deprivation of rights under color of law, judicial fraud, malicious prosecution, conspiracy, racketeering (RICO), and multiple violations of federal law, including but not limited to 18 U.S.C. §§ 241, 242, and 1962.
- 43. Defendants agree and accept that these matters must be immediately dismissed and terminated with prejudice, and that any continued action, omission, or obstruction shall constitute willful and knowing

misconduct under color of law, exposing all involved to personal liability, commercial lien enforcement, and lawful remedy in equity. Affiant and/or Plaintiff(s) accept no liability for any damages arising from your failure to act in honor or law

## **NO QUALIFIED OR LIMITED IMMUNITY**

- 44. "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.
- 45."Public officials are not immune from suit when they transcend their lawful authority by invading constitutional **rights**."—AFLCIO v. Woodward, 406 F2d 137 t.
- 46. "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.
- 47. "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.
- 48. "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.
- 49. "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.

AND EVIDENCE PROVING DEFENDANTS' DISHONOR:

23. The failure of Defendants to rebut or provide any valid evidence of their

AUTHORIZATION"/Self-Executing Contract Security Agreement (Exhibit H),

which is duly notarized and complies with the requirements of U.C.C. § 3-505.

24. Under U.C.C. § 3-505, a document regular in form, such as the notarized

performance is further confirmed by the, 'AFFIDAVIT CERTIFICATE of

DISHONOR, NON-RESPONSE, DEFAULT, JUDGEMENT, and LIEN

Affidavit Certificate serves as evidence of dishonor and creates a <u>presumption</u> of dishonor.

<u>U.C.C. § 3-505. Evidence of Dishonor:</u>

(a) The following are admissible as evidence and create a presumption of dishonor and of any notice of dishonor stated:

- (1) A document regular in form as provided in subsection (b) which purports to be a protest;
- (2) A purported stamp or writing of the drawee, payor bank, or presenting bank on or accompanying the instrument stating that acceptance or payment has been refused unless reasons for the refusal are stated and the reasons are not consistent with dishonor;
- (3) A book or record of the drawee, payor bank, or collecting bank, kept in the usual course of business which shows dishonor, even if there is no evidence of who made the entry.
- (b) A protest is a certificate of dishonor made by a United States consul or vice consul, or a notary public or other person authorized to administer oaths by the law of the place where dishonor occurs. It may be made upon information satisfactory to that person. The protest must identify the instrument and certify either that presentment has been made or, if not made, the reason why it was not made, and that the instrument has been dishonored by nonacceptance or nonpayment. The protest may also certify that notice of dishonor has been given to some or all parties.

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

25. The <u>notarized</u> 'AFFIDAVIT CERTIFICATE of DISHONOR, NON-RESPONSE, DEFAULT, JUDGEMENT, and LIEN AUTHORIZATION"/Self-Executing Contract Security Agreement (Exhibit L), complies with these requirements and serves as a formal protest and evidence of dishonor under U.C.C. § 3-505, as it clearly documents Defendants' refusal to respond or provide the necessary rebuttal to Plaintiff's claims.

- 26. Defendants have <u>not</u> submitted any evidence to contradict or rebut the statements made in the affidavits. As a result, the facts set forth in the affidavits are deemed true and uncontested. Additionally, the California Evidence Code § 664 and related case law support the presumption that official duties have been regularly performed, and unrebutted affidavits stand as Truth.
- 27. Defendants may **not** argue, controvert, or otherwise protest the finality of the administrative findings established through the unrebutted affidavits. As per established legal principles, once an affidavit is submitted and not rebutted, its content is accepted as true, and Defendants are barred from contesting these findings in subsequent processes, whether administrative or judicial.

#### 'Foundation of American Sovereignty:

28. The Declaration of Independence (1776) proclaims:

"Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

- 29. This foundational document establishes that the people are the true **sovereigns** of this nation.
- 30. The **U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights** serve as a **contract** that binds the government, securing the People's liberties and limiting governmental authority. The Tenth Amendment asserts:
  - 1. "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

3

4 5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

23

24

25 26

27

28

This affirms that any power not granted to the federal government remains with the States or the people.

#### **SUPREME COURT Affirmations of Sovereignty:**

- 31. The Supreme Court of the United States (SCOTUS) has repeatedly affirmed that sovereignty resides in the people:
  - Chisholm v. Georgia, 2 U.S. 419 (1793): "The sovereignty resides in the people... they are truly the sovereigns of the country."
  - Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356 (1886): "Sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all
    - government exists and acts."
  - Lansing v. Smith, 4 Wend. 9 (N.Y. 1829):
    - "People of a state are entitled to all the rights which formerly belonged to the King by his prerogative."
  - Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803):
  - "A law repugnant to the Constitution is void." Sherar v. Cullen, 481 F.2d 946 (9th Cir. 1973):
    - "There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of his exercise of constitutional rights."
  - **Congressional Recognition of Americans as 'Sovereigns':**
- 32. In his 1947 "I Am an American Day" address, Representative John F. Kennedy emphasized the active role Citizens must play in preserving liberty:
  - "The fires of liberty must be continually fueled by the positive and conscious actions of all of us." (JFKLIBRARY.ORG)
- 33. Further, Congress formally recognized the significance of American sovereignty through the establishment of "I Am An American Day," later designated as Citizenship Day:

"Whereas it is desirable that the <u>sovereign citizens</u> of our <u>Nation</u> be prepared for the responsibilities and impressed with the significance of their status in our self-governing Republic: Therefore be it Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the third Sunday in May each year be, and hereby is, set aside as Citizenship Day..."

This resolution affirms the foundational principle that sovereignty resides with the people, who are responsible for preserving and exercising their rights and freedoms.

### Status as a "national" and "state Citizen":

34. Under 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(21), the term *national* is defined as:

"A person owing permanent allegiance to a state."

Furthermore, **8 U.S.C. § 1101(B)(22)** defines national of the United States as: "(*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."

35. This distinction is clear: one can be a *national* without being a *citizen* of the United States, reinforcing the concept of sovereignty associated with state citizenship.

#### Distinction Between "state Citizen" and "citizen of the United States"

36. The Courts have **long** recognized that *state citizenship* and *U.S. citizenship* **are distinct** legal statuses:

#### United States v. Anthony (1873)

"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."

#### • Slaughter-House Cases, 83 U.S. 36 (1872)

"It is quite clear, then, that there is a citizenship of the United States and a

8 9

10

11 12

13

14 15

> 16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

28

citizenship of a State, which are distinct from each other and which depend upon different characteristics or circumstances in the individual."

#### United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542 (1875)

"We have in our political system a Government of the United States and a government of each of the several States. 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."

Thomasson v. State, 15 Ind. 449; Cory v. Carter, 48 Ind. 327 (1874); McDonel v. State, 90 Ind. 320 (1883):

"One may be a citizen of a State and yet not a citizen of the United States."

Tashiro v. Jordan, 201 Cal. 236 (1927):

"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."

Crosse v. Board of Supervisors of Elections, 221 A.2d 431 (1966):

"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."

Jones v. Temmer, 829 F.Supp. 1226 (USDC/DCO 1993):

"The privileges and immunities clause of the Fourteenth Amendment protects very few rights because it neither incorporates any of the Bill of Rights nor protects all rights of individual citizens... 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."

37. The first clause of the Fourteenth Amendment states:

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and the state wherein they reside."

as a regular passport."

26

27

- 44. **18 U.S.C. § 112** stipulates that Protections of foreign officials, official guests, and internationally protected persons, **apply to nationals.** This statute defines terms such as "foreign government," "foreign official," "internationally protected person," "international organization," "**national** of the United States," and "official guest," have **the same meaning**.
- 45. It is unequivocally true that **18 U.S.C. § 112** states that in addition to being a *national*, a *national* is also considered a:
  - foreign government
  - · foreign official
  - internationally protected person
  - international organization
  - national of the United States
  - · official guest
  - 46. The legal framework and court rulings confirm that:
    - One may be a "state Citizen" without being a citizen of the United States."
    - The Fourteenth Amendment created *U.S. citizenship*, which is distinct from *state citizenship*.
    - A *national* is someone who owes permanent allegiance to a <u>s</u>tate, not necessarily to the United States.
    - A *national of the United States* could be a *U.S. citizen*, but could also be a *non-citizen national* who owes allegiance without being a U.S. citizen.
  - Thus, the distinction between *state Citizens* and *U.S. citizens* is a well-established legal principle with profound implications on sovereignty, rights, and legal obligations.
- <u>Unrebutted Affidavits, Considered, Agreed, and Stipulated Facts,</u> <u>Contract Security Agreements, and Authorized Judgement and Lien:</u>
- 47. Plaintiff and Defendants are parties to certain Contracts and Security Agreements, specifically contract security agreement numbers

RF775821088US, #RF775821088US, #RF775822582US, and #RF775823645US. Each contract security agreement and/or self-executing contract security agreement was received, considered, and agreed to by Defendants through silent acquiescence, tacit agreement, and tacit procuration. Each contract also includes a corresponding Form 3811, which was signed as evidence of receipt. AN UNREBUTTED AFFIDAVIT STANDS AS TRUTH IN COMMERCE. (12 Pet. 1:25; Heb. 6:13-15;). 'He who does not deny, admits. AN UNREBUTTED AFFIDAVIT BECOMES THE JUDGEMENT IN **COMMERCE.** (Heb. 6:16-17;). 'There is nothing left to resolve.' All referenced contracts and signed Forms 3811 are attached hereto as Exhibits E, 10 F, G, H, I, J, K, and L respectively, as follows: Exhibit E: Contract Security Agreement #RF775820621US, titled: NOTICE OF 12 CONDITIONAL ACCEPTANCE, and FRAUD, RACKETEERING, 13 14

- CONSPIRACY, DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER THE COLOR OF LAW, IDENTITY THEFT, EXTORTION, COERCION, TREASON. Exhibit F: Contract Security Agreement #RF775821088US, titled: NOTICE OF
- DEFAULT, and FRAUD, RACKETEERING, CONSPIRACY, DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER THE COLOR OF LAW, IDENTITY THEFT, EXTORTION, COERCION, TREASON
- Exhibit G: Contract Security Agreement #RF775822582US, titled: NOTICE OF DEFAULT AND OPPORTUNITY TO CURE AND NOTICE OF FRAUD, RACKETEERING, CONSPIRACY, DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER THE COLOR OF LAW, IDENTITY THEFT, EXTORTION, COERCION, KIDNAPPING.
- Exhibit H: Contract Security Agreement #RF775823645US, titled: Affidavit Certificate of Dishonor, Non-response, DEFAULT, JUDGEMENT, and LIEN AUTHORIZATION.
- **Exhibit I**: Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit E.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- **Exhibit J**: Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit F.
- Exhibit K: Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit G.
- Exhibit L: Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit H.

3

48. Self-Executing Contract Security Agreement #RF775823645US (Exhibit L)

5

was *received, considered*, and *agreed* to by Defendants, acknowledging and accepting a Judgement, Summary Judgement, and Lien Authorization (in

O

accordance with U.C.C. § 9-509), against Defendants in the amount of One Trillion

8

Dollars (\$1,000,000,000,000.00) in lawfully recognized currency, such as gold and

silver coin, as authorized under Article I, Section 10, Clause 1 of the U.S.

10

Constitution, in favor of Plaintiff.

11

49. Defendants have a duty to respond to all of Plaintiff's NOTICES and binding

12

CONTRACTS, and have intentionally and willfully remained silent and and

13

dishonor.

50. Defendants have *received, considered,* and *agreed* to <u>all</u> the terms

14

of all contract agreements, including the Self-Executing Contract

16

Security Agreement (Exhibits E, F, G, and H), constituting a bona fide

17

contract under the principles of contract law and the Uniform

18

Commercial Code (U.C.C.). Pursuant to the mailbox rule, which

19

establishes that acceptance of an offer is effective when dispatched

20

(U.C.C. § 2-206. Offer and Acceptance in Formation of Contract) and

21

<u>principles</u> of silent acquiescence, tacit procuration, and tacit

22

agreement, the acceptance is valid. This acceptance is in alignment with

23 |

the doctrine of 'offer and acceptance' and the provisions of U.C.C.  $\S$ 

24

2-202, which governs the **final** expression of the CONTRACT.

25

Furthermore, under the U.C.C., all assets – whether registered or

26

unregistered – are held subject to the **allodial** title, with Plaintiff

27

maintaining sole and exclusive standing over all real property, assets,

28

27 af 116

securities, both tangible and intangible, registered and unregistered, as

10

11 12

13

14

16

15

17

18 19

20 21

22

24

23

25 26

27

28

evidenced by UCC1 filing NOTICE #2024385925-4 and UCC3 filing and NOTICE #2024402990-2 (Exhibits C and D).

# No Agreement to Arbitration and Defendants are Barred from **Contesting any of the established Facts:**

51. No Stipulation to Arbitration: It is important to assert that there is no stipulation to arbitration as evidenced by the unrebutted verified commercial Affidavits (Exhibits E, F, G, and H). These Affidavits present facts that all parties have agreed to. Consequently, all issues are considered settled according to the principles of res judicata, stare decisis, and collateral estoppel, barring Defendants from contesting any of the findings, established facts, conclusions, or determinations.

## **Uniform Commercial Code (U.C.C.) Provisions Supporting** Plaintiff's Claims

52. U.C.C. § 1-103 - Construction and Application of the Code: U.C.C. § 1-103 ensures that the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) applies to commercial transactions unless explicitly stated otherwise. This section incorporates principles of law and equity, ensuring that:

- Common law principles of fraud, duress, and misrepresentation remain applicable and do not negate the enforceability of valid contracts.
- The UCC is to be liberally construed to promote fair dealing and uphold the validity of commercial agreements.
- Any contract entered into in good faith is binding, unless proven otherwise through clear, rebuttable evidence.

In this case, Defendants failed to rebut the terms set forth in the contract and security agreements, thereby affirming their full enforceability under U.C.C. § 1-103.

53. U.C.C. § 2-202 - Final Written Expression, Parol or Extrinsic Evidence: Under U.C.C. § 2-202, when a written contract is intended as a final and complete expression of an agreement, its terms cannot be contradicted by

9

7

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

25

24

26 27

28

prior agreements, oral statements, or extrinsic evidence. This section ensures that:

- The contract and security agreements, as presented in the verified commercial **Affidavits**, are the **final** and **complete expression** of the parties' agreement.
- Defendants cannot introduce oral statements, prior discussions, or extrinsic evidence to dispute or alter the contract's terms.
  - Any modifications to the contract must be explicitly made in writing and agreed upon by both parties.

Since Defendants failed to rebut the contract and affidavits, U.C.C. § 2-202 bars any claims of ambiguity or modification, affirming the enforceability of Plaintiff's claims.

54. U.C.C. § 2-204 - Formation of Contract: U.C.C. § 2-204 establishes that a contract is legally formed when there is:

- 1. Intent to contract between the parties.
- 2. Agreement on essential terms, even if minor terms remain open.
- 3. Performance or conduct demonstrating acceptance of the contract.

In this case, Defendants:

- Demonstrated intent through their silence, non-response, and acquiescence.
- Accepted the terms by failing to dispute the verified affidavits, making the agreement self-executing and binding.
- **Performed in a manner that affirmed the contract**, either by engaging in financial transactions, receiving notices, or failing to object.

As a result, under U.C.C. § 2-204, the contract is legally enforceable, and arbitration or further negotiations are unnecessary.

55. U.C.C. § 2-206 - Offer and Acceptance in Contract Formation: U.C.C. § 2-206 establishes that:

1. An offer is deemed accepted when the offeree engages in conduct consistent with acceptance.

6

9

10

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24 25

27

26

28

2. A contract is formed when an offer is accepted, even if conditions or objections are not expressly stated.

Applying this to Plaintiff's verified claims:

- Defendants received and considered the verified affidavits, contract, and security agreements but failed to respond or contest them.
- Under U.C.C. § 2-206, Defendants' silence constitutes acceptance, making the contract and obligations binding and enforceable.
- The verified commercial affidavits and supporting exhibits serve as prima facie evidence of the existence and validity of the contract.

Thus, under U.C.C. § 1-103, 2-204, 2-206, and 3-303 Plaintiff's verified claims are fully enforceable, and Defendants' failure to rebut any of them constitutes uncontested acceptance.

56. U.C.C. § 3-303 - Value and Consideration for Negotiable Instruments: U.C.C. § 3-303 defines value and consideration in the enforcement of negotiable instruments. A negotiable instrument is issued for value when:

- It is given in exchange for a promise of performance or to satisfy a pre-existing obligation.
- The holder takes it in good faith and without notice of defects.
- It provides financial or legal benefit to the party receiving it.

#### In this case:

- Plaintiff provided value through agreements, instruments, and affidavits, which Defendants considered and accepted.
- Defendants' willful failure to dispute the obligation confirms that consideration was validly exchanged.
- Under U.C.C. § 3-303, Defendants cannot claim a lack of consideration to avoid liability, as their conduct establishes their acceptance of value.

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

16

15

17 18

19

20 21

22

24

23

25

26

27

28

57. U.C.C. § 9-509 – Authorization of Financing Statement; Obligation of
Debtor: Under U.C.C. § 9-509, a secured party is authorized to file a financing
statement when:

- The debtor **has authenticated a security agreement** covering the collateral.
- The secured party has control over the collateral as agreed in the security instrument.
- The debtor's failure to rebut or contest the filing **constitutes authorization** by default.
- The debtor authorizes the filing in an authenticated record.

#### In this case:

- Defendants' failure to rebut the security agreement affirms that the lien and financing statement are valid and enforceable.
- The self-executing contract and security agreement serve as authenticated proof under U.C.C. § 9-509.
- Plaintiff, as a secured party, has the full legal right to perfect and enforce their lien against Defendants' assets.
- Thus, under U.C.C. § 9-509, Plaintiff's lien is properly perfected and enforceable as a matter of law.
- 58. U.C.C. § 9-102 Definitions and Scope of Security Interests: U.C.C. § 9-102 provides definitions crucial to the enforcement of security agreements, including:
  - "Secured Party" A person in whose favor a security interest is created.
  - "Debtor" A person who has granted a security interest in collateral.
  - "Collateral" Property subject to a security interest.
- Applying U.C.C. § 9-102 to this matter:
  - Plaintiff is the secured party with enforceable rights over collateral under the security agreement.
  - Defendants, by failing to contest the claim, have conceded their role as debtors.

11

12 13

> 14 15

16 17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

25

27

26

28

The assets in question, including property, negotiable instruments, and funds, are collateral lawfully secured by Plaintiff.

Under U.C.C. § 9-102, the contractual security interests are valid, perfected, and enforceable against Defendants, who have waived all objections through inaction.

- 59. Plaintiff asserts that the provisions of the Uniform Commercial Code (U.C.C.), as outlined above, establish that:
  - 1. Contracts, negotiable instruments, and security agreements are enforceable under commercial law.
  - 2. Defendants' silence, failure to rebut, and inaction constitute binding acceptance under U.C.C. §§ 2-204, 2-206, and 9-509.
  - 3. Defendants have waived all rights to contest the contract, and any claims of fraud, duress, or invalidity are legally barred under U.C.C. §§ 1-103, 2-202, and 3-303.

Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to full enforcement of all claims, security interests, and remedies under the U.C.C.

- 60. 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, G, and H), Defendants may not argue, controvert, or otherwise protest the finality of the administrative findings established through the *unrebutted* verified commercial affidavits. As per established legal principles and legal maxims, once an affidavit is submitted and not rebutted, its content is accepted as true, and Defendants are estopped and barred from contesting these findings in subsequent processes, whether administrative or judicial.
- 61. 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, G, and H), Defendants or the entity they represent\_is/are the <u>DEBTOR(S)</u> in this matter.

62. 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, G, and H), Defendants are <a href="MOT">MOT</a> the CREDITOR, or an ASSIGNEE of the CREDITOR, in this matter.

- 63. 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, G, and H), Defendants are indebted to Plaintiff in the amount of One Trillion Dollars (\$1,000,000,000,000.00) in lawfully recognized currency, such as gold and silver coin, as authorized under Article I, Section 10, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.
- 64. As *considered*, *agreed*, and *stipulated* by Defendant(s) in the <u>unrebutted</u> verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and self-executing contract security agreements (Exhibits E, F, G, and H), Defendants do NOT have 'standing.'
- 65. As *considered*, *agreed*, and *stipulated* by Defendant(s) in the <u>unrebutted</u> verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and self-executing contract security agreements (Exhibits E, F, G, and H), under California Code of Civil Procedure § 437c(c), summary judgement is appropriate when there is no triable issue of material fact and the moving party is entitled to judgement as a matter of law. The <u>unrebutted</u> verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and/or self-executing contract security agreement(s) (Exhibits E, F, G, and H) submitted by Plaintiff demonstrate that no triable issues of material fact remain in dispute, and Plaintiff is *entitled* to judgement based on the evidence presented and as *a matter of law*.
- 66. As *considered*, *agreed*, and *stipulated* by Defendant(s) in the <u>unrebutted</u> verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and self-executing contract security agreements (Exhibits E, F, G, and H), "Statements of **fact** contained in affidavits which are **not** rebutted by the opposing party's **affidavit or pleadings** <u>may</u>[must] be accepted as **true** by the trial court." --Winsett v. Donaldson, 244 N.W.2d 355 (Mich. 1976).

67. As considered, agreed, and stipulated by Defendants in the unrebutted

security agreements (Exhibits E, F, G, and H), the principles of res judicata, stare

verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and self-executing contract

decisis, and collateral estoppel apply to the <u>unrebutted</u> commercial affidavits,

establishing that all issues are deemed settled and cannot be contested further.

**BATTLEFIELD FIRST LOSES BY DEFAULT.'** 

These *principles* reinforce the finality of the administrative findings and support

the granting of summary judgement, as a matter of law. - 'HE WHO LEAVES THE

3

5

6

8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

23

24

25

26

27

28

Judgement of \$1,000,000,000,000 Received, Considered, Agreed to, and Authorized:

68. As considered, agreed, and stipulated by Defendant(s) in the unrebutted verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and self-executing contract security agreements (Exhibits E, F, G, and H), Defendants fully authorize, endorse, support, and advocate for the entry of a UCC commercial judgement and lien in the amount of One Trillion Dollars (\$1,000,000,000,000.00) in lawfully recognized currency, such as gold and silver coin, as authorized under Article I, Section 10, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution, against Defendants, in favor of Plaintiff, as also evidenced by INVOICE/TRUE BILL #RIVSHERTREAS12312024 which is a part of Exhibit H. INVOICE/TRUE BILL #RIVSHERTREAS12312024 is attached hereto as **Exhibit M** and incorporated herein by reference.

69. 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, G, and H), should it be deemed necessary, the Plaintiff is **fully Authorized** to initiate the filing of a lien, and the seizing of property to secure satisfaction of the ADJUDGED, DECREED, AND **AUTHORIZED** sum total due to **Affiant**, and/or Plaintiff of, One Trillion Dollars (\$1,000,000,000,000.00) in lawfully recognized currency, such as gold and silver coin, as authorized under Article I, Section 10, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

# **Defendants' Actions as Acts of War Against the Constitution:**

- 70. 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, binding upon all states,

  courts, and officers.
- 71. **Violations of Constitutional Protections:** The defendants have intentionally and systematically engaged in acts that directly violate the protections guaranteed to the Plaintiff and the people under the Constitution, including but not limited to:
  - **Violation of the Plaintiff's Unalienable Rights**: The defendants have deprived the Plaintiff 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 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 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.
- 72. **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

5

6 7

9

10 11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

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.

- 73. Weaponizing Authority to Oppress: The defendants' intentional misuse of their authority to act against the interests of the Constitution and its Citizens 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 Plaintiff to protect their property and rights.
  - Engaging in acts of fraud, coercion, and racketeering that strip Plaintiff 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.
- 74. 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. Plaintiff 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:

75. Plaintiff's incorporation of "bare statutes" does **NOT** exonerate Defendants; rather, it serves as evidence of Defendants' guilt, which they have already

5

6

9

10

12

13

14

15

17

18 19

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

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 Plaintiff to compel a formal enforcer, such as a District Attorney or Attorney General, to prosecute the criminal violations. This requirement for enforcement does **NOT** negate the Defendants' culpability but, instead, affirms the gravity of their admitted violations.

76. In this matter, the Plaintiff has thoroughly detailed the Defendants' willful and intentional breaches of multiple federal statutes under Title 18, and Plaintiff's private right(s) of action.

77. 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.

## Defendants' Presumed to be in Dishonor: U.C.C. § 3-505:

- 78. Defendants are **presumed** to be in **dishonor**, in accordance with U.C.C. § 3-505, as evidenced by the attached Affidavit Certificate of Dishonor, Non-response, **DEFAULT**, JUDGEMENT, and LIEN AUTHORIZATION (Exhibit H).
- 79. Defendants have <u>not</u> submitted any evidence to contradict or rebut the statements made in the affidavits. As a result, the facts set forth in the affidavits are deemed true and uncontested. Additionally, the California Evidence Code § 664 and related case law support the presumption that official duties have been regularly performed, and unrebutted affidavits stand as Truth.
- 80. Defendants may **NOT** argue, controvert, or otherwise protest the finality of the administrative findings established through the unrebutted affidavits. As per established legal principles, once an affidavit is submitted and not rebutted, its content is accepted as true, and Defendants are barred from contesting these findings in subsequent processes, whether administrative or judicial.

## 'Special Deposit' and MASTER INDEMNITY BOND: 31 U.S. Code § 5312 and U.C.C. § 3-104

24

25

26

27

28

81. This notarized, authorized, and indorsed VERIFIED COMPLAINT itself acted as a BOND and/or MONETARY INSTRUMENT, as defined by 31 U.S. Code § 5312 and U.C.C. § 3-104, supplemented by the MASTER INDEMNITY BOND (Exhibit N), and that the BOND also satisfies the procedural and substantive requirements of Rule 67 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Exclusive equity supports this claim, as it ensures that no competing claims will infringe upon the Plaintiff's established rights to this bond of and will be reported on the forms 1099-A, 1099-OID, and/or 1099-B, with Plaintiff evidenced as the CREDITOR(S). 82. Janet Yellen, said Successor(s), and/or the <u>U</u>nited <u>S</u>tates Treasury is the registered holder and fiduciary of/for Plaintiff's the private Two Hundred Billion Dollar (\$200,000,000,000.00 USD) 'MASTER DISCHARGE AND INDEMNITY BOND' #RF661448567US, which was post deposited to private post registered account #RF 661 448 023 US. Said 'MASTER DISCHARGE AND INDEMNITY BOND' (#RF661448567US) expressly stipulates it is "insuring, underwriting, indemnifying, discharging, paying and satisfying all such account holders and accounts dollar for dollar against any and all pre-existing, current and future losses, costs, debts, taxes, encumbrances, deficits, deficiencies, liens, judgements, true bills, obligations of contract or performance, defaults, charges, and any and all other obligations as may exist or come to exist during the term of this Bond... Each of the said account holders and accounts shall be severally insured, underwritten and indemnified against any and all future Liabilities as may appear, thereby instantly satisfying all such obligations dollar for dollar without exception through the above-noted Private Offset Accounts up to and including the full face value of this Bond through maturity." A copy of 'MASTER DISCHARGE AND INDEMNITY BOND' #RF372320890US is attached hereto as Exhibit N and incorporated herein by reference, and will serve as an additional CAUTION and/

and/or BOND for immediate adjustment and setoff of any and all costs associated with these matters.

2 3

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

4

5

6

10

13

14

15

17 18

19

20

21

22

24

25

26

27

28

-39 of 116-

Principles and as evidenced by, 12 U.S.C 1831n - 'Accounting objectives,

5 6

8 9

10

12 13

14

15

17 18

19

20 21

23 24

25

26

27

28

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.["]

85. As *considered*, *agreed*, and *stipulated* by Defendants in the <u>unrebutted</u> verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and self-executing contract security agreements (Exhibits E, F, G, 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 Plaintiff.

86. As considered, agreed, and stipulated by Defendants in the unrebutted verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and self-executing contract security agreements (Exhibits E, F, G, and H), GAAP is intended to ensure consistency among financial records, financial transparency, and protection from fraud or misleading company reports.

## Summary Judgement is Due as a matter of law

87. Rule 56(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and California Code of Civil Procedure § 437c(c): Summary Judgment is warranted as a matter of law under

9

10

11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

28

Rule 56(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and California Code of Civil Procedure § 437c(c), both of which mandate judgment where there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact.

- 88. **Defendants are** <u>barred</u> from further dispute under the doctrines of:
  - Res Judicata This matter is already conclusively settled by Defendants' failure to rebut.
  - Stare Decisis Binding precedent supports Plaintiff's claims and demands judgment in their favor.
  - Collateral Estoppel Defendants are estopped from raising any defenses they failed to assert.
- 89. Unrebutted Affidavits Establish No Disputed Facts: Plaintiff's affidavits were submitted in good faith and stand as truth in commerce. These affidavits were served upon Defendants, providing sufficient notice and opportunity to rebut or contest the assertions therein. Defendants' failure to respond or dispute the affidavits results in a legal presumption of their validity. As a matter of law, an affidavit that is unrebutted is deemed admitted and undisputed, thereby precluding any triable issue of fact.
  - Pursuant to **Res Judicata**, the unrebutted affidavits have the same force and effect as a judgment and are now binding upon Defendants.
  - Under the principle of Stare Decisis, binding precedent affirms that undisputed affidavits establish facts conclusively in a civil proceeding.
  - **Collateral Estoppel** bars Defendants from re-litigating any issue previously resolved by the unrebutted affidavits, as they have failed to raise a substantive dispute within the prescribed timeframes.
  - 90. Defendants' Failure to Produce Contradictory Evidence:
- Defendants have neither provided competent evidence to dispute Plaintiff's claims nor identified any material fact requiring trial. Plaintiff's affidavits, contracts, and

supporting documents (attached hereto as *Exhibits E, F, G, and H*) collectively establish the absence of any genuine dispute. Without contradictory evidence or a triable issue, Plaintiff is **entitled** to judgment as <u>a matter of law</u>.

91. Judicially Recognized Finality of Affidavits: Courts have long held that when Affidavits are left *unrebutted*, they stand as Truth and are accepted as fact. See Morris v. National Cash Register Co., 44 Cal.App.2d 811, 813 (1941), which confirms that undisputed evidence is sufficient to warrant summary judgment. Additionally, under Federal and State Rules of Evidence, facts established by affidavit are considered *binding* when no counter-affidavit is provided.

### 92. Supported by Principles of Equity and Law:

- **Equity**: It would be inequitable to allow Defendants to delay proceedings when they have failed to rebut or contest the factual assertions of Plaintiff's affidavits.
- Law: Plaintiff has satisfied the procedural and substantive requirements for summary judgment, including providing sufficient admissible evidence to establish their claims.

# The COURT is **Barred** From SUMMARILY DISMISSING Anything, Especially After The **Overturning** of Chevron

- 93. The Court is hereby placed on notice that even the mere consideration of "summarily dismissing" anything in this matter constitutes a <u>constitutional</u> <u>violation</u> and an act of judicial overreach, arbitrary denial of due process, and a *willful* obstruction of justice.
- 94. The *Overturning* of the Chevron Doctrine Eliminates *Any* Judicial *Presumption* in Favor of Government or Institutional Parties:.
  - With the Chevron Doctrine overturned, courts no longer have
     discretion to defer to agency or institutional interpretations of law,
     and every case must be ruled strictly within the confines of the
     Constitution and statutory law.

8

9

10 11

1213

1415

16

17 18

19 20

2122

23

2425

26

2728

 Any judicial attempt to summarily dismiss Plaintiff's verified, unrebutted claims would constitute an abuse of discretion, a deprivation of due process, and a direct violation of Plaintiff's constitutional rights.

95. Due Process Requires Full Adjudication, Not Summary Disposition.

- Plaintiff has filed multiple verified, sworn affidavits, which have gone uncontested and unrebutted, and stand as Truth.
- Under U.C.C. § 3-505, an unrebutted Affidavit creates a presumption of dishonor, which the Court cannot arbitrarily ignore.
- Under 28 U.S.C. § 1361, Plaintiff has the right to compel the performance of
  a legal duty owed to them by the Court.
- A case may only be dismissed summarily if there is no valid claim or
  cause of action—which is inapplicable here, as Defendants have already
  defaulted and dishonored themselves by failing to rebut the Plaintiff's
  Conditional Acceptance, and they have admitted everything presented in
  all Affidavits.

96. Any Attempt to Dismiss Would Be a Violation of *Res Judicata, Stare Decisis,* and Collateral Estoppel.

- Res Judicata: The matters before this Court are already settled and decided, and
  no further litigation is necessary to determine the legal obligations of Defendants.
- Stare Decisis: The binding legal precedents of Marbury v. Madison, Rule 56 FRCP, and California CCP § 437c(c) require judgment in favor of the Plaintiff.
- Collateral Estoppel: Defendants cannot dispute issues they have already
  defaulted on; any attempt to dismiss the case would ignore the finality of
  Plaintiff's unrebutted claims and the legally binding nature of their
  conditional acceptance.
- 97. Summary Dismissal Would Constitute <u>Judicial Fraud</u> and Breach of Fiduciary Duty.

3

1516

17 18

19

20

22

21

23

2425

26

2728

 As a public trustee of justice, the Court has a fiduciary obligation to uphold constitutional rights and due process.

Any attempt to dismiss this matter—given that Defendants have already defaulted—would be tantamount to judicial fraud and an egregious breach of duty under 28 U.S.C. § 1361.

### NOTICE to the COURT: A DEMAND is NOT a mere MOTION

98. The Court is hereby placed on notice that Plaintiff's *Demand* for Summary Judgment is not a mere 'motion' *requesting* discretionary relief but a <u>binding</u> legal notice asserting an *absolute* <u>right</u> to judgment as a matter of law.

- 99. A Motion is a Request; A Demand Asserts a Right.
  - A **motion** asks the court to exercise *discretion* in granting relief.
  - A demand asserts an existing legal *right* that must be acknowledged *and* enforced.

100. Plaintiff's Demand for Summary Judgment is *a Matter of Law*, Not Judicial Discretion

- Under Rule 56(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the court "shall" grant summary judgment when there is no genuine dispute of material fact. The word "shall" is mandatory, not discretionary.
- California Code of Civil Procedure § 437c(c) likewise states: "The motion for summary judgment shall be granted if all the papers submitted show that there is no triable issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law."
- This establishes that the Court does not have the discretion to deny or delay judgment where Defendants have failed to contest the material facts.
- 101. Failure to Act on a Demand is Judicial Nonperformance and a Due Process Violation.
  - Plaintiff has filed **undisputed**, **sworn affidavits** establishing their claims.

 Defendants have failed to rebut, respond, or oppose, thereby conceding by tacit acquiescence.

• Judicial failure to rule on a demand where no genuine dispute exists is an obstruction of justice and a due process violation under 28 U.S.C. § 1361.

## Unrebutted Affidavits are 'prima facie' evidence:

102. As *considered*, *agreed*, and *stipulated* by Defendants in the <u>unrebutted</u> verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and self-executing contract security agreements (Exhibits E, F, G, and H), Exhibits E, F, G, and H are *prima facie* evidence of fraud, racketeering, indentity theft, treason, breach of trust and fiduciary duties, extortion, coercion, deprivation of rights under the color of law, conspiracy to deprive of rights under the color of law, monopolization of trade and commerce, forced peonage, obstruction of enforcement, extortion of a national/internationally protected person, false imprisonment, torture, creating trusts in restraint of trade dereliction of fiduciary duties, bank fraud, breach of trust, treason, tax evasion, bad faith actions, dishonor, injury and damage to Affiant and Plaintiff 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."

# <u>Unlawful and Unconstitutional Detainment and Arrest while</u> <u>'Traveling' in Private Automobile:</u>

103. As *considered*, *agreed*, and *stipulated* by Defendants in the <u>unrebutted</u> verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and self-executing contract security agreements (Exhibits E, F, G, and H):

1. On December 31, 2024, at approximately 9:32am, Kevin: Walker, sui juris, was traveling privately in my private automobile, displaying a 'PRIVATE' plate, indicating I was 'not for hire' or operating commercially, and the private automobile was not displaying a STATE plate of any sort. This clearly established that the private automobile was 'not for hire' or

'commercial' use and, therefore explicitly classifying the automobile as <u>private</u> <u>property</u>, and <u>NOT</u> within any statutory and/or commercial jurisdiction. A copy of the PRIVATE 'not for hire' or 'commercial' use is attached hereto as **Exhibits O** and incorporated herein by reference.

- 2. Upon unlawfully stopping and detaining the private traveler(Kevin: Walker), Defendants, including Gregory D Eastwood, Robert C V Bowman, George Reyes, William Pratt, **conspired** on the scene in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 241 and 242. Photographs of Defendants, Gregory D Eastwood, Robert C V Bowman, and William Pratt, are attached hereto as **Exhibits O, P, and Q** respectively, and incorporated by reference herein.
- 3. All Defendants on the scene at that time, including Gregory D Eastwood, Robert C V Bowman, George Reyes, William Pratt, were NOTICED that the traveler is a state Citizen, non-citizen national/national/internationally protected person, <u>privately traveling</u> in a <u>private</u> automobile, as articulated by the traveler, and as evidenced by the 'PRIVATE' plate on the private automobile.
- 4. The <u>private</u> automobile and <u>trust property</u> was **not** in *any* way displaying STATE or government registration or stickers, and was displaying a PRIVATE plate, removing the automobile from the Defendant's jurisdiction. See Exhibit N.
- 5. The <u>private</u> automobile is duly reflected on Private UCC Contract Trust/ UCC1 filing NOTICE #2024385925-4 and UCC3 filing and NOTICE #2024402990-2 (Exhibits C and D).
- 6. **Under threat, duress, and coercion, and at gunpoint,** the private traveler(Kevin: Walker) presented Defendants Gregory D Eastwood and Robert C V Bowman national/non-citizen national, #C35510079 and passport book #A39235161. Copy attached hereto as **Exhibits O and P** respectively, and incorporated herein by reference.

- 7. Defendant(s), acted against the Constitution, even when explicitly reminded of their duties to support and uphold the Constitution.
- 8. At no point in time were Defendants presented with a CALIFORNIA DRIVER'S LICENSE (COMMERCIAL CONTRACT), and any information added to the CITATION/CONTRACT was done so in fraud, without consent, full disclosure, and thus is *void ab initio*.
- 9. The private traveler and national (Kevin: Walker), should never have been stopped exercising his **inherent** and *unalienable* **right** to travel, in a <u>private</u> automobile that was clearly marked "PRIVATE" and "not for hire" and "not for commercial use.

# Fraudulent Alteration of Signature, Coercion, Assault, Torture, Kidnapping:

- 104. As *considered*, *agreed*, and *stipulated* by Defendants in the <u>unrebutted</u> verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and self-executing contract security agreements (Exhibits E, F, G, and H)
  - 1. After being kidnapped, handcuffed, tortured, and deprived of rights and livery under the color of law, the private traveler national/internationally protected person(Kevin: Walker), Defendant Robert Gell threatened to "house" the national if he did not sign every document presented, exactly as he (Robert Gell) wanted the national to. Camera records will evidence Robert telling the national return to the release tank for no apparent reason, and then **assaulting**, **shoving**, **and pushing** the national/internationally protected person into the tank at the end of the walk.
  - 2. Defendant Robert Gell went as far as aggressively rushing around a desk and assaulting Kevin, and snatching a pen from hiss hand, simply because the attempted to write 'under duress' by his signature.
  - 3. Defendant Robert Gell willfully and intentionally altered Affiant's signature on one document and crossed out 'UCC 1-308,' immediately after Affiant hand wrote it on the document.

4. Defendant Robert Gell stated he had no idea what an attorney-in-fact is and that Kevin: Walker was a, ["]jackass["] for stating that such a thing exists, evidencing Gell's incompetence.

### Fruit of the Poisonous Tree Doctrine:

- 105. Plaintiff further asserts and establishes again on the record that the undisputedly unlawful and unconstitutional stop, arrest, and subsequent actions of the Defendants/Respondents are in violation of the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution of the united States of America and constitute an unlawful arrest and seizure. The "fruit of the poisonous tree" doctrine, as articulated by the <u>U.S. Supreme Court</u>, establishes that <u>any</u> evidence obtained as a result of an unlawful stop or detainment is tainted and inadmissible in <u>any</u> subsequent proceedings. The unlawful actions of Gregory D. Eastwood, Robert C. V. Bowman, George Reyes, William Pratt, and Robert Gell including *but not limited to* the issuance of fraudulent citations/contracts under threat, duress, and coercion, render all actions and evidence derived therefrom <u>void ab initio</u>. See Wong Sun v. United States, 371 U.S. 471 (1963).
- 106. Plaintiff therefore declares and demands that all actions and evidence obtained in connection with this unlawful stop be deemed inadmissible and void as fruits of the poisonous tree.
- 107. As *considered*, *agreed*, and *stipulated* by Defendants in the <u>unrebutted</u> verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and self-executing contract security agreements (Exhibits E, F, G, and H).

## **Use** defines classification:

1. It is **well established law** that the **highways** of the state **are public property**, and **their primary and preferred use is for <u>private</u> purposes**, and that their use for purposes of gain is special and extraordinary which, generally at least, the legislature may prohibit or condition as it sees fit." **Stephenson vs. Rinford**, 287 US 251; **Pachard** 

vs Banton, 264 US 140, and cases cited; Frost and F. Trucking Co. vs. Railroad Commission, 271 US 592; Railroad commission vs. Inter-City Forwarding Co., 57 SW.2d 290; Parlett Cooperative vs. Tidewater Lines, 164 A. 313

- 2. The California Motor Vehicle Code, section 260: Private cars/vans etc. not in commerce / for profit, are immune to registration fees:
  - (a) A "commercial vehicle" is a vehicle of a type <u>REQUIRED</u> to be **REGISTERED** under this code".
  - **(b)** "Passenger vehicles which are **not used** for the transportation of persons **for hire**, compensation or profit, and housecars, **are not commercial vehicles**".
  - (c) "a vanpool vehicle is not a commercial vehicle."
- 3. <u>18 U.S. Code § 31 Definition</u>, expressly stipulates, "The term "motor vehicle" means every description of carriage or other contrivance propelled or drawn by mechanical power <u>and</u> used for <u>commercial</u> purposes on the highways in the transportation of passengers, passengers and property, or property or cargo".
- 4. A vehicle not used for **commercial** activity is a "consumer goods", ...it is **NOT** a type of vehicle **required** to be registered and "use tax" paid of which the tab is evidence of receipt of the tax." Bank of Boston vs Jones, 4 UCC Rep. Serv. 1021, 236 A2d 484, UCC PP 9-109.14.
- 5. "The 'privilege' of using the streets and highways by the operation thereon of motor carriers <u>for hire</u> can be acquired only by permission or license from the state or its political subdivision. "—Black's Law Dictionary, 5th ed, page 830.
- 6. "It is held that a tax upon common carriers by motor vehicles is based upon a reasonable classification, and does not involve any unconstitutional discrimination, although it does not apply to private vehicles, or those

used by the owner in his own business, and not for hire." **Desser v. Wichita**, (1915) 96 Kan. 820; Iowa Motor Vehicle Asso. v. Railroad Comrs., 75 A.L.R. 22.

- 7. "Thus self-driven vehicles are **classified according to the use** to which they are put rather than according to the means by which they are propelled." Ex Parte Hoffert, 148 NW 20.
- 8. In view of this rule a statutory provision that the supervising officials "may" exempt such persons when the transportation is not on a commercial basis means that they "must" exempt them." State v. Johnson, 243 P. 1073; 60 C.J.S. section 94 page 581.
- 9. "The use to which an item is put, rather than its physical characteristics, determine whether it should be classified as ``consumer goods'' under UCC 9-109(1) or ``equipment'' under UCC 9-109(2)." **Grimes v Massey Ferguson, Inc.**, 23 UCC Rep Serv 655; 355 So.2d 338 (Ala., 1978).
- 10. "Under UCC 9-109 there is a real distinction between goods purchased for personal use and those purchased for business use. The two are mutually exclusive and the **principal use to which the property is put should be considered as determinative**." **James Talcott, Inc. v Gee**, 5 UCC Rep Serv 1028; 266 Cal.App.2d 384, 72 Cal.Rptr. 168 (1968).
- 11. "The classification of goods in UCC 9-109 are mutually exclusive."

  McFadden v Mercantile-Safe Deposit & Trust Co., 8 UCC Rep Serv 766;

  260 Md 601, 273 A.2d 198 (1971).
- 12. "The classification of ``goods'' under [UCC] 9-109 is a question of fact."

  Morgan County Feeders, Inc. v McCormick, 18 UCC Rep Serv 2d 632; 836

  P.2d 1051 (Colo. App., 1992).
- 13. "The definition of ``goods'' includes an automobile." Henson v Government Employees Finance & Industrial Loan Corp., 15 UCC Rep Serv 1137; 257 Ark 273, 516 S.W.2d 1 (1974).

14. "No State government entity has the power to allow or deny passage on the highways, byways, nor waterways... transporting his vehicles and personal property for either recreation or business, but by being subject only to local regulation i.e., safety, caution, traffic lights, speed limits, etc. Travel is not a privilege requiring, licensing, vehicle registration, or forced insurances." *Chicago Coach Co.* v. *City of Chicago*, 337 Ill. 200, 169 N.E. 22.

## The **RIGHT** to Travel is not a **Privilege**:

- 15. The fundamental Right to travel is NOT a Privilege, it's a gift granted by your Creator and restated by our founding fathers as Unalienable and cannot be taken by any Man / Government made Law or color of law known as a private "Code" (secret) or a "Statute."
- 16. "Traveling is passing from place to place--act of performing journey; and traveler is person who travels." In Re Archy (1858), 9 C. 47.
- 17."Right of transit through each state, with every species of property known to constitution of United States, and recognized by that paramount law, is secured by that instrument to each citizen, and does not depend upon uncertain and changeable ground of mere comity."

  In Re Archy (1858), 9 C. 47.
- 18. Freedom to **travel** is, indeed, an important aspect of the citizen's "liberty". We are first concerned with the extent, if any, to which Congress has authorized its curtailment. (Road) **Kent v. Dulles**, 357 U.S. 116, 127.
- 19. The **right** to **travel** is a part of the "liberty" of which the citizen cannot be deprived without due process of law under the Fifth Amendment. So much is conceded by the solicitor general. In Anglo Saxon law that right was emerging at least as early as Magna Carta. **Kent v. Dulles**, 357 U.S. 116, 125.
- 20. "Even the legislature **has no power** to deny to a citizen the **right** to travel upon the highway and transport his property in the ordinary course of his

business or pleasure, though this right may be regulated in accordance with public interest and convenience. *Chicago Coach Co.* v. *City of Chicago*, 337 Ill. 200, 169 N.E. 22, 206.

- 21."... It is now universally recognized that the state does possess such power [to impose such burdens and limitations upon private carriers when using the public highways for the transaction of their business] with respect to common carriers using the public highways for the transaction of their business in the transportation of persons or property for hire. That rule is stated as follows by the **supreme court of the United States**: 'A citizen may have, under the fourteenth amendment, the **right** to travel and transport his property upon them (the public highways) by **auto vehicle**, but **he has no right to make the highways his place of business by using them as a common carrier for hire**. Such use is a privilege which may be granted or withheld by the state in its discretion, without violating either the due process clause or the equal protection clause.' (*Buck v. Kuykendall*, 267 U. S. 307 [38 A. L. R. 286, 69 L. Ed. 623, 45 Sup. Ct. Rep. 324].
- 22. "The right of a citizen to travel upon the highway and transport his property thereon in the ordinary course of life and business differs radically an obviously from that of one who makes the highway his place of business and uses it for private gain, in the running of a stage coach or omnibus. The former is the usual and ordinary right of a citizen, a right common to all; while the latter is special, unusual and extraordinary. As to the former, the extent of legislative power is that of regulation; but as to the latter its power is broader; the right may be wholly denied, or it may be permitted to some and denied to others, because of its extraordinary nature. This distinction, elementary and fundamental in character, is recognized by all the authorities."

- 23. "Even the legislature has no power to deny to a citizen the right to travel upon the highway and transport his/her property in the ordinary course of his business or pleasure, though this right may be regulated in accordance with the public interest and convenience." ["regulated" means traffic safety enforcement, stop lights, signs etc.]—Chicago Motor Coach v. Chicago, 169 NE 22.
- 24. "The claim and exercise of a constitutional right cannot be converted into a crime." Miller v. U.S., 230 F 2d 486, 489.
- 25. "There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of this exercise of constitutional rights." —Sherar v. Cullen, 481 F. 945.
- 26. The right of the citizen to **travel** upon the highway and to transport his property thereon, in the ordinary course of life and business, differs radically and obviously from that of one who makes the highway his place of business for private gain in the running of a stagecoach or omnibus." State vs. City of Spokane, 186 P. 864.
- 27. "The right of the citizen to **travel** upon the public highways and to transport his/her property thereon either by carriage or automobile, is **not** a mere privilege which a city [or State] may prohibit or permit at will, but a common right which he/she has under the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." —Thompson v. Smith, 154 SE 579.
- 28. "The right of the Citizen to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, in the ordinary course of life and business, is a common right which he has under the right to enjoy life and liberty, to acquire and possess property, and to pursue happiness and safety. It includes the right, in so doing, to use the ordinary and usual conveyances of the day, and under the existing modes of travel, includes the right to drive a horse drawn carriage or wagon thereon or to operate an automobile thereon, for the usual and ordinary purpose

Danforth, Miss., 12 S.2d 784.

29. "The use of the highways for the purpose of **travel** and transportation is not a mere **privilege**, but a common and fundamental **Right** of which the public and the individual cannot be rightfully deprived." — Chicago Motor Coach

of life and business." — Thompson vs. Smith, supra.; Teche Lines vs.

- vs. Chicago, 169 NE 22;Ligare vs. Chicago, 28 NE 934;Boon vs. Clark, 214
- SSW 607;25 Am.Jur. (1st) Highways Sect.163.
- 30. "The right to b is part of the Liberty of which a citizen cannot deprived without due process of law under the Fifth Amendment. This Right was emerging as early as the Magna Carta." Kent vs. Dulles, 357 US 116 (1958).
- 31. "The state **cannot** diminish **Rights** of the people." **Hurtado vs. California**, 110 US 516.
- 32. "Personal liberty largely consists of the Right of locomotion -- to go where and when one pleases -- only so far restrained as the Rights of others may make it necessary for the welfare of all other citizens. The Right of the Citizen to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, by horse drawn carriage, wagon, or automobile, is not a mere privilege which may be permitted or prohibited at will, but the common Right which he has under his Right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Under this Constitutional guarantee one may, therefore, under normal conditions, travel at his inclination along the public highways or in public places, and while conducting himself in an orderly and decent manner, neither interfering with nor disturbing another's Rights, he will be protected, not only in his person, but in his safe conduct." —II Am.Jur. (1st) Constitutional Law, Sect.329, p.1135.
- 33. 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.

34. "The state **cannot** diminish **Rights** of the **people."** —Hurtado vs. California, 110 US 516.

## **NO QUALIFIED OR LIMITED IMMUNITY**

- 35. "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.
- 36. "Public officials are not immune from suit when they transcend their lawful authority by invading constitutional **rights**." AFLCIO v. Woodward, 406 F2d 137 t.
- 37. "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.
- 38. "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.
- 39. "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.
- 40. "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.
- 41. "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.

8

11

12 13

1415

16

17

18 19

20

21

2223

24

2526

2728

## Legal Maxims, Standards, and Principles

108. Plaintiff cites the following established **legal maxims**, **standards**, and *principles*.

- Unrebutted Affidavits as Judgment in Commerce: Plaintiff's 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 Plaintiff's claims under the doctrines of res
  judicata and collateral estoppel, as all material facts and claims have been
  resolved conclusively.
- Breach of U.C.C. Obligations and <u>Presumed Dishonor</u>: Defendants'
  dishonor and default are evidenced by their failure to fulfill obligations
  defined by U.C.C. § 3-505 (see Exhibit L) and other applicable statutes.
- ALL ARE EQUAL UNDER THE LAW. 'No one is above the law.'
- IN COMMERCE FOR ANY MATTER TO BE RESOLVED MUST BE
   EXPRESSED. 'To lie is to go against the mind.'
- TRUTH IS EXPRESSED IN THE FORM OF AN AFFIDAVIT.
- <u>IN COMMERCE TRUTH IS SOVEREIGN.</u> Truth is sovereign and the Sovereign tells only the truth.
- AN UNREBUTTED AFFIDAVIT STANDS AS TRUTH IN COMMERCE.
   '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[must]** 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.
- "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. 'He
  who does not repel a wrong when he can occasions it.'
- AN UNREBUTTED AFFIDAVIT BECOMES THE JUDGEMENT IN COMMERCE. There is nothing left to resolve.

#### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(For Fraud and Misrepresentation against all Defendants)

- 109. Plaintiff re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 108 as if set forth herein.
- 110. Defendants, acting under **color of law**, have *willfully and intentionally* engaged in **fraudulent** conduct by knowingly **misrepresenting** material facts regarding their authority and jurisdiction over Plaintiff, thereby violating Plaintiff's constitutionally protected **private rights**.
- 111. Defendants' fraudulent misconduct includes, but is not limited to, fabricating legal authority, creating false claims, unlawfully detaining and interfering with Plaintiff's **private** affairs, and initiating legal proceedings devoid of any lawful basis.
- 112. Defendants knowingly misrepresented their authority to enforce **statutory provisions** against Plaintiff, fabricated legal obligations, and unlawfully seized or interfered with Plaintiff's **private** property, all with the intent to deprive Plaintiff of their rights, property, and financial interests **under the guise of lawful authority.**
- 113. In furtherance of this unlawful **enterprise** and scheme, Defendants transmitted fraudulent documents, including but not limited to fabricated reports, false citations, and deceptive legal filings, through the U.S. Postal Service and other commercial carriers, knowing that these documents were false and intended to defraud Plaintiff.

4

10

11

9

12

13

14

16

15

17

18

19 20

21

2223

2425

2627

2728

114. Defendants' fraudulent misrepresentation and deceit violate Plaintiff's **private** rights under various statutes that provide for a 'private right of action', including but not limited to:

- 42 U.S. Code § 1983 (Civil Action for Deprivation of Rights) Establishes
  liability for any person acting under color of law who deprives another of their
  constitutionally protected rights, privileges, or immunities.
- 18 U.S. Code § 1001 (False Statements Act) Criminalizes knowingly making false statements or fraudulent misrepresentations in legal and administrative proceedings.
- **18 U.S. Code § 1341 (Mail Fraud)** Prohibits the use of U.S. mail to transmit fraudulent documents with intent to deceive.
- 15 U.S. Code § 1692 (Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, FDCPA) Prohibits
  fraudulent misrepresentation and deceptive practices used to enforce unlawful
  claims against individuals, including fabricated financial obligations.
- UCC § 1-308 (Performance or Acceptance Under Reservation of Rights) –
   Protects individuals from unknowingly waiving rights under fraudulent or coercive contracts or enforcement actions.
- 115. By willfully and intentionally engaging in the fraudulent conduct described above, Defendants have violated statutory and constitutional protections, resulting in the Plaintiff being subjected to:
  - Unlawful deprivation of property and private rights
  - Financial losses due to fraudulent enforcement actions
  - Harm to their reputation, business, and economic interests
  - Emotional distress and significant hardship resulting from Defendants' unlawful conduct
- 116. Defendants, by their own actions, willful silence, non-compliance, and tacit admission, have engaged in the unlawful conduct described in this complaint. As such, these facts must be taken as true and are dispositive in this action.

12

14

15

13

16 17

18

19

2021

22

24

2526

27

28

117. Defendants' wrongful conduct includes but is not limited to:

- Fabrication of authority and fraudulent claims to enforce laws against
   Plaintiff
- Knowingly misrepresenting their jurisdiction and legal standing to detain, fine, or seize property
- Use of fraudulent documentation and legal proceedings to impose unlawful penalties and restrictions
- Unlawful use of U.S. Postal Service and other communication channels to further their fraudulent scheme
- 118. As a direct result of Defendants' fraudulent and unlawful actions, Plaintiff has suffered severe and irreparable harm, including but not limited to:
  - Deprivation of private property without due process
  - Violation of constitutionally protected rights and immunities
  - Financial and economic damages stemming from Defendants' unlawful interference
  - Psychological and emotional distress caused by Defendants' oppressive conduct
- 119. 18 U.S. Code § 1341 Frauds and swindles, expressly stipulates: "whoever, having devised or intending to devise any scheme or artifice to defraud, or for obtaining money or property by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises, or to sell, dispose of, loan, exchange, alter, give away, distribute, supply, or furnish or procure for unlawful use any counterfeit or spurious coin, obligation, security, or other article, or anything represented to be or intimated or held out to be such counterfeit or spurious article, for the purpose of executing such scheme or artifice or attempting so to do, places in any post office or authorized depository for mail matter, any matter or thing whatever to be sent or delivered by the Postal Service, or

deposits or causes to be deposited any matter or thing whatever to be sent or delivered by any private or commercial interstate carrier, or takes or receives therefrom, any such matter or thing, or knowingly causes to be delivered by 3 mail or such carrier according to the direction thereon, or at the place at which it is directed to be delivered by the person to whom it is addressed, any such matter or thing, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both. If the violation occurs in relation to, or involving any benefit authorized, transported, transmitted, transferred, disbursed, or paid in connection with, a presidentially declared major disaster or emergency (as those terms are defined in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford 10 Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122)), or affects a financial institution, such person shall be fined not more than \$1,000,000 or 12 imprisoned not more than 30 years, or both." 13 14

### SECOND (2nd) CAUSE OF ACTION

## (For Breach of Contract against all Defendants)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 120. Plaintiff re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 119 as if set forth herein
- 121. Breach of Contractual Obligations: Defendants willfully and intentionally breached contractual obligations by failing to honor the terms set forth in the underlying Contract and Security Agreements between the parties.
- 122. Nature of Defendants' Breach: Defendants' breach includes, but is not limited to, the failure to perform specified duties, the pursuit of false claims of debt, and the illegal, unlawful, and unconstitutional seizure of Plaintiff's private property without proper contractual or legal authority.
- 123. Violation of Contract Agreement: Defendants' conduct constitutes a violation of both the express and implied terms of the agreement, including Defendants' obligations to act in good faith and deal fairly with Plaintiff, resulting in substantial financial harm, injury, and damages to Plaintiff.

\_

124. U.C.C. § 2-202 Compliance: Pursuant to U.C.C. § 2-202, which establishes the parol evidence rule and affirms the <u>final</u> written expression of a contract, Defendants are bound by the agreed-upon terms that constitute the complete and exclusive statement of the agreement.

125. **Acceptance and Binding Agreement**: Defendants received, considered, and agreed to the contract offer and final expression of the contract as defined under **U.C.C.** provisions. This acceptance is evidenced through Defendants' willful and intentional silent acquiescence, tacit agreement, and tacit procuration to the *unrebutted* **Affidavits** and contract security agreements (Exhibits I, J, K, L, and N), affidavit certificate of non-response, default, and the judgment and lien authorization, all of which were duly received by Defendants.

126. **Obligations under U.C.C.**: Defendants' agreement to these terms thereby creates binding obligations under **U.C.C. Article 2** as well as other relevant sections, such as **U.C.C. §§ 1-103, 1-202, 2-204**, and **2-206**. Despite these clear terms, Defendants, through various improper and bad-faith actions, breached the contract by failing to settle and close the account, refusing to reconvey the title free of encumbrances, and neglecting to settle the debt owed to Plaintiff.

127. **Failure to Cease Illegal Activities**: Defendants also failed to cease any illegal, unlawful, and unconstitutional collection efforts on an undisputedly fraudulent debt, engaging in conduct that included but was not limited to threats, violations of Plaintiff's **inherent and** *unalienable* rights, racketeering, paper terrorism, coercion, extortion, bank fraud, monopolization of trade and commerce, restraint-of-trade violations, deprivation of rights, conspiracy under color of law, breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, identity theft, and taking unreasonable positions that forced Plaintiff into litigation.

128. **Material Breach and Deprivation of Bargain**: This failure to perform, along with the unauthorized actions, directly violates the terms and conditions of the express contract security agreements. These actions constitute a material breach that

9 10

11

1213

1415

1617

18

19 20

21

2223

24

2526

2728

has deprived Plaintiff of the benefit of their bargain, as defined under **U.C.C. § 2-202** and related provisions that govern the enforceability of the final contract terms.

#### 129. Private Right of Action:

- Plaintiff hereby asserts a Private Right of Action to enforce their rights under the Contract and Security Agreements, as well as the Uniform Commercial Code.
- Plaintiff is entitled to bring this action pursuant to U.C.C. § 2-202, U.C.C. §§
   1-103, 1-202, 2-204, and Article 9 to seek appropriate remedies, including but not limited to compensatory damages, punitive damages, declaratory relief, and equitable remedies as the Court may deem just and proper.

#### 130. Plaintiff's Private Rights of Action under Embezzlement Laws:

- Plaintiff asserts their Private Right of Action under 18 U.S.C. § 666 for embezzlement, as well as common law embezzlement principles, for the wrongful appropriation of funds and assets by Defendants.
- 18 U.S.C. § 666 provides a federal basis for a Private Right of Action when Defendants have engaged in fraudulent misapplication or theft of funds, particularly when those funds are derived from financial institutions or governmental transactions. Plaintiff is entitled to restitution for any funds or assets misappropriated and for damages caused by Defendants' fraudulent conduct, including any related losses.

## THIRD (3rd) CAUSE OF ACTION

# (For Theft, Embezzlement, and Fraudulent Misapplication of Funds and Assets against all Defendants)

- 131. Plaintiff re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 130 as if fully set forth herein.
- 132. Defendants engaged in illegal, unlawful, unconstitutional, and fraudulent acts, including but not limited to:

7

13

15

16

17

18 19

20

2122

2324

25

26

2728

- Embezzling funds and/or assets entrusted to their care.
- Executing unconstitutional and unlawful seizures of assets and private property without legal standing or proper authorization.
- Fraudulently transferring or attempting to transfer ownership of Plaintiff's property through deceit, deception, and abuse of process.
- Creating a fraudulent claim of ownership and title to the property,
   depriving Plaintiff of their legal rights, interests, and equity.
- 133. Plaintiff affirms, as evidenced by **Exhibits I, J, K, L, and N**, that Defendants, including any officers, directors, agents, or employees connected to financial institutions, acted in direct violation of federal law and fiduciary obligations. Specifically:
  - Defendants, while acting in their capacity as agents or employees of financial institutions, fraudulently misapplied or embezzled funds and property entrusted to their care.
  - The misappropriation and subsequent unconstitutional and unlawful seizures resulted in direct harm to Plaintiff, including but not limited to financial loss, damage to property interests, and violations of constitutional and statutory rights.
- 134. Defendants' actions are actionable under **federal statutes** providing a **private right of action**, including but not limited to:
  - 12 U.S. Code § 503 Allows individuals harmed by the embezzlement or misapplication of funds to seek civil remedies.
  - 18 U.S. Code § 656 (Theft, Embezzlement, or Misapplication by Bank Officer or Employee) Criminalizes the willful misapplication, abstraction, or embezzlement of funds by any officer, director, agent, or employee of a financial institution, Federal Reserve bank, or insured depository institution.
  - Federal and State Consumer Protection Laws Prohibit deceptive and fraudulent practices in financial transactions, including wrongful claims of ownership.

7

10 11

12

13 14

1516

17 18

19 20

21

2223

24

2526

27

28

135. **Defendants violated fiduciary duties** owed to Plaintiff as property owner and rightful asset holder **by acting in bad faith** and *without* lawful authority, willfully misapplying funds, purloining assets, and engaging in acts of fraud, resulting in injury, harm, and damages to Plaintiff.

136. Defendants' conduct constitutes willful and intentional violations of the law and warrants treble damages pursuant to applicable statutes.

## 137. **18 U.S. Code § 656 (Theft, Embezzlement, or Misapplication by Bank Officer or Employee)** expressly stipulates that:

"Whoever, being an officer, director, agent or employee of, or connected in any capacity with any Federal Reserve bank, member bank, depository institution holding company, national bank, insured bank, branch or agency of a foreign bank, or organization operating under section 25 or section 25(a) of the Federal Reserve Act, or a receiver of a national bank, insured bank, branch, agency, or organization or any agent or employee of the receiver, or a Federal Reserve Agent, or an agent or employee of a Federal Reserve Agent or of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, embezzles, abstracts, purloins or willfully misapplies any of the moneys, funds or credits of such bank, branch, agency, or organization or holding company or any moneys, funds, assets or securities entrusted to the custody or care of such bank, branch, agency, or organization, or holding company or to the custody or care of any such agent, officer, director, employee or receiver, shall be fined not more than \$1,000,000 or imprisoned not more than 30 years, or both..." As a direct result of Defendants' theft, embezzlement, and fraudulent misapplication of funds and assets, Plaintiff has been unlawful and unconstitutionally subjected to mental anguish, emotional trauma, financial loss, deprivation of property, reputational harm, and emotional distress.

### 

## 

## 

## 

## 

## 

## 

## 

#### 

## 

## 

## 

### 

#### 

## 

### 

## 

## 

## 

#### FOURTH (4th) CAUSE OF ACTION

## (For Fraud, Forgery, and Unauthorized Use of Identity against all Defendants)

138. Plaintiff re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 137 as if fully set forth herein.

139. Plaintiff affirms that Defendants **illegally**, **unlawfully**, **and unconstitutionally** used Plaintiff's identity, including estate and trust information, without Plaintiff's consent or authorization, for their own benefit by creating false financial instruments, misrepresentations, and fraudulent claims to the subject private property.

140. Defendants intentionally, willfully, and knowingly engaged in **fraudulent conduct** by attempting to **unlawfully and unconstitutionally seize Plaintiff's private property** without Plaintiff's consent or any legal or lawful authority. In furtherance of their **illegal**, **unlawful**, **and unconstitutional actions**, Defendants:

- Forged Plaintiff's signature on financial documents and legal instruments.
- Obtained Plaintiff's signature under false pretenses.
- Used these falsified and fraudulent documents to support their unlawful seizure attempts and misrepresent their claims of ownership or control over the subject private property.
- 141. Plaintiff affirms that Defendants' fraudulent actions, including **forgery and the unauthorized use of Plaintiff's identity**, violate common law principles of **fraud, forgery, and identity theft**, as well as applicable **state and federal statutes**, including but not limited to:
  - 15 U.S. Code § 1681n (Fair Credit Reporting Act) Provides a private right
    of action for willful and knowing violations related to the misuse of
    personal and financial information.
  - 15 U.S. Code § 1692e (Fair Debt Collection Practices Act) Provides a
    private right of action prohibiting false, deceptive, or misleading
    representations in the collection of debts.

10

11 12

13 14

1516

17

18 19

20

2122

23

2425

26

27

28

- 18 U.S. Code § 1028A (Aggravated Identity Theft) Establishes criminal liability and additional penalties for knowingly using or transferring another person's identity without lawful authority.
- State Civil Code on Forgery or Fraudulent Misrepresentation Provides a private right of action prohibiting the falsification of documents and misrepresentation in financial transactions and property matters.
- 142. Private Right of Action: Plaintiff asserts a private right of action to enforce their rights under the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. § 1681n), the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (15 U.S.C. § 1692e), and applicable state and federal laws prohibiting identity theft, fraud, and forgery.
- 143. Plaintiff further affirms that **Defendants' conduct constitutes a willful and intentional scheme to deprive Plaintiff of their property**, as follows:
  - The creation of false financial instruments and forged signatures
    demonstrates a pattern of fraudulent misrepresentation and forgery.
  - The misuse of Plaintiff's identity, including estate and trust information, constitutes a direct violation of Plaintiff's rights to privacy, autonomy, and protection from unauthorized exploitation.
- 144. Defendants' **unlawful** actions have directly caused **harm** to Plaintiff, including:
  - Loss of property value, enjoyment, and equity.
  - Emotional distress, humiliation, mental trauma, and reputational harm.
  - Financial expenses incurred in defending against fraudulent seizure actions and restoring rightful title to the property.
- 145. Defendants' actions rise to the level of gross and intentional misconduct, warranting the imposition of treble damages pursuant to applicable civil statutes and laws governing fraudulent conduct.
- 146. **18 U.S. Code § 1025 (Fraudulent Acquisition of Property or Signatures)** expressly stipulates:

"Whoever, upon any waters or vessel within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, by any fraud, or false pretense, obtains from any person anything of value, or procures the execution and delivery of any instrument of writing or conveyance of real or personal property, or the signature of any person, as maker, endorser, or guarantor, to or upon any bond, bill, receipt, promissory note, draft, or check, or any other evidence of indebtedness, or fraudulently sells, barters, or disposes of any bond, bill, receipt, promissory note, draft, or check, or other evidence of indebtedness, for value, knowing the same to be worthless, or knowing the signature of the maker, endorser, or guarantor thereof to have been obtained by any false pretenses, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

### 147. 18 U.S. Code § 1028A (Aggravated Identity Theft) expressly stipulates:

"Whoever, during and in relation to any felony violation enumerated in subsection (c), knowingly transfers, possesses, or uses, without lawful authority, a means of identification of another person shall, in addition to the punishment provided for such felony, be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of 2 years. (2) Terrorism offense. — Whoever, during and in relation to any felony violation enumerated in section 2332b(g)(5)(B), knowingly transfers, possesses, or uses, without lawful authority, a means of identification of another person or a false identification document shall, in addition to the punishment provided for such felony, be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of 5 years."

148. As a direct result of Defendants' fraud, forgery, and unauthorized use of Plaintiff's identity, Plaintiff has suffered financial loss, deprivation of property, reputational harm, and emotional distress.

#### FIFTH (5th) CAUSE OF ACTION

## (For Monopolization of Trade and Commerce, and Unfair Business Practices against all Defendants)

149. Plaintiff re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 148 as if fully set forth herein.

9

11

13

16

15

17 18

1920

2122

2324

25

2627

28

150. Plaintiff affirms that Defendants, in **violation of 15 U.S.C. § 2**, willfully engaged in **monopolization of trade and commerce** by manipulating financial systems and processes to further their fraudulent objectives. Specifically, Defendants engaged in **illegal and unlawful conduct**, including but not limited to:

- **Fabricating false debts** and creating **fraudulent security interests** without Plaintiff's knowledge, authorization, or consent.
- Utilizing financial institutions to process unlawful and unconstitutional seizures of private property through fraudulent claims.
- Engaging in deceptive and unfair business practices designed to monopolize trade and commerce, restrain competition, and deprive Plaintiff of their rightful property and legal protections.
- 151. Defendants' actions, as alleged, were part of a larger **scheme to monopolize trade and commerce** through **unfair and deceptive practices**, thereby violating applicable civil statutes, including but not limited to:
  - 15 U.S.C. § 15(a) (Clayton Act) Provides a private right of action for damages resulting from anticompetitive and monopolistic practices.
  - **15 U.S.C. § 2 (Sherman Act)** Prohibits monopolization, attempts to monopolize, and conspiracies to monopolize trade and commerce.
  - State Unfair Competition Laws Prohibit fraudulent, deceptive, and unlawful business practices in trade and commerce.
  - Uniform Commercial Code (U.C.C.) Governs negotiable instruments, discharge of obligations, and fair trade practices.
- 152. **Private Right of Action:** Plaintiff asserts a private right of action to enforce their rights under 15 U.S.C. § 15(a) (Clayton Act), the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. § 2), state unfair competition laws, and the UCC to seek appropriate remedies, including but not limited to:
  - Compensatory damages for financial harm.
  - Treble damages under 15 U.S.C. § 15(a).

8

9

7

10 11

1213

1415

16

17 18

19

2021

22

24

23

2526

27

28

- Injunctive relief to prevent further monopolistic and fraudulent practices.
- 153. As part of this fraudulent scheme, Defendants engaged in unfair and deceptive business practices by:
  - Creating false debts and fabricating fraudulent security interests.
  - Fraudulently misrepresenting and concealing material facts regarding the nature and validity of alleged debts.
  - Engaging in a calculated effort to monopolize trade and commerce by suppressing competition and enforcing unlawful claims against Plaintiff's private property.
  - Violating Plaintiff's rights under applicable common law and civil statutes.
- 154. Plaintiff further **asserts and affirms** that Defendants' actions were part of a broader scheme to unfairly restrain trade and commerce by:
  - Leveraging fraudulent financial instruments to secure unlawful gains.
  - Misusing public policy and statutory frameworks to enforce monopolistic practices.
  - Exploiting their position of power within the financial system to deprive Plaintiff of lawful protections and remedies.
- 155. Plaintiff affirms that Defendants' actions, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 2, caused direct harm and damages to Plaintiff's financial and legal interests.

### 156. 15 U.S.C. § 2 (Sherman Act) expressly stipulates:

"Every person who shall monopolize, or attempt to monopolize, or combine or conspire with any other person or persons, to monopolize any part of the trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by fine not exceeding \$100,000,000 if a corporation, or, if any other person, \$1,000,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding 10 years, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court."

9

1112

13 14

16

15

17 18

19 20

2122

2324

25

2627

28

157. Plaintiff affirms that Defendants' illegal, unlawful, and unconstitutional practices directly resulted in injury and harm, warranting the imposition of treble damages under 15 U.S.C. § 15(a), which provides for compensation in cases of antitrust violations and monopolistic practices.

158. Plaintiff further affirm that Defendants' conduct constitutes willful, intentional, and egregious violations of their rights, including but not limited to:

- · Deprivation of property without due process of law.
- Restraint of trade and competition in violation of public policy.
- Fraudulent business practices designed to defraud Plaintiff and gain unlawful advantage.
- 159. As a direct result of Defendants' monopolization of trade and commerce and unfair business practices, Plaintiff has suffered financial loss, deprivation of property, reputational harm, and emotional distress

#### SIXTH (6th) CAUSE OF ACTION

(For Deprivation of Rights Under the Color of Law against all Defendants)
(Private Cause of Action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and Constitutional Law)

- 160. Plaintiff re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 159 as if fully set forth herein.
- 161. Plaintiff affirms that **Defendants**, acting under color of law, willfully and intentionally deprived Plaintiff of rights inherent and unalienable secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States, specifically in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
- 162. Plaintiff affirms that Defendants engaged in **illegal**, **unlawful**, **and coercive actions** by threatening the **unconstitutional and unlawful seizure of Plaintiff's private property** through fraudulent enforcement proceedings. These actions included but were not limited to:
  - Attempting to coerce Plaintiff into complying with baseless and unlawful financial demands under the imminent threat of losing their property.

1011

12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

2223

24

2526

27

28

• Depriving Plaintiff of their property rights and protections secured by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution.

- Exercising fraudulent and deceptive practices designed to unjustly enrich Defendants at Plaintiff's expense.
- 163. Plaintiff affirms that Defendants' actions **violated Plaintiff's due process rights**, as secured by the **Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments**, by failing to provide **proper notice**, **fair hearings**, **and lawful justification** for their unconstitutional and unlawful enforcement actions.
- 164. Plaintiff affirms and asserts that Defendants' conduct **caused direct harm** to Plaintiff, resulting in **significant emotional**, **financial**, **and legal damages**. Specifically, Defendants' actions deprived Plaintiff of:
  - The right to due process of law, secured and protected by the Fifth and
     Fourteenth Amendments of the Constitution.
  - The right to be free from coercion and extortion under color of law.
  - The right to enjoy private property without unlawful interference or deprivation.
- 165. **Private Right of Action:** Plaintiff respectfully demands relief for the injury, damage, and harm caused by Defendants' actions, as authorized under **42 U.S.C. § 1983**, which provides a **private right of action** for the deprivation of constitutional rights under color of state law.

### 166. 18 U.S.C. § 241 (Conspiracy Against Rights) expressly stipulates:

"If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same; or If two or more persons go in disguise on the highway, or on the premises of another, with intent to prevent or hinder his free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege so secured — They shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both."

---

167. Plaintiff further asserts and affirms that Defendants, acting under the authority and guise of legal processes, conspired to deprive Plaintiff of their **constitutional rights.** These actions represent a **calculated** effort to abuse their positions and disregard established legal and constitutional protections.

168. Plaintiff further affirms that Defendants' actions represent a systematic and deliberate violation of Plaintiff's rights and protections under the United States Constitution and federal law, warranting full and appropriate relief as determined by this Court.

169. Plaintiff further affirms that Defendants, acting under the authority and guise of legal processes, conspired to deprive Plaintiff of their constitutional rights. These actions represent a calculated effort to abuse their positions and disregard established legal and constitutional protections.

170. Plaintiff further affirms that Defendants' actions represent a systematic and deliberate violation of Plaintiff's rights and protections under the United States Constitution and federal law, warranting full and appropriate relief as determined by this Court.

#### SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

### (For Receiving Extortion Proceeds against all Defendants)

171. Plaintiff re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 170 as if fully set forth herein.

172. Defendants employed **coercive tactics**, including the **unlawful and unconstitutional seizure of private property**, **threats**, **and false claims of authority**, to compel Plaintiff to act against their interests and submit to fraudulent claims. These actions constitute a **violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983**, which provides a **private right of action** for the deprivation of rights secured by the **Constitution and federal law**. Defendants, **acting under color of law**, **have deprived Plaintiff of their property rights**, as secured under the **Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments** of the Constitution.

13

14

15 16

17

18

1920

21

2223

24

25

2627

28

173. Defendants' actions also constitute **violations of 15 U.S.C. § 1 of the Sherman Antitrust Act**, which prohibits **conspiracies to restrain trade or commerce**. If these coercive and unlawful seizures of private property were part of a broader effort to **monopolize or restrain trade** (e.g., through fraudulent property acquisition or market manipulation), such actions would be in direct violation of **federal antitrust law**.

174. Moreover, by engaging in these unlawful activities, Defendants have unlawfully received and benefited from extortion proceeds obtained through fraudulent means, thus constituting unjust enrichment under the Restatement (Second) of Torts, which provides for civil remedies when one party benefits at the expense of another through wrongful conduct. The wrongful nature of Defendants' actions has caused significant injury and harm to Plaintiff, warranting restitution, disgorgement of ill-gotten gains, and other appropriate remedies.

175. **Private Right of Action:** Plaintiff asserts a private right of action to enforce their rights under **42 U.S.C. § 1983, 15 U.S.C. § 1 (Sherman Act)**, the Restatement (Second) of Torts (Unjust Enrichment), and applicable federal extortion laws to seek appropriate remedies, including but not limited to:

- Compensatory damages for financial harm.
- Treble damages under 15 U.S.C. § 15(a).
- Restitution and disgorgement of all fraudulently obtained proceeds.
- Injunctive relief to prevent further extortionate and fraudulent practices.
- Defendants employed coercive tactics, including but not limited to:
- Unlawful and unconstitutional seizure of private property through fraudulent claims and misrepresentation of legal authority.
- Threats and intimidation tactics aimed at forcing Plaintiff into compliance with fraudulent demands.

• Fabrication of false debts and fraudulent security interests designed to unlawfully extract financial benefits from Plaintiff.

176. Defendants' actions constitute a violation of 18 U.S.C. § 880, which criminalizes the receipt of extortion proceeds. By engaging in these unlawful activities, Defendants have unlawfully received and benefited from extortion proceeds obtained through fraudulent means, thereby reinforcing the wrongful nature of their actions and the resulting harm inflicted upon Plaintiff.

177. 18 U.S.C. § 880 (Receiving Extortion Proceeds) expressly stipulates:

"A person who receives, possesses, conceals, or disposes of any money or other property which was obtained from the commission of any offense under this chapter that is punishable by imprisonment for more than 1 year, knowing the same to have been unlawfully obtained, shall be imprisoned not more than 3 years, fined under this title, or both."

178. As a direct result of Defendants' receipt of extortion proceeds, Plaintiff has suffered financial loss, deprivation of property, reputational harm, and emotional distress.

#### EIGHTH (8th) CAUSE OF ACTION

(For False Pretenses and Fraud all Defendants)

179. Plaintiff re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 178 as if set forth herein.

180. Defendants' Fraudulent Actions and 'Fraud in the Factum': Defendants willfully and intentionally engaged in fraudulent actions by knowingly misrepresenting material facts and creating fraud in the factum, concerning the interest, ownership, title, and authority to execute the unlawful and unconstitutional seizure of private property. These actions were conducted under blatantly fraudulent and false pretenses, and ignorance of the law is no excuse.

181. **False Claims of Debt and Fraudulent Proceedings:** Defendants willfully and intentionally:

Created false claims of debt to deceive Plaintiff into compliance with

9 10

11 12

13 14

> 15 16

17

18

1920

2122

23

2425

2627

- fraudulent demands.
  Placed fraudulent documents in the post office or authorized depositories for mail, constituting mail fraud.
- Initiated unlawful and unconstitutional enforcement actions that lacked any lawful or legal basis.
- 182. By engaging in these fraudulent actions, Defendants wrongfully deprived Plaintiff of property or assets through deceptive means, causing direct financial harm and legal injury to Plaintiff.
- 183. **Fraudulent Tactics and Deceptive Representations:** Defendants **employed fraudulent tactics**, including but not limited to:
  - Unlawful initiation of transactions under false pretenses.
  - Deceitful representations and the use of fraudulent instruments to obtain property from Plaintiff.
  - **Procuring signatures under false pretenses**, knowing that the documents and signatures were obtained through fraudulent misrepresentations.
- 184. **Defendants' Conduct Constitutes Fraud and Misrepresentation:** Defendants' actions constitute fraud and misrepresentation under common law tort principles, including fraudulent misrepresentation and false pretenses. This conduct entitles Plaintiff to seek damages and remedies for the unlawful appropriation of property.
- 185. Unlawful Benefit from Fraudulent Conduct: Defendants unlawfully benefited from Plaintiff by fraudulently obtaining property, goods, services, or financial benefits, which constitutes a breach of duty to Plaintiff. By obtaining property or value through fraud, Defendants have caused significant harm and financial loss to Plaintiff.
- 186. **Specific Fraudulent Actions by Defendants:** Defendants' fraudulent acts include, but are not limited to:
  - Use of Fraudulent Instruments Defendants used, attempted to use, or procured the use of fraudulent documents, including forged contracts,

9

7

10

11 12

1314

15 16

17 18

19 20

21

2223

24

25

2627

28

falsified notes, or other fraudulent evidence of debt, to transfer or encumber Plaintiff's private property.

- False Pretenses Defendants made false and misleading representations
  with intent to deceive Plaintiff into parting with private property or
  financial assets. Plaintiff reasonably relied upon these false representations
  to their detriment.
- Misappropriation of Property Defendants unlawfully obtained property,
   money, or goods through fraud, deceit, or false pretenses, knowing that
   the property was obtained through fraudulent means.
- 187. **Damages from Fraudulent Conduct:** As a **direct result** of Defendants' fraudulent conduct, Plaintiff has suffered:
  - Actual damages for property lost or fraudulently obtained.
  - Consequential damages resulting from Defendants' fraudulent actions.
  - Punitive damages due to Defendants' willful and intentional misconduct.
  - 188. Private Right of Action: Plaintiff asserts a private right of action under:
    - 18 U.S.C. § 1964 (RICO) Defendants' fraudulent conduct constitutes
       racketeering activity, allowing Plaintiff to seek treble damages.
    - 15 U.S.C. § 1 (Sherman Antitrust Act) Provides a private right of action for fraudulent practices that restrain trade or commerce through false pretenses.
    - State Fraud and Deceit Laws Plaintiff is entitled to damages for fraud, deceit, and misrepresentation under state law tort claims.
  - 189. Recovery and Restitution: Defendants' actions entitle Plaintiff to:
    - Actual damages for property lost or fraudulently obtained.
  - Consequential damages resulting from Defendants' fraudulent actions.
  - Punitive damages due to Defendants' willful and intentional misconduct.
  - Equitable relief, including but not limited to the return of wrongfully obtained property or its financial equivalent.

1112

13

10

1415

1617

18 19

20

21

22

2324

25

26

27

28

190. **Unjust Enrichment:** Defendants have been unjustly enriched by receiving property or benefits through fraudulent means. Equity demands that Defendants return the unjustly obtained property or its value. Plaintiff seeks the following legal and equitable remedies:

- Restitution of all credits, money, funds, property, or financial value wrongfully obtained by Defendants.
- Full compensation for the harm suffered, including consequential and punitive damages resulting from Defendants' fraudulent conduct.
- 191. 18 U.S. Code § 1341 (Frauds and Swindles) Expressly Stipulates:

"Whoever, having devised or intending to devise any scheme or artifice to defraud, or for obtaining money or property by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises, or to sell, dispose of, loan, exchange, alter, give away, distribute, supply, or furnish or procure for unlawful use any counterfeit or spurious coin, obligation, security, or other article, or anything represented to be or intimated or held out to be such counterfeit or spurious article, for the purpose of executing such scheme or artifice or attempting so to do, places in any post office or authorized depository for mail matter, any matter or thing whatever to be sent or delivered by the Postal Service, or deposits or causes to be deposited any matter or thing whatever to be sent or delivered by any private or commercial interstate carrier, or takes or receives therefrom, any such matter or thing, or knowingly causes to be delivered by mail or such carrier according to the direction thereon, or at the place at which it is directed to be delivered by the person to whom it is addressed, any such matter or thing, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both."

192. If the violation involves a financial institution, the penalty increases to imprisonment of up to 30 years and a fine of up to \$1,000,000.

10

12 13

14

1516

17

18 19

20

2122

23

2425

26

2728

193. As a direct result of Defendants' **false pretenses and fraudulent conduct,** Plaintiff has suffered financial loss, deprivation of property, reputational harm, and emotional distress.

#### NINETH (9th) CAUSE OF ACTION

(For Threats and Extortion against all Defendants)

- 194. Plaintiff re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 193 as if set forth herein.
- 195. **Acknowledgment of Unrebutted Affidavits:** As considered, agreed, and admitted by Defendants in the unrebutted affidavits (**Exhibits E, F, G, and H**), Defendants knowingly and willfully engaged in threatening conduct, including threats of harm and extortion, in violation of applicable laws concerning internationally protected persons, foreign officials, and nationals of the United States.
- 196. Extortionate Demands and Coercion: Defendants made extortionate demands or threats to influence or coerce Plaintiff through intimidation, fraud, or force, knowing that such threats would lead to harm or unlawful actions that would benefit Defendants.
- 197. **Nature of Defendants' Threats and Extortionate Conduct:** Defendants' actions include but are not limited to:
  - Threatening to violate the rights or safety of an internationally protected person or foreign official, as defined under 18 U.S.C. § 112 (Protection of Foreign Officials, Official Guests, and Internationally Protected Persons).
  - Making extortionate demands in connection with the threats described above.
  - Using threats, coercion, and intimidation to force Plaintiff into compliance with unlawful demands.
- 198. **Coercion and Extortion:** By engaging in these unlawful and unconstitutional actions, Defendants knowingly engaged in coercion and extortion,

3 4

6

5

7 8

9 10

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24 25

26

27

28

using threats to unlawfully influence or compel Plaintiff to act against their interests or submit to Defendants' fraudulent claims.

199. Harm to Plaintiff: Defendants' extortionate actions directly harmed Plaintiff by:

- Depriving Plaintiff of their rights or property under duress or threat of further deprivation and harm.
- Forcing Plaintiff into submission through unlawful intimidation and threats.
- Inflicting financial, reputational, and legal damages through coercive tactics.
- 200. Unjust Enrichment of Defendants: Defendants made these extortionate demands with full knowledge of their unlawfulness, intending to benefit from the coerced conduct. Defendants' fraudulent and coercive actions have resulted in unjust enrichment, which demands restitution under the principles of equity and common law fraud.
  - 201. Private Right of Action: Plaintiff assert a private right of action under:
    - 18 U.S.C. § 873 (Extortion by Officers or Employees of the United States) Provides a **civil remedy** for individuals who have been victims of extortion.
    - 18 U.S.C. § 878 (Threats and Extortion Against Foreign Officials, Official Guests, or Internationally Protected Persons) - Establishes penalties for coercion, threats, and extortionate demands tied to federally protected persons or entities.
    - Civil RICO (18 U.S.C. § 1964) Allows Plaintiff to pursue damages when extortion is tied to racketeering activities that involve coercive tactics to gain unlawful financial benefits.
- 202. Civil Cause of Action for Extortion and Coercion: Defendants' actions are subject to private civil liability for:
  - Compensatory damages for Plaintiff due to Defendants' extortion attempts, which forced Plaintiff into statutory compliance through unlawful demands.

1112

13 14

1617

15

19

20

18

21

22

23

2425

26

2728

Punitive damages for Defendants' intentional, willful, and malicious extortion under 18 U.S.C. § 878, which provides for criminal penalties as well as civil liability in cases of coercion, threats, or extortion.

- Consequential damages resulting from Defendants' coercive actions, including financial and reputational harm.
- Equitable relief, including restitution and the return of any property wrongfully obtained through extortion.
- 203. **Violation of Constitutional and Statutory Rights:** Defendants' conduct also constitutes a violation of Plaintiff's constitutional and statutory rights, including but not limited to:
  - Unlawful coercion and the deprivation of property.
  - The use of intimidation and extortion to override due process protections.
  - Forcing Plaintiff to act against their will under the threat of harm.
  - Relevant Statutes and Legal Precedent
- 204. 18 U.S. Code § 878 (Threats and Extortion Against Foreign Officials, Official Guests, or Internationally Protected Persons) expressly stipulates:
  - "(a) Whoever knowingly and willfully threatens to violate 18 U.S. Code § 112, 18 U.S. Code § 1116, or 18 U.S. Code § 1201 shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than five years, or both, except that imprisonment for a threatened assault shall not exceed three years.
  - (b) Whoever in connection with any violation of subsection (a) or actual violation of 18 U.S. Code § 112, 18 U.S. Code § 1116, or 18 U.S. Code § 1201 makes any extortionate demand shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than twenty years, or both.
  - (c) For the purpose of this section, "foreign official," "internationally protected person," "national of the United States," and "official guest" shall have the same meanings as those provided in 18 U.S. Code § 1116(a).
  - (d) If the victim of an offense under subsection (a) is an internationally

9 10

1112

13

15

14

17

16

18

20

19

21

2223

24

25

27

26

28

protected person outside the United States, the United States may exercise jurisdiction over the offense if:

- The victim is a representative, officer, employee, or agent of the United States.
- The offender is a national of the United States.
- The offender is afterward found in the United States.
- 205. **Relief Sought:** Plaintiff seeks the following **civil and equitable** remedies:
  - Compensatory damages for the harm suffered due to the unlawful and extortionate conduct of Defendants.
  - Consequential damages arising from Defendants' coercive actions, including financial and reputational harm.
  - Punitive damages for Defendants' intentional, malicious, and willful misconduct in unlawfully threatening and coercing Plaintiff.
  - Restitution and disgorgement of any wrongfully obtained property or financial gains resulting from extortion and coercion.
  - Equitable relief, including an injunction against further coercive or extortionate conduct by Defendants.
  - As a direct result of Defendants' coercion, extortion, and unjust enrichment, Plaintiff has suffered financial loss, emotional distress, reputational harm, and the deprivation of their rights under federal law.

## TENTH (10th) CAUSE OF ACTION (For Racketeering against all Defendants)

- 206. Plaintiff re-asserts and re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 205 as if set forth herein.
- 207. **Defendants' Racketeering Scheme:** Defendants willfully and intentionally engaged in a pattern of racketeering activity designed to defraud, extort, and

9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

28

unlawfully deprive Plaintiff of their property and rights. This conduct constitutes racketeering under 18 U.S.C. § 1961 et seq., as Defendants engaged in multiple predicate acts of fraud, extortion, mail and wire fraud, conspiracy, and the unlawful assertion of jurisdiction to further their scheme.

208. Defendants' actions include but are not limited to:

- Fraudulent misrepresentations regarding financial transactions, debt obligations, and the creation of money.
- Knowingly asserting false claims of debt to coerce compliance.
- Filing fraudulent documents with courts and financial institutions to legitimize unlawful claims.
- Attempting to force Plaintiff into their jurisdiction despite being made aware of the lack of jurisdiction.
- Conspiring to violate Plaintiff's constitutional rights through coercion, intimidation, and fraudulent legal actions.
- 209. Defendants' actions were committed as part of a broader scheme to extort financial and property interests from Plaintiff through fraudulent and deceptive practices, demonstrating a clear pattern of racketeering activity as defined under 18 U.S.C. § 1961(1).
- 210. Predicate Acts of Racketeering: Defendants have engaged in multiple **predicate acts of racketeering**, including but not limited to:
  - Mail Fraud (18 U.S.C. § 1341) Defendants used the U.S. mail and commercial carriers to send fraudulent documents, false financial claims, and unlawful notices to deceive Plaintiff.
  - Wire Fraud (18 U.S.C. § 1343) Defendants transmitted fraudulent communications via electronic means to further their racketeering scheme.
  - Extortion (18 U.S.C. § 1951, Hobbs Act) Defendants used threats, coercion, and intimidation to force Plaintiff to submit to fraudulent demands.

9 10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

2021

2223

2425

2627

- Money Laundering (18 U.S.C. §§ 1956, 1957) Defendants engaged in financial transactions designed to disguise the fraudulent nature of their activities.
- Conspiracy to Commit Racketeering (18 U.S.C. § 1962(d)) Defendants conspired with others to carry out a pattern of racketeering activity with the intent to defraud and extort Plaintiff.
- 211. **Unlawful Assertion of Jurisdiction as a Racketeering Tactic:** Defendants' **fraudulent assertion of jurisdiction** over Plaintiff is an integral part of their racketeering enterprise. Specifically, Defendants:
  - Falsely claimed authority over Plaintiff despite being notified that no jurisdiction existed.
  - Attempted to coerce Plaintiff into recognizing an unlawful jurisdiction through fraud, intimidation, and economic duress.
  - Conspired to use fraudulent legal proceedings as a means to enforce illegitimate claims and extract financial gains from Plaintiff.
- 212. This **abuse of legal processes** is a key racketeering tactic that violates **18 U.S.C. §§ 1341, 1343, 1951, and 1962**.
- 213. **Private Right of Action Under RICO:** Pursuant to **18 U.S.C. § 1964(c)** (**RICO**), Plaintiff asserts a **private right of action** for damages resulting from Defendants' **racketeering activities**, including but not limited to:
  - The unlawful deprivation of property and economic resources.
  - Fraudulent legal claims and financial extortion.
  - Economic harm, reputational damage, and emotional distress.
- 214. **Pattern of Racketeering Activity:** Defendants have engaged in a **pattern of racketeering activity**, demonstrating their intent to:
  - Defraud Plaintiff through false financial claims and fraudulent transactions.
  - Conceal unlawful financial transactions through fraudulent filings and misrepresentations.

11

9

1213

14

15 16

1718

19

20

2122

23

24

25

2627

28

- Coerce compliance through threats, deception, and financial manipulation.
- Enforce fraudulent claims through the unlawful assertion of jurisdiction.
- 215. **Relief Sought:** As a **direct result** of Defendants' **racketeering and fraudulent conduct**, Plaintiff has suffered:
  - Compensatory damages for financial losses incurred as a result of the racketeering scheme.
  - Treble damages under 18 U.S.C. § 1964(c) (RICO) due to the extensive pattern of racketeering activity.
  - Punitive damages due to Defendants' intentional and willful misconduct.
  - Equitable relief, including injunctive relief to prevent further racketeering activity and disgorgement of unlawfully obtained property or funds

#### ELEVENTH (11th) CAUSE OF ACTION

(For Bank Fraud against all Defendants)

- 216. Plaintiff re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 215 as if set forth herein.
- 217. Plaintiff hereby asserts a cause of action for bank fraud under 12 U.S. Code § 1831, which provides a basis for a **private cause of action** for the unlawful conduct of Defendants.
  - 1. Violation of 12 U.S. Code § 1831 Bank Fraud
    - Defendants willfully and intentionally violated 12 U.S. Code § 1831, which expressly stipulates:
    - "Whoever knowingly executes, or attempts to execute, a scheme or artifice—
      (1) to defraud a financial institution; or (2) to obtain any of the moneys,
      funds, credits, assets, securities, or other property owned by, or under the
      custody or control of a financial institution, by means of false or fraudulent
      pretenses, representations, or promises; shall be fined not more than
      \$1,000,000 or imprisoned not more than 30 years, or both."

2. Defendants' Scheme to Defraud

Defendants engaged in a deliberate and fraudulent scheme to defraud a financial institution, specifically by placing fraudulent claims on the property, misrepresenting ownership, and creating false debt instruments, all under false pretenses. These actions were executed with the intent to unlawfully obtain funds, securities, assets, and other property under the custody and control of the financial institution.

#### 3. Plaintiff's Financial Harm

The fraudulent conduct perpetrated by Defendants caused substantial financial harm to Plaintiff. By unlawfully manipulating financial assets and misleading the financial institution, Defendants' actions further violated Plaintiff's rights, resulting in significant economic damages.

#### 4. Damages Sought

As a result of the Defendants' violations of 12 U.S. Code § 1831, Plaintiff seeks to recover compensatory damages, including but not limited to financial losses, consequential damages, and any other relief the Court deems appropriate. Additionally, Plaintiff seeks punitive damages in order to deter further unlawful conduct

218. Defendants willfully and intentionally violated 18 U.S. Code § 1344 – Bank Fraud, which expressly stipulates: "Whoever knowingly executes, or attempts to execute, a scheme or artifice—(1) to defraud a financial institution; or (2) to obtain any of the moneys, funds, credits, assets, securities, or other property owned by, or under the custody or control of a financial institution, by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises; shall be fined not more than \$1,000,000 or imprisoned not more than 30 years, or both." Defendants engaged in a scheme to defraud the financial institution by placing fraudulent claims on the property, misrepresenting ownership, and creating false debt instruments,

3

4

5

8

9

12

13 14

15

1617

18

19 20

21

23

2425

26

2728

all while under false pretenses. Their actions were designed to obtain funds, securities, and assets unlawfully, further violating Plaintiff's rights and causing financial harm."

#### TWELFTH (12th) CAUSE OF ACTION

(For Fraudulent Transportation and Transfer of Stolen Goods, Property, and Securities against all Defendants)

219. Plaintiff re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 218 as if set forth herein.

220. **Defendants' Unlawful Actions:** Defendants willfully and knowingly engaged in the unlawful transportation, transmission, and transfer of stolen, converted, and fraudulently obtained goods, securities, and money across state lines, in violation of:

- 18 U.S. Code § 2314 Prohibits the interstate transportation of stolen, converted, or fraudulently obtained property, including securities and money.
- **18 U.S. Code § 2315** Prohibits the receipt, possession, concealment, and disposal of stolen or fraudulently obtained goods, securities, or money.
- 15 U.S. Code § 78j (Securities Exchange Act of 1934) Prohibits
  manipulative and deceptive practices in connection with the purchase or
  sale of securities.

221. Defendants engaged in a coordinated scheme to unlawfully acquire and transfer Plaintiff's property and financial interests, including but not limited to:

- Real property fraudulently transferred through forged deeds and fraudulent filings.
- Monetary instruments and negotiable instruments unlawfully converted through deception and misrepresentation.
- **Financial securities and assets exceeding \$5,000 in value** obtained through fraudulent means.

4

12

13

1415

16

17 18

19 20

21

23

24

2526

2728

222. Fraudulent Transfers and Participation in Deceptive Conduct: Defendants knowingly participated in fraudulent transfers of assets and securities, including but not limited to:

- **Fabricated financial documents** falsely asserting ownership over Plaintiff's property.
- Fraudulent deeds and forged instruments used to unlawfully transfer ownership of Plaintiff's assets.
- Misrepresentation of financial obligations designed to coerce Plaintiff into accepting false claims.
- 223. These fraudulent activities were knowingly executed by Defendants despite being on notice of their illegality, as evidenced by the verified and *unrebutted* commercial affidavits (**Exhibits E, F, G, and H**).
- 224. **Conspiracy to Defraud:** Defendants conspired to transport and transfer stolen goods, property, and financial securities, with the specific intent to:
  - Deprive Plaintiff of their rightful assets.
  - Conceal the fraudulent nature of their acquisitions.
  - Manipulate financial records to create the appearance of legitimacy.
- 225. This conspiracy violates 15 U.S. Code § 78j, which prohibits fraud, misrepresentation, and deceptive conduct in the sale or transfer of securities.
- 226. Execution of Fraudulent and Unlawful Transfers: Defendants' scheme to unlawfully transfer Plaintiff's property, including financial securities, was executed without legal authority or justification, demonstrating:
  - **Intentional misrepresentation** in legal filings and financial records.
  - Knowingly transferring stolen and fraudulently acquired assets.
  - Utilizing deceptive practices to obscure the unlawful nature of their transactions.

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

2425

26

27

28

227. **Violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (FDCPA):** As further evidenced by the unrebutted commercial affidavits, Defendants engaged in fraudulent debt collection practices, in violation of:

- 15 U.S. Code § 1692 (FDCPA) Prohibits deceptive and misleading debt collection practices.
- 15 U.S. Code § 1692e Prohibits false representations and deceptive conduct in the collection of debts.
- **15 U.S. Code § 1692f** Prohibits unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt.

#### 228. Defendants:

- Falsely represented financial obligations through fraudulent documents and fabricated debt instruments.
- Coerced Plaintiff into compliance using unlawful and deceptive tactics.
- Attempted to mislead Plaintiff into relinquishing property, funds, or assets under false pretenses.
- 229. **Harm and Financial Loss:** As a **direct result** of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff has suffered:
  - The wrongful deprivation of property and financial securities.
  - Significant emotional distress and reputational harm.
  - Financial damages resulting from forced legal proceedings to reclaim unlawfully transferred assets.
  - Loss of revenue
- 230. **Private Right of Action and Relief Sought:** Plaintiff asserts a private right of action under:
  - 18 U.S.C. § 2314 and § 2315 Plaintiff seeks full compensatory and treble damages for losses incurred due to Defendants' fraudulent transfer and transportation of stolen property.

10

11 12

13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

- 15 U.S. Code § 78j Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief and damages for Defendants' deceptive and fraudulent securities transactions.
- 15 U.S. Code § 1692k (FDCPA) Plaintiff is entitled to:
  - **Actual damages** for financial loss.
  - Statutory damages due to Defendants' deceptive debt collection practices.
  - **Attorney's fees and costs** associated with enforcing their rights.
- 231. Defendants have engaged in a systematic scheme to fraudulently transport and transfer stolen property, securities, and financial instruments, in violation of federal racketeering, fraud, and debt collection laws. Plaintiff seeks full redress, damages, and equitable relief as provided under all applicable laws.

## THIRTEENTH (13th) CAUSE OF ACTION (For Torture against all Defendants)

- 232. Plaintiff re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 231 as if set forth herein.
- 233. Defendants' Unlawful and Unconstitutional Acts: Defendants willfully and intentionally subjected Plaintiff to unlawful and unconstitutional arrest, detention, and involuntary imprisonment, constituting torture and cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment in violation of federal and international law. Defendants' actions include but are not limited to:
  - The unlawful deprivation of Plaintiff's liberty without due process of law.
  - The use of coercion, threats, and force to compel Plaintiff into compliance.
  - The infliction of severe mental, emotional, and physical distress.
  - Deliberate indifference to Plaintiff's constitutional and human rights.
- 234. These actions constitute acts of torture, as defined under 18 U.S.C. § 2340 and § 2340A (Torture Statute), which prohibits acts intended to inflict severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, upon a person in custody or control of government officials or agents.

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27 28

239. Defendants acted with intent to:

235. Unlawful Arrest and Involuntary Imprisonment as Torture: Defendants
acted under the color of law to unlawfully seize, detain, and imprison Plaintiff
without lawful authority, violating:

- **42 U.S.C.** § **1983** Deprivation of rights under the color of law.
- **42 U.S.C. § 1985** Conspiracy to interfere with civil rights.
- **42 U.S.C. § 1986** Neglect to prevent civil rights violations.
- 236. The false imprisonment and deprivation rights and of liberty were carried out with:
  - No valid warrant or probable cause.
  - No due process, lawful charges, or legitimate legal justification.
  - No immediate access to legal counsel, communication, or redress.
- 237. Defendants' actions violated Plaintiff's fundamental rights, including but not limited to:
  - The Fourth Amendment Protection against unlawful searches and seizures.
  - The Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments Right to due process and protection against self-incrimination and coercion.
  - The Eighth Amendment Prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment, including inhumane treatment.
- 238. Mental and Physical Suffering Inflicted: Defendants' coercive and unlawful tactics caused Plaintiff:
  - Severe emotional and psychological trauma, including distress, humiliation, and fear.
  - Physical harm and deterioration due to mistreatment while unlawfully detained.
  - Economic losses, reputational damage, and the deprivation of life, liberty, and property.

7

10

1112

13 14

15

1617

18

1920

21

23

24

2526

27

28

- Break Plaintiff's will through coercion, threats, and duress.
- Cause prolonged suffering through unlawful confinement and psychological manipulation.
- Force Plaintiff into compliance with fraudulent and unlawful legal proceedings.
- 240. **Private Right of Action and Relief Sought:** Plaintiff asserts a private right of action under:
  - 18 U.S.C. § 2340A Prohibiting acts of torture committed under color of law.
  - **42 U.S.C. § 1983** Seeking damages for violations of constitutional rights.
  - 42 U.S.C. § 1985 Seeking damages for conspiracy to violate civil rights.
  - 42 U.S.C. § 1986 Seeking damages for failure to prevent rights violations.
  - 241. Plaintiff seeks the Following Relief:
    - Compensatory damages for physical, emotional, and economic harm.
    - Treble damages under 18 U.S.C. § 2340A for acts of torture.
    - Punitive damages to deter future unconstitutional conduct.
    - Injunctive relief to prevent further abuse by Defendants.
- 242. Defendants deliberately engaged in acts of torture, unlawful imprisonment, and cruel and inhumane treatment under color of law, violating constitutional, statutory, and international human rights protections. Plaintiff demand full redress, damages, and equitable relief as provided under all applicable laws.

### FOURTEENTH (14th) CAUSE OF ACTION

(For Kidnapping against all Defendants)

243. Plaintiff re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 242 as if fully set forth herein.

- 244. **Defendants' Unlawful and Unconstitutional Acts:** Defendants willfully and intentionally engaged in the unlawful seizure, detention, and forced transportation of Plaintiff against their will, constituting kidnapping under federal law. Defendants' actions include but are not limited to:
  - The unlawful deprivation of Plaintiff's liberty through force, threats, deception, or coercion.
  - The illegal arrest, detention, and transportation of Plaintiff without lawful authority or due process.
  - The use of intimidation and duress to compel Plaintiff into submission.
  - The refusal to recognize Plaintiff's constitutional protections and lawful objections.
- 245. These actions constitute kidnapping as defined under 18 U.S.C. § 1201(a) (Federal Kidnapping Act), which states:
  - "Whoever unlawfully seizes, confines, inveigles, decoys, kidnaps, abducts, or carries away and holds for ransom or reward or otherwise any person, except in the case of a minor by the parent thereof, when (1) the person is willfully transported in interstate or foreign commerce, regardless of whether the person was alive when transported; (2) the offender travels in interstate or foreign commerce or uses the mail or any means, facility, or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce in committing or in furtherance of the offense; (3) any person is kidnapped within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States; or (4) the offense involves a foreign official, an internationally protected person, or an official guest as those terms are defined in section 1116(b) of this title, shall be punished by imprisonment for any term of years or for life."
- 246. **Unlawful Arrest and Forced Detention as Kidnapping:** Defendants acted under the color of law to unlawfully seize, detain, and transport Plaintiff without legal authority, in violation of:
  - 42 U.S.C. § 1983 Deprivation of rights under color of law.

3

4 5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24 25

26

27 28

- **42 U.S.C.** § **1985** Conspiracy to interfere with civil rights.
- **42 U.S.C. § 1986** Neglect to prevent civil rights violations.

247. The false arrest and forced detention were executed:

- Without a valid warrant, probable cause, or lawful justification.
- Without providing Plaintiff with due process or access to legal representation.
- Through threats, coercion, and physical restraint, depriving Plaintiff of their freedom.

248. Defendants' actions violated Plaintiff's constitutional rights, including:

- The Fourth Amendment Protection against unlawful searches and seizures.
- The Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments Right to due process and protection from unlawful detention.
- The Eighth Amendment Prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment.
- Forced Transportation and Deprivation of Liberty
- 249. Defendants kidnapped Plaintiff by physically restraining, transporting, and detaining them against their will under fraudulent and unlawful pretense, including but not limited to:
  - Forcing Plaintiff into custody without lawful authority.
  - Transporting Plaintiff against their will to an undisclosed or unauthorized location.
  - Detaining Plaintiff unlawfully while depriving them of communication and legal recourse.
- 250. These actions constitute kidnapping and unlawful imprisonment, carried out willfully and with deliberate intent to deprive Plaintiff of their rights.
- 251. Harm and Damages Suffered: As a direct result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff suffered:

^	`	

- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14

- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20 21
- 22
- 23
- 24 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

- Severe emotional distress, trauma, and psychological harm.
- Physical harm resulting from unlawful restraint and detention.
- Reputational damage, loss of income, and deprivation of life, liberty, and property.
- 252. Private Right of Action and Relief Sought: Plaintiff asserts a private right of action under:
  - 18 U.S.C. § 1201(a) (Federal Kidnapping Act) Prohibits the unlawful seizure and transportation of individuals.
  - 42 U.S.C. § 1983 Provides for civil liability for those acting under color of law who deprive individuals of their constitutional rights.
  - 42 U.S.C. § 1985 Prohibits conspiracies to interfere with constitutional rights, including unlawful abduction.
  - 42 U.S.C. § 1986 Holds those accountable who fail to prevent civil rights violations.
  - 253. Plaintiff seeks the Following Relief:
    - Compensatory damages for emotional, physical, and financial harm.
  - Treble damages under 18 U.S.C. § 1201 for acts of kidnapping.
  - **Punitive damages** to deter future unlawful detentions and abductions.
  - **Injunctive relief** to prevent further unlawful acts by Defendants.
- 254. Defendants willfully and unlawfully seized, transported, and detained Plaintiff against their will, depriving them of their fundamental rights. Plaintiff demand full redress, damages, and equitable relief under all applicable laws.

#### FIFTEENTH (15th) CAUSE OF ACTION

#### (Forced Peonage – Against all Defendants)

- 255. Plaintiff re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 254 as if fully set forth herein.
- 256. Defendants' Unlawful and Unconstitutional Acts: Defendants willfully and intentionally subjected Plaintiff to forced peonage, involuntary servitude, and

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

economic coercion, in violation of federal law and constitutional protections.

Plaintiff was unlawfully compelled to work, perform obligations, or comply with

- fraudulent demands under duress, coercion, and the threat of legal and financial penalties, including but not limited to:
  - Unlawful and unconstitutional enforcement of financial claims without due process.
  - Compelling Plaintiff to pay or perform under threats of arrest, asset seizure, or legal action.
  - Depriving Plaintiff of their right to be free from involuntary servitude and forced labor.
  - Using fraud, coercion, and intimidation to impose involuntary financial and contractual obligations.
- 257. These actions constitute peonage and forced servitude under 18 U.S.C. § 1581 (Peonage Law), 18 U.S.C. § 1584 (Involuntary Servitude), and the Thirteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution, which prohibit:
  - "Holding or returning any person to a condition of peonage, or arresting them with the intent to place them in such condition."
  - "Knowingly and willfully holding any person in involuntary servitude, except as punishment for a crime whereof the party has been duly convicted."
- 258. **Defendants' Scheme to Enforce Peonage Through Coercion and Threats:** Defendants acted under color of law to compel Plaintiff into compliance with fraudulent financial and legal demands, in violation of:
  - 42 U.S.C. § 1983 Deprivation of rights under color of law.
  - 42 U.S.C. § 1985 Conspiracy to interfere with civil rights.
  - 42 U.S.C. § 1986 Neglect to prevent civil rights violations.
  - 15 U.S.C. § 1692 (FDCPA) Prohibiting fraudulent and coercive financial demands.
  - 259. Defendants' actions forced Plaintiff into involuntary compliance by:

7 8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

20

19

21

2223

24

25

2627

- Threatening financial ruin, legal penalties, and physical confinement to compel labor, payment, or performance.
- Fabricating legal claims and financial obligations to keep Plaintiff in a cycle of perpetual servitude.
- Illegally seizing or threatening to seize Plaintiff's property to enforce compliance.
- Coercing Plaintiff into fraudulent contractual agreements under economic duress.
- 260. Economic Coercion as a Form of Peonage: Defendants' fraudulent enforcement of obligations through threats, coercion, and economic restraint constitutes forced peonage, as:
  - Plaintiff was unlawfully and unconstitutionally extorted and coerced to pay or perform under threat of harm.
  - Defendants unlawfully asserted financial and legal control over Plaintiff's lives.
  - Plaintiff were deprived of the ability to challenge these fraudulent claims without severe financial and legal consequences.
- 261. Defendants utilized legal and financial mechanisms to create a system of involuntary servitude, using debt, force, and coercion as tools of control, violating:
  - **18 U.S.C. § 1581** Peonage, compelling a person to work off a debt through force or threat.
  - **18 U.S.C. § 1584** Involuntary servitude, unlawfully coercing an individual to labor against their will.
  - The Thirteenth Amendment Prohibiting slavery and involuntary servitude except as punishment for a crime after due process.
- 262. **Harm and Damages Suffered:** As a **direct result** of Defendants' actions, Plaintiff has suffered:
  - Severe financial losses due to unlawful coercion.

11 12

13

1415

16

17 18

19

2021

2223

24

25

26

27

28

- Emotional distress, mental anguish, and reputational damage.
- Deprivation of rights, property, and economic independence.
- 263. **Private Right of Action and Relief Sought:** Plaintiff asserts a private right of action under:
  - 18 U.S.C. § 1581 (Peonage Law) Prohibiting forced labor or servitude under threat or coercion.
  - 18 U.S.C. § 1584 (Involuntary Servitude) Prohibiting the use of force or legal coercion to enslave or control individuals.
  - 42 U.S.C. § 1983 Civil remedy for deprivation of rights under color of law.
  - **42 U.S.C. § 1985** Prohibiting conspiracies to interfere with constitutional rights, including economic servitude.
  - 42 U.S.C. § 1986 Liability for failing to prevent civil rights violations.
  - **15 U.S.C. § 1692 (FDCPA)** Prohibiting deceptive financial practices and coercion.

#### 264. Plaintiff seeks the Following Relief:

- Compensatory damages for financial, emotional, and reputational harm.
- Treble damages under 18 U.S.C. § 1581 for forced peonage.
- Punitive damages to deter future unconstitutional conduct.
- Injunctive relief to prevent further acts of peonage and forced servitude.
- 265. Defendants willfully engaged in the unlawful imposition of forced peonage and economic servitude, violating constitutional, statutory, and human rights protections. Plaintiff respectfully demands full redress, damages, and equitable relief under all applicable laws.

#### SIXTEENTH (16th) CAUSE OF ACTION

## (Unlawful Interference, Intimidation, Extortion, and Emotional Distress – Against all Defendants)

266. Plaintiff re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 265 as if fully set forth herein.

9

12

11

13 14

15

1617

18

19 20

2122

23

2425

26

2728

267. **Defendants' Unlawful Conduct:** Defendants willfully and knowingly engaged in unlawful interference, intimidation, and extortion, designed to coerce, manipulate, and deprive Plaintiff of their rights, property, and economic interests. This conduct included:

- Threats of violence, intimidation, and coercion to force Plaintiff into compliance with unlawful demands.
- Intentional disruption of Plaintiff's business and economic pursuits through extortionate tactics.
- Use of fear and duress to interfere with Plaintiff's lawful activities.
- Defendants' actions were malicious, unlawful, and calculated to inflict harm, constituting violations of:
- **18 U.S.C. § 1951 (Hobbs Act)** Prohibiting extortion through wrongful use of force, violence, or threats.
- **18 U.S.C. § 875** Criminalizing threats made through electronic communication.
- 42 U.S.C. § 1983 Prohibiting deprivation of rights under color of law.
- 42 U.S.C. § 1985 Prohibiting conspiracies to interfere with civil rights.
- **42 U.S.C. § 1986** Holding accountable those who fail to prevent civil rights violations.
- 268. **Threats and Coercion:** Defendants **intentionally engaged in coercive tactics** designed to instill fear and force Plaintiff to act against their will. These threats:
  - Were communicated through electronic means, written correspondence, and verbal intimidation.
  - Included explicit and implicit threats of harm, financial ruin, and legal repercussions.
  - Were aimed at coercing Plaintiff into relinquishing their property, business interests, or legal rights.

7

10

11

12

13

1415

1617

18

19 20

21

2223

24

25

26

27

28

273. Defendants' acts included:

269. Defendants' admissions in their <i>unrebutted</i> affidavits confirm that these
threats were made with the specific intent to intimidate, coerce, and interfere with
Plaintiff's lawful activities. These affidavits, being uncontested, must be deemed as
established facts under applicable legal principles.

270. **Resulting Economic and Emotional Harm:** As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' wrongful conduct, Plaintiff suffered:

#### A. Economic Damages

- Loss of business opportunities and revenue due to Defendants' intentional interference.
- Damage to Plaintiff's business reputation caused by Defendants' wrongful conduct.
- **Significant financial losses** stemming from extortionate demands and threats.

#### **B.** Emotional Distress

- Severe emotional trauma, humiliation, and anxiety inflicted through threats and coercion.
- **Psychological harm** resulting from Defendants' reckless disregard for Plaintiff's well-being.
- Mental anguish caused by intimidation and wrongful interference with Plaintiff's livelihood.
- 271. These damages, detailed in Plaintiff's *unrebutted* **affidavits**, remain unchallenged by Defendants and must therefore be accepted as true and dispositive.
- 272. **Extortionate Conduct:** Defendants' actions constitute extortion under 18 U.S.C. § 1951 (Hobbs Act), which criminalizes:
  - "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."

10

12

11

13 14

16

15

17

19

18

20

21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

- Coercing Plaintiff into relinquishing property, services, or financial assets.
- · Coercing and forcing Plaintiff to act against their will under threat of harm, legal consequences, or financial destruction.
- Engaging in fraud and intimidation to deprive Plaintiff of their rightful property and business interests.
- 274. These acts, documented in Plaintiff's unrebutted affidavits, remain uncontested and must be accepted as legal fact.
- 275. Outrageous and Extreme Behavior: Defendants' conduct was extreme, outrageous, and beyond all bounds of decency, demonstrating:
  - A reckless disregard for Plaintiff's economic and personal well-being.
  - Deliberate efforts to manipulate, threaten, and coerce Plaintiff into compliance with unlawful demands.
  - A willful intent to disrupt Plaintiff's lives through intimidation, extortion, and fraud.
- 276. Damages and Relief: As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful acts, Plaintiff seeks the following relief:

#### A. Compensatory Damages

- Restitution for financial losses resulting from unlawful interference and extortion.
- Damages for severe emotional distress and psychological harm.
- Recovery of expenses, including legal costs incurred to defend against Defendants' intimidation tactics.
- **B. Punitive Damages**
- To punish Defendants for their willful, malicious, and unlawful conduct.
- To deter similar wrongful actions in the future.

#### C. Other Relief

Injunctive relief to prevent further intimidation, interference, and extortion by Defendants.

Any additional relief deemed just and appropriate by the Court.

277. *Unrebutted* Affidavits and Legal Entitlement: Defendants failed to rebut Plaintiff's sworn affidavits, which provide uncontested evidence of unlawful interference, intimidation, and extortion. Under established legal principles, these affidavits must be deemed as true and dispositive.

278. Defendants *willfully* engaged in a coordinated scheme of intimidation, extortion, and interference, violating federal law, constitutional protections, and civil rights statutes. Plaintiff respectfully demands full redress, compensatory and punitive damages, and equitable relief under all applicable laws

# SEVENTEENTH (17th) CAUSE OF ACTION (Declaratory Judgement and Relief — Against all Defendants)

279. Plaintiff re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 278 as if fully set forth herein.

280. Nature of the Relief Sought: Plaintiff seeks a declaratory judgment affirming that Defendants have engaged in unlawful, fraudulent, and injurious conduct and that Plaintiff is entitled to immediate legal and equitable relief as a matter of law. This Court is empowered under 28 U.S.C. § 2201 (Declaratory Judgment Act) to declare the rights, status, and legal relations of the parties in this matter.

281. Plaintiff further asserts that all facts, claims, and allegations stated herein have been unrebutted and, under applicable law, must be deemed true and dispositive. Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to a declaratory judgment confirming the following:

#### 1. Fraud and Misrepresentation

Defendants knowingly engaged in **fraudulent misrepresentation** by falsifying financial obligations, misrepresenting material facts, and asserting authority they did not lawfully possess. Plaintiff seeks a declaration that Defendants' actions constitute **fraud in the factum** and **fraudulent** 

**inducement**, rendering all transactions, claims, and agreements void ab initio.

#### 2. Breach of Contract

Defendants willfully and intentionally breached contractual obligations, violating express and implied agreements, including but not limited to fraudulently created financial obligations. Plaintiff seeks a declaration that Defendants' conduct constitutes a material breach, entitling Plaintiff to full restitution and damages.

## 3. Theft, Embezzlement, and Fraudulent Misapplication of Funds and Assets

Defendants unlawfully took possession of, converted, or misapplied funds and assets belonging to Plaintiff, in violation of **18 U.S.C. §§ 656 and 666**. Plaintiff seeks a declaration confirming Defendants' **unlawful appropriation of funds and assets**, requiring **full restitution and treble damages**.

#### 4. Fraud, Forgery, and Unauthorized Use of Identity

Defendants engaged in **identity theft, forgery, and fraud**, fabricating false claims and documents to manipulate legal and financial proceedings. Plaintiff seeks a declaration that all fraudulent claims, transactions, and instruments are **null and void** as a matter of law.

#### 5. Monopolization of Trade and Commerce, and Unfair Business Practices

Defendants conspired to monopolize trade, restrict competition, and restrain commerce through fraudulent and unfair practices, violating **15 U.S.C. § 2**. Plaintiff seeks a declaration that Defendants' **anticompetitive and monopolistic conduct** renders all related transactions **unenforceable and unlawful**.

#### 6. Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law

Defendants, acting under color of law, deprived Plaintiff of fundamental rights in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff seeks a declaration that

Defendants **violated Plaintiff's constitutionally protected rights** and are **liable for compensatory and punitive damages**.

#### 7. Receiving Extortion Proceeds

Defendants **knowingly received and benefited from proceeds obtained through extortion**, violating **18 U.S.C. § 880**. Plaintiff seeks a declaration confirming Defendants' **unjust enrichment through criminal means**, requiring full disgorgement and treble damages.

#### 8. False Pretenses and Fraud

Defendants engaged in **fraudulent misrepresentation and false pretenses** to unlawfully obtain assets, violating **18 U.S.C. § 1341**. Plaintiff seeks a declaration that all fraudulently obtained property, funds, and assets **must be returned to Plaintiff immediately**.

#### 9. Threats and Extortion

Defendants engaged in **coercion**, **intimidation**, **and extortion**, in violation of **18 U.S.C. § 1951 (Hobbs Act)**. Plaintiff seeks a declaration that Defendants **engaged in unlawful threats and extortion**, entitling Plaintiff to **full compensatory and punitive damages**.

#### 10. Racketeering (RICO Violations)

Defendants engaged in a **pattern of racketeering activity** under **18 U.S.C. § 1961 et seq.**, including fraud, extortion, and money laundering. Plaintiff seek a declaration confirming Defendants' **criminal liability under RICO**, entitling Plaintiff to **treble damages and injunctive relief**.

#### 11. Bank Fraud

Defendants engaged in **fraudulent banking transactions**, violating **18 U.S.C. § 1344**. Plaintiff seeks a declaration that Defendants' **fraudulent banking practices render all related claims and transactions void**. **12. Fraudulent Transportation and Transfer of Stolen Goods and Securities** 

4

5

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26 27

28

Defendants unlawfully transported stolen property, securities, and financial instruments across state lines, violating 18 U.S.C. §§ 2314 and 2315. Plaintiff respectfully seeks a declaration that all fraudulently transferred assets must be immediately returned.

#### 13. Torture

Defendants engaged in torture through unlawful imprisonment, coercion, and psychological abuse, violating 18 U.S.C. § 2340A. Plaintiff seeks a declaration confirming Defendants' liability for cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment.

#### 14. Kidnapping

Defendants unlawfully seized, detained, and transported Plaintiff against their will, violating 18 U.S.C. § 1201. Plaintiff seeks a declaration confirming that Defendants engaged in criminal kidnapping, entitling Plaintiff to **treble damages**.

#### 15. Forced Peonage

Defendants subjected Plaintiff to economic servitude and forced labor, violating 18 U.S.C. § 1581. Plaintiff seeks a declaration confirming that Defendants engaged in forced peonage, requiring full restitution and injunctive relief.

## 16. Unlawful Interference, Intimidation, Extortion, and Emotional **Distress**

Defendants engaged in extreme and outrageous conduct, causing economic harm and severe emotional distress. Plaintiff seeks a declaration that Defendants are liable for intentional infliction of emotional distress and unlawful business interference.

282. Declaratory Judgment and Relief Requested: Based on the uncontested and unrebutted affidavits submitted by Plaintiff, which Defendants failed to dispute, Plaintiff's request that this Court enter a declaratory judgment confirming the following:

7 8

9

11

12

13

1415

16

17 18

19

2021

22

23

25

24

27

26

28

- All fraudulent claims, financial instruments, and transactions asserted by Defendants are null and void as a matter of law.
- Defendants engaged in willful violations of federal and constitutional law and are liable for all resulting damages.
- Plaintiff is entitled to immediate relief, including the return of all unlawfully taken property, financial assets, and securities.
- Defendants' fraudulent actions constitute RICO violations, entitling
   Plaintiff to treble damages and injunctive relief.
- 283. **Demand for Summary Judgment:** As a matter of uncontested fact and law, Plaintiff respectfully demands summary judgment confirming Defendants' liability for all causes of action stated herein and granting:
  - Dollars (\$1,000,000,000,000.00) in lawfully recognized currency, such as gold and silver coin, as authorized under Article I, Section 10, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.
  - A perfected lien against Defendants' assets in satisfaction of this judgment.
  - · Any and all additional relief deemed just and appropriate by the Court.
- 284. Defendants' failure to rebut Plaintiff's sworn affidavits constitutes tacit admission of all claims asserted herein. Plaintiff is therefore entitled to declaratory and summary judgment as a matter of law.

### EIGHTEENTH (18th) CAUSE OF ACTION

- (Summary Judgement as <u>a Matter of Law</u> Against all Defendants)
- 285. Plaintiff re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 284 as if fully set forth herein.
- 286. Plaintiff respectfully moves for **summary judgment** in their favor as the **undisputed material facts** establish Defendants' **liability** under the clear, enforceable terms of the **Contract and Security Agreement**. As a matter of law, Defendants have:

9

10

1112

13 14

16

15

17 18

19 20

2122

23

2425

26

•	<b>Explicitly stipulated and accepted</b> , through their conduct and inaction, a
	binding judgment, summary judgment, and lien authorization (pursuant
	to <b>U.C.C.</b> § 9-509).

- Accepted liability in the agreed-upon amount of One Trillion Dollars (\$1,000,000,000,000.000) in lawfully recognized currency, such as gold and silver coin, as authorized under Article I, Section 10, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution, as evidenced by their failure to rebut the *unrebutted* commercial affidavits and the self-executing Contract and Security Agreement.
- Waived any grounds to contest this judgment through tacit procuration,
   silent acquiescence, and willful default.
- 287. Defendants were **duly served** with the necessary legal instruments, including:
  - *Unrebutted* affidavits establishing the facts of this case.
  - Contract and Security Agreement confirmed and accepted via USPS Registered, Express, and/or Certified Mail (Form 3811). See exhibits E, F, G, and H.
  - Public notices and filings confirming Defendants' default and consent to judgment.
- 288. Application of **Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure:** Under Rule 56(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, summary judgment must be granted when:
  - "The movant shows that there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law."
  - 289. The undisputed, unrebutted commercial affidavits conclusively establish:
    - **Defendants' liability** under the Contract and Security Agreement.
    - Defendants' failure to rebut or contest the claims, making all facts stated therein legally binding.
    - Defendants' waiver of defenses and objections due to willful silence and acquiescence.

3

8 9

10 11

12

13 14

16 17

15

18

19 20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27 28

290. Since all material facts have been admitted and remain undisputed, Plaintiff is entitled to summary judgment as a matter of law.

- 291. Application of Legal Doctrines: Pursuant to well-established legal principles, this matter is conclusively settled and cannot be contested:
  - Res Judicata The matters presented in Plaintiff's affidavits are final and binding, precluding Defendants from raising any new defenses or objections.
  - **Collateral Estoppel -** The **administrative findings** contained in Plaintiff's unrebutted affidavits are conclusive and enforceable as a matter of law.
  - Stare Decisis The legal issues presented in this case have been established through precedent and must be applied consistently.
- 292. Given these uncontested facts, there is no genuine issue of material fact, making summary judgment appropriate as a matter of law.
- 293. California Code of Civil Procedure § 437c(a): Under California Code of Civil Procedure § 437c(a):
  - "A party may move for summary judgment if it is contended that the action has no merit or that there is no defense to the action. The motion shall be granted if all the papers submitted show that there is no triable issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law."
- 294. Since all material facts have been deemed admitted and remain undisputed, Plaintiff is entitled to judgment in their favor.

#### CLAIM, REQUEST, and DEMAND FOR RELIEF:

- 295. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 294 as if fully set forth herein.
  - 296. Plaintiff **respectfully and honorably** demands the following relief:
    - Summary Judgment as a matter of law, in the Amount of One Trillion Dollars (\$1,000,000,000,000.00) in lawfully recognized currency, such as gold and silver coin, as authorized under Article I, Section 10, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

8 9

10

11

12

13 14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

26

25

- Liquidated damages as agreed upon in the Contract and Security Agreement.
- Full satisfaction of all claims through enforcement of the perfected lien.
- 2. Permanent Injunction Against Defendants
  - Prohibiting further fraud, extortion, coercion, and unlawful interference.
  - Ordering the immediate cessation of all unlawful acts affecting Plaintiff's rights and property.
- 3. Compensatory and Treble Damages
  - Full restitution for all property, assets, and funds wrongfully taken or transferred.
  - Treble damages under applicable statutes, including RICO violations (18 U.S.C. § 1964(c)).
- 4. Declaratory Judgment Affirming Defendants' Liability
  - Confirming that all fraudulent claims, documents, and transactions asserted by Defendants are null and void.
  - Affirming that Defendants have willfully violated federal and state laws, entitling Plaintiff to full legal and equitable relief.
- 5. Enforcement of the Lien Against Defendants' Assets
  - Perfected lien under U.C.C. § 9-509, securing Plaintiff's claims against all property, accounts, and holdings of Defendants.
  - Immediate liquidation of assets to satisfy judgment.
- 6. Any Additional Relief Deemed Just and Proper by the Court.
- 7. Defendants have failed to rebut the sworn commercial affidavits, have waived all defenses through silence, and are bound by the terms of the Contract and Security Agreement. Under Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff is entitled to immediate

9. Exhibit I: Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit E.

- 1 | 10. **Exhibit J**: Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit F.
- 2 | 11. **Exhibit K**: Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit G.
- 3  $\parallel$  12. **Exhibit L**: Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit H.
- 4 | 13. Exhibit M: INVOICE/TRUE BILL #RIVSHERTREAS12312024
- 5 | 14. Exhibit N: Copy of 'MASTER DISCHARGE AND INDEMNITY BOND' #RF661448567US.
- 7 | 15.**Exhibit O**: Photograph(s) of Defendant/Respondent Gregory D Eastwood.
- 8 | 16. Exhibit P: Photograph(s) of Defendant/Respondent Robert C V Bowman.
- 9 | 17. **Exhibit Q**: Photograph(s) of Defendant/Respondent Willam Pratt.
- 10 18. Exhibit R: Affidavit 'Right to Travel': CANCELLATION, TERMINATION, AND
- 11 REVOCATION of COMMERCIAL "For Hire" DRIVER'S LICENSE CONTRACT
- 12 and AGREEMENT. LICENSE/BOND # B6735991
- 13 19. Exhibit S: Revocation Termination and Cancelation of Franchise.
- 14 20. Exhibit T: CITATION/BOND #TE464702, accepted under threat, duress, and coercion.
- 16 21. Exhibit U: Private Transport's PRIVATE PLATE displayed on the automobile
- 17 22. Exhibit V: Copy of "Automobile" and "commercial vehicle" defined by DMV
   18 (Department of Motor Vehicles).
- 19 23. Exhibit W: Copy of CA CODE § 260 from <a href="https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov">https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov</a>.
- 20 24. Exhibit X: national/non-citizen national passport card #C35510079.
- 21 25. **Exhibit Y**: national/non-citizen national passport book #A39235161.
- 22 || 26.**Exhibit Z**: ™KEVIN LEWIS WALKER© Copyright and Trademark Agreement.
- 23 | 27. **Exhibit AA:** A copy of American Bar Association's 'Attorney In Fact' Definition.
- 24 | 28. **Exhibit BB:** A Copy of Rule 8.4: (Misconduct) of the American Bar Association.
- 25 /
- 26 //
- 27 ||
- 28 | /

1	<b>COMMERCIAL OATH AND VERIFICATION:</b>
2	County of Riverside )
3	) Commercial Oath and Verification
4	The State of California )
5	I, <u>KEVIN WALKER</u> , under my unlimited liability and Commercial Oath proceeding
6	in good faith being of sound mind states that the facts contained herein are true,
7	correct, complete and not misleading to the best of Affiant's knowledge and belief
8	under penalty of International Commercial Law and state this to be HIS Affidavit of
9	Truth regarding same signed and sealed this <u>17TH</u> day of <u>APRIL</u> in the year of Our
0	Lord two thousand and twenty five:
1	proceeding sui juris, In Propria Persona, by Special Limited Appearance,
2	All rights reserved without prejudice and without recourse.
3	By: Kevin Watker, national, Secured Party
4	Let this document stand as truth before the Almighty Supreme Creator and let it be
5	established before men according as the scriptures saith: "But if they will not listen, take one
6	or two others along, so that every matter may be established by the testimony of two or three
7	witnesses." Matthew 18:16. "In the mouth of two or three witnesses, shall every word be
8	established" 2 Corinthians 13:1.
9	sui juris, By Special Limited Appearance,
0	By: Degle
1	Domabelle Mortel (Witness)
2	sui juris, By Special Limited Appearance,
3	By: Coles Dahad Worky
4	Corey Walker (Witness)
5	
6	
7	<b>//</b>

Case No.: 5:25-cv-00646-WLH-MAA — Registered Mail #RF775824950US — Dated: April 17, 2025

PROOF OF SERVICE

2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
3	) ss.
4	COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE )
5	I competent, over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within
6	action. My mailing address is the Delfond Group, care of: 30650 Rancho California
7	Road suite 406-251, Temecula, California [92591]. On or before April 17, 2025, I
8	served the within documents:
9	1. [AMENDED] <u>VERIFIED</u> COMPLAINT FOR FRAUD, BREACH OF
10	CONTRACT, THEFT, DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER THE COLOR OF
11	LAW, CONSPIRACY, RACKETEERING, KIDNAPPING, TORTURE, and
12	SUMMARY JUDGEMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW.
13	2. Exhibits A through BB.
14	3. NOTICE OF FILING FIRST AMENDED VERIFIED COMPLAINT AS A
15	MATTER OF COURSE
16	By United States Mail. I enclosed the documents in a sealed envelope or package
17	addressed to the persons at the addresses listed below by placing the envelope for
18	collection and mailing, following our ordinary business practices. I am readily
19	familiar with this business's practice for collecting and processing correspondence
20	for mailing. On the same day that correspondence is placed for collection and
21	mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States
22	Postal Service, in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepared. I am a resident or
23	employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was
24	placed in the mail in Riverside County, California, and sent via Registered Mail
25	with a form 3811.
26	Gregory D Eastwood, Robert C V Bowman, George Reyes, William Pratt,
27	Robert Gell, Joseph Sinz, Nicholas Gruwell, C/o RIVERSIDE SHERIFF
28	30755-D Auld Road, Suite L-067 Murrieta, California [92563]

[AMENDED] YERIEED COMPLAINT FOR FRAUD, BREACH OF CONTRACT, THEFT, DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER THE COLOR OF LAW, CONSPIRACY, RACKETEERING, KIDNAPPING, TORTURE, and SUMMARY JUDGEMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW

1	Registered Mail #RF775824929US
2	<b>Steven-Arthur: Sherman</b> C/o STEVEN ARTHUR SHERMAN
3	1631 East 18th Street Santa Ana, California [92705-7101] <b>Registered Mail</b> #RF775824932US, with form 3811
4	Chad: Bianco
5	C/o RIVERSIDE COUNTY SHERIFF 4095 Lemon Street, 2nd Floor
6   7	Riverside, California [92501] <b>Registered Mail</b> #RF775824946US, with form 3811
	Clerk, Agent(s), Fiduciary(ies)
8 9	C/o CLERK OF COURT 350 West 1st Street, Courtroom 9B, 9th Floor Los Angeles, California [90012]
10	Registered Mail #RF775824950US, with form 3811
11	Clerk, Agent(s), Fiduciary(ies) C/o CLERK OF COURT
12	255 East Temple Street, Suite TS-134 Los Angeles, California [90012]
13	Registered Mail #RF775824977US, with form 3811
14	Pam Bondi C/o U.S. Department of Justice
15	950 Pennsylvania Avenue, North West Washington, District of Colombia [20530] <b>Registered Mail</b> #RF775824963US, with form 3811
16	Registered Wall #IX177302490303, With form 3011
17	Miranda Thomson, Michael Hestrin C/o RIVERSIDE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY, THE PEOPLE OF
18	THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
19	3960 Orange Street Riverside, California [92501] <b>Registered Mail</b> #RF775825102US, with form 3811
20	<b>By Electronic Service.</b> Based on a contract, and/or court order, and/or ar
21	agreement of the parties to accept service by electronic transmission, I caused the
22	documents to be sent to the persons at the electronic notification addresses listed
23	below.
24	Steven-Arthur: Sherman
25	C/o STEVEN ARTHUR SHERMAN 1631 East 18th Street
26	Santa Ana, California [92705-7101] ssherman@law4cops.com
27	csherman@law4cops.com

-115 of 116-

**NOTICE:** 1 Using a notary on this document does not constitute any adhesion, nor does it alter my status in any manner. The purpose for notary is verification and identification 3 only and not for entrance into any foreign jurisdiction. 5 6 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: State of California 8 A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the 9 ) ss. truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that documen County of Riverside 10 On this 17th day of April, 2025, before me, <u>Joyti Patel</u>, a Notary Public, personally 11 appeared Kevin Walker, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to 12 be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and 13 acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their 14 authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument 15 the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument. 17 I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California 18 that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct. 19 WITNESS my hand and official seal. 20 JOYTI PATEL otary Public - California 21 Riverside County Commission # 2407742 Comm. Expires Jul 8, 2026 22 (Seal) 23 Signature \_ 24 25 26 27 28