Case	5:25-cv-00646-WLH-MAA Docume	nt 15 #:648	Filed 04/21/25	Page 9 of 63	Page ID
	Case No.: 5:25-cv-00646-WLH-MAA — R	legistered	Mail # RF775824950U S	S Dated: April 17	7, 2025
1	Kevin Walker, <i>sui juris, In Propria Pe</i> C/ o 30650 Rancho California Road		51		
2	Temecula, California [92591] non-domestic <i>without</i> the <u>U</u> nited <u>S</u> ta	tor			
3	Email: <u>team@walkernovagroup.com</u>				
4					
5	Plaintiff, Real Party In Interest, Injured	d Party			
6	TMKEVIN WALKER©				
7					
8	UNITED STA	TES E	DISTRICT CO	URT	
9	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF	CALIF	ORNIA, EAS	TERN DIVI	SION
10	Kevin Walker, sui juris	Danta	Case No.: 5:25-	cv-00646-WLH	-MAA
11	Plaintiff/Real Party in Interest/Injured I	uriy	[AMENDED] <u>VE</u>	and the Engeneer of	
12	vs. Chad Bianco,		2. BREACH OF		
13	Steven Arthur Sherman, Gregory D Eastwood,			BEZZLEMENT, AN NT MISAPPLICAT ASSETS	
14	Robert C V Bowman,			GERY, AND UNAU	UTHORIZED
15	George Reyes, William Pratt,		5. MONOPOLIZ	ZATION OF TRAD E, AND UNFAIR BU	
16	Robert Gell, Nicholas Gruwell,		PRACTICES	ON OF RIGHTS UN	
17	Joseph Sinz, Michael Hestrin,		COLOR OF I 7. RECEIVING	EXTORTION PRO	
18	Miranda Thomson,		9. THREATS AN	TENSES AND FRAUND EXTORTION	U D
19	RIVERSIDE COUNTY SHERIFF, THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF		10. RACKETEEH 11. BANK FRAU	D	
20	CALIFORNIA, MENIFEE JUSTICE CENTER,			NT TRANSPORTAT	
21	FERGUSON PRAET & SHERMAN A	A	13. TORTURE 14. KIDNAPPING	G	
22	PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION, <i>Does 1-100 Inclusive,</i>			INTERFERENCE,	
23	Defendant(s).		EMOTIONAL	ON, EXTORTION, L DISTRESS DRY JUDGEMENT	
24			18. DEMAND FO	R SUMMARY JUI	DGEMENT
25			ACCEPTED,	AGREED, AND ST ON (\$1,000,000,000	TIPULATED
26			JUDGEMEN		
27	COMES NOW, Plaintiff ™Kevi	n Walk	er (hereinafter "I	Plaintiff" and/	or "Real
28	Party in Interest"), who is proceeding	ng <i>sui j</i> i	uris, In Propria I	Persona, and b	y Special
		-1 of	116-		
	[AMENDED] VERIEED COMPLAINT FOR FRAUD, BREACE OF CONTRACT, THEFT, DEPRIVATION OF RIG	ghts under the col	OR OF LAW, CONSPIRACY, RACKETEERING, KIDN	APPING, TORTURE, and SUMMARY JUDGEME	NT AS A MATTER OF LAW

Limited Appearance (NOT generally). Kevin is natural freeborn sovereign and state
 Citizen of California the republic in its De'jure capacity as one of the several states
 of the Union 1789. This incidentally makes him a non-citizen national/national
 American Citizen of the republic as per the De'Jure Constitution for the United
 States 1777/1789.

6 Plaintiff, appearing by Special Limited Appearance, sui juris, and In Propria

7 *Persona*, asserts his *unalienable* right to <u>contract</u>, as secured by Article I, Section 10

8 of the **Constitution**, which states: "No <u>State shall...</u> pass any Law impairing the

9 Obligation of <u>Contracts</u>," and thus which *prohibits* states from impairing the

10 obligation of **contracts**.

11 This clause **unequivocally** prohibits states from impairing the obligation of

12 contracts, including but not limited to, a trust and contract agreement as an

13 *Attorney-In-Fact,* and any private contract existing between Plaintiff and

14 Defendants. A copy of the 'Affidavit: Power of Attorney In Fact,' is attached hereto

15 as **Exhibits A** and incorporated herein by reference.

Plaintiff further invokes his inherent unalienable rights under the Constitution and
the common law – rights that predate the formation of the tatse and remain
safeguarded by due process of law.

19

Constitutional Basis:

20 Plaintiff asserts that their **private rights** are secured *and* protected under the

21 Constitution, common law, and exclusive equity, which govern their ability to

22 freely contract and protect their property and interests..

23 Plaintiff respectfully asserts and affirms:

"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 <u>unlimited</u>. He owes no such duty [to submit his books and papers
 for an examination] to the State, since he receives nothing therefrom, beyond

28 the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the

-2 of 116-

1		law of the land [Common Law] long antecedent to the organization of the	
2		State, and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in	
3		accordance with the Constitution. Among his rights are a refusal to	
4		incriminate himself, and the immunity of himself and his property from	
5		arrest or seizure except under a warrant of the law. He owes nothing to the	
6		public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights." (Hale v. Henkel, 201	
7		U.S. 43, 47 [1905]).	
8	•	"The claim and exercise of a constitutional right cannot be converted into a	
9		crime." – Miller v. U.S., 230 F 2d 486, 489.	
10	•	"Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule	
11		making or legislation which would abrogate them." – Miranda v. Arizona,	
12		384 U.S.	
13	•	"There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of this	
14		exercise of constitutional rights." – Sherar v. Cullen, 481 F. 945.	
15	•	"A law repugnant to the Constitution is void ." – <i>Marbury v. Madison,</i> 5 U.S.	
16		(1 Cranch) 137, 177 (1803).	
17	•	"It is not the duty of the citizen to surrender his rights, liberties, and	
18		immunities under the guise of police power or any other governmental	
19		power." – Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, 491 (1966).	
20	•	"An unconstitutional act is not law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties;	
21		affords no protection; it creates no office; it is, in legal contemplation, as	
22		inoperative as though it had never been passed." – Norton v. Shelby County,	
23		118 U.S. 425, 442 (1886).	
24	•	"No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law, and no courts are bound to	
25		enforce it." – 16 Am. Jur. 2d, Sec. 177, Late Am. Jur. 2d, Sec. 256.	
26	•	"Sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all	
27		government exists and acts." – Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356, 370	
28		(1886).	
I			1

-3 of 116-

Supremacy Clause:

2 Plaintiff respectfully asserts and affirms that:

1

The Supremacy Clause of the Constitution of the United States (Article 3 VI, Clause 2) establishes that the Constitution, federal laws made 4 pursuant to it, and treaties made under its authority, constitute the 5 "supreme Law of the Land", and thus take priority over any 6 conflicting state laws. It provides that state courts are bound by, and 7 state constitutions subordinate to, the supreme law. However, federal 8 statutes and treaties must be within the parameters of the Constitution; 9 that is, they must be pursuant to the federal government's enumerated 10 powers, and not violate other constitutional limits on federal power 11 ... As a constitutional provision identifying the supremacy of federal 12 law, the Supremacy Clause assumes the underlying priority of federal 13 authority, albeit only when that authority is expressed in the 14 Constitution itself; no matter what the federal or state governments 15 might wish to do, they must stay within the boundaries of the 16 Constitution. 17 18 **Plaintiff** sues Defendant(s) and assert as **established**, *considered*, *agreed* and *admitted* by Defendants: 19 1. Plaintiff, Kevin Walker, proceeding, sui juris, In Propria Person, by Special 20 Limited Appearance, is undisputedly the holder in due course' of all assets, 21 intangible and tangible, hold allodial title to all assets, in accordance with UCC § 22

23 3-302, and security interest and title has been perfected.

24 2. Plaintiff is foreign to the 'United States', which is a federal corporation, as
25 evidenced by 28 U.S. Code § 3002.

26 **3.** Plaintiff is **<u>undisputedly</u>** 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 <u>none</u>.

-4 of 116-

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

4

Description of Affected Private Trust Property:

13. This action affects title to the private Trust property (herein referred to as 5 "private property" and/or "subject property"), a Lamborghini Urus, VIN 6 #ZPBUA1ZL9KLA02762, including all ownership, title, interest, and authority over 7 said private property, as well as all bonds, securities, Federal Reserve Notes, assets, 8 both tangible and intangible, registered and unregistered, and all assets held in 9 trust, as more particularly described in the authentic UCC1 filing and NOTICE 10 #2024385925-4 and UCC3 filing and NOTICE #2024402990-2, all filed in the Office 11 of the Secretary of State, State of Nevada, and attached hereto as Exhibits C and D, 12 13 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").

20

Standing:

21 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, 22 tangible or intangible, in accordance with contract law, principles, common law, 23 exlcusive equity, the right to equitable subrogation, and the UCC (Uniform 24 Commercial Code). This is further evidenced by the following UCC filings, all duly 25 filed in the Office of the Secretary of State, State of Nevada: UCC1 filing NOTICE 26 #2024385925-4 and UCC3 filing and NOTICE #2024402990-2 (Exhibits C and D), 27 and in accordance with UCC §§ 3-302, 9-105, and 9-509. 28

-6 of 116-

1 16. While this action arises out of private trust contracts and fiduciary injuries,
 2 the sole Plaintiff is Kevin Walker, *sui juris*, individually and not as trustee or agent
 3 for any other party

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.

8 18.Plaintiff maintains exclusive and sole standing in relation to said assets and
9 their interests, as duly recorded and affirmed by these filing.

10 19. Plaintiff (not Defendants) possesses *exclusive equity*.

11 20. Defendants do **<u>NOT</u>** 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.

15

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 20 compelled to perform under any contract that I did not enter into 21 knowingly, voluntarily, and intentionally, and with complete and full 22 disclosure, and without misrepresentation, duress, or coercion. And 23 furthermore, I do not accept the liability associated with the compelled and 24 pretended "benefit" of any hidden or unrevealed contract or commercial 25 agreement. As such, the hidden or unrevealed contracts that supposedly 26 create obligations to perform, for persons of subject status, are inapplicable to 27 me, and are null and void. If I have participated in any of the supposed 28

-7 of 116-

1

2

3

4

11

17

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

2. I, Kevin, proceeding sui juris, by Special Limited Appearance, hereby declare 5 and affirm that, consistent with the eternal tradition of natural common law, 6 unless I have harmed or violated someone or their property, I have 7 committed no crime; and I am therefore not subject to any penalty. I act in 8 accordance with the following U.S. Supreme Court case: "The individual 9 may stand upon his **constitutional rights** as a <u>c</u>itizen. He is entitled to carry 10 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 12 13 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 14 [Common Law] long antecedent to the organization of the State, and can 15 only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the 16 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 18 warrant of the law. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not 19 trespass upon their rights." Hale v. Henkel, 201 U.S. 43 at 47 (1905). 20

3. I, Kevin, proceeding sui juris, by Special Limited Appearance, herby assert, 21 affirm, state, and verify for the record that the 'commercial' and 'for hire' 22 Driver's License/Contract/Bond # B6735991 has been canceled, revoked, 23 terminated, and liquidated, as evidenced by instructions and notice accepted 24 by Steven Gordon, with the California Department of Motor Vehicles," as 25 evidenced by AFFIDAVIT RIGHT TO TRAVEL CANCELLATION, 26 **TERMINATION, AND REVOCATION of COMMERCIAL "For Hire"** 27 28 DRIVER'S LICENSE CONTRACT and AGREEMENT LICENSE/BOND

#B6735991 (#RF661447751US), attached hereto as Exhibit D and incorporated 1 herein by reference. 2 4. I, Kevin: Walker, sui juris, am not a "person" when such term is defined in 3 statutes of the United States or statutes of the several states when such 4 definition includes artificial entities. I refuse to be treated as a federally or 5 state created entity which is only capable of exercising certain rights, 6 privileges, or immunities as specifically granted by federal or state 7 8 governments. 5. I voluntarily choose to comply with the man-made laws which serve to bring 9 harmony to society, but no such laws, nor their enforcers, have any authority 10 over me. I am not in any jurisdiction, for I am not of subject status. 11 6. Consistent with the eternal tradition of natural common law, unless I have 12 harmed or violated someone or their property, I have committed no crime; 13 and am therefore not subject to any penalty. 14 7. I, Kevin, sui juris, proceeding sui juris, hereby declare and re-affirm that, no 15 valid contract exists compelling my performance by Defendants. 16 8. I, Kevin, sui juris, reserve my natural common law right not to be compelled 17 to perform under any contract that I did not enter into knowingly, 18 voluntarily, and intentionally. And furthermore, I do not accept the liability 19 associated with the compelled and pretended "benefit" of any hidden or 20 unrevealed contract or commercial agreement. 21 9. As such, any hidden or unrevealed contracts that supposedly create 22 obligations to perform, for persons of subject status, are inapplicable to 23 me, and are null and void. If I have participated in any of the supposed 24 "benefits" associated with these hidden contracts, I have done so under 25 duress and/or for lack of any other practical alternative. I may have 26 received such "benefits" but I have not accepted them in a manner that 27 binds me to anything. 28

-9 of 116-

1	10. Any such participation does not constitute "acceptance" in contract law,
2	because of the absence of <u>full disclosure</u> of any valid "OFFER," and
3	voluntary consent <i>without</i> misrepresentation or coercion, under contract law.
4	Without a valid voluntary 'offer and acceptance', knowingly entered into by
5	both parties, there is no "meeting of the minds," and therefore no valid
6	contract. Any supposed "contract" is therefore void, ab initio
7	11. I, Kevin, <i>proceeding sui juris</i> , state for the record, that it is a long-standing
8	legal principle that jurisdiction must be proven on the record and cannot be
9	assumed.
10	12. I, Kevin, <i>proceeding sui juris</i> , hereby declare and affirm that, I do no consent
11	to any of the retaliatory and fraudulent proceedings being conducts by
12	Defendants, including but not limited to, the fraudulent Trust action/CASE
13	NO.: SWM2303376.
14	13. I, Kevin, <i>proceeding sui juris</i> , affirm that, I have NOT injured any man or
15	woman nor have I damaged any property.
16	Revocation of 'Power of Attorney':
17	14. Furthermore, I, Kevin, proceeding sui juris, by Special Limited Appearance,
18	hereby revoke, rescind, and make void ab initio, all powers of attorney, in
19	fact or otherwise, implied in law or otherwise, signed either by me or anyone
20	else, as it pertains to the Social Security Number assigned to, WALKER,
21	KEVIN LEWIS, as it pertains to any BIRTH CERTIFICATE/BANK NOTE,
22	BOND, TRUST, DEPOSIT ACCOUNT, SECURITY, SECURITY ACCOUNT,
23	INVESTMENT, marriage or business licenses, or any other licenses or
24	certificates issued by any and all government or quasi-governmental entities,
25	due to the use of various elements of fraud by said agencies to attempt to
26	deprive me of my Sovereignty and/or property.
27	15. I, Kevin, <i>proceeding sui juris</i> , by <i>Special Limited Appearance</i> , hereby waive,
28	cancel, repudiate, and refuse to knowingly accept any alleged "benefit" or
	-10 of 116-

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

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.

<u>Claim of Entire ESTATE:</u>

17. I, Kevin, proceeding sui juris, by Special Limited Appearance, having attained 17 the age of majority and reason under divine law competent first-hand 18 witness to the truth and facts recited herein, hereby makes a claim against the 19 corpus, all property whether real or personal, tangible or intangible, all 20 deposit accounts blocked by reason of presumption of death of Claimant, 21 cash, credit lines, Credit default swap, all federal funds, collateralized debt 22 obligation, options, derivates, and futures received by the said court in the 23 said county, state and federal for the administration of the named estate, and 24 all estates in agency, including but not limited to KEVIN LEWIS WALKER, or 25 by whatsoever name the said ESTATE shall be called or *charged*. 26 18. ACTUAL CONSTRUCTIVE NOTIVE HAS BEEN GIVEN and THIS IS 27 28

AGAIN ACTUAL AND CONSTRUCTIVE NOTICE BY SPECIAL

-11 of 116-

1	DEPOSIT FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE SECURED PARTY/GRANTEE
2	BENEFICIARY/CLAIMANT IN THIS TRUST ACTION FOR THE
3	CLAIMANT'S CLAIM: Notice of absolute claim of all investment,
4	commodity and trust deposit account contract with attached collateral
5	and proceeds to secure collateral, along with claim of TRADENAME/
6	TRADEMARK, COPYRIGHT/PATENT of the Name KEVIN LEWIS
7	WALKER, my mind, body, soul of infants, spirit, and Live Borne
8	Record, and reject and rebuke <u>all</u> assumptions and presumptions of
9	being Property of any Cestui Que Vie Trust/ESTATE as mentioned
10	under CANON 2055-2056, and assignment of all debt obligations to the
11	Office of Secretary of the Treasury. Discharge all tax matters in
12	accordance with but <i>not limited to</i> , U.C.C. 1-103, 2-202, 2-204, 2-206,
13	3-104, 3-311, 3-601, 3-603, 9-104, 9-105, 9-150, 9-509, and House Joint
14	Resolution 192 of June 5 1933, public law 73-10, and 31 U.S.C. §§ 3123,
15	5118, and 18 U.S.C. 8.
16	19. Defendants, are undisputedly the <u>DEBTORS</u> in this matter.
17	20. Defendants are undisputedly <u>NOT</u> the CREDITOR(S), or an ASSIGNEE(S) of
18	the CREDITOR(S), in this matter.
19	21. Defendants do <u>NOT</u> have power of attorney in any way.
20	22. Defendants do <u>NOT</u> have <u>any</u> standing
21	23. The actions of Defendant undermine the fundamental principles of
22	fairness and justice enshrined in the Constitution, denying Plaintiffs
23	and/or Affiant the opportunity to be heard and to defend against the
24	allegations. These due process violations not only infringe upon
25	constitutional protections but also erode public trust in the judicial
26	system
27	24. Defendants actions violate various U.S. Code sections including but not
28	limited to the following:

-12 of 116-

25.42 U.S.C. § 1983 – which provides a civil remedy for individuals deprived of 1 constitutional rights under the color of law. The lack of notice and due 2 process constitutes a clear deprivation of rights under both the Fifth and 3 Fourteenth Amendments. 4 26. 18 U.S.C. § 241 - which criminalizes conspiracies to deprive individuals of 5 their constitutional rights. Any coordinated effort or negligence leading to 6 this denial of due process is punishable under this statute. 7 27.18 U.S.C. § 242 - which prohibits willful deprivation of constitutional rights 8 under the color of law. By advancing legal proceedings without proper 9 notice, Defendants have knowingly violated this protection. 10 28. All Affidavits Notices and Self-Executing Contract and Security 11 Agreements (Exhibits E, F, G, and H) are prima facie evidence of 12 fraud, racketeering, indentity theft, treason, breach of trust and 13 fiduciary duties, extortion, coercion, deprivation of rights under the 14 color of law, conspiracy to deprive of rights under the color of law, 15 monopolization of trade and commerce, forced peonage, obstruction of 16 enforcement, extortion of a national/internationally protected person, 17 false imprisonment, torture, creating trusts in restraint of trade 18 dereliction of fiduciary duties, bank fraud, breach of trust, treason, tax 19 evasion, bad faith actions, dishonor, injury and damage to Affiant and 20 proof of claim. See United States v. Kis, 658 F.2d, 526 (7th Cir. 1981)., 21 "Appellee had the burden of first proving its prima facie case and 22 could do so by affidavit or other evidence." 23 **UNLAWFUL ARREST, IMPRISONMENT, AND TORTURE** 24 29. On December 31, 2024, at approximately 9:32am I, Kevin: Walker, sui juris, 25 was traveling privately in a private conveyance/automobile, displaying a 26 'PRIVATE' plate, indicating I was 'not for hire' or operating commercially, 27 and the private automobile was not displaying a STATE plate of any sort. 28

-13 of 116-

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.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

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 14 Trust action/CASE NO.: SWM2303376, there is no corpus delicti – no 15 injured party, no damaged property, and no sworn affidavit of harm from 16 any living man or woman. Therefore, this matter is without merit, lacks 17 standing, and constitutes an improper attempt to impose authority without 18 lawful jurisdiction. Any further action absent evidence of a valid cause of 19 action is a violation of due process and a deprivation of rights under color 20 of law. 21

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.

-14 of 116-

1	34. The <u>private</u> automobile and <u>trust property</u> was not in <i>any</i> way displaying STATE or
2	government registration or stickers, and was displaying a PRIVATE plate.
3	35. Upon being unlawfully stopped and arrested by Gregory D Eastwood,
4	Robert C V Bowman, William Pratt, and George Reyes, Affiant, informed all
5	Defendants who willfully conspired on the scene in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§
6	241 and 242, that Affiant was a American national of the republic, non-citizen
7	national/national/internationally protected person, privately traveling in a
8	private automobile/conveyance, as articulated by Affiant and as also clearly
9	evidenced by the ' <u>PRIVATE'</u> plate on the <u>private</u> automobile.
10	36. The private automobile is duly reflected on Private UCC Contract Trust/
11	UCC1 filing #2024385925-4 (Exhibit C).
12	37. Under threat, duress, and coercion, and at gunpoint, Gregory D Eastwood
13	and Robert C V Bowman were <i>presented</i> with American national/non-citizen
14	national PASSPORT CARD #C35510079 and PASSPORT BOOK #A39235161
15	(Exhibits X and Y).
16	38. Defendants, willfully and intentionally acted against the Bill of Rights, State
17	Constitution, and Constitution of the United States, even when reminded of
18	their duties to support and uphold the Constitution.
19	FRUIT OF THE POISONOUS TREE DOCTRINE
20	39. I, Kevin, <i>proceeding sui juris</i> , by <i>Special Limited Appearance</i> , further asserts
21	and establishes <u>on the record</u> that the undisputedly unlawful and
22	unconstitutional stop, arrest, and subsequent actions of the Defendants/
23	Respondents are in violation of the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution of
24	the united States of America and constitute an unlawful arrest and seizure.
25	The " fruit of the poisonous tree " doctrine, as articulated by the <u>U.S.</u>
26	Supreme Court, establishes that any evidence obtained as a result of an
27	unlawful stop or detainment is tainted and inadmissible in <u>any</u> subsequent
28	proceedings. The unlawful actions of Gregory D. Eastwood, Robert C. V.
	-15 of 116-

1	Bowman, George Reyes, William Pratt, and Robert Gell including but not
2	<i>limited to</i> the issuance of fraudulent citations/contracts under threat, duress,
3	and coercion, render all actions and evidence derived therefrom <i>void ab</i>
4	<u>initio</u> . See Wong Sun v. United States, 371 U.S. 471 (1963).
5	40. I, Kevin, <i>proceeding sui juris</i> , hereby re-affirm, re-asset, declare, and assert
6	that all actions, evidence, and instruments obtained in connection with the
7	unlawful stop and arrest are inadmissible and void as <i>fruits of the</i>
8	<i>poisonous tree</i> . This includes, but is not limited to, Trust action/CASE/
9	CONTRACT #SWM2303376 and/or Trust action/CASE/CONTRACT
10	#B038555 (Exhibit J) and/or Trust action/CASE/CONTRACT
11	#MISW2501134, which was executed under duress, threat, and coercion,
12	while Affiant was unlawfully deprived of liberty and imprisoned against his
13	will, without Affiant's consent.
14	41. Again, for the record, I, Kevin, proceeding sui juris, by Special Limited
15	Appearance, I simply wish to be left alone in peace and not be harassed,
16	stalked, robbed, deprived under color of law, coerced into commercial
17	contracts, extorted, and/or forced into peonage and/or involuntary servitude.
18	I have NOT injured any man or woman nor have I damaged any property.
19	FAILURE TO PROVIDE PROOF AND EVIDENCE
20	42.Defendants are deemed to have unequivocally agreed by tacit
21	acquiescence that any further attempt to prosecute, proceed, or
22	interfere in these matters shall constitute fraud, deprivation of rights
23	under color of law, judicial fraud, malicious prosecution, conspiracy,
24	racketeering (RICO), and multiple violations of federal law, including
25	but not limited to 18 U.S.C. §§ 241, 242, and 1962.
26	43.Defendants agree and accept that these matters must be immediately
27	dismissed and terminated with prejudice, and that any continued
28	action, omission, or obstruction shall constitute willful and knowing
	-16 of 116-

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

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.

-17 of 116-

1	50. "It is one of the fundamental maxims of the common law that ignorance of
2	the law excuses no one." Daniels v. Dean (1905), 2 C.A. 421, 84 P. 332.
3	51. "the people, not the States, are sovereign." – Chisholm v. Georgia, 2 Dall. 419,
4	2 U.S. 419, 1 L.Ed. 440 (1793).
5	52. ALL ARE EQUAL UNDER THE LAW. (God's Law - Moral and Natural
6	Law). Exodus 21:23-25; Lev. 24: 17-21; Deut. 1; 17, 19:21; Mat. 22:36-40; Luke
7	10:17; Col. 3:25. "No one is above the law".
8	53. IN COMMERCE FOR ANY MATTER TO BE RESOLVED MUST BE
9	EXPRESSED. (Heb. 4:16; Phil. 4:6; Eph. 6:19-21) Legal maxim: "To lie is to
10	go against the mind."
11	54. IN COMMERCE TRUTH IS SOVEREIGN. (Exodus 20:16; Ps. 117:2; John
12	8:32; II Cor. 13:8) Truth is sovereign and the Sovereign tells only the truth.
13	55. TRUTH IS EXPRESSED IN THE FORM OF AN AFFIDAVIT. (Lev. 5:4-5;
14	Lev. 6:3-5; Lev. 19:11-13: Num. 30:2; Mat. 5:33; James 5: 12).
15	56.AN UNREBUTTED AFFIDAVIT STANDS AS TRUTH IN
16	COMMERCE. (12 Pet. 1:25; Heb. 6:13-15;). "He who does not deny,
17	admits."
18	57. AN UNREBUTTED AFFIDAVIT BECOMES THE JUDGEMENT IN
19	COMMERCE. (Heb. 6:16-17;). "There is nothing left to resolve.
20	58. WORKMAN IS WORTHY OF HIS HIRE. The first of these is expressed in
21	Exodus 20:15; Lev. 19:13; Mat. 10:10; Luke 10"7; II Tim. 2:6. Legal maxim: "It
22	is against equity for freemen not to have the free disposal of their own
23	property."
24	59. HE WHO LEAVES THE BATTLEFIELD FIRST LOSES BY DEFAULT.
25	(Book of Job; Mat. 10:22) Legal maxim: "He who does not repel a wrong
26	when he can occasions it.")
27	DEFENDANTS' PRESUMPTION OF DISHONOR UNDER U.C.C. § 3-505
28	AND EVIDENCE PROVING DEFENDANTS' DISHONOR:
	-18 of 116-

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

-19 of 116-

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 <u>not</u> 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.

17

19

20

'Foundation of American Sovereignty:

18 28. The Declaration of Independence (1776) proclaims:

"Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from

the <u>consent</u> of the governed."

21 29. This foundational document establishes that the people are the true
22 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 <u>States</u>, are reserved to the States respectively, or to
 the people."

-20 of 116-

This affirms that any power not granted to the federal government remains 2. 1 with the <u>States</u> or the people. 2 **SUPREME COURT Affirmations of Sovereignty:** 3 31. The Supreme Court of the United States (SCOTUS) has repeatedly affirmed 4 that sovereignty resides in the people: 5 • Chisholm v. Georgia, 2 U.S. 419 (1793): 6 "The sovereignty resides in the **people**... they are truly the sovereigns of the 7 country." 8 Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356 (1886): 9 "Sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all 10 government exists and acts." 11 Lansing v. Smith, 4 Wend. 9 (N.Y. 1829): 12 "People of a state are entitled to all the rights which formerly belonged to 13 the King by his prerogative." 14 Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803): 15 "A law repugnant to the Constitution is void." 16 Sherar v. Cullen, 481 F.2d 946 (9th Cir. 1973): 17 "There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of his 18 exercise of constitutional rights." 19 **Congressional Recognition of Americans as 'Sovereigns':** 20 32. In his 1947 "I Am an American Day" address, Representative 21 John F. Kennedy emphasized the active role Citizens must play in 22 preserving liberty: 23 "The fires of liberty must be continually fueled by the positive and 24 conscious actions of all of us." (JFKLIBRARY.ORG) 25 33. Further, Congress formally recognized the significance of American 26 sovereignty through the establishment of "I Am An American Day," later 27 designated as Citizenship Day: 28 -21 of 116-

1	"Whereas it is desirable that the sovereign citizens of our Nation be
2	prepared for the responsibilities and impressed with the significance
3	of their status in our self-governing Republic: Therefore be it Resolved by
4	the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in
5	Congress assembled, That the third Sunday in May each year be, and hereby
6	is, set aside as Citizenship Day"
7	This resolution affirms the foundational principle that sovereignty resides with the
8	people, who are responsible for preserving and exercising their rights and
9	freedoms.
10	Status as a "national" and "state Citizen":
11	34. Under 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(21), the term <i>national</i> is defined as:
12	"A person owing permanent allegiance to a state."
13	Furthermore, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(B)(22) defines national of the United States as:
14	"(A) a <u>c</u> itizen of the United States, or (B) a person who, though not a <u>c</u> itizen of the
15	United States, owes permanent allegiance to the United States."
16	35. This distinction is clear: one can be a <i>national</i> without being a <u>citizen</u> of the United
17	<i>States,</i> reinforcing the concept of sovereignty associated with state citizenship.
18	Distinction Between "state Citizen" and "citizen of the United States"
19	36. The Courts have long recognized that <i>state citizenship</i> and <i>U.S. citizenship</i> are
20	distinct legal statuses:
21	 United States v. Anthony (1873)
22	"The Fourteenth Amendment creates and defines citizenship of the United
23	States. It had long been contended, and had been held by many learned
24	authorities, and had never been judicially decided to the contrary, that there
25	was no such thing as a citizen of the United States, except as that condition
26	arose from citizenship of some state."
27	Slaughter-House Cases, 83 U.S. 36 (1872)
28	"It is quite clear, then, that there is a citizenship of the United States and a
	-22 of 116-

1	citizenship of a State, which are distinct from each other and which depend
2	upon different characteristics or circumstances in the individual."
3	• United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542 (1875)
4	"We have in our political system a Government of the United States and a
5	government of each of the several States. Each one of these governments is
6	distinct from the others, and each has citizens of its own who owe it
7	allegiance, and whose rights, within its jurisdiction, it must protect."
8	• Thomasson v. State, 15 Ind. 449; Cory v. Carter, 48 Ind. 327 (1874);
9	McDonel v. State, 90 Ind. 320 (1883):
10	"One may be a citizen of a State and yet not a citizen of the United States."
11	• Tashiro v. Jordan, 201 Cal. 236 (1927):
12	"That there is a citizenship of the United States and a citizenship of a state,
13	and the privileges and immunities of one are not the same as the other is
14	well established by the decisions of the courts of this country."
15	• Crosse v. Board of Supervisors of Elections, 221 A.2d 431 (1966):
16	"Both before and after the Fourteenth Amendment to the federal
17	Constitution, it has not been necessary for a person to be a citizen of the
18	United States in order to be a citizen of his state."
19	• Jones v. Temmer, 829 F.Supp. 1226 (USDC/DCO 1993):
20	"The privileges and immunities clause of the Fourteenth Amendment protects
21	very few rights because it neither incorporates any of the Bill of Rights nor
22	protects all rights of individual citizens Instead, this provision protects only
23	those rights peculiar to being a citizen of the federal government; it does not
24	protect those rights which relate to state citizenship."
25	37. The first clause of the Fourteenth Amendment states:
26	"All persons born or naturalized in the United States, <u>and</u> subject to the
27	jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and the state wherein
28	they reside."

-23 of 116-

1	38. However, this clause does NOT state:
2	"All persons born or naturalized in the United States, <u>are</u> subject to the
3	jurisdiction thereof"
4	39. This confirms that United States citizenship requires both :
5	H. Being born or naturalized in the United States, and
6	I. Being subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.
7	Status as "national" / "non-citizen national" (state Citizen)
8	39. The U.S. Department of State document, Certificates of Non-Citizen
9	Nationality (https://travel.state.gov/content/travel/en/legal/travel-legal-
10	considerations/us-citizenship/Certificates-Non-Citizen-Nationality.html), states:
11	"Section 101(a)(21) of the INA defines the term ' national ' as 'a person
12	owing permanent allegiance to a state.' Section 101(a)(22) of the INA
13	provides that the term 'national of the United States' includes all U.S.
14	citizens as well as persons who, though not citizens of the United
15	States, owe permanent allegiance to the United States (non-citizen
16	nationals)."
17	40. 8 U.S.C. § 1101(22) defines national of the United States as:
18	"(A) a <u>c</u> itizen of the United States, or (B) a person who, though not a <u>c</u> itizen of the
19	United States, owes permanent allegiance to the United States."
20	41. 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(22) explicitly stipulates that one can be a 'national of the
21	United States' without being a 'citizen of the United States' if they owe permanent
22	allegiance to the United States.
23	42. 22 CFR § 51.2 stipulates that Passports are issued to nationals only:
24	"A passport may be issued only to a U.S. national."
25	43. 22 CFR § 51.3 stipulates the Types of passports issued:
26	"(a) A regular passport is issued to a national of the United States."
27	"(e) A passport card is issued to a national of the United States on the same basis
28	as a regular passport."
	-24 of 116-

1	44. 18 U.S.C. § 112 stipulates that Protections of foreign officials, official		
2	guests, and internationally protected persons, apply to nationals . This statute		
3	defines terms such as "foreign government," "foreign official,"		
4	"internationally protected person," "international organization," "national of		
5	the United States," and "official guest," have <u>the same meaning</u> .		
6	45. It is unequivocally true that 18 U.S.C. § 112 states that in addition to being a		
7	<i>national,</i> a <i>national</i> is also considered a:		
8	foreign government		
9	foreign official		
10	internationally protected person		
11	international organization		
12	national of the United States		
13	official guest		
14	46. The legal framework and court rulings confirm that:		
15	• One may be a " <i>state Citizen</i> " without being a <u>citizen of the United States</u> ."		
16	• The Fourteenth Amendment created <i>U.S. citizenship</i> , which is distinct from		
17	state citizenship.		
18	• A <i>national</i> is someone who owes permanent allegiance to a <u>s</u> tate, not		
19	necessarily to the United States.		
20	• A <i>national of the United States</i> could be a <i>U.S. citizen</i> , but could also be a <i>non</i> -		
21	citizen national who owes allegiance without being a U.S. citizen.		
22	Thus, the distinction between <i>state Citizens</i> and <i>U.S. citizens</i> is a well-established		
23	legal principle with profound implications on sovereignty, rights, and legal		
24	obligations.		
25	<u>Unrebutted Affidavits, Considered, Agreed, and Stipulated Facts,</u>		
26	Contract Security Agreements, and Authorized Judgement and Lien:		
27	47. Plaintiff and Defendants are parties to certain Contracts and Security		
28	Agreements, specifically contract security agreement numbers		
	-25 of 116-		

1	RF775821088US, #RF775821088US, #RF775822582US, and #RF775823645US.
2	Each contract security agreement and/or self-executing contract security
3	agreement was received, considered, and agreed to by Defendants through
4	silent acquiescence, tacit agreement, and tacit procuration. Each contract
5	also includes a corresponding Form 3811, which was signed as evidence of
6	receipt. <u>AN UNREBUTTED AFFIDAVIT STANDS AS TRUTH IN</u>
7	COMMERCE. (12 Pet. 1:25; Heb. 6:13-15;). 'He who does not deny, admits.
8	AN UNREBUTTED AFFIDAVIT BECOMES THE JUDGEMENT IN
9	<u>COMMERCE</u> (Heb. 6:16-17;). 'There is nothing left to resolve.' All
10	referenced contracts and signed Forms 3811 are attached hereto as Exhibits E,
11	F, G, H, I, J, K, and L respectively, as follows:
12	• Exhibit E: Contract Security Agreement #RF775820621US, titled: NOTICE OF
13	CONDITIONAL ACCEPTANCE, and FRAUD, RACKETEERING,
14	CONSPIRACY, DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER THE COLOR OF LAW,
15	IDENTITY THEFT, EXTORTION, COERCION, TREASON.
16	• Exhibit F: Contract Security Agreement #RF775821088US, titled: NOTICE OF
17	DEFAULT, and FRAUD, RACKETEERING, CONSPIRACY, DEPRIVATION
18	OF RIGHTS UNDER THE COLOR OF LAW, IDENTITY THEFT,
19	EXTORTION, COERCION, TREASON
20	• Exhibit G: Contract Security Agreement #RF775822582US, titled: NOTICE
21	OF DEFAULT AND OPPORTUNITY TO CURE <u>AND</u> NOTICE OF FRAUD,
22	RACKETEERING, CONSPIRACY, DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER THE
23	COLOR OF LAW, IDENTITY THEFT, EXTORTION, COERCION,
24	KIDNAPPING.
25	• Exhibit H: Contract Security Agreement #RF775823645US, titled: Affidavit
26	Certificate of Dishonor, Non-response, DEFAULT, JUDGEMENT, and LIEN
27	AUTHORIZATION.
28	• Exhibit I: Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit E.
	-26 of 116-

• Exhibit J: Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit F.

- **Exhibit K**: Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit G.
- 23

1

• **Exhibit L**: Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit H.

4 48. Self-Executing Contract Security Agreement #RF775823645US (Exhibit L)
5 was *received, considered,* and *agreed* to by Defendants, acknowledging and
6 accepting a Judgement, Summary Judgement, and Lien Authorization (in
7 accordance with U.C.C. § 9-509), against Defendants in the amount of One Trillion
8 Dollars (\$1,000,000,000,000) in lawfully recognized currency, such as gold and
9 silver coin, as authorized under Article I, Section 10, Clause 1 of the U.S.

10 Constitution, in favor of Plaintiff.

49. Defendants have a duty to respond to all of Plaintiff's NOTICES and binding
CONTRACTS, and have intentionally and willfully remained silent and and
dishonor.

50. Defendants have *received*, *considered*, and *agreed* to <u>all</u> the terms 14 of all contract agreements, including the Self-Executing Contract 15 Security Agreement (Exhibits E, F, G, and H), constituting a bona fide 16 contract under the principles of contract law and the Uniform 17 Commercial Code (U.C.C.). Pursuant to the mailbox rule, which 18 establishes that acceptance of an offer is effective when dispatched 19 (U.C.C. § 2-206. Offer and Acceptance in Formation of Contract) and 20 principles of silent acquiescence, tacit procuration, and tacit 21 agreement, the acceptance is valid. This acceptance is in alignment with 22 the doctrine of 'offer and acceptance' and the provisions of U.C.C. § 23 2-202, which governs the **final** expression of the CONTRACT. 24 Furthermore, under the U.C.C., all assets - whether registered or 25 unregistered – are held subject to the allodial title, with Plaintiff 26 maintaining sole and exclusive standing over all real property, assets, 27 securities, both tangible and intangible, registered and unregistered, as 28

-27 of 116-

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.

12

13

20

21

3

4

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.

26 53. U.C.C. § 2-202 – Final Written Expression, Parol or Extrinsic Evidence:
27 Under U.C.C. § 2-202, when a written contract is intended as a <u>final</u> and

28 **complete expression of an agreement**, its terms *cannot* be contradicted by

-28 of 116-

[AMENDED] VERIEED 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	prior agreements, oral statements, or extrinsic evidence . This section ensures
2	that:
3	• The contract and security agreements , as presented in the verified commercial
4	Affidavits, are the <u>final</u> and complete expression of the parties' agreement.
5	• Defendants cannot introduce oral statements, prior discussions, or extrinsic
6	evidence to dispute or alter the contract's terms.
7	• Any modifications to the contract must be explicitly made in writing and
8	agreed upon by both parties.
9	Since Defendants failed to rebut the contract and affidavits, U.C.C. § 2-202 bars any claims
10	of ambiguity or modification, affirming the enforceability of Plaintiff's claims.
11	54. U.C.C. § 2-204 – Formation of Contract: U.C.C. § 2-204 establishes that a
12	contract is legally formed when there is:
13	1. Intent to contract between the parties.
14	2. Agreement on essential terms, even if minor terms remain open.
15	3. Performance or conduct demonstrating acceptance of the contract.
16	In this case, Defendants:
17	• Demonstrated intent through their silence, non-response, and
18	acquiescence.
19	• Accepted the terms by failing to dispute the verified affidavits, making the
20	agreement self-executing and binding.
21	• Performed in a manner that affirmed the contract , either by engaging in
22	financial transactions, receiving notices, or failing to object.
23	As a result, under U.C.C. § 2-204, the contract is legally enforceable, and
24	arbitration or further negotiations are unnecessary.
25	55. U.C.C. § 2-206 – Offer and Acceptance in Contract Formation: U.C.C. §
26	2-206 establishes that:
27	1. An offer is deemed accepted when the offeree engages in conduct
28	consistent with acceptance.

-29 of 116-

1	2. A contract is formed when an offer is accepted, even if conditions or
2	objections are not expressly stated.
3	Applying this to Plaintiff's verified claims:
4	• Defendants received and <i>considered</i> the verified affidavits, contract, and
5	security agreements but failed to respond or contest them.
6	• Under U.C.C. § 2-206, Defendants' silence constitutes acceptance, making
7	the contract and obligations binding and enforceable .
8	• The verified commercial affidavits and supporting exhibits serve as prima
9	facie evidence of the existence and validity of the contract.
10	Thus, under U.C.C. § 1-103, 2-204, 2-206, and 3-303 Plaintiff's verified claims are
11	fully enforceable, and Defendants' failure to rebut any of them constitutes
12	uncontested acceptance.
13	56. U.C.C. § 3-303 – Value and Consideration for Negotiable
14	Instruments: U.C.C. § 3-303 defines value and consideration in the
15	enforcement of negotiable instruments. A negotiable instrument is issued
16	for value when:
17	• It is given in exchange for a promise of performance or to satisfy a
18	pre-existing obligation.
19	• The holder takes it in good faith and without notice of defects.
20	• It provides financial or legal benefit to the party receiving it.
21	In this case:
22	 Plaintiff provided value through agreements, instruments, and
23	affidavits, which Defendants considered and accepted.
24	• Defendants' willful failure to dispute the obligation confirms that
25	consideration was validly exchanged.
26	 Under U.C.C. § 3-303, Defendants cannot claim a lack of
27	consideration to avoid liability, as their conduct establishes their
28	acceptance of value.
	-30 of 116-

1	57. U.C.C. § 9-509 – Authorization of Financing Statement; Obligation of
2	Debtor: Under U.C.C. § 9-509 , a secured party is <i>authorized</i> to file a financing
3	statement when:
4	• The debtor has authenticated a security agreement covering the collateral.
5	• The secured party has control over the collateral as agreed in the security
6	instrument.
7	• The debtor's failure to rebut or contest the filing constitutes authorization
8	by default.
9	• The debtor authorizes the filing in an authenticated record.
10	In this case:
11	• Defendants' failure to rebut the security agreement affirms that the lien
12	and financing statement are valid and enforceable.
13	• The self-executing contract and security agreement serve as authenticated
14	proof under U.C.C. § 9-509.
15	• Plaintiff, as a secured party , has the full legal right to perfect and enforce
16	their lien against Defendants' assets.
17	Thus, under U.C.C. § 9-509, Plaintiff's lien is properly perfected and enforceable as
18	a matter of law.
19	58. U.C.C. § 9-102 – Definitions and Scope of Security Interests: U.C.C. § 9-102
20	provides definitions crucial to the enforcement of security agreements, including:
21	• "Secured Party" – A person in whose favor a security interest is created.
22	• "Debtor" – A person who has granted a security interest in collateral.
23	• "Collateral" – Property subject to a security interest.
24	Applying U.C.C. § 9-102 to this matter:
25	• Plaintiff is the secured party with enforceable rights over collateral under
26	the security agreement.
27	• Defendants, by failing to contest the claim, have conceded their role as
28	debtors.
	-31 of 116-
	[1001.00.05] JUNETICO CONTRACT, NETTOR TRADI, DE RIVATION OF ROLLO OF CONTRACT, RACKETEERING, RIDNAFFING, TORTURE, BR SUMMART JUDGEMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW

1	• The assets in question, including property , negotiable instruments , and
2	funds, are collateral lawfully secured by Plaintiff.
3	Under U.C.C. § 9-102, the contractual security interests are valid, perfected, and
4	enforceable against Defendants, who have waived all objections through inaction.
5	59. Plaintiff asserts that the provisions of the Uniform Commercial Code
6	(U.C.C.), as outlined above, establish that:
7	1. Contracts, negotiable instruments, and security agreements are
8	enforceable under commercial law.
9	2. Defendants' silence, failure to rebut, and inaction constitute binding
10	acceptance under U.C.C. §§ 2-204, 2-206, and 9-509.
11	3. Defendants have waived all rights to contest the contract, and any claims
12	of fraud, duress, or invalidity are legally barred under U.C.C. §§ 1-103,
13	2-202, and 3-303.
14	Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to <u>full enforcement</u> of <i>all</i> claims, security
15	interests, and remedies under the U.C.C.
16	60. As <i>considered, agreed,</i> and <i>stipulated</i> by Defendant(s) in the <u>unrebutted</u>
16 17	60. As <i>considered, agreed,</i> and <i>stipulated</i> by Defendant(s) in the <u>unrebutted</u> verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and/or self-executing contract
17	verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and/or self-executing contract
17 18	verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and/or self-executing contract security agreement(s) (Exhibits E, F, G, and H), Defendants may <u>not</u> argue,
17 18 19	verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and/or self-executing contract security agreement(s) (Exhibits E, F, G, and H), Defendants may <u>not</u> argue, controvert, or otherwise protest the finality of the administrative findings
17 18 19 20	verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and/or self-executing contract security agreement(s) (Exhibits E, F, G, and H), Defendants may <u>not</u> argue, controvert, or otherwise protest the finality of the administrative findings established through the <u>unrebutted</u> verified commercial affidavits. As per
17 18 19 20 21	verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and/or self-executing contract security agreement(s) (Exhibits E, F, G, and H), Defendants may <u>not</u> argue, controvert, or otherwise protest the finality of the administrative findings established through the <u>unrebutted</u> verified commercial affidavits. As per established legal principles and legal maxims, once an affidavit is submitted and
 17 18 19 20 21 22 	verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and/or self-executing contract security agreement(s) (Exhibits E, F, G, and H), Defendants may <u>not</u> argue, controvert, or otherwise protest the finality of the administrative findings established through the <u>unrebutted</u> 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
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and/or self-executing contract security agreement(s) (Exhibits E, F, G, and H), Defendants may <u>not</u> argue, controvert, or otherwise protest the finality of the administrative findings established through the <u>unrebutted</u> 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
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 	verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and/or self-executing contract security agreement(s) (Exhibits E, F, G, and H), Defendants may <u>not</u> argue, controvert, or otherwise protest the finality of the administrative findings established through the <u>unrebutted</u> 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.
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 	 verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and/or self-executing contract security agreement(s) (Exhibits E, F, G, and H), Defendants may <u>not</u> argue, controvert, or otherwise protest the finality of the administrative findings established through the <u>unrebutted</u> 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 <u>unrebutted</u>
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 	 verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and/or self-executing contract security agreement(s) (Exhibits E, F, G, and H), Defendants may <u>not</u> argue, controvert, or otherwise protest the finality of the administrative findings established through the <u>unrebutted</u> 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 <u>unrebutted</u> verified commercial affidavits, ontract agreement, and/or self-executing contract

-32 of 116-

62. 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 <u>NOT</u> 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 unrebutted 14 verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and self-executing contract 15 security agreements (Exhibits E, F, G, and H), under California Code of Civil 16 Procedure § 437c(c), summary judgement is appropriate when there is no triable issue of 17 18 material fact and the moving party is entitled to judgement as a matter of law. The unrebutted verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and/or self-executing 19 contract security agreement(s) (Exhibits E, F, G, and H) submitted by Plaintiff demonstrate 20 that no triable issues of material fact remain in dispute, and Plaintiff is entitled to 21 judgement based on the evidence presented and as a matter of law. 22

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).

-33 of 116-

67. As *considered*, *agreed*, and *stipulated* by Defendants in the <u>unrebutted</u> 1 verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and self-executing contract 2 security agreements (Exhibits E, F, G, and H), the principles of res judicata, stare 3 decisis, and collateral estoppel apply to the *unrebutted* commercial affidavits, 4 establishing that all issues are deemed settled and *cannot* be contested further. 5 These *principles* reinforce the finality of the administrative findings and support 6 the granting of summary judgement, as a matter of law. - 'HE WHO LEAVES THE 7 **BATTLEFIELD FIRST LOSES BY DEFAULT.'** 8

9 Judgement of \$1,000,000,000,000 Received, Considered, Agreed 10 to, and Authorized:

68. As considered, agreed, and stipulated by Defendant(s) in the unrebutted 11 verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and self-executing contract 12 security agreements (Exhibits E, F, G, and H), Defendants fully authorize, endorse, 13 support, and advocate for the entry of a UCC commercial judgement and lien in the 14 amount of One Trillion Dollars (\$1,000,000,000,000.00) in lawfully recognized 15 16 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 17 evidenced by INVOICE/TRUE BILL #RIVSHERTREAS12312024 which is a part of 18 Exhibit H. INVOICE/TRUE BILL #RIVSHERTREAS12312024 is attached hereto as 19 Exhibit M and incorporated herein by reference. 20

69. 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), should it be **deemed** necessary, the
Plaintiff is <u>fully Authorized</u> to initiate the filing of a lien, and the seizing of
property to secure satisfaction of the ADJUDGED, DECREED, AND

26 AUTHORIZED sum total due to Affiant, and/or Plaintiff of, One Trillion Dollars

27 (\$1,000,000,000,000.00) in lawfully recognized currency, such as gold and silver coin,

28 as authorized under Article I, Section 10, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

-34 of 116-

Defendants' Actions as Acts of War Against the Constitution:

1

12

13

14

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.

9 71. Violations of Constitutional Protections: The defendants have intentionally
10 and systematically engaged in acts that directly violate the protections guaranteed
11 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.

27 72. Acts of Aggression and Tyranny: The defendants' actions amount to a
28 usurpation of authority and a direct attack on the sovereignty of the people, who

-35 of 116-

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
<u>C</u>itizens 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.

25 26

12

13

14

15

<u>'Bare Statutes' as Confirmation of Guilt and the Necessity of</u> <u>Prosecution by an Enforcer:</u>

27 75. Plaintiff's incorporation of "bare statutes" does <u>NOT</u> exonerate Defendants;
28 rather, it serves as evidence of Defendants' guilt, which they have already

-36 of 116-

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 <u>NOT</u> 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.

14

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

78. Defendants are <u>presumed</u> 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 <u>NOT</u> 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.

-37 of 116-

<u>'Special Deposit' and MASTER INDEMNITY BOND: 31 U.S. Code §</u> 5312 and U.C.C. § 3-104

81. This notarized, authorized, and indorsed VERIFIED COMPLAINT itself 3 acted as a BOND and/or MONETARY INSTRUMENT, as defined by 31 U.S. Code 4 § 5312 and U.C.C. § 3-104, supplemented by the MASTER INDEMNITY BOND 5 (Exhibit N), and that the BOND also satisfies the procedural and substantive 6 requirements of Rule 67 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Exclusive equity 7 supports this claim, as it ensures that no competing claims will infringe upon the 8 Plaintiff's established rights to this bond of and will be reported on the forms 1099-9 A, 1099-OID, and/or 1099-B, with Plaintiff evidenced as the CREDITOR(S). 10 82. Janet Yellen, said Successor(s), and/or the United States Treasury is the 11 registered holder and fiduciary of/for Plaintiff's the private Two Hundred Billion 12 Dollar (\$200,000,000,000 USD) 'MASTER DISCHARGE AND INDEMNITY 13 BOND' #RF661448567US, which was post deposited to private post registered 14 account #RF 661 448 023 US. Said 'MASTER DISCHARGE AND INDEMNITY 15 BOND' (#RF661448567US) expressly stipulates it is "insuring, underwriting, 16 indemnifying, discharging, paying and satisfying all such account holders and 17 accounts dollar for dollar against any and all pre-existing, current and future 18 losses, costs, debts, taxes, encumbrances, deficits, deficiencies, liens, judgements, 19 true bills, obligations of contract or performance, defaults, charges, and any and all 20 other obligations as may exist or come to exist during the term of this Bond... Each 21 of the said account holders and accounts shall be severally insured, underwritten 22 and indemnified against any and all future Liabilities as may appear, thereby 23 instantly satisfying all such obligations dollar for dollar without exception 24 through the above-noted Private Offset Accounts up to and including the full face 25 value of this Bond through maturity." A copy of 'MASTER DISCHARGE AND 26 INDEMNITY BOND' #RF372320890US is attached hereto as Exhibit N and 27 incorporated herein by reference, and will serve as an additional CAUTION and/ 28

1

and/or BOND for immediate adjustment and setoff of any and all costs 1 associated with these matters. 2

3

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

83. As considered, agreed, and stipulated by Defendants in the unrebutted verified 4 commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and self-executing contract security agreements 5 (Exhibits E, F, G, and H), as under 12 U.S.C. 1813(L)(1), ["]the term 'deposit' means - the 6 unpaid balance of money or its equivalent received or held by a bank or savings 7 association in the usual course of business and for which it has given or is obligated to 8 9 give credit, either conditionally or unconditionally, to a commercial, checking, savings, time, or thrift account, or which is evidenced by its certificate of deposit, thrift certificate, 10 investment certificate, certificate of indebtedness, or other similar name, or a check or draft 11 12 drawn against a deposit account and certified by the bank or savings association, or a 13 letter of credit or a traveler's check on which the bank or savings association is primarily liable: Provided, That, without limiting the generality of the term "money or its 14 equivalent", any such account or instrument must be regarded as evidencing the receipt 15 of the equivalent of money when credited or issued in exchange for checks or drafts or 16 for a **promissory note** upon which the person obtaining any such **credit** or instrument is 17 primarily or secondarily liable, or for a charge against a deposit account, or in settlement 18 19 of checks, drafts, or other instruments forwarded to such bank or savings association for collection.["] 20

21

GENERALLY Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP)

84. As considered, agreed, and stipulated by Defendants in the unrebutted 22 verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and self-executing contract 23 security agreements (Exhibits E, F, G, and H), Defendants never at any time risked 24 any of its assets and truly only exchanged the GENUINE ORIGINAL 25

PROMISSORY NOTE for "credit" according to the Generally Accepted Accounting 26 Principles (GAAP). 'Banks' are required to adhere Generally Accepted Accounting 27 28

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

-39 of 116-

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.["]

7 85. As *considered, agreed,* and *stipulated* by Defendants in the <u>unrebutted</u> verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and self-executing contract security agreements 8 (Exhibits E, F, G, and H), GAAP follows an accounting convention that lies at the heart of 9 the double-entry bookkeeping system called the Matching Principle. This principle 10 works are follows: when a bank accepts bullion, coin, currency, drafts, promissory notes, 11 or any other similar instruments (hereinafter "instruments") from customers and deposits 12 13 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 14 15 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 16 (assets held by banks) are created by the banks, once they purchase/acquire the TRUE 17 18 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 19 20 of borrowers. Said Asset remains an Asset to Plaintiff.

86. 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 is <u>intended</u> to ensure
consistency among financial records, financial transparency, and protection from
fraud or misleading company reports.

26

Summary Judgement is Due as a matter of law

27 87. Rule 56(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure <u>and</u> California Code of

28 Civil Procedure § 437c(c): Summary Judgment is warranted as <u>a matter of law</u> under

-40 of 116-

Rule 56(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and California Code of Civil 1 Procedure § 437c(c), both of which mandate judgment where there is no genuine 2 dispute as to any material fact. 3

88. Defendants are *barred* 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.
- 9

10

21

4

5

6

7

8

Collateral Estoppel - Defendants are estopped from raising any defenses they failed to assert.

89. Unrebutted Affidavits Establish No Disputed Facts: Plaintiff's affidavits 11 were submitted in good faith and stand as truth in commerce. These affidavits were 12 served upon Defendants, providing sufficient notice and opportunity to rebut or 13 contest the assertions therein. Defendants' failure to respond or dispute the 14 affidavits results in a legal presumption of their validity. As a matter of law, an 15 16 affidavit that is unrebutted is deemed admitted and undisputed, thereby precluding any triable issue of fact. 17

- 18 Pursuant to **Res Judicata**, the unrebutted affidavits have the same force and effect as a judgment and are now binding upon Defendants. 19
- Under the principle of Stare Decisis, binding precedent affirms that 20 • undisputed affidavits establish facts conclusively in a civil proceeding. 22
- 23 **Collateral Estoppel** bars Defendants from re-litigating any issue • previously resolved by the unrebutted affidavits, as they have failed to 24 raise a substantive dispute within the prescribed timeframes. 25

26 90. Defendants' Failure to Produce Contradictory Evidence:

Defendants have neither provided competent evidence to dispute Plaintiff's claims 27

nor identified any material fact requiring trial. Plaintiff's affidavits, contracts, and 28

-41 of 116-

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.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

- 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.

17The COURT is Barred From SUMMARILY DISMISSING Anything,18Especially 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.

-42 of 116-

1	Any judicial attempt to summarily dismiss Plaintiff's verified,
2	unrebutted claims would constitute an abuse of discretion, a
3	deprivation of due process, and a direct violation of Plaintiff's
4	constitutional rights.
5	95. Due Process Requires Full Adjudication, Not Summary Disposition.
6	• Plaintiff has filed <i>multiple</i> verified, sworn affidavits, which have gone
7	uncontested and <i>unrebutted</i> , and stand as Truth.
8	• Under U.C.C. § 3-505, an <i>unrebutted</i> Affidavit creates a presumption of
9	dishonor, which the Court cannot arbitrarily ignore.
10	• Under 28 U.S.C. § 1361 , Plaintiff has the right to compel the performance of
11	a legal duty owed to them by the Court.
12	• A case may only be dismissed summarily if there is no valid claim or
13	cause of action – which is inapplicable here, as Defendants have already
14	defaulted and dishonored themselves by failing to rebut the Plaintiff's
15	Conditional Acceptance, and they have admitted everything presented in
16	all Affidavits.
17	96. Any Attempt to Dismiss Would Be a Violation of Res Judicata, Stare Decisis,
18	and Collateral Estoppel.
19	• Res Judicata : The matters before this Court are already settled and decided , and
20	no further litigation is necessary to determine the legal obligations of Defendants.
21	• Stare Decisis: The binding legal precedents of Marbury v. Madison, Rule 56
22	FRCP, and California CCP § 437c(c) require judgment in favor of the Plaintiff.
23	Collateral Estoppel: Defendants cannot dispute issues they have already
24	defaulted on ; any attempt to dismiss the case would ignore the finality of
25	Plaintiff's unrebutted claims and the legally binding nature of their
26	conditional acceptance.
27	97. Summary Dismissal Would Constitute <u>Judicial Fraud</u> and Breach of
28	Fiduciary Duty.

-43 of 116-

1	• As a public trustee of justice , the Court has a fiduciary obligation to
2	uphold constitutional rights and due process.
3	• Any attempt to dismiss this matter – given that Defendants have already
4	defaulted – would be tantamount to judicial fraud and an egregious
5	breach of duty under 28 U.S.C. § 1361.
6	NOTICE to the COURT: A DEMAND is NOT a mere MOTION
7	98. The Court is hereby placed on notice that Plaintiff's <i>Demand</i> for Summary
8	Judgment is not a mere 'motion' <i>requesting</i> discretionary relief but a <u>binding</u> legal
9	notice asserting an <i>absolute</i> <u>right</u> to judgment as a matter of law.
10	99. A Motion is a Request; A Demand Asserts a Right.
11	• A motion asks the court to exercise <i>discretion</i> in granting relief.
12	• A demand asserts an existing legal <i>right</i> that must be acknowledged <i>and</i>
13	enforced.
14	100. Plaintiff's Demand for Summary Judgment is <i>a Matter of Law</i> , Not Judicial
15	Discretion
16	• Under Rule 56(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the court "shall"
17	grant summary judgment when there is no genuine dispute of material
18	fact. The word "shall" is mandatory, not discretionary.
19	• California Code of Civil Procedure § 437c(c) likewise states:"The motion
20	for summary judgment shall be granted if all the papers submitted show
21	that there is no triable issue as to any material fact and that the moving
22	party is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law."
23	• This establishes that the Court does not have the discretion to deny or
24	delay judgment where Defendants have failed to contest the material
25	facts.
26	101. Failure to Act on a Demand is Judicial Nonperformance and a Due Process
27	Violation.
28	• Plaintiff has filed undisputed , sworn affidavits establishing their claims.
	-44 of 116-
	[AMENDED] VERIFIED 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

- 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.
 <u>Unrebutted Affidavits are 'prima facie' evidence:</u>

102. As considered, agreed, and stipulated by Defendants in the unrebutted 6 verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and self-executing contract 7 security agreements (Exhibits E, F, G, and H), Exhibits E, F, G, and H are prima facie 8 evidence of fraud, racketeering, indentity theft, treason, breach of trust and 9 fiduciary duties, extortion, coercion, deprivation of rights under the color of law, 10 conspiracy to deprive of rights under the color of law, monopolization of trade and 11 commerce, forced peonage, obstruction of enforcement, extortion of a national/ 12 internationally protected person, false imprisonment, torture, creating trusts in 13 restraint of trade dereliction of fiduciary duties, bank fraud, breach of trust, treason, 14 tax evasion, bad faith actions, dishonor, injury and damage to Affiant and Plaintiff 15 proof of claim. See United States v. Kis, 658 F.2d, 526 (7th Cir. 1981)., "Appellee 16 had the burden of first proving its prima facie case and could do so by affidavit 17 or other evidence." 18

19

20

1

2

3

4

5

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

21 103. As *considered, agreed,* and *stipulated* by Defendants in the <u>unrebutted</u>
22 verified commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and self-executing contract
23 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

-45 of 116-

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

'commercial' use and, therefore explicitly classifying the automobile as private property, and NOT 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 12 traveler is a state Citizen, non-citizen national/national/internationally 13 protected person, privately traveling in a private automobile, as articulated by 14 the traveler, and as evidenced by the 'PRIVATE' plate on the private 15 automobile. 16

4. The private automobile and trust property 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 private 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 24 traveler(Kevin: Walker) presented Defendants Gregory D Eastwood and Robert 25 C V Bowman national/non-citizen national, #C35510079 and passport book 26 #A39235161. Copy attached hereto as Exhibits O and P respectively, and 27 incorporated herein by reference. 28

-46 of 116-

7. Defendant(s), acted against the Constitution, even when explicitly reminded of their duties to support and uphold the Constitution.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

23

24

25

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.

-47 of 116-

1

2

3

4

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 5 undisputedly unlawful and unconstitutional stop, arrest, and subsequent actions 6 of the Defendants/Respondents are in violation of the Fourth Amendment to the 7 Constitution of the united States of America and constitute an unlawful arrest 8 and seizure. The "fruit of the poisonous tree" doctrine, as articulated by the U.S. 9 Supreme Court, establishes that *any* evidence obtained as a result of an 10 unlawful stop or detainment is tainted and inadmissible in any subsequent 11 proceedings. The unlawful actions of Gregory D. Eastwood, Robert C. V. 12 Bowman, George Reyes, William Pratt, and Robert Gell including but not limited 13 to the issuance of fraudulent citations/contracts under threat, duress, and 14 15 coercion, render all actions and evidence derived therefrom *void ab initio*. See Wong Sun v. United States, 371 U.S. 471 (1963). 16 106. Plaintiff therefore declares and demands that all actions and evidence obtained 17 in connection with this unlawful stop be deemed inadmissible and void as fruits 18 19 of the poisonous tree. 107.As considered, agreed, and stipulated by Defendants in the unrebutted verified 20 21 commercial affidavits, contract agreement, and self-executing contract security agreements (Exhibits E, F, G, and H). 22 **Use** defines classification: 23 1. It is well established law that the highways of the state are public 24 property, and their primary and preferred use is for private 25 purposes, and that their use for purposes of gain is special and 26 extraordinary which, generally at least, the legislature may prohibit or 27 condition as it sees fit." Stephenson vs. Rinford, 287 US 251; Pachard 28

1	vs Banton, 264 US 140, and cases cited; Frost and F. Trucking Co. vs.
2	Railroad Commission, 271 US 592; Railroad commission vs. Inter-
3	City Forwarding Co., 57 SW.2d 290; Parlett Cooperative vs. Tidewater
4	Lines, 164 A. 313
5	2. The California Motor Vehicle Code, section 260: Private cars/vans
6	etc. not in commerce / for profit, are immune to registration fees:
7	(a) A "commercial vehicle" is a vehicle of a type <u>REQUIRED</u> to
8	be REGISTERED under this code".
9	(b) "Passenger vehicles which are not used for the transportation
10	of persons for hire, compensation or profit, and housecars, are
11	not commercial vehicles".
12	(c) "a vanpool vehicle is not a commercial vehicle."
13	3. <u>18 U.S. Code § 31 - Definition</u> , expressly stipulates, "The term "motor
14	vehicle" means every description of carriage or other contrivance
15	propelled or drawn by mechanical power <u>and</u> used for commercial
16	purposes on the highways in the transportation of passengers,
17	passengers and property, or property or cargo".
18	4. A vehicle not used for commercial activity is a "consumer goods",
19	it is NOT a type of vehicle required to be registered and "use
20	tax" paid of which the tab is evidence of receipt of the tax." Bank
21	of Boston vs Jones, 4 UCC Rep. Serv. 1021, 236 A2d 484, UCC PP
22	9-109.14.
23	5. "The 'privilege' of using the streets and highways by the operation thereon of
24	motor carriers <u>for hire</u> can be acquired only by permission or license from the
25	state or its political subdivision. "– Black's Law Dictionary, 5th ed, page 830.
26	6. "It is held that a tax upon common carriers by motor vehicles is based upon
27	a reasonable classification, and does not involve any unconstitutional
28	discrimination, although it does not apply to <u>private</u> vehicles , or those
	-49 of 116-

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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.
- 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.
- "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).
- 20 11. "The classification of goods in UCC 9-109 are mutually exclusive."
 21 McFadden v Mercantile-Safe Deposit & Trust Co., 8 UCC Rep Serv 766;
 22 260 Md 601, 273 A.2d 198 (1971).
- 23 12. "The classification of ``goods" under [UCC] 9-109 is a question of fact."
 24 Morgan County Feeders, Inc. v McCormick, 18 UCC Rep Serv 2d 632; 836
 25 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).

-50 of 116-

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

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 <u>private</u> "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.
- 27 20. "Even the legislature has no power to deny to a citizen the right to travel
 28 upon the highway and transport his property in the ordinary course of his

-51 of 116-

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

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."

-52 of 116-

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

-53 of 116-

1	of life and business." – Thompson vs. Smith, supra.; Teche Lines vs.
2	Danforth, Miss., 12 S.2d 784.
3	29. "The use of the highways for the purpose of travel and transportation is not
4	a mere privilege, but a common and fundamental Right of which the public
5	and the individual cannot be rightfully deprived." – Chicago Motor Coach
6	vs. Chicago, 169 NE 22;Ligare vs. Chicago, 28 NE 934;Boon vs. Clark, 214
7	SSW 607;25 Am.Jur. (1st) Highways Sect.163.
8	30. "The right to b is part of the Liberty of which a citizen cannot deprived without
9	due process of law under the <u>Fifth Amendment</u> . This Right was emerging as early
10	as the Magna Carta." – <u>Kent vs. Dulles</u> , 357 US 116 (1958).
11	31. "The state cannot diminish Rights of the people." – <u>Hurtado vs. California</u> ,
12	110 US 516.
13	32. "Personal liberty largely consists of the Right of locomotion to go where
14	and when one pleases only so far restrained as the Rights of others may
15	make it necessary for the welfare of all other citizens. The Right of the
16	Citizen to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property
17	thereon, by horse drawn carriage, wagon, or automobile, is not a mere
18	privilege which may be permitted or prohibited at will, but the
19	common Right which he has under his Right to life, liberty, and the pursuit
20	of happiness. Under this Constitutional guarantee one may, therefore, under
21	normal conditions, travel at his inclination along the public highways or in
22	public places, and while conducting himself in an orderly and decent
23	manner, neither interfering with nor disturbing another's Rights, he will be
24	protected, not only in his person, but in his safe conduct." – II Am.Jur. (1st)
25	Constitutional Law, Sect.329, p.1135.
26	33. Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule
27	making or legislation which would abrogate them." – Miranda v. Arizona,
28	384 U.S.

-54 of 116-

34. "The state cannot diminish Rights of the people." – Hurtado vs. California, 1 110 US 516. 2 **NO QUALIFIED OR LIMITED IMMUNITY** 3 35. "When enforcing mere statutes, judges of all courts do not act judicially 4 (and thus are not protected by "qualified" or "limited immunity," - SEE: 5 Owen v. City, 445 U.S. 662; Bothke v. Terry, 713 F2d 1404) - - "but merely act 6 as an extension as an agent for the involved agency -- but only in a 7 "ministerial" and not a "discretionary capacity..." Thompson v. Smith, 154 8 S.E. 579, 583; Keller v. P.E., 261 US 428; F.R.C. v. G.E., 281, U.S. 464. 9 36. "Public officials are not immune from suit when they transcend their 10 lawful authority by invading constitutional rights." - AFLCIO v. 11 Woodward, 406 F2d 137 t. 12 37. "Immunity fosters neglect and breeds irresponsibility while liability 13 promotes care and caution, which caution and care is owed by the 14 government to its people." (Civil Rights) Rabon vs Rowen Memorial 15 Hospital, Inc. 269 N.S. 1, 13, 152 SE 1 d 485, 493. 16 38. "Judges not only can be sued over their official acts, but could be held 17 liable for injunctive and declaratory relief and attorney's fees." 18 Lezama v. Justice Court, A025829. 19 39. "Ignorance of the law does not excuse misconduct in anyone, least of all in 20 a sworn officer of the law." In re McCowan (1917), 177 C. 93, 170 P. 1100. 21 40. "All are presumed to know the law." San Francisco Gas Co. v. Brickwedel 22 (1882), 62 C. 641; Dore v. Southern Pacific Co. (1912), 163 C. 182, 124 P. 817; 23 People v. Flanagan (1924), 65 C.A. 268, 223 P. 1014; Lincoln v. Superior 24 Court (1928), 95 C.A. 35, 271 P. 1107; San Francisco Realty Co. v. Linnard 25 (1929), 98 C.A. 33, 276 P. 368. 26 41. "It is one of the fundamental maxims of the common law that ignorance of 27 the law excuses no one." Daniels v. Dean (1905), 2 C.A. 421, 84 P. 332. 28 -55 of 116-

Legal Maxims, Standards, and Principles

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

1

24

25

Unrebutted Affidavits as Judgment in Commerce: Plaintiff's unrebutted 4 affidavits are binding truth under the maxim, "An unrebutted affidavit 5 becomes the judgment in commerce." 6 Res Judicata and Collateral Estoppel: Defendants are *barred* from 7 contesting the finality of Plaintiff's claims under the doctrines of res 8 judicata and collateral estoppel, as all material facts and claims have been 9 resolved conclusively. 10 Breach of U.C.C. Obligations and Presumed Dishonor: Defendants' 11 dishonor and default are evidenced by their failure to fulfill obligations 12 defined by U.C.C. § 3-505 (see Exhibit L) and other applicable statutes. 13 ALL ARE EQUAL UNDER THE LAW. - 'No one is above the law.' 14 15 **IN COMMERCE FOR ANY MATTER TO BE RESOLVED MUST BE EXPRESSED.** – 'To lie is to go against the mind.' 16 TRUTH IS EXPRESSED IN THE FORM OF AN AFFIDAVIT. 17 ٠ **IN COMMERCE TRUTH IS SOVEREIGN.** – Truth is sovereign -- and the 18 Sovereign tells only the truth. 19 AN UNREBUTTED AFFIDAVIT STANDS AS TRUTH IN COMMERCE. 20 - 'He who does not deny, admits.' 21 "Statements of fact contained in affidavits which are not rebutted by 22 the opposing party's affidavit or pleadings **may[must]** be accepted as 23

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

-56 of 116-

1	within the time permitted," thus, under the specific provisions of Ark.
2	and Fed. R. Civ. P. 36, the facts in question were deemed admitted as
3	true. Failure to answer is well established in the court. <i>Beasley v. U. S.,</i>
4	81 F. Supp. 518 (1948)., "I, therefore, hold that the requests will be
5	considered as having been admitted." Also as previously referenced,
6	"Statements of fact contained in affidavits which are not rebutted by
7	the opposing party's affidavit or pleadings may[must] be accepted as
8	true by the trial court."Winsett v. Donaldson, 244 N.W.2d 355 (Mich.
9	1976).
10	• 'The state cannot diminish Rights of the people ." – Hurtado vs. California,
11	110 US 516.
12	• "Public officials are not immune from suit when they transcend their lawful
13	authority by invading constitutional rights ."—AFLCIO v. Woodward, 406
14	F2d 137 t.
15	"Immunity fosters neglect and breeds irresponsibility while liability
16	promotes care and caution, which caution and care is owed by the
17	government to its people." (Civil Rights) Rabon vs Rowen Memorial
18	Hospital, Inc. 269 N.S. 1, 13, 152 SE 1 d 485, 493.
19	• "Judges not only can be sued over their official acts, but could be held liable
20	for injunctive and declaratory relief and attorney's fees." Lezama v. Justice
21	Court , A025829.
22	• "Ignorance of the law does not excuse misconduct in anyone, least of all in a sworn
23	officer of the law." In re McCowan (1917), 177 C. 93, 170 P. 1100.
24	• "All are presumed to know the law." San Francisco Gas Co. v. Brickwedel
25	(1882), 62 C. 641; Dore v. Southern Pacific Co. (1912), 163 C. 182, 124 P. 817;
26	People v. Flanagan (1924), 65 C.A. 268, 223 P. 1014; Lincoln v. Superior Court
27	(1928), 95 C.A. 35, 271 P. 1107; San Francisco Realty Co. v. Linnard (1929), 98
28	C.A. 33, 276 P. 368.
	-57 of 116-

Case No.: 5:25-cv-00646-WLH-MAA — Registered Mail #RF775824950US — Dated: April 17, 2025 "It is one of the fundamental maxims of the common law that **ignorance of the** 1 law excuses no one." Daniels v. Dean (1905), 2 C.A. 421, 84 P. 332. 2 "the people, not the States, are sovereign." – Chisholm v. Georgia, 2 Dall. 419, 2 3 U.S. 419, 1 L.Ed. 440 (1793). 4 HE WHO LEAVES THE BATTLEFIELD FIRST LOSES BY DEFAULT. - 'He 5 who does not repel a wrong when he can occasions it.' 6 7 AN UNREBUTTED AFFIDAVIT BECOMES THE JUDGEMENT IN <u>COMMERCE.</u> – There is nothing left to resolve. 8 FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION 9 (For Fraud and Misrepresentation against all Defendants) 10 109. Plaintiff re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 108 as if set forth 11 herein. 12 13 110. Defendants, acting under **color of law**, have *willfully and intentionally* engaged in fraudulent conduct by knowingly misrepresenting material facts 14 regarding their authority and jurisdiction over Plaintiff, thereby violating Plaintiff's 15 16 constitutionally protected private rights. 111. Defendants' fraudulent misconduct includes, but is not limited to, 17 fabricating legal authority, creating false claims, unlawfully detaining and 18 interfering with Plaintiff's private affairs, and initiating legal proceedings devoid of 19 any lawful basis. 20 21 112. Defendants knowingly misrepresented their authority to enforce statutory provisions against Plaintiff, fabricated legal obligations, and unlawfully seized or 22 interfered with Plaintiff's private property, all with the intent to deprive Plaintiff of 23 their rights, property, and financial interests **under the guise of lawful authority**. 24 25 113. In furtherance of this unlawful enterprise and scheme, Defendants transmitted fraudulent documents, including but not limited to fabricated reports, false citations, and 26 deceptive legal filings, through the U.S. Postal Service and other commercial carriers, 27 28 knowing that these documents were false and intended to defraud Plaintiff.

-58 of 116-

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 4 5 liability for any person acting under color of law who deprives another of their constitutionally protected rights, privileges, or immunities. 6 7 18 U.S. Code § 1001 (False Statements Act) – Criminalizes knowingly making false statements or fraudulent misrepresentations in legal and administrative 8 9 proceedings. 18 U.S. Code § 1341 (Mail Fraud) - Prohibits the use of U.S. mail to transmit 10 fraudulent documents with intent to deceive. 11 12 15 U.S. Code § 1692 (Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, FDCPA) – Prohibits 13 fraudulent misrepresentation and deceptive practices used to enforce unlawful claims against individuals, including fabricated financial obligations. 14 UCC § 1-308 (Performance or Acceptance Under Reservation of Rights) -15 Protects individuals from unknowingly waiving rights under fraudulent or 16 coercive contracts or enforcement actions. 17 115. By willfully and intentionally engaging in the fraudulent conduct described 18 above, Defendants have violated statutory and constitutional protections, resulting 19 in the Plaintiff being subjected to: 20 Unlawful deprivation of property and private rights 21 Financial losses due to fraudulent enforcement actions 22 Harm to their reputation, business, and economic interests 23 • Emotional distress and significant hardship resulting from Defendants' 24 • unlawful conduct 25 116. Defendants, by their own actions, willful silence, non-compliance, and tacit 26 admission, have engaged in the unlawful conduct described in this complaint. As 27 such, these facts must be taken as true and are dispositive in this action. 28

-59 of 116-

Case No.: 5:25-cv-00646-WLH-MAA — Registered Mail #RF775824950US — Dated: April 17, 2025 117. Defendants' wrongful conduct includes but is not limited to: 1 Fabrication of authority and fraudulent claims to enforce laws against 2 • Plaintiff 3 Knowingly misrepresenting their jurisdiction and legal standing to 4 detain, fine, or seize property 5 Use of fraudulent documentation and legal proceedings to impose 6 unlawful penalties and restrictions 7 Unlawful use of U.S. Postal Service and other communication channels to 8 further their fraudulent scheme 9 118. As a direct result of Defendants' fraudulent and unlawful actions, 10 Plaintiff has suffered severe and irreparable harm, including but not limited 11 12 to: Deprivation of private property without due process 13 • Violation of constitutionally protected rights and immunities 14 • Financial and economic damages stemming from Defendants' unlawful 15 ٠ interference 16 Psychological and emotional distress caused by Defendants' oppressive 17 conduct 18 119. 18 U.S. Code § 1341 - Frauds and swindles, expressly stipulates: 19 "whoever, having devised or intending to devise any scheme or artifice to 20 defraud, or for obtaining money or property by means of false or fraudulent 21 pretenses, representations, or promises, or to sell, dispose of, loan, exchange, 22 alter, give away, distribute, supply, or furnish or procure for unlawful use any 23 counterfeit or spurious coin, obligation, security, or other article, or anything 24 represented to be or intimated or held out to be such counterfeit or spurious 25 article, for the purpose of executing such scheme or artifice or attempting so 26 to do, places in any post office or authorized depository for mail matter, any 27 matter or thing whatever to be sent or delivered by the Postal Service, or 28

-60 of 116-

deposits or causes to be deposited any matter or thing whatever to be sent or 1 delivered by any private or commercial interstate carrier, or takes or receives 2 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 4 which it is directed to be delivered by the person to whom it is addressed, 5 any such matter or thing, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not 6 more than **20 years, or both**. If the violation occurs in relation to, or involving 7 any benefit authorized, transported, transmitted, transferred, disbursed, or 8 paid in connection with, a presidentially declared major disaster or 9 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 11 financial institution, such person shall be fined not more than \$1,000,000 or 12 imprisoned not more than 30 years, or both." 13 SECOND (2nd) CAUSE OF ACTION 14

15

(For Breach of Contract against all Defendants)

120. Plaintiff re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 119 as if set forth
herein

18 121. Breach of Contractual Obligations: Defendants willfully and intentionally
19 breached contractual obligations by failing to honor the terms set forth in the
20 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.

-61 of 116-

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.

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

127. Failure to Cease Illegal Activities: Defendants also failed to cease any 18 illegal, unlawful, and unconstitutional collection efforts on an undisputedly 19 fraudulent debt, engaging in conduct that included but was not limited to threats, 20 violations of Plaintiff's inherent and unalienable rights, racketeering, paper 21 terrorism, coercion, extortion, bank fraud, monopolization of trade and commerce, 22 restraint-of-trade violations, deprivation of rights, conspiracy under color of law, 23 breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, identity theft, and 24 taking unreasonable positions that forced Plaintiff into litigation. 25

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

-62 of 116-

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.

4	129. Private Right of Action:
5	• Plaintiff hereby asserts a Private Right of Action to enforce their rights
6	under the Contract and Security Agreements, as well as the Uniform
7	Commercial Code.
8	• Plaintiff is entitled to bring this action pursuant to U.C.C. § 2-202, U.C.C. §§
9	1-103, 1-202, 2-204, and Article 9 to seek appropriate remedies, including but not
10	limited to compensatory damages, punitive damages, declaratory relief, and
11	equitable remedies as the Court may deem just and proper.
12	130. Plaintiff's Private Rights of Action under Embezzlement Laws:
13	• Plaintiff asserts their Private Right of Action under 18 U.S.C. § 666 for
14	embezzlement, as well as common law embezzlement principles, for the
15	wrongful appropriation of funds and assets by Defendants.
16	• 18 U.S.C. § 666 provides a federal basis for a Private Right of Action when
17	Defendants have engaged in fraudulent misapplication or theft of funds,
18	particularly when those funds are derived from financial institutions or
19	governmental transactions. Plaintiff is entitled to restitution for any funds or
20	assets misappropriated and for damages caused by Defendants' fraudulent
21	conduct, including any related losses.
22	THIRD (3rd) CAUSE OF ACTION
23	(For Theft, Embezzlement, and Fraudulent Misapplication of Funds
24	and Assets against all Defendants)
25	131. Plaintiff re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 130 as if fully set
26	forth herein.
27	132. Defendants engaged in illegal, unlawful, unconstitutional, and fraudulent
28	acts, including but not limited to:
	-63 of 116-

1	• Embezzling funds and/or assets entrusted to their care.
2	• Executing unconstitutional and unlawful seizures of assets and private
3	property without legal standing or proper authorization.
4	• Fraudulently transferring or attempting to transfer ownership of
5	Plaintiff's property through deceit, deception, and abuse of process.
6	• Creating a fraudulent claim of ownership and title to the property,
7	depriving Plaintiff of their legal rights, interests, and equity.
8	133. Plaintiff affirms, as evidenced by Exhibits I, J, K, L, and N, that Defendants,
9	including any officers, directors, agents, or employees connected to financial institutions,
10	acted in direct violation of federal law and fiduciary obligations. Specifically:
11	• Defendants, while acting in their capacity as agents or employees of
12	financial institutions, fraudulently misapplied or embezzled funds and
13	property entrusted to their care.
14	• The misappropriation and subsequent unconstitutional and unlawful
15	seizures resulted in direct harm to Plaintiff, including but not limited to
16	financial loss, damage to property interests, and violations of
17	constitutional and statutory rights.
18	134. Defendants' actions are actionable under federal statutes providing a
19	private right of action, including but not limited to:
20	• 12 U.S. Code § 503 – Allows individuals harmed by the embezzlement or
21	misapplication of funds to seek civil remedies.
22	• 18 U.S. Code § 656 (Theft, Embezzlement, or Misapplication by Bank
23	Officer or Employee) – Criminalizes the willful misapplication, abstraction,
24	or embezzlement of funds by any officer, director, agent, or employee of a
25	financial institution, Federal Reserve bank, or insured depository
26	institution.
27	• Federal and State Consumer Protection Laws – Prohibit deceptive and fraudulent
28	practices in financial transactions, including wrongful claims of ownership.
	-64 of 116-

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.

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

7 137. 18 U.S. Code § 656 (Theft, Embezzlement, or Misapplication by Bank
8 Officer or Employee) expressly stipulates that:

"Whoever, being an officer, director, agent or employee of, or connected 9 in any capacity with any Federal Reserve bank, member bank, depository 10 institution holding company, national bank, insured bank, branch or 11 agency of a foreign bank, or organization operating under section 25 or 12 section 25(a) of the Federal Reserve Act, or a receiver of a national bank, 13 insured bank, branch, agency, or organization or any agent or employee 14 of the receiver, or a Federal Reserve Agent, or an agent or employee of a 15 Federal Reserve Agent or of the Board of Governors of the Federal 16 Reserve System, embezzles, abstracts, purloins or willfully misapplies 17 any of the moneys, funds or credits of such bank, branch, agency, or 18 organization or holding company or any moneys, funds, assets or 19 securities entrusted to the custody or care of such bank, branch, agency, 20 or organization, or holding company or to the custody or care of any 21 such agent, officer, director, employee or receiver, shall be fined not more 22 than \$1,000,000 or *imprisoned not more than 30 years, or both...*" 23 As a direct result of Defendants' theft, embezzlement, and 24 fraudulent misapplication of funds and assets, Plaintiff has been 25 unlawful and unconstitutionally subjected to mental anguish, 26 emotional trauma, financial loss, deprivation of property, 27 reputational harm, and emotional distress. 28

-65 of 116-

FOURTH (4th) CAUSE OF ACTION 1 (For Fraud, Forgery, and Unauthorized Use of Identity against all 2 **Defendants**) 3 138. Plaintiff re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 137 as if fully set 4 forth herein. 5 139. Plaintiff affirms that Defendants illegally, unlawfully, and unconstitutionally 6 used Plaintiff's identity, including estate and trust information, without Plaintiff's consent 7 or authorization, for their own benefit by creating false financial instruments, 8 9 misrepresentations, and fraudulent claims to the subject private property. 140. Defendants intentionally, willfully, and knowingly engaged in fraudulent 10 conduct by attempting to unlawfully and unconstitutionally seize Plaintiff's 11 private property without Plaintiff's consent or any legal or lawful authority. In 12 furtherance of their illegal, unlawful, and unconstitutional actions, Defendants: 13 Forged Plaintiff's signature on financial documents and legal instruments. 14 • Obtained Plaintiff's signature under false pretenses. 15 Used these falsified and fraudulent documents to support their unlawful 16 seizure attempts and misrepresent their claims of ownership or control over 17 18 the subject private property. 141. Plaintiff affirms that Defendants' fraudulent actions, including forgery and 19 the unauthorized use of Plaintiff's identity, violate common law principles of 20 fraud, forgery, and identity theft, as well as applicable state and federal statutes, 21 including but not limited to: 22 15 U.S. Code § 1681n (Fair Credit Reporting Act) – Provides a private right 23 of action for willful and knowing violations related to the misuse of 24 personal and financial information. 25 15 U.S. Code § 1692e (Fair Debt Collection Practices Act) - Provides a 26 private right of action prohibiting false, deceptive, or misleading 27 representations in the collection of debts. 28 -66 of 116-

1	• 18 U.S. Code § 1028A (Aggravated Identity Theft) – Establishes criminal
2	liability and additional penalties for knowingly using or transferring
3	another person's identity without lawful authority.
4	• State Civil Code on Forgery or Fraudulent Misrepresentation – Provides a
5	private right of action prohibiting the falsification of documents and
6	misrepresentation in financial transactions and property matters.
7	142. Private Right of Action: Plaintiff asserts a private right of action to enforce
8	their rights under the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. § 1681n), the Fair Debt
9	Collection Practices Act (15 U.S.C. § 1692e), and applicable state and federal laws
10	prohibiting identity theft, fraud, and forgery.
11	143. Plaintiff further affirms that Defendants' conduct constitutes a willful and
12	intentional scheme to deprive Plaintiff of their property, as follows:
13	• The creation of false financial instruments and forged signatures
14	demonstrates a pattern of fraudulent misrepresentation and forgery .
15	• The misuse of Plaintiff's identity, including estate and trust information,
16	constitutes a direct violation of Plaintiff's rights to privacy, autonomy, and
17	protection from unauthorized exploitation.
18	144. Defendants' unlawful actions have directly caused harm to Plaintiff,
19	including:
20	 Loss of property value, enjoyment, and equity.
21	• Emotional distress, humiliation, mental trauma, and reputational harm.
22	• Financial expenses incurred in defending against fraudulent seizure
23	actions and restoring rightful title to the property.
24	145. Defendants' actions rise to the level of gross and intentional misconduct,
25	warranting the imposition of treble damages pursuant to applicable civil statutes
26	and laws governing fraudulent conduct.
27	146. 18 U.S. Code § 1025 (Fraudulent Acquisition of Property or Signatures)
28	expressly stipulates:

1	"Whoever, upon any waters or vessel within the special maritime and territorial
2	jurisdiction of the United States, by any fraud, or false pretense, obtains from any person
3	anything of value, or procures the execution and delivery of any instrument of writing or
4	conveyance of real or personal property, or the signature of any person, as maker, endorser,
5	or guarantor, to or upon any bond, bill, receipt, promissory note, draft, or check, or any
6	other evidence of indebtedness, or fraudulently sells, barters, or disposes of any bond, bill,
7	receipt, promissory note, draft, or check, or other evidence of indebtedness, for value,
8	knowing the same to be worthless, or knowing the signature of the maker, endorser, or
9	guarantor thereof to have been obtained by any false pretenses, shall be fined under this
10	title or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."
11	147. 18 U.S. Code § 1028A (Aggravated Identity Theft) expressly stipulates:
12	"Whoever, during and in relation to any felony violation enumerated in subsection
13	(c), knowingly transfers, possesses, or uses, without lawful authority, a means of
14	identification of another person shall, in addition to the punishment provided for
15	such felony, be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of 2 years. (2) Terrorism
16	offense. – Whoever, during and in relation to any felony violation enumerated in
17	section 2332b(g)(5)(B), knowingly transfers, possesses, or uses, without lawful
18	authority, a means of identification of another person or a false identification
19	document shall, in addition to the punishment provided for such felony, be
20	sentenced to a term of imprisonment of 5 years."
21	148. As a direct result of Defendants' fraud, forgery, and unauthorized use of
22	Plaintiff's identity, Plaintiff has suffered financial loss, deprivation of property,
23	reputational harm, and emotional distress.
24	FIFTH (5th) CAUSE OF ACTION
25	(For Monopolization of Trade and Commerce, and Unfair Business
26	Practices against all Defendants)
27	149. Plaintiff re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 148 as if fully set
28	forth herein.
	-68 of 116-

1	150. Plaintiff affirms that Defendants, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 2 , willfully
2	engaged in monopolization of trade and commerce by manipulating financial
3	systems and processes to further their fraudulent objectives. Specifically,
4	Defendants engaged in illegal and unlawful conduct , including but not limited to:
5	• Fabricating false debts and creating fraudulent security interests without
6	Plaintiff's knowledge, authorization, or consent.
7	Utilizing financial institutions to process unlawful and unconstitutional
8	seizures of private property through fraudulent claims.
9	• Engaging in deceptive and unfair business practices designed to
10	monopolize trade and commerce, restrain competition, and deprive
11	Plaintiff of their rightful property and legal protections.
12	151. Defendants' actions, as alleged, were part of a larger scheme to monopolize
13	trade and commerce through unfair and deceptive practices, thereby violating
14	applicable civil statutes, including but not limited to:
15	• 15 U.S.C. § 15(a) (Clayton Act) – Provides a private right of action for
16	damages resulting from anticompetitive and monopolistic practices.
17	• 15 U.S.C. § 2 (Sherman Act) – Prohibits monopolization, attempts to
18	monopolize, and conspiracies to monopolize trade and commerce.
19	• State Unfair Competition Laws – Prohibit fraudulent, deceptive, and
20	unlawful business practices in trade and commerce.
21	• Uniform Commercial Code (U.C.C.) – Governs negotiable instruments,
22	discharge of obligations, and fair trade practices.
23	152. Private Right of Action: Plaintiff asserts a private right of action to enforce
24	their rights under 15 U.S.C. § 15(a) (Clayton Act), the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. § 2),
25	state unfair competition laws, and the UCC to seek appropriate remedies, including
26	but not limited to:
27	Compensatory damages for financial harm.
28	• Treble damages under 15 U.S.C. § 15(a).

-69 of 116-

Injunctive relief to prevent further monopolistic and fraudulent practices. 1 153. As part of this fraudulent scheme, Defendants engaged in unfair and 2 deceptive business practices by: 3 • Creating false debts and fabricating fraudulent security interests. 4 Fraudulently misrepresenting and concealing material facts regarding the 5 nature and validity of alleged debts. 6 Engaging in a calculated effort to monopolize trade and commerce by 7 suppressing competition and enforcing unlawful claims against Plaintiff's 8 private property. 9 Violating Plaintiff's rights under applicable common law and civil 10 statutes. 11 154. Plaintiff further asserts and affirms that Defendants' actions were part of a 12 broader scheme to unfairly restrain trade and commerce by: 13 Leveraging fraudulent financial instruments to secure unlawful gains. 14 • Misusing public policy and statutory frameworks to enforce monopolistic 15 16 practices. Exploiting their position of power within the financial system to deprive 17 Plaintiff of lawful protections and remedies. 18 155. Plaintiff affirms that Defendants' actions, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 2, 19 caused direct harm and damages to Plaintiff's financial and legal interests. 20 21 156. 15 U.S.C. § 2 (Sherman Act) expressly stipulates: "Every person who shall monopolize, or attempt to monopolize, or combine or 22 conspire with any other person or persons, to monopolize any part of the trade or 23 commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, shall be deemed guilty 24 of a felony, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by fine not exceeding 25 \$100,000,000 if a corporation, or, if any other person, \$1,000,000, or by 26 imprisonment not exceeding 10 years, or by both said punishments, in the 27 discretion of the court." 28 -70 of 116157. 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.

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

7

8

9

10

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.

11 159. As a direct result of Defendants' monopolization of trade and commerce
12 and unfair business practices, Plaintiff has suffered financial loss, deprivation of
13 property, reputational harm, and emotional distress

14

SIXTH (6th) CAUSE OF ACTION

15 || (For Deprivation of Rights Under the Color of Law against all Defendants)

16

(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 set18 forth herein.

19 161. Plaintiff affirms that Defendants, acting under color of law, willfully and
20 *intentionally* deprived Plaintiff of rights inherent and *unalienable* secured by the
21 Constitution and laws of the United States, specifically in violation of 42 U.S.C. §
22 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.

-71 of 116-

- Depriving Plaintiff of their property rights and protections secured by the 1 Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution. 2 Exercising fraudulent and deceptive practices designed to unjustly enrich 3 Defendants at Plaintiff's expense. 4 163. Plaintiff affirms that Defendants' actions violated Plaintiff's due process 5 rights, as secured by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, by failing to provide 6 proper notice, fair hearings, and lawful justification for their unconstitutional and 7 unlawful enforcement actions. 8 164. Plaintiff affirms and asserts that Defendants' conduct caused direct harm to 9 Plaintiff, resulting in significant emotional, financial, and legal damages. 10 Specifically, Defendants' actions deprived Plaintiff of: 11 The right to due process of law, secured and protected by the Fifth and 12 Fourteenth Amendments of the Constitution. 13 The right to be free from coercion and extortion under color of law. 14 The right to enjoy private property without unlawful interference or 15 deprivation. 16 165. Private Right of Action: Plaintiff respectfully demands relief for the injury, 17 damage, and harm caused by Defendants' actions, as authorized under 42 U.S.C. § 18 1983, which provides a private right of action for the deprivation of constitutional 19 rights under color of state law. 20 21 166. 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 22 23 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 24 United States, or because of his having so exercised the same; or If two or more persons go 25 in disguise on the highway, or on the premises of another, with intent to prevent or hinder 26 his free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege so secured – They shall be fined 27 28
 - under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both."

-72 of 116-

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.

9 169. Plaintiff further affirms that Defendants, acting under the authority and
10 guise of legal processes, conspired to deprive Plaintiff of their constitutional rights.
11 These actions represent a calculated effort to abuse their positions and disregard
12 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.

17

18

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(For Receiving Extortion Proceeds against all Defendants)

19 171. Plaintiff re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 170 as if fully set20 forth herein.

21 172. Defendants employed coercive tactics, including the unlawful and unconstitutional seizure of private property, threats, and false claims of 22 authority, to compel Plaintiff to act against their interests and submit to fraudulent 23 claims. These actions constitute a violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983, which provides a 24 private right of action for the deprivation of rights secured by the Constitution 25 and federal law. Defendants, acting under color of law, have deprived Plaintiff of 26 their property rights, as secured under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments of 27 the Constitution. 28

-73 of 116-

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 7 unlawfully received and benefited from extortion proceeds obtained through 8 fraudulent means, thus constituting unjust enrichment under the Restatement 9 (Second) of Torts, which provides for civil remedies when one party benefits at the 10 expense of another through wrongful conduct. The wrongful nature of 11 Defendants' actions has caused significant injury and harm to Plaintiff, 12 warranting restitution, disgorgement of ill-gotten gains, and other appropriate 13 remedies. 14

15 175. 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:

- 19
- Compensatory damages for financial harm.
- 20

21

- 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.

-74 of 116-

1 2

8

9

10

11

12

13

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."

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

17

18

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 forth20 herein.

21 180. Defendants' Fraudulent Actions and 'Fraud in the Factum': Defendants willfully and intentionally engaged in fraudulent actions by knowingly 22 misrepresenting material facts and creating fraud in the factum, concerning the 23 interest, ownership, title, and authority to execute the unlawful and 24 unconstitutional seizure of private property. These actions were conducted under 25 blatantly fraudulent and false pretenses, and ignorance of the law is no excuse. 26 181. False Claims of Debt and Fraudulent Proceedings: Defendants willfully 27 and intentionally: 28

-75 of 116-

Created false claims of debt to deceive Plaintiff into compliance with 1 fraudulent demands. 2 Placed fraudulent documents in the post office or authorized depositories 3 for mail, constituting mail fraud. 4 Initiated unlawful and unconstitutional enforcement actions that lacked 5 any lawful or legal basis. 6 182. By engaging in these fraudulent actions, Defendants wrongfully deprived 7 Plaintiff of property or assets through deceptive means, causing direct financial 8 harm and legal injury to Plaintiff. 9 183. Fraudulent Tactics and Deceptive Representations: Defendants employed 10 fraudulent tactics, including but not limited to: 11 Unlawful initiation of transactions under false pretenses. 12 Deceitful representations and the use of fraudulent instruments to obtain 13 • property from Plaintiff. 14 15 **Procuring signatures under false pretenses**, knowing that the documents and signatures were obtained through fraudulent misrepresentations. 16 184. Defendants' Conduct Constitutes Fraud and Misrepresentation: Defendants' 17 actions constitute fraud and misrepresentation under common law tort principles, 18 including fraudulent misrepresentation and false pretenses. This conduct entitles Plaintiff 19 20 to seek damages and remedies for the unlawful appropriation of property. 21 185. Unlawful Benefit from Fraudulent Conduct: Defendants unlawfully benefited from Plaintiff by fraudulently obtaining property, goods, services, or financial benefits, 22 which **constitutes a breach of duty** to Plaintiff. By obtaining property or value through 23 fraud, Defendants have caused significant harm and financial loss to Plaintiff. 24 186. Specific Fraudulent Actions by Defendants: Defendants' fraudulent acts 25 include, but are not limited to: 26 Use of Fraudulent Instruments - Defendants used, attempted to use, or 27 procured the use of fraudulent documents, including forged contracts, 28 -76 of 116-

1	falsified notes, or other fraudulent evidence of debt, to transfer or
2	encumber Plaintiff's private property.
3	False Pretenses – Defendants made false and misleading representations
4	with intent to deceive Plaintiff into parting with private property or
5	financial assets. Plaintiff reasonably relied upon these false representations
6	to their detriment.
7	• Misappropriation of Property – Defendants unlawfully obtained property ,
8	money, or goods through fraud, deceit, or false pretenses, knowing that
9	the property was obtained through fraudulent means.
10	187. Damages from Fraudulent Conduct: As a direct result of Defendants'
11	fraudulent conduct, Plaintiff has suffered:
12	• Actual damages for property lost or fraudulently obtained.
13	Consequential damages resulting from Defendants' fraudulent actions.
14	• Punitive damages due to Defendants' willful and intentional misconduct.
15	188. Private Right of Action: Plaintiff asserts a private right of action under:
16	• 18 U.S.C. § 1964 (RICO) – Defendants' fraudulent conduct constitutes
17	racketeering activity, allowing Plaintiff to seek treble damages.
18	• 15 U.S.C. §1 (Sherman Antitrust Act) – Provides a private right of action
19	for fraudulent practices that restrain trade or commerce through false
20	pretenses.
21	• State Fraud and Deceit Laws – Plaintiff is entitled to damages for fraud,
22	deceit, and misrepresentation under state law tort claims.
23	189. Recovery and Restitution: Defendants' actions entitle Plaintiff to:
24	• Actual damages for property lost or fraudulently obtained.
25	Consequential damages resulting from Defendants' fraudulent actions.
26	• Punitive damages due to Defendants' willful and intentional misconduct.
27	• Equitable relief, including but not limited to the return of wrongfully
28	obtained property or its financial equivalent.
	-77 of 116-

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.

5

6

7

8

• 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: 9 "Whoever, having devised or intending to devise any scheme or artifice 10 to defraud, or for obtaining money or property by means of false or 11 fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises, or to sell, dispose of, 12 loan, exchange, alter, give away, distribute, supply, or furnish or 13 procure for unlawful use any counterfeit or spurious coin, obligation, 14 security, or other article, or anything represented to be or intimated or 15 held out to be such counterfeit or spurious article, for the purpose of 16 executing such scheme or artifice or attempting so to do, places in any 17 post office or authorized depository for mail matter, any matter or thing 18 whatever to be sent or delivered by the Postal Service, or deposits or 19 causes to be deposited any matter or thing whatever to be sent or 20 delivered by any private or commercial interstate carrier, or takes or 21 receives therefrom, any such matter or thing, or knowingly causes to be 22 delivered by mail or such carrier according to the direction thereon, or at 23 the place at which it is directed to be delivered by the person to whom it 24 is addressed, any such matter or thing, shall be fined under this title or 25 imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both." 26

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

-78 of 116-

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

4

5

(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.

14 196. Extortionate Demands and Coercion: Defendants made extortionate
15 demands or threats to influence or coerce Plaintiff through intimidation, fraud, or
16 force, knowing that such threats would lead to harm or unlawful actions that
17 would benefit Defendants.

- 18 197. Nature of Defendants' Threats and Extortionate Conduct: Defendants'
 19 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.
- 27 198. Coercion and Extortion: By engaging in these unlawful and
- 28 unconstitutional actions, Defendants knowingly engaged in coercion and extortion,

-79 of 116-

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

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

5

6

7

• **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.

14 201. **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.

24 202. Civil Cause of Action for Extortion and Coercion: Defendants' actions are
25 subject to private civil liability for:

Compensatory damages for Plaintiff due to Defendants' extortion
 attempts, which forced Plaintiff into statutory compliance through
 unlawful demands.

-80 of 116-

1	•	Punitive damages for Defendants' intentional, willful, and malicious
2		extortion under 18 U.S.C. § 878, which provides for criminal penalties as
3		well as civil liability in cases of coercion, threats, or extortion .
4	•	Consequential damages resulting from Defendants' coercive actions,
5		including financial and reputational harm.
6	•	Equitable relief, including restitution and the return of any property
7		wrongfully obtained through extortion.
8	203	. Violation of Constitutional and Statutory Rights: Defendants' conduct
9	also co	onstitutes a violation of Plaintiff's constitutional and statutory rights,
10	includ	ing but not limited to:
11	•	Unlawful coercion and the deprivation of property.
12	•	The use of intimidation and extortion to override due process protections.
13	•	Forcing Plaintiff to act against their will under the threat of harm.
14	•	Relevant Statutes and Legal Precedent
15	204	. 18 U.S. Code § 878 (Threats and Extortion Against Foreign Officials,
16	Offici	al Guests, or Internationally Protected Persons) expressly stipulates:
17		"(a) Whoever knowingly and willfully threatens to violate 18 U.S. Code §
18		112, 18 U.S. Code § 1116, or 18 U.S. Code § 1201 shall be fined under this
19		title or imprisoned not more than five years, or both, except that
20		imprisonment for a threatened assault shall not exceed three years.
21		(b) Whoever in connection with any violation of subsection (a) or actual
22		violation of 18 U.S. Code § 112, 18 U.S. Code § 1116, or 18 U.S. Code § 1201
23		makes any extortionate demand shall be fined under this title or imprisoned
24		not more than twenty years, or both.
25		(c) For the purpose of this section, "foreign official," "internationally
26		protected person," "national of the United States," and "official guest" shall
27		have the same meanings as those provided in 18 U.S. Code § 1116(a).
28		(d) If the victim of an offense under subsection (a) is an internationally
		-81 of 116-

1	protected person outside the United States, the United States may exercise
2	jurisdiction over the offense if:
3	- The victim is a representative, officer, employee, or agent of the United
4	States.
5	- The offender is a national of the United States.
6	- The offender is afterward found in the United States.
7	205. Relief Sought: Plaintiff seeks the following civil and equitable
8	remedies:
9	Compensatory damages for the harm suffered due to the unlawful
10	and extortionate conduct of Defendants.
11	Consequential damages arising from Defendants' coercive actions,
12	including financial and reputational harm .
13	• Punitive damages for Defendants' intentional, malicious, and willful
14	misconduct in unlawfully threatening and coercing Plaintiff.
15	 Restitution and disgorgement of any wrongfully obtained property
16	or financial gains resulting from extortion and coercion.
17	• Equitable relief, including an injunction against further coercive or
18	extortionate conduct by Defendants.
19	• As a direct result of Defendants' coercion, extortion, and unjust
20	enrichment, Plaintiff has suffered financial loss, emotional distress,
21	reputational harm, and the deprivation of their rights under federal
22	law.
23	TENTH (10th) CAUSE OF ACTION
24	(For Racketeering against all Defendants)
25	206. Plaintiff re-asserts and re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through
26	205 as if set forth herein.
27	207. Defendants' Racketeering Scheme: Defendants willfully and intentionally
28	engaged in a pattern of racketeering activity designed to defraud, extort, and
	-82 of 116-

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: 5 Fraudulent misrepresentations regarding financial transactions, debt 6 obligations, and the creation of money. 7 Knowingly asserting false claims of debt to coerce compliance. 8 Filing fraudulent documents with courts and financial institutions to 9 • legitimize unlawful claims. 10 Attempting to force Plaintiff into their jurisdiction despite being made 11 aware of the lack of jurisdiction. 12 Conspiring to violate Plaintiff's constitutional rights through coercion, 13 • intimidation, and fraudulent legal actions. 14 209. Defendants' actions were committed as part of a broader scheme to extort 15 financial and property interests from Plaintiff through fraudulent and deceptive 16 practices, demonstrating a clear pattern of racketeering activity as defined under 17 18 U.S.C. § 1961(1). 18 210. Predicate Acts of Racketeering: Defendants have engaged in multiple 19 predicate acts of racketeering, including but not limited to: 20 21 • Mail Fraud (18 U.S.C. § 1341) - Defendants used the U.S. mail and
- 22 commercial carriers to send fraudulent documents, false financial claims,
 23 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.

-83 of 116-

9	• Falsely claimed authority over Plaintiff despite being notified that no
10	jurisdiction existed.
11	• Attempted to coerce Plaintiff into recognizing an unlawful jurisdiction
12	through fraud, intimidation, and economic duress.
13	• Conspired to use fraudulent legal proceedings as a means to enforce
14	illegitimate claims and extract financial gains from Plaintiff.
15	212. This abuse of legal processes is a key racketeering tactic that violates 18
16	U.S.C. §§ 1341, 1343, 1951, and 1962.
17	213. Private Right of Action Under RICO: Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1964(c)
18	(RICO), Plaintiff asserts a private right of action for damages resulting from
19	Defendants' racketeering activities , including but not limited to:
20	• The unlawful deprivation of property and economic resources.
21	Fraudulent legal claims and financial extortion.
22	Economic harm, reputational damage, and emotional distress.
23	214. Pattern of Racketeering Activity: Defendants have engaged in a pattern of
24	racketeering activity, demonstrating their intent to:
25	Defraud Plaintiff through false financial claims and fraudulent
26	transactions.
27	Conceal unlawful financial transactions through fraudulent filings and
28	misrepresentations.
	-84 of 116-

Case No.: 5:25-cv-00646-WLH-MAA — Registered Mail #RF775824950US — Dated: April 17, 2025 Coerce compliance through threats, deception, and financial 1 manipulation. 2 3 Enforce fraudulent claims through the unlawful assertion of jurisdiction. 215. Relief Sought: As a direct result of Defendants' racketeering and 4 fraudulent conduct, Plaintiff has suffered: 5 Compensatory damages for financial losses incurred as a result of the 6 racketeering scheme. 7 Treble damages under 18 U.S.C. § 1964(c) (RICO) due to the extensive 8 pattern of racketeering activity. 9 Punitive damages due to Defendants' intentional and willful misconduct. 10 Equitable relief, including injunctive relief to prevent further racketeering 11 activity and disgorgement of unlawfully obtained property or funds 12 ELEVENTH (11th) CAUSE OF ACTION 13 (For **Bank Fraud** against all Defendants) 14 216. Plaintiff re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 215 as if set forth 15 herein. 16 217. Plaintiff hereby asserts a cause of action for bank fraud under 12 U.S. Code 17 § 1831, which provides a basis for a private cause of action for the unlawful 18 conduct of Defendants. 19 1. Violation of 12 U.S. Code § 1831 – Bank Fraud 20 Defendants willfully and intentionally violated 12 U.S. Code § 1831, which 21 expressly stipulates: 22 "Whoever knowingly executes, or attempts to execute, a scheme or artifice – 23 (1) to defraud a financial institution; or (2) to obtain any of the moneys, 24 funds, credits, assets, securities, or other property owned by, or under the 25 custody or control of a financial institution, by means of false or fraudulent 26 pretenses, representations, or promises; shall be fined not more than 27 \$1,000,000 or imprisoned not more than 30 years, or both." 28 -85 of 116-

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.

8

9

10

11

12

13

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

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

19 218. Defendants willfully and intentionally violated **<u>18 U.S. Code § 1344</u>** –

20 **Bank Fraud**, which expressly stipulates: **"Whoever knowingly executes, or**

21 **attempts to execute**, a scheme or artifice -(1) to defraud a financial

22 institution; or (2) to obtain any of the **moneys**, funds, credits, assets,

23 securities, or other property owned by, or under the custody or control of a
24 <u>financial institution</u>, by means of false or fraudulent pretenses,

25 representations, or promises; shall be fined not more than **\$1,000,000** or

26 imprisoned not more than **30 years, or both**." Defendants engaged in a

27 scheme to defraud the financial institution by placing fraudulent claims on

28 the property, misrepresenting ownership, and creating false debt instruments,

-86 of 116-

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."

4

5

6

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.

9 220. Defendants' Unlawful Actions: Defendants willfully and knowingly
10 engaged in the unlawful transportation, transmission, and transfer of stolen,
11 converted, and fraudulently obtained goods, securities, and money across state
12 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.

20 221. Defendants engaged in a coordinated scheme to unlawfully acquire
21 and transfer Plaintiff's property and financial interests, including but not
22 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.

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).

13 224. Conspiracy to Defraud: Defendants conspired to transport and
14 transfer stolen goods, property, and financial securities, with the specific
15 intent to:

• Deprive Plaintiff of their rightful assets.

17

26

16

4

5

6

7

8

9

• 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.

21 226. Execution of Fraudulent and Unlawful Transfers: Defendants'
22 scheme to unlawfully transfer Plaintiff's property, including financial
23 securities, was executed without legal authority or justification,
24 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.

-88 of 116-

1	227	. Violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (FDCPA): As further
2	eviden	ced by the unrebutted commercial affidavits, Defendants engaged in
3	fraudu	lent debt collection practices, in violation of:
4	•	15 U.S. Code § 1692 (FDCPA) – Prohibits deceptive and misleading debt
5		collection practices.
6	•	15 U.S. Code § 1692e – Prohibits false representations and deceptive
7		conduct in the collection of debts.
8	•	15 U.S. Code § 1692f – Prohibits unfair or unconscionable means to collect
9		or attempt to collect any debt.
10	228	. Defendants:
11	•	Falsely represented financial obligations through fraudulent documents
12		and fabricated debt instruments.
13	•	Coerced Plaintiff into compliance using unlawful and deceptive
14		tactics.
15	•	Attempted to mislead Plaintiff into relinquishing property, funds, or
16		assets under false pretenses.
17	229	. Harm and Financial Loss: As a direct result of Defendants' unlawful
18	condu	ct, Plaintiff has suffered:
19	•	The wrongful deprivation of property and financial securities.
20	•	Significant emotional distress and reputational harm.
21	•	Financial damages resulting from forced legal proceedings to reclaim
22		unlawfully transferred assets.
23	•	Loss of revenue
24	230	. Private Right of Action and Relief Sought: Plaintiff asserts a private right
25	of action	on under:
26	•	18 U.S.C. § 2314 and § 2315 – Plaintiff seeks full compensatory and treble
27		damages for losses incurred due to Defendants' fraudulent transfer and
28		transportation of stolen property.
		-89 of 116-

[AMENDED] VERIETED 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

15 U.S. Code § 78j – Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief and damages for 1 Defendants' deceptive and fraudulent securities transactions. 2 15 U.S. Code § 1692k (FDCPA) - Plaintiff is entitled to: 3 Actual damages for financial loss. 4 0 Statutory damages due to Defendants' deceptive debt collection 5 0 practices. 6 7 Attorney's fees and costs associated with enforcing their rights. 0 231. Defendants have engaged in a systematic scheme to fraudulently transport 8 and transfer stolen property, securities, and financial instruments, in violation of 9 federal racketeering, fraud, and debt collection laws. Plaintiff seeks full redress, 10 damages, and equitable relief as provided under all applicable laws. 11 THIRTEENTH (13th) CAUSE OF ACTION 12 (For Torture against all Defendants) 13 232. Plaintiff re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 231 as if set forth 14 15 herein. 233. Defendants' Unlawful and Unconstitutional Acts: Defendants willfully 16 and intentionally subjected Plaintiff to unlawful and unconstitutional arrest, 17 detention, and involuntary imprisonment, constituting torture and cruel, inhuman, 18 and degrading treatment in violation of federal and international law. Defendants' 19 actions include but are not limited to: 20 The unlawful deprivation of Plaintiff's liberty without due process of law. 21 The use of coercion, threats, and force to compel Plaintiff into compliance. 22 The infliction of severe mental, emotional, and physical distress. 23 ٠ Deliberate indifference to Plaintiff's constitutional and human rights. 24 234. These actions constitute acts of torture, as defined under 18 U.S.C. § 2340 25 and § 2340A (Torture Statute), which prohibits acts intended to inflict severe pain or 26 suffering, whether physical or mental, upon a person in custody or control of 27 government officials or agents. 28 -90 of 116-

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.

7 236. The false imprisonment and deprivation rights and of liberty were carried
8 out with:

9

10

11

4

5

6

- No valid warrant or probable cause.
- No due process, lawful charges, or legitimate legal justification.
 - No immediate access to legal counsel, communication, or redress.

12 237. Defendants' actions violated Plaintiff's fundamental rights, including but13 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.

20 238. Mental and Physical Suffering Inflicted: Defendants' coercive and
21 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.
- 28 239. Defendants acted with intent to:

-91 of 116-

	Case No.: 5:25-cv-00646-WLH-MAA — Registered Mail #RF775824950US — Dated: April 17, 2025
1	• Break Plaintiff's will through coercion, threats, and duress.
2	Cause prolonged suffering through unlawful confinement and
3	psychological manipulation.
4	• Force Plaintiff into compliance with fraudulent and unlawful legal
5	proceedings.
6	240. Private Right of Action and Relief Sought: Plaintiff asserts a private right
7	of action under:
8	• 18 U.S.C. § 2340A – Prohibiting acts of torture committed under color of
9	law.
10	• 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Seeking damages for violations of constitutional
11	rights.
12	• 42 U.S.C. § 1985 – Seeking damages for conspiracy to violate civil
13	rights.
14	• 42 U.S.C. § 1986 – Seeking damages for failure to prevent rights
15	violations.
16	241. Plaintiff seeks the Following Relief:
17	Compensatory damages for physical, emotional, and economic harm.
18	• Treble damages under 18 U.S.C. § 2340A for acts of torture.
19	Punitive damages to deter future unconstitutional conduct.
20	• Injunctive relief to prevent further abuse by Defendants.
21	242. Defendants deliberately engaged in acts of torture, unlawful imprisonment,
22	and cruel and inhumane treatment under color of law, violating constitutional,
23	statutory, and international human rights protections. Plaintiff demand full redress,
24	damages, and equitable relief as provided under all applicable laws.
25	FOURTEENTH (14th) CAUSE OF ACTION
26	(For Kidnapping against all Defendants)
27	243. Plaintiff re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 242 as if fully set
28	forth herein.
	-92 of 116-

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 14 carries away and holds for ransom or reward or otherwise any person, except in the 15 case of a minor by the parent thereof, when -(1) the person is willfully transported 16 in interstate or foreign commerce, regardless of whether the person was alive when 17 transported; (2) the offender travels in interstate or foreign commerce or uses the 18 mail or any means, facility, or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce in 19 committing or in furtherance of the offense; (3) any person is kidnapped within the 20 special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States; or (4) the offense 21 involves a foreign official, an internationally protected person, or an official guest as 22 those terms are defined in section 1116(b) of this title, shall be punished by 23 imprisonment for any term of years or for life." 24

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:

28

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

• 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Deprivation of rights under color of law.

[AMENDED] VERIFIED 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

⁻⁹³ of 116-

	Case No.: 5:25-cv-00646-WLH-MAA — Registered Mail #RF775824950US — Dated: April 17, 2025
1	• 42 U.S.C. § 1985 – Conspiracy to interfere with civil rights.
2	• 42 U.S.C. § 1986 – Neglect to prevent civil rights violations.
3	247. The false arrest and forced detention were executed:
4	• Without a valid warrant, probable cause, or lawful justification.
5	• Without providing Plaintiff with due process or access to legal
6	representation.
7	• Through threats, coercion, and physical restraint, depriving Plaintiff of
8	their freedom.
9	248. Defendants' actions violated Plaintiff's constitutional rights, including:
10	• The Fourth Amendment – Protection against unlawful searches and
11	seizures.
12	• The Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments – Right to due process and
13	protection from unlawful detention.
14	The Eighth Amendment – Prohibition of cruel and unusual
15	punishment.
16	 Forced Transportation and Deprivation of Liberty
17	249. Defendants kidnapped Plaintiff by physically restraining, transporting, and
18	detaining them against their will under fraudulent and unlawful pretense,
19	including but not limited to:
20	• Forcing Plaintiff into custody without lawful authority.
21	• Transporting Plaintiff against their will to an undisclosed or
22	unauthorized location.
23	• Detaining Plaintiff unlawfully while depriving them of communication
24	and legal recourse.
25	250. These actions constitute kidnapping and unlawful imprisonment, carried
26	out willfully and with deliberate intent to deprive Plaintiff of their rights.
27	251. Harm and Damages Suffered: As a direct result of Defendants' unlawful
28	conduct, Plaintiff suffered:
	-94 of 116-

	Case No.: 5:25-cv-00646-WLH-MAA — Registered Mail #RF775824950US — Dated: April 17, 2025
1	 Severe emotional distress, trauma, and psychological harm.
2	• Physical harm resulting from unlawful restraint and detention.
3	• Reputational damage, loss of income, and deprivation of life, liberty, and
4	property.
5	252. Private Right of Action and Relief Sought: Plaintiff asserts a private right
6	of action under:
7	• 18 U.S.C. § 1201(a) (Federal Kidnapping Act) – Prohibits the unlawful
8	seizure and transportation of individuals.
9	• 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Provides for civil liability for those acting under color of
10	law who deprive individuals of their constitutional rights.
11	• 42 U.S.C. § 1985 – Prohibits conspiracies to interfere with constitutional
12	rights, including unlawful abduction.
13	• 42 U.S.C. § 1986 – Holds those accountable who fail to prevent civil rights
14	violations.
15	253. Plaintiff seeks the Following Relief:
16	• Compensatory damages for emotional, physical, and financial harm.
17	• Treble damages under 18 U.S.C. § 1201 for acts of kidnapping.
18	• Punitive damages to deter future unlawful detentions and abductions.
19	• Injunctive relief to prevent further unlawful acts by Defendants.
20	254. Defendants willfully and unlawfully seized, transported, and detained
21	Plaintiff against their will, depriving them of their fundamental rights. Plaintiff
22	demand full redress, damages, and equitable relief under all applicable laws .
23	FIFTEENTH (15th) CAUSE OF ACTION
24	(Forced Peonage – Against all Defendants)
25	255. Plaintiff re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 254 as if fully set
26	forth herein.
27	256. Defendants' Unlawful and Unconstitutional Acts: Defendants willfully
28	and intentionally subjected Plaintiff to forced peonage, involuntary servitude, and
	-95 of 116-

1	economic coercion, in violation of federal law and constitutional protections.
2	Plaintiff was unlawfully compelled to work, perform obligations, or comply with
3	fraudulent demands under duress, coercion, and the threat of legal and financial
4	penalties, including but not limited to:
5	• Unlawful and unconstitutional enforcement of financial claims without
6	due process.
7	• Compelling Plaintiff to pay or perform under threats of arrest, asset
8	seizure, or legal action.
9	• Depriving Plaintiff of their right to be free from involuntary servitude
10	and forced labor.
11	• Using fraud, coercion, and intimidation to impose involuntary financial
12	and contractual obligations.
13	257. These actions constitute peonage and forced servitude under 18 U.S.C. §
14	1581 (Peonage Law), 18 U.S.C. § 1584 (Involuntary Servitude), and the Thirteenth
15	Amendment of the United States Constitution, which prohibit:
16	"Holding or returning any person to a condition of peonage, or arresting them with
17	the intent to place them in such condition."
18	"Knowingly and willfully holding any person in involuntary servitude, except as
19	punishment for a crime whereof the party has been duly convicted."
20	258. Defendants' Scheme to Enforce Peonage Through Coercion and Threats:
21	Defendants acted under color of law to compel Plaintiff into compliance with
22	fraudulent financial and legal demands, in violation of:
23	• 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Deprivation of rights under color of law.
24	• 42 U.S.C. § 1985 – Conspiracy to interfere with civil rights.
25	• 42 U.S.C. § 1986 – Neglect to prevent civil rights violations.
26	• 15 U.S.C. § 1692 (FDCPA) – Prohibiting fraudulent and coercive financial
27	demands.
28	259. Defendants' actions forced Plaintiff into involuntary compliance by:
	-96 of 116-

1	• Threatening financial ruin, legal penalties, and physical confinement to
2	compel labor, payment, or performance.
3	• Fabricating legal claims and financial obligations to keep Plaintiff in a
4	cycle of perpetual servitude.
5	• Illegally seizing or threatening to seize Plaintiff's property to enforce
6	compliance.
7	Coercing Plaintiff into fraudulent contractual agreements under economic
8	duress.
9	260. Economic Coercion as a Form of Peonage: Defendants' fraudulent
10	enforcement of obligations through threats, coercion, and economic restraint
11	constitutes forced peonage , as:
12	Plaintiff was unlawfully and unconstitutionally extorted and coerced to
13	pay or perform under threat of harm.
14	Defendants unlawfully asserted financial and legal control over
15	Plaintiff's lives.
16	• Plaintiff were deprived of the ability to challenge these fraudulent claims
17	without severe financial and legal consequences.
18	261. Defendants utilized legal and financial mechanisms to create a system of
19	involuntary servitude, using debt, force, and coercion as tools of control, violating:
20	• 18 U.S.C. § 1581 – Peonage, compelling a person to work off a debt through
21	force or threat.
22	• 18 U.S.C. § 1584 – Involuntary servitude, unlawfully coercing an individual
23	to labor against their will.
24	• The Thirteenth Amendment – Prohibiting slavery and involuntary
25	servitude except as punishment for a crime after due process.
26	262. Harm and Damages Suffered: As a direct result of Defendants' actions,
27	Plaintiff has suffered:
28	Severe financial losses due to unlawful coercion.
	-97 of 116-
	(AMENDED) SEBILIES 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

	Case No.: 5:25-cv-00646-WLH-MAA — Registered Mail #RF775824950US — Dated: April 17, 2025
1	Emotional distress, mental anguish, and reputational damage.
2	Deprivation of rights, property, and economic independence.
3	263. Private Right of Action and Relief Sought: Plaintiff asserts a private right
4	of action under:
5	• 18 U.S.C. § 1581 (Peonage Law) – Prohibiting forced labor or servitude
6	under threat or coercion.
7	• 18 U.S.C. § 1584 (Involuntary Servitude) – Prohibiting the use of force or
8	legal coercion to enslave or control individuals.
9	• 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Civil remedy for deprivation of rights under color of law.
10	• 42 U.S.C. § 1985 – Prohibiting conspiracies to interfere with constitutional
11	rights, including economic servitude.
12	• 42 U.S.C. § 1986 – Liability for failing to prevent civil rights violations.
13	• 15 U.S.C. § 1692 (FDCPA) – Prohibiting deceptive financial practices and
14	coercion.
15	264. Plaintiff seeks the Following Relief:
16	• Compensatory damages for financial, emotional, and reputational harm.
17	• Treble damages under 18 U.S.C. § 1581 for forced peonage.
18	Punitive damages to deter future unconstitutional conduct.
19	• Injunctive relief to prevent further acts of peonage and forced servitude.
20	265. Defendants willfully engaged in the unlawful imposition of forced
21	peonage and economic servitude , violating constitutional, statutory, and human
22	rights protections. Plaintiff respectfully demands full redress, damages, and
23	equitable relief under all applicable laws.
24	SIXTEENTH (16th) CAUSE OF ACTION
25	(Unlawful Interference, Intimidation, Extortion, and Emotional
26	Distress – Against all Defendants)
27	266. Plaintiff re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 265 as if fully set forth
28	herein.
	- 98 of 116-

[AMENDED] VERIFIED 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

 $\|$

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.

5

6

7

8

- Intentional disruption of Plaintiff's business and economic pursuits through extortionate tactics.
- 9 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.

-99 of 116-

269. Defendants' admissions in their *unrebutted* 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.

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

A. Economic Damages

7

8

9

- Loss of business opportunities and revenue due to Defendants' intentional interference.
- Damage to Plaintiff's business reputation caused by Defendants' wrongful
 conduct.
- 12 **Significant financial losses** stemming from extortionate demands and threats.
- 13 **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.

20 271. These damages, detailed in Plaintiff's *unrebutted* affidavits, remain
21 unchallenged by Defendants and must therefore be accepted as true and
22 dispositive.

- 23 272. Extortionate Conduct: Defendants' actions constitute extortion under 18
 24 U.S.C. § 1951 (Hobbs Act), which criminalizes:
- 25 "The obtaining of property from another, with his consent, induced by
 26 wrongful use of actual or threatened force, violence, or fear, or under color of
 27 official right."
- 28 273. Defendants' acts included:

-100 of 116-

Case No.: 5:25-cv-00646-WLH-MAA — Registered Mail #RF775824950US — Dated: April 17, 2025 Coercing Plaintiff into relinquishing property, services, or financial assets. 1 • Coercing and forcing Plaintiff to act against their will under threat of 2 harm, legal consequences, or financial destruction. 3 Engaging in fraud and intimidation to deprive Plaintiff of their rightful 4 property and business interests. 5 274. These acts, documented in Plaintiff's unrebutted affidavits, remain 6 7 uncontested and must be accepted as legal fact. 275. Outrageous and Extreme Behavior: Defendants' conduct was extreme, 8 outrageous, and beyond all bounds of decency, demonstrating: 9 • A reckless disregard for Plaintiff's economic and personal well-being. 10 Deliberate efforts to manipulate, threaten, and coerce Plaintiff into 11 compliance with unlawful demands. 12 A willful intent to disrupt Plaintiff's lives through intimidation, 13 ٠ extortion, and fraud. 14 276. Damages and Relief: As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' 15 unlawful acts, Plaintiff seeks the following relief: 16 A. Compensatory Damages 17 • Restitution for financial losses resulting from unlawful interference and 18 19 extortion. Damages for severe emotional distress and psychological harm. 20 Recovery of expenses, including legal costs incurred to defend against 21 Defendants' intimidation tactics. 22 B. Punitive Damages 23 To punish Defendants for their willful, malicious, and unlawful conduct. 24 ٠ To deter similar wrongful actions in the future. 25 ٠ C. Other Relief 26 Injunctive relief to prevent further intimidation, interference, and extortion 27 by Defendants. 28 -101 of 116Any 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

10

11

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 setforth 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.

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

24

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

-102 of 116-

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

2. Breach of Contract

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

23

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 <u>Assets</u>

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.

16 <u>4. Fraud, Forgery, and Unauthorized Use of Identity</u>

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.

215. Monopolization of Trade and Commerce, and Unfair Business Practices22Defendants conspired to monopolize trade, restrict competition, and restrain

- commerce through fraudulent and unfair practices, violating **15 U.S.C. § 2**.
- 24 Plaintiff seeks a declaration that Defendants' **anticompetitive and monopolistic**

25 **conduct** renders all related transactions **unenforceable and unlawful**.

26 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

-103 of 116-

1	Defendants violated Plaintiff's constitutionally protected rights and are
2	liable for compensatory and punitive damages.
3	7. Receiving Extortion Proceeds
4	Defendants knowingly received and benefited from proceeds obtained
5	through extortion, violating 18 U.S.C. § 880. Plaintiff seeks a declaration
6	confirming Defendants' unjust enrichment through criminal means,
7	requiring full disgorgement and treble damages.
8	8. False Pretenses and Fraud
9	Defendants engaged in fraudulent misrepresentation and false pretenses
10	to unlawfully obtain assets, violating 18 U.S.C. § 1341 . Plaintiff seeks a
11	declaration that all fraudulently obtained property, funds, and assets must
12	be returned to Plaintiff immediately.
13	9. Threats and Extortion
14	Defendants engaged in coercion, intimidation, and extortion, in violation
15	of 18 U.S.C. § 1951 (Hobbs Act) . Plaintiff seeks a declaration that
16	Defendants engaged in unlawful threats and extortion, entitling Plaintiff to
17	full compensatory and punitive damages.
18	10. Racketeering (RICO Violations)
19	Defendants engaged in a pattern of racketeering activity under 18 U.S.C. §
20	1961 et seq., including fraud, extortion, and money laundering. Plaintiff
21	seek a declaration confirming Defendants' criminal liability under RICO,
22	entitling Plaintiff to treble damages and injunctive relief.
23	<u>11. Bank Fraud</u>
24	Defendants engaged in fraudulent banking transactions , violating 18
25	U.S.C. § 1344. Plaintiff seeks a declaration that Defendants' fraudulent
26	banking practices render all related claims and transactions void.
27	12. Fraudulent Transportation and Transfer of Stolen Goods and
28	<u>Securities</u>

-104 of 116-

1	Defendants unlawfully transported stolen property, securities, and financial
2	instruments across state lines, violating 18 U.S.C. §§ 2314 and 2315. Plaintiff
3	respectfully seeks a declaration that all fraudulently transferred assets must
4	be immediately returned.
5	1 <u>3. Torture</u>
6	Defendants engaged in torture through unlawful imprisonment, coercion, and
7	psychological abuse, violating 18 U.S.C. § 2340A. Plaintiff seeks a declaration
8	confirming Defendants' liability for cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment.
9	<u>14. Kidnapping</u>
10	Defendants unlawfully seized, detained, and transported Plaintiff against
11	their will, violating 18 U.S.C. § 1201. Plaintiff seeks a declaration
12	confirming that Defendants engaged in criminal kidnapping, entitling
13	Plaintiff to treble damages .
14	15. Forced Peonage
15	Defendants subjected Plaintiff to economic servitude and forced labor,
16	violating 18 U.S.C. § 1581. Plaintiff seeks a declaration confirming that
17	Defendants engaged in forced peonage , requiring full restitution and
18	injunctive relief.
19	16. Unlawful Interference, Intimidation, Extortion, and Emotional
20	Distress
21	Defendants engaged in extreme and outrageous conduct , causing economic
22	harm and severe emotional distress. Plaintiff seeks a declaration that
23	Defendants are liable for intentional infliction of emotional distress and
24	unlawful business interference.
25	282. Declaratory Judgment and Relief Requested: Based on the uncontested
26	and <i>unrebutted</i> affidavits submitted by Plaintiff, which Defendants failed to
27	dispute, Plaintiff's request that this Court enter a declaratory judgment confirming
28	the following:
I	

-105 of 116-

1	• All fraudulent claims, financial instruments, and transactions asserted by
2	Defendants are null and void as a matter of law.
3	• Defendants engaged in willful violations of federal and constitutional
4	law and are liable for all resulting damages.
5	• Plaintiff is entitled to immediate relief, including the return of all
6	unlawfully taken property, financial assets, and securities.
7	Defendants' fraudulent actions constitute RICO violations, entitling
8	Plaintiff to treble damages and injunctive relief.
9	283. Demand for Summary Judgment: As a matter of uncontested fact and law,
10	Plaintiff respectfully demands summary judgment confirming Defendants' liability
11	for all causes of action stated herein and granting:
12	• A final judgment in favor of Plaintiff in the amount of One Trillion
13	Dollars (\$1,000,000,000,000.00) in lawfully recognized currency, such as
14	gold and silver coin, as authorized under Article I, Section 10, Clause 1 of
15	the U.S. Constitution.
16	• A perfected lien against Defendants' assets in satisfaction of this
17	judgment.
18	• Any and all additional relief deemed just and appropriate by the Court.
19	284. Defendants' failure to rebut Plaintiff's sworn affidavits constitutes tacit
20	admission of all claims asserted herein. Plaintiff is therefore entitled to declaratory
21	and summary judgment as a matter of law.
22	EIGHTEENTH (18th) CAUSE OF ACTION
23	(Summary Judgement as <u>a Matter of Law</u> – Against all Defendants)
24	285. Plaintiff re-affirms and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 284 as if fully set
25	forth herein.
26	286. Plaintiff respectfully moves for summary judgment in their favor as the
27	undisputed material facts establish Defendants' liability under the clear, enforceable
28	terms of the Contract and Security Agreement . As a matter of law, Defendants have:
	-106 of 116-

- Explicitly stipulated and accepted, through their conduct and inaction, a binding judgment, summary judgment, and lien authorization (pursuant 2 to U.C.C. § 9-509). 3
- Accepted liability in the agreed-upon amount of One Trillion Dollars 4 (\$1,000,000,000,000.00) in lawfully recognized currency, such as gold and silver 5 coin, as authorized under Article I, Section 10, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution, 6 7 as evidenced by their failure to rebut the unrebutted commercial affidavits and the self-executing Contract and Security Agreement. 8
- Waived any grounds to contest this judgment through tacit procuration, 9 silent acquiescence, and willful default. 10
- 287. Defendants were duly served with the necessary legal instruments, 11 including: 12 13 Unrebutted affidavits establishing the facts of this case.
- Contract and Security Agreement confirmed and accepted via USPS Registered, 14 Express, and/or Certified Mail (Form 3811). See exhibits E, F, G, and H. 15
- Public notices and filings confirming Defendants' default and consent to 16 judgment. 17
- 288. Application of Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure: Under Rule 18 56(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, summary judgment must be granted 19
- when: 20

21

22

24

1

- "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: 23
 - Defendants' liability under the Contract and Security Agreement. •
- Defendants' failure to rebut or contest the claims, making all facts stated 25 ٠ therein legally binding. 26
- Defendants' waiver of defenses and objections due to willful silence and 27 acquiescence. 28

-107 of 116-

1	290. Since all material facts have been admitted and remain undisputed,
2	Plaintiff is entitled to summary judgment as a matter of law.
3	291. Application of Legal Doctrines: Pursuant to well-established legal
4	principles, this matter is conclusively settled and cannot be contested:
5	• Res Judicata – The matters presented in Plaintiff's affidavits are final and
6	binding , precluding Defendants from raising any new defenses or objections.
7	• Collateral Estoppel – The administrative findings contained in Plaintiff's
8	unrebutted affidavits are conclusive and enforceable as a matter of law.
9	• Stare Decisis – The legal issues presented in this case have been established
10	through precedent and must be applied consistently.
11	292. Given these uncontested facts, there is no genuine issue of material fact,
12	making summary judgment appropriate as a matter of law.
13	293. California Code of Civil Procedure § 437c(a): Under California Code of
14	Civil Procedure § 437c(a):
15	"A party may move for summary judgment if it is contended that the action has
16	no merit or that there is no defense to the action. The motion shall be granted if all
17	the papers submitted show that there is no triable issue as to any material fact and
18	that the moving party is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law."
19	294. Since all material facts have been deemed admitted and remain undisputed,
20	Plaintiff is entitled to judgment in their favor.
21	CLAIM, REQUEST, and DEMAND FOR RELIEF:
22	295. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
23	through 294 as if fully set forth herein.
24	296. Plaintiff respectfully and honorably demands the following relief:
25	1. Summary Judgment as a matter of law, in the Amount of One Trillion
26	Dollars (\$1,000,000,000,000) in lawfully recognized currency, such as gold
27	and silver coin, as authorized under Article I, Section 10, Clause 1 of the
28	U.S. Constitution.
	-108 of 116-

	Case No.: 5:25-cv-00646-WLH-MAA — Registered Mail #RF775824950US — Dated: April 17, 2025
1	Liquidated damages as agreed upon in the Contract and Security
2	Agreement.
3	• Full satisfaction of all claims through enforcement of the perfected
4	lien.
5	2. Permanent Injunction Against Defendants
6	Prohibiting further fraud, extortion, coercion, and unlawful
7	interference.
8	• Ordering the immediate cessation of all unlawful acts affecting
9	Plaintiff's rights and property.
10	3. Compensatory and Treble Damages
11	• Full restitution for all property, assets, and funds wrongfully taken
12	or transferred.
13	Treble damages under applicable statutes, including RICO
14	violations (18 U.S.C. § 1964(c)).
15	4. Declaratory Judgment Affirming Defendants' Liability
16	• Confirming that all fraudulent claims, documents, and transactions
17	asserted by Defendants are null and void.
18	• Affirming that Defendants have willfully violated federal and state
19	laws, entitling Plaintiff to full legal and equitable relief.
20	5. Enforcement of the Lien Against Defendants' Assets
21	 Perfected lien under U.C.C. § 9-509, securing Plaintiff's claims
22	against all property, accounts, and holdings of Defendants.
23	 Immediate liquidation of assets to satisfy judgment.
24	6. Any Additional Relief Deemed Just and Proper by the Court.
25	7. Defendants have failed to rebut the sworn commercial affidavits,
26	have waived all defenses through silence , and are bound by the
27	terms of the Contract and Security Agreement. Under Rule 56 of the
28	Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff is entitled to immediate
	-109 of 116-

summary judgment, full relief, and enforcement of all remedies 1 requested herein. 2 111. Exhibits "A" through "BB," which include the unrebutted commercial 3 affidavits and related documentation establishing Defendants' tacit 4 agreement and the undisputed merit and validity of Plaintiff's claims. 5 //6 LIST OF EXHIBITS / EVIDENCE: 7 1. Exhibit A: Affidavit: Power of Attorney In Fact' 8 2.Exhibit B: Hold Harmless Agreement 9 3. Exhibit C: Private UCC Contract Trust/UCC1 filing #2024385925-4. 10 4. Exhibit D: Private UCC Contract Trust/UCC3 filing ##2024402990-2. 11 5. E Exhibit E: Contract Security Agreement #RF775820621US, titled: NOTICE OF 12 CONDITIONAL ACCEPTANCE, and FRAUD, RACKETEERING, 13 CONSPIRACY, DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER THE COLOR OF LAW, 14 15 IDENTITY THEFT, EXTORTION, COERCION, TREASON. 6. Exhibit F: Contract Security Agreement #RF775821088US, titled: NOTICE OF 16 DEFAULT, and FRAUD, RACKETEERING, CONSPIRACY, DEPRIVATION OF 17 RIGHTS UNDER THE COLOR OF LAW, IDENTITY THEFT, EXTORTION, 18 COERCION, TREASON 19 7. Exhibit G: Contract Security Agreement #RF775822582US, titled: NOTICE OF 20 DEFAULT AND OPPORTUNITY TO CURE AND NOTICE OF FRAUD, 21 RACKETEERING, CONSPIRACY, DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER THE 22 COLOR OF LAW, IDENTITY THEFT, EXTORTION, COERCION, 23 KIDNAPPING. 24 8. Exhibit H: Contract Security Agreement #RF775823645US, titled: Affidavit 25 26 Certificate of Dishonor, Non-response, DEFAULT, JUDGEMENT, and LIEN AUTHORIZATION. 27

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

-110 of 116-

- 1 10. **Exhibit J**: Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit F.
- 2 11. Exhibit K: Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit G.
- 3 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.

6

- 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
 15 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 <u>https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov</u>.
- 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 //
- -111 of 116-

COMMERCIAL OATH AND VERIFICATION:

1

2	County of Riverside)
3) Commercial Oath and Verification
4	The State of California)
5	I, KEVIN WALKER, 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
10	Lord two thousand and twenty five:
11	proceeding sui juris, In Propria Persona, by Special Limited Appearance,
12	All rights reserved without prejudice and without recourse.
13	By: Jan Ma
14	Kevin Watker, national, Secured Party
15	Let this document stand as truth before the Almighty Supreme Creator and let it be
16	established before men according as the scriptures saith: "But if they will not listen, take one
17	or two others along, so that every matter may be established by the testimony of two or three
17	witnesses." Matthew 18:16. "In the mouth of two or three witnesses, shall every word be
	established" 2 Corinthians 13:1.
19 20	sui juris, By Special Limited Appearance,
	By: Domashalla Martal (Mituaca)
21	Domabelle Mortel (Witness)
22	sui juris, By Special Limited Appearance,
23	By: Cour Datan Warky
24	Corey Walker (Witness)
25	
26	
27	
28	
	-112 of 116-
	(AMERICIED) VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR FRAUD, BREACH OF CONTRACT, THEFT, DEPRIVATION OF BUHTS UNLIRE THE COLOR OF LAW, CONSPIRACY, RACKETEBRIND, KIDNAPPIND, TORTURE, and SUMMARY JUDGEMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW

PROOF OF SERVICE

2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA

1

3

13

2.

4 COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

SS.

I competent, over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within
action. My mailing address is the Delfond Group, care of: 30650 Rancho California
Road suite 406-251, Temecula, California [92591]. On or before April 17, 2025, I
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.

Exhibits A through BB.

 14
 3. NOTICE OF FILING FIRST AMENDED VERIFIED COMPLAINT AS A MATTER OF COURSE

By United States Mail. I enclosed the documents in a sealed envelope or package 16 addressed to the persons at the addresses listed below by placing the envelope for 17 collection and mailing, following our ordinary business practices. I am readily 18 familiar with this business's practice for collecting and processing correspondence 19 for mailing. On the same day that correspondence is placed for collection and 20 mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States 21 Postal Service, in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepared. I am a resident or 22 employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was 23 placed in the mail in Riverside County, California, and sent via Registered Mail 24 with a form 3811. 25

26

- 20
- 27

28

Gregory D Eastwood, Robert C V Bowman, George Reyes, William Pratt, Robert Gell, Joseph Sinz, Nicholas Gruwell, C/o RIVERSIDE SHERIFF 30755-D Auld Road, Suite L-067 Murrieta, California [92563]

-113 of 116-

	Case No.: 5:25-cv-00646-WLH-MAA — Registered Mail #RF775824950US — Dated: April 17, 2025
1	Registered Mail #RF775824929US
2	Steven-Arthur: Sherman C/o STEVEN ARTHUR SHERMAN
3	1631 East 18th Street Santa Ana, California [92705-7101]
4	Registered Mail #RF775824932US, with form 3811
5	Chad: Bianco C/o RIVERSIDE COUNTY SHERIFF
6	4095 Lemon Street, 2nd Floor Riverside, California [92501]
7	Registered Mail #RF775824946US, with form 3811
8	Clerk, Agent(s), Fiduciary(ies) C/o CLERK OF COURT 350 West 1st Street, Courtroom 9B, 9th Floor
9	350 West 1st Street, Courtroom 9B, 9th Floor Los Angeles, California [90012] Registered Mail #RF775824950US, with form 3811
10	Clerk, Agent(s), Fiduciary(ies)
11	C/o CLERK OF COURT 255 East Temple Street, Suite TS-134
12	Los Angeles, California [90012] Registered Mail #RF775824977US, with form 3811
13	Pam Bondi
14	C/o U.S. Department of Justice 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, North West Washington, District of Calambia [20520]
15 16	Washington, District of Colombia [20530] Registered Mail #RF775824963US, with form 3811
10	Miranda Thomson, Michael Hestrin
18	C/0 RIVERSIDE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY, THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
19	3960 Orange Street Riverside, California [92501] Registered Mail #RF775825102US, with form 3811
20	
21	By Electronic Service. Based on a contract, and/or court order, and/or an
22	<u>agreement of the parties</u> to accept service by electronic transmission, I caused the 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] <u>ssherman@law4cops.com</u> <u>csherman@law4cops.com</u>
27	<u>csherman@law4cops.com</u>
28	
	- 114 of 116-

1 2 3 4 5	Chad: Bianco C/o RIVERSIDE COUNTY SHERIFF 4095 Lemon Street, 2nd Floor Riverside, California [92501] <u>ssherman@law4cops.com</u> <u>csherman@law4cops.com</u> <u>rsoscscentral@riversidesheriff.org</u> jsinz@riversidesheriff.org wpratt@riversidesheriff.org
6	Patricia Guerrero C/o Judicial Council of California
7	455 Gold Gate Avenue San Francisco, California [94102]
8	j <u>udicialcouncil@jud.ca.gov</u>
9	Rob Bonta C/o Office of the Attorney General 1300 "I" Street
10	Sacramento, California [95814-2919]
11	Police-Practices@doj.ca.gov
12	Clerk, Agent(s), Fiduciary(ies) C/o CLERK OF COURT
13	350 West 1st Street, Courtroom 9B, 9th Floor Los Angeles, California [90012
14	WLH_Chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov
15	Clerk, Agent(s), Fiduciary(ies) C/o CLERK OF COURT
16	255 East Temple Street, Suite TS-134 Los Angeles, California [90012]
17	MAA_Chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov
18	Pam Bondi C/o U.S. Department of Justice
19	950 Pennsylvania Avenue, North West Washington, District of Colombia [20530]
20	crm.section@usdoj.gov
21	Miranda Thomson, Michael Hestrin C/o RIVERSIDE COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY, THE PEOPLE OF
22	THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 3960 Orange Street
23	Riverside, California [92501] DAOffice@rivco.org
23	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California
25	that the above is true and correct. Executed on April 17, 2025 in Riverside County,
23 26	California.
	/s/Corey Walker/
27	Corey Walker
28	
	-115 of 116-
	[AMENDED] VERIEIED 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

NOTICE:

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
only and not for entrance into any foreign jurisdiction.
//

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:

) ss.

8 State of California

County of Riverside

1

6

7

9

10

28

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 truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

On this <u>17th</u> day of <u>April</u>, <u>2025</u>, 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 16 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 sytilatel (Seal) 23 Signature _ 24 25 26 27