

Kevin: Realworldfare, *sui juris, in propria Persona*
Care of: 30650 Rancho California Road # 406-251
Temecula, California [92591]
non-domestic without the United States
Email: team@walkernovagroup.com

*Real Party in Interest, Injured Party, Secured Party,
Respondent*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF
CALIFORNIA (fraudulently
substituted),**

Purported *Plaintiff,*

vs.

**KEVIN LEWIS WALKER (ENS
LEGIS),**

Purported *Defendant.*

Case No. 5:25-cr-00163-ODW

**VERIFIED NOTICE OF MOTION AND
VERIFIED EMERGENCY MOTION
AND DEMAND TO STRIKE AND
VACATE VOID ORDER FOR **LACK OF
SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION,
FRAUD ON THE COURT,
UNCONSTITUTIONAL PROCEDURE,
AND DENIAL OF DUE PROCESS****

(SPECIAL LIMITED APPEARANCE — IN
EQUITY ONLY — EQUITY JURISDICTION
PRESERVED)

TO THE HONORABLE COURT AND ALL PARTIES:

This matter is brought in equity, under the original and exclusive jurisdiction of this
Court as authorized by the Constitution of the United States, Article III, Section 2.

All statutory jurisdiction is expressly denied and rebutted. This is a Court of
Record. All rights are reserved without prejudice pursuant to UCC 1-308.

COMES NOW Kevin: Realworldfare (formerly Kevin: Walker), responding as
Respondent, Injured Party, Real Party in Interest, and Secured Party, expressly
objecting to **any** misclassification as a “Defendant” or subject to any jurisdiction not

1 proven on the record. Kevin: Realworldfare (formerly Kevin: Walker) is proceeding
2 *sui juris, in propria persona*, by *Special Limited Appearance* only, not generally, **not**
3 **pro se**, not as a "United States citizen" as defined under the 14th Amendment, nor
4 as surety for any ALL-CAP LEGAL FICTION, artificial entity, corporate construct,
5 transmitting utility, or cestui que trust — but **solely as the living, sentient man**,
6 appearing in his true private capacity, competent to state and defend his own
7 rights, title, and interest, and hereby demands that this Court immediately
8 **VACATE** the purported "Order Striking Notice of Removal and Remand" (Dkt. 11)
9 as **void ab initio**, issued in violation of **federal removal statutes, due process**, and
10 **binding equity principles**. The order is facially defective, legally unsound, and
11 procedurally fraudulent.

12 **I. REMOVAL UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1443 IS NOT SUBJECT TO A TIME LIMIT**
13 **AND CANNOT BE DISMISSED BASED ON FABRICATED DEADLINES**

14 This case was **lawfully removed** under **28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)**, a specific and
15 constitutionally protected removal provision designed to safeguard parties from
16 **state-level deprivation of federally secured civil rights**. The Court's assertion that
17 the removal was "too late" is **false, legally baseless, and constitutes reversible**
18 **judicial error**.

19 **Governing Law: No Time Limitation Under § 1443(1)**

20 Unlike general civil removals under §§ 1441 or 1446(b), which include specific
21 timing requirements, **§ 1443(1) contains no such restriction**. Courts have explicitly
22 recognized that **removals based on civil rights violations under § 1443(1)** are not
23 barred by technical deadlines and cannot be dismissed on procedural grounds
24 when constitutional rights are at stake.

25 "Statutory language must be interpreted according to its plain meaning... The
26 absence of a time restriction in § 1443(1) reflects congressional intent to prioritize
27 the protection of civil rights over procedural rigidity."

28 — *Georgia v. Rachel*, 384 U.S. 780, 794 (1966)

“Section 1443(1) allows removal where it is evident the defendant cannot enforce a federal right in the state court... procedural time bars cannot override constitutional protections.”

— *City of Greenwood v. Peacock*, 384 U.S. 808, 828 (1966)

“Removal under 28 U.S.C. § 1443 is not subject to ordinary procedural technicalities where the core of the matter is the denial of equal civil rights.”

— *People v. Washington*, 626 F. Supp. 1446, 1449 (C.D. Cal. 1986)

Therefore, any ruling dismissing this case on the basis of alleged “late filing” under § 1443 is **facially void**, lacks lawful foundation, and reflects an **improper evasion of federal jurisdiction** intended to shield **state-level fraud, simulated legal process, and human rights violations** from judicial scrutiny.

This Removal Was Substantively Valid and Jurisdictionally Mandated

The Notice of Removal detailed specific and verifiable facts evidencing:

- **Denial of federally protected civil rights** under the color of law;
- **Unlawful party substitution**, depriving the Defendant of a real Plaintiff;
- **Prosecution based on a void caption involving a legal fiction** (“KEVIN LEWIS WALKER”), absent any verified claim by a real, living party;
- **Obstruction of access to equitable and constitutional remedy** in the state forum.

Such facts meet and exceed the threshold required for § 1443 removal, as affirmed in *Rachel, Peacock*, and numerous **9th Circuit** cases interpreting civil rights removal narrowly but forcefully where due process and equal protection are denied.

Summary

This Court’s attempt to remand or dismiss this case based on a **fabricated timing argument** under § 1443(1) is not merely erroneous—it is a **manifest abuse of discretion and a constitutional violation in itself**. No court may invent limitations where Congress deliberately created none, especially where **civil rights, due process, and jurisdictional integrity** are in question.

II. VOID JUDGMENT FOR FAILURE TO ADDRESS REMOVAL BASIS, FRAUD CLAIMS, AND EQUITABLE RECORD

The July 9, 2025 Order (Dkt. 11) is **jurisdictionally void** on its face and must be vacated ab initio for fatal omissions. The Court:

- **Failed to address or even mention** the controlling basis of removal under **28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)**, which provides for federal jurisdiction where state courts obstruct civil rights — and carries **no 30-day removal deadline**;
- **Ignored all verified un rebutted affidavits**, including sworn declarations, administrative defaults, and UCC filings which stand as judicial admissions by operation of law;
- **Made no findings of fact or law** concerning the core claims of **fraud, commercial dishonor, false party substitution, or simulated legal process**;
- **Provided no hearing, no review of evidence, and no engagement with the record** — a wholesale denial of due process and equal protection.

“A void judgment is a nullity and may be vacated at any time.”

— *Valley v. Northern Fire & Marine Ins. Co.*, 254 U.S. 348 (1920)

“Unrebutted affidavits are judicial admissions which the court must accept as true.”

— *United States v. Kis*, 658 F.2d 526, 536 (7th Cir. 1981)

“Silence where there is a duty to speak amounts to fraud.”

— *U.S. v. Tweel*, 550 F.2d 297 (5th Cir. 1977)

By refusing to acknowledge the verified factual record and the explicit federal removal statute invoked, the Court **abandoned its duty, exceeded its jurisdiction, and rendered an ultra vires order** that is **null and void from inception**. Judicial silence in the face of jurisdictional challenge and unrebutted evidence **does not equate to adjudication** — it confirms estoppel, fraud, and a due process collapse. Accordingly, this Order must be **struck and vacated immediately**, and the case restored under proper federal jurisdiction and equitable oversight.

**III. PURPORTED PLAINTIFF IS NOT A REAL PARTY IN INTEREST AND
PARTY SUBSTITUTION IS FRAUD ON THE COURT**

The caption purports to name “THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA” as Plaintiff. However, this is a FICTIONAL designation without legal standing, verification, or capacity to bring a claim in its own name. Specifically:

- There is no living man or woman who has come forward under oath to claim injury, submit a verified complaint, or affirm first-hand knowledge of any alleged facts;
- There is no sworn affidavit from a competent fact witness, under penalty of perjury, in support of this action;
- There is no showing of capacity or standing under Fed. R. Civ. P. 17(a), which requires that “[a]n action must be prosecuted in the name of the real party in interest.”

A purported Plaintiff must be an actual legal or equitable claimant with standing to sue — not a fictitious political abstraction. “THE PEOPLE” as referenced here is a non-juristic entity used as a placeholder for prosecutorial convenience and cannot meet the burden of proof or status of a real party in interest.

“It is elementary that a plaintiff must allege an injury in fact traceable to the defendant and likely to be redressed by a favorable judicial decision.” —

Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555, 560–61 (1992)

Further, the substitution of an artificial governmental label *without* a valid affidavit, proper agency authority, or party verification constitutes:

- **Fraud on the court,**
- **Simulated legal process, and**
- **A calculated obstruction of lawful remedy in violation of constitutional and procedural safeguards.**

“Fraud upon the court is fraud which... defiles the court itself.” — Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co., 322 U.S. 238 (1944)

1 **Worse still**, the record reflects a covert and unauthorized substitution of the
2 purported Plaintiff from "THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA" to
3 "UNITED STATES OF AMERICA" without any motion, judicial order, notice, or
4 entry of appearance by a duly authorized U.S. Attorney as required by 28 U.S.C. §
5 547 and Fed. R. Crim. P. 42(a).

6 **This silent substitution:**

- 7 • **Violates Fed. R. Civ. P. 17(a),**
- 8 • **Evades due process,**
- 9 • **Confirms that the initiating party was never competent or properly before**
10 **the Court,**
- 11 • **Further evidences that this entire prosecution is a simulated legal process**
12 **under color of law.**

13 A proceeding brought by an unauthorized, substituted, or fictitious Plaintiff –
14 whether state or federal – is **void ab initio**.

15 The use of a corporate fiction as Plaintiff, where no lawful contract, injury, or first-party
16 claimant exists, is a fatal jurisdictional defect. The Court cannot proceed in equity or law
17 without a real party in interest who is capable of bearing witness and incurring liability.
18 Accordingly, this case is procedurally void and must be **dismissed ab initio**.

19 **IV. JUDICIAL ADMISSION OF ERROR, BIAS, AND FAILURE TO APPLY** 20 **CONTROLLING LAW**

21 The July 9, 2025 “Order Striking Removal” (Dkt. 11), issued by Judge Otis D. Wright
22 II, is **not** merely erroneous – **it is an admission of judicial incompetence, bias, and**
23 **refusal to apply binding law**. The order demonstrates on its face:

- 24 • That **the Court did not read or comprehend the pleadings**, openly stating it
25 was “*unclear what Walker is asking the Court to do,*” despite multiple
26 **verified** filings clearly stating the relief demanded;
- 27 • That the Court **failed to address the explicit statutory basis for removal** – 28
28 U.S.C. § 1443(1) – which **has no time limitation**, unlike §§ 1441 or 1446;

- That the Court **misapplied 28 U.S.C. § 1455**, which governs removal of state criminal prosecutions – not civil rights removals. § 1455 is inapplicable to removals under § 1443(1), as confirmed by *Georgia v. Rachel*, 384 U.S. 780 (1966);
- That the Court **ignored all verified affidavits**, contrary to settled law that mandates judicial notice and acceptance of un rebutted sworn statements. In *United States v. Kis*, 658 F.2d 526, 536 (7th Cir. 1981), the Seventh Circuit held: “Unrebutted affidavits are judicial admissions which the court must accept as true.”

Further, where material facts are not addressed and unrebutted affidavits are dismissed out-of-hand, such conduct violates **procedural due process** and confirms **arbitrary and capricious adjudication**.

The **Supreme Court** in *Ex parte Fisk*, 113 U.S. 713, 717 (1885) emphasized:

“A court that proceeds without jurisdiction renders its orders null and void.”

Moreover, *Valley v. Northern Fire & Marine Ins. Co.*, 254 U.S. 348 (1920) held:

“A void judgment is a nullity and may be vacated at any time.”

This Court’s refusal to engage the legal basis for removal, analyze the statutory protections invoked, or consider unrebutted factual records is tantamount to **fraud by omission** and a **denial of fundamental fairness**.

Such conduct cannot stand. The Order is facially void, judicially defective, and must be vacated with prejudice to prevent further injury, fraud, and obstruction of lawful remedy.

V. JUDICIAL BIAS, DEFAMATION, AND DEPRIVATION OF FAIR TRIBUNAL

In the July 9, 2025 Order (Dkt. 11), the Court falsely and gratuitously labeled the undersigned with the derogatory and pejorative term “sovereign citizen” – **a slur** that is neither supported by the record nor grounded in any factual or legal basis.

This constitutes:

- 1 • **Defamation by a judicial officer**, without evidence or proper findings, in
2 violation of due process;
- 3 • **Irrefutable judicial bias**, disqualifying the presiding judge under *Liteky v.*
4 *United States*, 510 U.S. 540, 555 (1994), which held:
5 “Bias or prejudice... derived from an extrajudicial source and results in an
6 opinion on the merits on some basis other than what the judge learned from
7 his participation in the case disqualifies the judge.”
- 8 • **Denial of the constitutional right to a neutral and detached tribunal**, as
9 guaranteed by the Due Process Clause of the Fifth and Fourteenth
10 Amendments;
- 11 • **A violation of Canon 3(C) of the Code of Conduct for United States Judges**,
12 which mandates recusal where a judge’s impartiality “might reasonably be
13 questioned.”

14 The **Supreme Court** made clear in *Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.*, 556 U.S. 868,
15 881 (2009):

16 “Due process requires recusal when a judge has a personal bias or interest that
17 poses a serious risk of actual bias – whether or not proven.”

18 This Court's **prejudicial labeling** and refusal to engage with the verified record
19 reflect a **pre-judged outcome**, not an impartial adjudication. Judicial defamation –
20 especially of a party acting in lawful private capacity – compounds the injury and
21 taints the entire proceeding.

22 A tribunal so compromised lacks lawful authority to adjudicate. All resulting orders
23 are void ab initio and must be vacated under *Ex parte Virginia*, 100 U.S. 339 (1880),
24 which confirms:

25 “A judge who acts without jurisdiction, or with clear bias, ceases to function as a
26 judge and his acts are nullities.”

27 Accordingly, the undersigned demands **mandatory disqualification**, vacatur of all
28 rulings, and reassignment to a neutral Article III judge in the interest of justice.

**VI. THE JULY 9, 2025 ORDER CONSTITUTES JUDICIAL
COMPLICITY IN FRAUD, COMMERCIAL DISHONOR, AND
DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS**

The Court's July 9, 2025 Order is not merely erroneous — **it is a calculated evasion of truth and a procedural smokescreen designed to conceal material fraud, enforce a simulated legal process, and deny fundamental rights secured under the Constitution and law.**

Key Facts Obscured:

- **Michael Hestrin**, alleged counsel for the fictitious Plaintiff, is a named Defendant in **active federal Case No. 5:25-cv-00646-WLH(MAA)**. He stands accused of **fraud, deprivation of rights under color of law, misrepresentation, and commercial dishonor.**
- Hestrin and the fictitious entity "THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA" were lawfully served with **multiple verified affidavits, conditional acceptances, and notices of dishonor. No rebuttal** has ever been entered. Silence in equity is acquiescence. Tacit acquiescence under UCC §§ 1-103 and 2-206 constitutes binding agreement by performance.
- The Court has unlawfully ignored these unrebutted, self-executing instruments, which **stand as judicial admissions.**
"Unrebutted affidavits are judicial admissions which the court must accept as true."
— *United States v. Kis*, 658 F.2d 526, 536 (7th Cir. 1981)

Judicial Misconduct and Void Ruling:

By dismissing the matter based on an arbitrary and legally inapplicable "deadline," the Court has:

- **Aided and abetted concealment of material facts;**
- **Covered up multiple counts of unrebutted dishonor;**
- **Perpetuated a fraudulent party substitution and ignored the total absence of a real party in interest.**

1 “Silence, where there is a duty to speak, amounts to fraud.”

2 – *United States v. Tweel*, 550 F.2d 297 (5th Cir. 1977)

3 “A judgment is void if the court that rendered it lacked jurisdiction of the subject
4 matter, or of the parties, or if it acted in a manner inconsistent with due process.”

5 – *Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(4)*; *United States v. Indoor Cultivation Equip.*,
6 55 F.3d 1311, 1317 (7th Cir. 1995)

7 This Order constitutes an **ultra vires act**, devoid of legal force, and is further
8 evidence of **collusion to suppress verified equity claims and protect complicit**
9 **actors from exposure.**

10 **This Court is now on notice:** aiding in the enforcement of simulated legal process
11 based on fictitious parties, un rebutted fraud, and administrative silence constitutes
12 **gross judicial misconduct and renders any such ruling void *ab initio*.**

13 **VII. CONTROLLING AUTHORITY MANDATES IMMEDIATE**

14 **VACATUR OF VOID ORDER**

15 The Court’s July 9, 2025 order must be vacated as a matter of law. It is **void ab**
16 **initio**, issued in the **absence of subject-matter jurisdiction, in disregard of**
17 **unrebutted judicial admissions, and in open violation of controlling Supreme**
18 **Court and Circuit precedent.**

19 **Binding Precedent Confirms: A Court Without Jurisdiction Issues Nothing**

- 20 • **Ex parte Fisk**, 113 U.S. 713, 718 (1885):
21 “A court that proceeds without jurisdiction renders its orders null and void.”
- 22 • **Valley v. Northern Fire & Marine Ins. Co.**, 254 U.S. 348, 353 (1920):
23 “A void judgment is a nullity and may be vacated at any time, regardless of
24 the passage of time or finality doctrine.”
- 25 • **United States v. Indoor Cultivation Equip.**, 55 F.3d 1311, 1317 (7th Cir. 1995):
26 “A judgment is void if the court that rendered it lacked jurisdiction of the
27 subject matter, or of the parties, or if it acted in a manner inconsistent with
28 due process of law.”

The July 9, 2025 order is precisely such a judgment – **void for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, lack of a real party in interest, and lack of procedural due process.**

The Unrebutted Affidavits Are Legally Binding and Must Be Recognized

- **United States v. Kis**, 658 F.2d 526, 536 (7th Cir. 1981):
“Unrebutted affidavits are judicial admissions which the court must accept as true.”
- **New Hampshire v. Maine**, 532 U.S. 742, 749 (2001):
“When a party has accepted facts in an affidavit and fails to rebut them, they are estopped from later contesting those facts.”
- **United States v. Tweel**, 550 F.2d 297, 299 (5th Cir. 1977):
“Silence, where there is a duty to speak, amounts to fraud.”

All verified affidavits filed by Defendant have **gone unrebutted**. They include **sworn statements, notices of dishonor, and verified rebuttals of jurisdiction and party status**. These are now established facts and stand as **uncontroverted admissions under law**. The Court's refusal to recognize them constitutes **gross procedural fraud and denial of due process**.

Equity and Federal Rules Also Require Vacatur

- **Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(4)**:
A void judgment **must be set aside** when the rendering court lacked jurisdiction or the judgment was obtained in violation of constitutional rights.

The record is irrefutable and required mandatory vacatur:

1. The Court lacked jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1), which permits removal where a defendant is denied or cannot enforce civil rights in state court. **This provision contains no time limitation**, and any ruling to remand on timing grounds is contrary to controlling law and therefore void.

2. The purported Plaintiff, “THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,” is a fictitious, unverified entity that has never appeared

1 **through a real party in interest**, in direct violation of **Fed. R. Civ. P. 17(a)**.
2 No living man or woman has submitted a verified complaint under
3 penalty of perjury. **This is a textbook fraudulent party substitution**
4 designed to shield the true wrongdoers and preserve a simulated legal
5 process.

6 **3. All affidavits, verified notices, and evidentiary filings submitted by the**
7 **Defendant stand un rebutted**, triggering legal estoppel and conclusive
8 presumption under:

- 9 ○ *United States v. Kis*, 658 F.2d 526 (7th Cir. 1981): Unrebutted affidavits
10 are judicial admissions.
- 11 ○ *New Hampshire v. Maine*, 532 U.S. 742 (2001): Failure to rebut affidavits
12 estops later contradiction.
- 13 ○ *United States v. Tweel*, 550 F.2d 297 (5th Cir. 1977): Silence where there
14 is a duty to speak is fraud.

15 **4. The Court's July 9, 2025 order violates both procedural and substantive**
16 **due process**, having ignored controlling precedent, accepted a simulated
17 Plaintiff without standing, and disregarded the un rebutted facts. This
18 renders the order **void ab initio**, not voidable, and compels immediate
19 vacatur under:

- 20 ○ *Ex parte Fisk*, 113 U.S. 713 (1885): No jurisdiction means no valid order.
- 21 ○ *Valley v. Northern Fire & Marine Ins. Co.*, 254 U.S. 348 (1920): A void
22 judgment is a nullity and may be vacated at any time.
- 23 ○ **Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(4)**: Any judgment issued
24 without jurisdiction or in violation of due process **must** be vacated.

25 This Court cannot maintain the fiction of jurisdiction or Plaintiff identity in
26 the face of un rebutted fact, binding precedent, and admitted procedural
27 violations. **The July 9, 2025 order must be vacated immediately** or risk
28 compounding the fraud upon the court.

VIII. EQUITABLE STANDING AND VERIFIED FACTUAL RECORD

Undersigned has lawfully secured, perfected, and recorded all material rights and interests through:

- **UCC-1 Financing Statements Nos. 2024385925-4 and 2025470746-9,** establishing superior security and equitable claim;
- **Verified Affidavits of Fact,** un rebutted and filed into the record, constituting judicial admissions;
- **Judicial Notices** and Notices of Default in Dishonor;
- **Formal Rebuttal of all presumptions of contract, corporate citizenship, or statutory jurisdiction,** consistent with UCC §§ 1-308, 1-103, and 3-501, as well as California Commercial Code §§ 1201(b)(3), 1305, and 3501.

The living man **Kevin: Realworldfare** is **not** the same legal entity as the corporate fiction "**KEVIN LEWIS WALKER,**" which is an **ens legis** – a created legal person and transmitting utility. That distinction has been formally declared, recorded, and remains un rebutted in law or fact.

"A party is not bound to accept the burden of a contract unless he has voluntarily entered into it."

– *Hertz Corp. v. Zurich American Ins. Co.*, 496 F. Supp. 2d 668 (S.D. Miss. 2007)

"Un rebutted affidavits are judicial admissions which the court must accept as true."

– *United States v. Kis*, 658 F.2d 526, 536 (7th Cir. 1981)

"Where a party fails to rebut verified affidavits, the facts therein must be accepted as true and deemed admitted."

– *New Hampshire v. Maine*, 532 U.S. 742 (2001)

"The use of a name in all capital letters is not legally equivalent to the use of upper and lower case letters."

– *In re Bast*, 253 B.R. 263, 266 n.1 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2000)

Any attempt to merge the living man with the artificial CORPORATE FICTION **violates due process, creates legal confusion,** and constitutes a fatal jurisdictional

defect. In equity, this Court must recognize and uphold the private, non-commercial status of the undersigned, who appears *sui juris, in propria persona*, and **by Special Limited Appearance only**.

IX. IMPROPER AND CONTRADICTORY DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL AND REMAND CANNOT CO-EXIST

The July 9, 2025 Order purports to both **dismiss** and **remand** the action. This is legally incoherent.

A federal court may **either** dismiss a case **or** remand it — **not both**. A dismissal terminates the federal action; a remand returns it to state court for further proceedings. The two are **mutually exclusive**.

“A remand requires a live controversy to return; a dismissal ends the controversy. To order both is jurisdictionally void.”

— *Valley v. Northern Fire & Marine Ins. Co.*, 254 U.S. 348 (1920)

“Judicial acts without jurisdiction are nullities and must be vacated.”

— *Ex parte Fisk*, 113 U.S. 713 (1885)

The court’s attempt to dismiss and remand is:

- **Void for vagueness**, and
- **Void ab initio** for exceeding lawful authority under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1443 and 1446(d), which vested federal jurisdiction upon removal.

Such contradiction further confirms the necessity of **immediate vacatur** and proper reassignment under Article III for due process restoration.

X. RELIEF DEMANDED

The undersigned respectfully demands the following relief as a matter of law, equity, and necessity to cure fraud, restore due process, and uphold constitutional protections:

1. Immediate Vacatur and Striking of Void Order

Vacate and STRIKE the July 9, 2025 “Order Striking Removal” as **void ab initio** for want of jurisdiction, reliance on a fictitious Plaintiff, fraudulent party substitution, and deprivation of due process.

“A judgment rendered without jurisdiction is void and subject to collateral attack at any time.” — *Valley v. Northern Fire & Marine Ins. Co.*, 254 U.S. 348 (1920)

“Fraud vitiates the most solemn contracts, documents, and even judgments.” — *United States v. Throckmorton*, 98 U.S. 61 (1878)

2. Recognition of Removal Under 28 U.S.C. § 1443

Affirm that removal was properly executed pursuant to **28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)**, which is exempt from any 30-day limitation and is specifically designed to protect **federal civil rights** from state court obstruction.

Georgia v. Rachel, 384 U.S. 780 (1966): “Section 1443(1) provides federal jurisdiction when civil rights cannot be enforced in state courts.”

3. Reinstatement and Article III Reassignment

Reinstate the federal docket **and transfer to a neutral Article III judge**, as required where verified bias, party substitution, and conflicts of interest compromise judicial integrity and disqualify inferior Article I proceedings.

4. Judicial Notice of Unrebutted Affidavits and Exhibits

Take full **judicial notice under Fed. R. Evid. 201(b)(2)** of all unrebutted affidavits, UCC filings, notices, and exhibits which stand as binding admissions by operation of law.

“Unrebutted affidavits are judicial admissions which the court must accept as true.”

— *United States v. Kis*, 658 F.2d 526 (7th Cir. 1981)

“Silence where there is a duty to speak amounts to fraud.” — *U.S. v. Tweel*, 550 F.2d 297 (5th Cir. 1977)

5. Equitable Relief and Further Remedy as Justice Requires

Grant **all additional relief in law or equity** necessary to restore standing, void fraudulent acts, and permanently bar any future action based on simulated legal process, fictitious party claims, or unconstitutional enforcement.

“Where there is fraud, there is no jurisdiction.” — *Ex parte Fisk*, 113 U.S. 713 (1885)

6. **Final Demand for Judicial Action and Notice of Escalation** The undersigned gives NOTICE that unless this Court vacates the July 9, 2025 void order, acknowledges the un rebutted record, and corrects the jurisdictional and procedural violations within three (3) calendar days of this filing, the undersigned shall seek emergency appellate relief via **Petition for Writ of Mandamus to the Ninth Circuit and/or an Application under Supreme Court Rule 20**, as necessary to preserve rights and prevent further irreparable injury under color of law.

//

//

//

//

//

//

VERIFICATION:

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746

I, Kevin: Realworldfare, over the age of 18, competent to testify, and having firsthand knowledge of the facts stated herein, do hereby **declare, certify, verify, affirm, and state** under penalty of perjury under the laws of the **United States of America and the State of California**, that the foregoing statements are **true, correct, and complete**, to the best of my **understanding, knowledge, and belief**, and made in **good faith**.

Executed, signed, and sealed this 9th day of July in the year of Our Lord two thousand and twenty five, *without* the United States, **with all rights reserved and without recourse and without prejudice**.

All rights reserved without prejudice or recourse, UCC § 1-308, 3-402.

By: Kevin: Realworldfare
Kevin: Realworldfare, Real Party In Interest,
Secured Party, Injured Party, living man

LIST OF EXHIBITS / EVIDENCE:

1. **Exhibit A:** Affidavit and **Contract** Security Agreement #**RF775820621US**, titled:
NOTICE OF CONDITIONAL ACCEPTANCE, and **FRAUD, RACKETEERING, CONSPIRACY, DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER THE COLOR OF LAW, IDENTITY THEFT, EXTORTION, COERCION, TREASON.**
2. **Exhibit B:** Affidavit and **Contract** Security Agreement #**RF775821088US**, titled:
NOTICE OF DEFAULT, and **FRAUD, RACKETEERING, CONSPIRACY, DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER THE COLOR OF LAW, IDENTITY THEFT, EXTORTION, COERCION, TREASON**
3. **Exhibit C:** Affidavit and **Contract** Security Agreement #**RF775822582US**, titled:
NOTICE OF DEFAULT AND OPPORTUNITY TO CURE AND NOTICE OF FRAUD, RACKETEERING, CONSPIRACY, DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER THE COLOR OF LAW, IDENTITY THEFT, EXTORTION, COERCION, KIDNAPPING.
4. **Exhibit D:** Affidavit and **Contract** Security Agreement #**RF775823645US**, titled:
Affidavit Certificate of Dishonor, Non-response, **DEFAULT, JUDGEMENT, and LIEN AUTHORIZATION.**
5. **Exhibit E:** *PURPORTED* DEFENDANT'S **VERIFIED** NOTICE OF **CONDITIONAL ACCEPTANCE**, NOTICE OF **MANDATORY COUNTERCLAIM**, AND NOTICE OF **JUDICIAL FRAUD AND CONSPIRACY TO DEPRIVE UNDER COLOR OF LAW**, AND **DEMAND** FOR DISMISSAL, **SANCTIONS, RESTITUTION**, AND SUMMARY JUDGEMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW IN FAVOR OF *PURPORTED* DEFENDANT
6. **Exhibit F:** UCC Financiang Statement No. **2024385925-4**
7. **Exhibit G:** UCC Financiang Statement No. **2025470746-9**
8. **Exhibit H** AFFIDAVIT of Truth: **RIGHT TO TRAVEL CANCELLATION**, TERMINATION, AND REVOCATION of **COMMERCIAL "For Hire" DRIVER'S LICENSE CONTRACT and AGREEMENT. LICENSE/BOND # B6735991.**

1 9. **Exhibit I:** Affidavit: Resolution, Revocation, and Termination of Franchise

2 10. **Exhibit J:** Affidavit: Power of Attorney In Fact

3 11. **Exhibit K:** TMKEVIN LEWIS WALKER© Trademark and Copyright Agreement.

4 12. **Exhibit L:** Hold Harmless Agreement.

5 13. **Exhibit M: Docket Record from Superior Court of California, County of**

6 **Riverside, Case No. MISW2501134**, titled *The People of the State of California v.*

7 *Kevin Lewis Walker*, evidencing the original administrative citation and absence

8 of any adjudicated conviction or lawful removal by the prosecuting agency.

9 //

10 //

11 //

12 //

13 //

14 //

15 //

16 //

17 //

18 //

19 //

20 //

21 //

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE)

I competent, over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within action. My mailing address is the Walkernova Group, care of: 30650 Rancho California Road suite #406-251, Temecula, California [92591]. On or about July 9, 2025, I served the within documents:

1. **VERIFIED NOTICE OF MOTION AND VERIFIED EMERGENCY MOTION AND DEMAND TO STRIKE AND VACATE VOID ORDER FOR LACK OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, FRAUD ON THE COURT, UNCONSTITUTIONAL PROCEDURE, AND DENIAL OF DUE PROCESS**

By Electronic Service. Based on a court order and/or an agreement of the parties to accept service by electronic transmission, I caused the documents to be sent to the persons at the electronic notification addresses listed below.

Michael: Hestrin, Miranda Thomson, Monika Vermani
C/o THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY’S OFFICE, THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE
OF CALIFORNIA
3960 Orange Street,
Riverside, California [92501-3611]
DAOoffice@rivco.org

US Attorney's Office
Ausa - Office Of Us Attorney
[213-894-2434](tel:213-894-2434)
usacac.criminal@usdoj.gov

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct. Executed on July 9, 2025 in Riverside County, California.

/s/Chris Yarbra/
Chris Yarbra

//
//
//

Date: July 9, 2025

NOTICE:

Using a notary on this document does *not* constitute joinder adhesion, or consent to any foreign jurisdiction, *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:

State of California)
) ss.
County of Riverside)

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 9th day of July, 2025, before me, Joyti Patel, a Notary Public, personally appeared Kevin Realworlfare (formerly Kevin Walker), who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature Joyti Patel (Seal)

