

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

(310) 923-8521

Petitioner, Real Party in Interest, Injured Party

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

Kevin: Realworldfare, a living man

Petitioner sui juris, in original jurisdiction,

vs.

**U.S. District Court for the Central District
of California;**

**Hon. Otis D. Wright II, in his private and
official capacity**

Respondents.

Case No.

(District Court Case No 5:25-cr-00163-
ODW)

**VERIFIED EMERGENCY PETITION
FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS TO
STRIKE VOID ORDER, DISMISS VOID
CASE FOR LACK OF JURISDICTION,
AND ENFORCE FEDERAL CIVIL
RIGHTS REMOVAL UNDER 28 U.S.C.
§ 1443(1)**

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

I. INTRODUCTION, CONSTITUTIONAL INVOCATION, AND VERIFIED BASIS

This Verified Petition for Writ of Mandamus is brought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a) (the All Writs Act), Rule 21 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, and Article III, Section 2 of the Constitution of the United States, which grants this Honorable Court original and supervisory jurisdiction over all lower courts within the Ninth Circuit. Petitioner proceeds in equity, not at law, and invokes this Court's inherent constitutional jurisdiction, not inferior statutory or legislative jurisdiction.

This is a Court of Record. All statutory presumptions are rebutted. Petitioner expressly reserves all rights without prejudice under UCC § 1-308, and proceeds by

1 Special Limited Appearance solely to invoke the original jurisdiction of this Court
2 to restrain a lower tribunal that has acted in clear excess of lawful authority.

3 **COMES NOW** Petitioner, **Kevin: Realworldfare**, a living, competent man,
4 proceeding *sui juris, in propria persona* and by *Special Limited Appearance only*
5 — not pro se, not as a "United States citizen" as defined under the 14th
6 Amendment, and not as the artificial ENS LEGIS LEGAL FICTION "KEVIN LEWIS
7 WALKER" or any presumed transmitting utility, cestui que trust, or corporate
8 fiction created *without* full disclosure or consent. Petitioner/Injured Party acts solely
9 in his true **private capacity**, invoking his standing as the **Real Party in Interest**,
10 **Secured Party, Creditor, and one of the people.**

11 Petitioner brings this action to compel a **ministerial duty** of the United States
12 District Court for the Central District of California to **vacate a void order** issued
13 without subject matter jurisdiction, in fraud, and in violation of constitutional due
14 process, and to redress ongoing harm stemming from a **simulated legal process**
15 under **color of law**.

16 Petitioner seeks emergency intervention and mandamus relief from this Honorable
17 Court to correct and strike a **void and ultra vires order** issued by Respondent Judge
18 **Otis D. Wright II**, sitting in the U.S. District Court for the Central District of
19 California, Western Division, in Case No. 5:25-cv-00163, captioned "**USA v.**
20 **Walker.**"

21 The **verified and un rebutted** record below establishes beyond dispute:

- 22 1. The case **originated as a civil removal** under **28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)**, not as a
23 criminal prosecution;
- 24 2. There is **no indictment, no verified complaint, no charging instrument, and**
25 **no corpus delicti** in the record;
- 26 3. A **fraudulent party substitution** occurred, replacing "**THE PEOPLE OF THE**
27 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA**" with "**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**" as
28 plaintiff — **without notice, motion, verified pleading, or lawful authority;**

4. The July 9, 2025 “Order Striking Removal” improperly invoked **28 U.S.C. § 1455**, a statute that applies **exclusively to criminal prosecutions** and is inapplicable to **civil rights removals under § 1443(1)**;
5. The District Court entirely **failed to acknowledge, review, or adjudicate the verified affidavits, UCC-1 Financing Statements, and unrebutted jurisdictional and procedural objections** filed by Petitioner;
6. The record contains multiple **judicial admissions**, administrative defaults, and unrebutted commercial instruments that were **ignored in direct violation of due process**.

Mandamus relief is not only proper but **mandatory** to:

1. **Strike the July 9, 2025 order** as void ab initio for lack of jurisdiction;
2. **Prevent unlawful remand** to a state forum that lacks any legitimate jurisdiction over a federally protected removal pursuant to § 1443(1);
3. **Uphold the supremacy of the Constitution** and **28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)** by compelling federal judicial officers to honor civil rights removal safeguards;
4. **Compel reassignment to a neutral Article III judge** untainted by procedural fraud, substitution of parties, or extrajudicial prejudice;
5. **Restore jurisdictional integrity, prevent further harm**, and ensure lawful adjudication based on the verified and unrebutted record.

II. JURISDICTION

This Court has original and supervisory jurisdiction under **28 U.S.C. § 1651(a)** (the “All Writs Act”), **28 U.S.C. § 1291**, and **Rule 21 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure** to issue all writs necessary and appropriate in aid of its appellate jurisdiction. This includes the authority to correct clear usurpations of power, constitutional violations, and jurisdictional defects by inferior tribunals.

Mandamus relief is appropriate where a district court has:

- **Acted without subject matter jurisdiction;**
- **Failed to perform a non-discretionary duty;**

- **Exceeded its lawful authority;**
- Or where there exists **no adequate alternative remedy** and immediate intervention is necessary to prevent irreparable harm.

“Mandamus is appropriate when the district court’s order is clearly erroneous as a matter of law, such that the court usurped judicial power or acted outside the scope of its jurisdiction.”

— *Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Ct.*, 542 U.S. 367, 380 (2004)

“Where there is no plain, adequate, and speedy remedy in the ordinary course of law, a writ of mandamus lies.”

— *Kerr v. U.S. Dist. Ct.*, 426 U.S. 394, 402 (1976)

Because the Respondent District Court has issued a void order based on misapplication of law, ignored binding authority under **28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)**, and failed to adjudicate verified jurisdictional objections, mandamus is the only remedy sufficient to correct the ongoing injury and prevent further miscarriage of justice.

III. RELIEF REQUESTED

Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court:

- 1. Issue a Writ of Mandamus** directing the U.S. District Court to vacate the July 9, 2025 Order (Dkt. 11) as void ab initio for lack of jurisdiction and fraud on the court;
- 2. Strike all party substitutions**, including the fraudulent conversion of the Plaintiff from “The People of the State of California” to the “United States of America,” which was done without legal basis or verified pleading;
- 3. Reinstate the removed case** under 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1) and transfer it to a neutral Article III judge for adjudication on the merits, consistent with constitutional due process;
- 4. Bar any further attempts to remand, dismiss, or re-characterize** the proceeding absent jurisdiction and verified pleadings, as any such acts constitute judicial fraud, obstruction, and color of law abuse.

IV. GROUNDS FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

A. Lack of Jurisdiction and Misapplication of Statutory Authority

The District Court's Order dated July 9, 2025 is **void ab initio** for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and egregious misapplication of law. The Petitioner lawfully and clearly removed the matter under **28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)**, which governs civil rights removals from state courts where constitutional protections cannot be enforced. Instead, Respondent Judge **Otis D. Wright II** falsely applied **28 U.S.C. § 1455**, a statute that governs only **criminal prosecutions**, despite there being no indictment, no criminal complaint, no charging instrument, and no criminal proceedings in the original state case.

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

Ex parte Fisk, 113 U.S. 713 (1885): *"A court that proceeds without jurisdiction renders its orders null and void."*

The Court lacked all lawful basis to strike the removal, apply a criminal statute to a civil rights claim, or remand a matter that it never had jurisdiction to adjudicate under § 1455.

B. Fraudulent Substitution of Parties and Simulated Legal Process

The record shows that the original state action was styled "**THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA v. KEVIN LEWIS WALKER**" — a civil proceeding. Yet, without lawful authority, verified motion, or substitution procedure, the District Court silently allowed and endorsed the **unconstitutional substitution** of a fictitious federal Plaintiff: "**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.**" No notice of appearance, no complaint, and no proper joinder or substitution ever occurred. This is a **simulated legal process**, constituting **fraud upon the court, deprivation of rights, and a fundamental due process violation.**

Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555 (1992): *A valid plaintiff must demonstrate standing, injury-in-fact, and real party in interest status.*

1 **Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co.**, 322 U.S. 238 (1944): *"Fraud upon*
2 *the court is fraud which defiles the court itself."*

3 There is no lawful basis for a fictitious Plaintiff to hijack the case, no valid
4 prosecutorial authority asserted, and no jurisdiction conferred by silence or
5 presumption. This simulated and collusive substitution constitutes both
6 **constructive fraud and procedural treason.**

7 **C. Bias, Defamation, and Judicial Misconduct**

8 Judge Wright's written order defamed the Petitioner by falsely labeling him a
9 **"sovereign citizen"** — a weaponized slur used by law enforcement and courts to
10 discredit individuals asserting constitutional or commercial rights. This label has no
11 legal meaning and reflects **judicial bias, animus, and lack of impartiality**, in
12 violation of **due process** and **judicial ethics**. It constitutes **prejudicial misconduct**,
13 prejudging the Petitioner's character and claims without a hearing or evidence, and
14 signaling overt hostility to constitutional arguments.

15 **Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.**, 556 U.S. 868 (2009): *"Due process requires an*
16 *impartial tribunal."*

17 This conduct renders any order void, not just voidable. The judge's refusal to acknowledge
18 jurisdictional filings, combined with defamatory mischaracterization, reveals a pattern
19 of **deliberate obstruction, bad faith, and willful violation of oath of office.**

20 **D. Constructive Denial of Access to the Courts and Refusal to Adjudicate**
21 **Verified Facts**

22 Despite multiple **verified affidavits, UCC filings, and jurisdictional notices** on
23 record — none of which were rebutted or addressed — the District Court **issued an**
24 **adverse order without any hearing, without findings, and without confronting**
25 **the operative facts.** This constitutes a **constructive denial of access to the courts**
26 and a **violation of fundamental due process rights.**

27 **United States v. Kis**, 658 F.2d 526 (7th Cir. 1981): *"Unrebutted affidavits are judicial*
28 *admissions which the court must accept as true."*

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

3 **The record is clear:** No valid jurisdiction existed, no fair process was granted, and
4 no lawful adjudication occurred. This is **judicial tyranny cloaked in procedure,**
5 and immediate supervisory intervention is required to **strike the void order,**
6 **prevent further harm, and enforce constitutional supremacy.**

7 **V. MANDAMUS IS THE APPROPRIATE AND NECESSARY REMEDY**

8 Mandamus is proper and required where a lower court has acted **in excess of its**
9 **jurisdiction, refused to perform a clear ministerial duty,** or where there is **no**
10 **adequate remedy at law.** The record establishes that Respondent Judge **Otis D.**
11 **Wright II:**

- 12 • Proceeded under a **wholly inapplicable criminal statute** (28 U.S.C. § 1455) in
13 a **civil rights removal** under 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1);
- 14 • Permitted **fraudulent substitution of parties** without motion, notice, or legal
15 basis;
- 16 • Issued an **order without findings,** hearing, or reference to the actual
17 record;
- 18 • **Defamed and prejudiced** the Petitioner by labeling him a “sovereign
19 citizen”;
- 20 • **Violated due process** by refusing to adjudicate un rebutted affidavits and
21 jurisdictional notices;
- 22 • Attempted to both **dismiss and remand,** an internally contradictory act that
23 reflects judicial incompetence or intent to obfuscate lawful remedy.

24 These violations are not procedural errors — they are **fundamental structural**
25 **defects** that render the district court’s order **void ab initio** and incapable of
26 enforcement. A standard appeal is **not available,** nor is it adequate, as the harm
27 stems from **jurisdictional fraud, defamation, and obstruction,** which continue to
28 prejudice Petitioner irreparably.

Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Ct., 542 U.S. 367, 380 (2004): “*Mandamus is proper where the petitioner has no other adequate means to attain the relief he desires.*”

Ex parte Peru, 318 U.S. 578 (1943): “*A clear abuse of discretion or usurpation of judicial power compels mandamus.*”

The Ninth Circuit has an **affirmative constitutional duty** to restrain such usurpation and fraud. No lawful remedy remains below.

**VI. CONTINUING FRAUD, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, AND
TREASONOUS SUPPRESSION OF RECORD**

On **July 10, 2025**, one day after Petitioner filed a **Verified Emergency Motion to Strike Void Order**, accompanied by sworn affidavits, jurisdictional notices, and judicial records confirming the court’s lack of subject matter jurisdiction and fraudulent party substitution, Respondent **Judge Otis D. Wright II** issued **Docket Entry 17**, declaring:

“THE COURT WILL NOT ACCEPT NO FURTHER FILINGS ON THIS
CLOSED CASE.”

This act constitutes:

- **Fraud on the Court** – An attempt to conceal un rebutted affidavits, verified evidence, and jurisdictional facts.
See *Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co.*, 322 U.S. 238 (1944):
“Fraud upon the court is fraud which defiles the court itself.”
- **Obstruction of Justice** – A judicial officer actively suppressing lawful filings after issuance of a void order is a textbook example of obstruction under **18 U.S.C. § 1503** and **18 U.S.C. § 1512**.
- **Suppression of Evidence** – The court illegally struck sworn filings that constitute **judicial admissions** and un rebutted affidavits, which under law, **must be accepted as true**.

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

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

- 3 • **Judicial Misconduct and Bias** – Respondent ignored every statutory and
4 constitutional challenge on the record, **falsely invoked 28 U.S.C. § 1455**
5 (criminal removal) to dismiss a civil rights removal under **28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)**,
6 and maliciously referred to Petitioner as a “sovereign citizen,” a **known**
7 **government slur** used to discredit lawful challengers and justify de facto
8 tyranny.
- 9 • **Treason by Judicial Usurpation** – Under **18 U.S.C. § 2381**, treason includes
10 “adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort.” When a judicial
11 officer knowingly suppresses civil rights filings, fabricates jurisdiction, and
12 protects fraudulent state proceedings, he ceases to function as a neutral
13 arbiter and instead acts **in rebellion against the Constitution**.
- 14 • **Denial of Due Process** – No hearing was granted, no evidence was reviewed,
15 no factual findings made. Instead, the court **retaliated** by purporting to
16 permanently seal the file and refuse any further filings, a direct violation of **the**
17 **right to petition, due process under the 5th Amendment, and access to the courts**.
18 See *Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.*, 556 U.S. 868 (2009):
19 “Due process requires an impartial tribunal.”

20 **Therefore, the July 10, 2025 order (Dkt. 17) is further evidence of systemic**
21 **judicial corruption and an urgent call for this Court to intervene.** The suppression
22 of constitutional claims, jurisdictional challenges, and civil rights affidavits is a
23 direct affront to the **Supremacy Clause**, the **Separation of Powers**, and the ethical
24 integrity of the judiciary.

25 Petitioner demands immediate **STRIKING AND NULLIFICATION** of Dkt. 17,
26 enforcement of all unrebutted affidavits and exhibits under Rule 201 and 902 of the
27 Federal Rules of Evidence, and issuance of all appropriate orders to **investigate,**
28 **vacate, and prosecute** the actors responsible.

VI. DEMAND FOR RELIEF

Petitioner and Injured Party Kevin: Realworldfare respectfully demands that this Honorable Court issue a Writ of Mandamus compelling:

1. Vacatur and Final Dismissal of Void Proceedings (Case No. 5:25-cv-00163)

This Court must declare the July 9, 2025 “Order Striking Removal” and all derivative actions **void ab initio** for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, fraudulent party substitution, and unconstitutional procedure. No lawful proceeding ever commenced. The record reflects:

- No valid complaint or indictment,
- No real party in interest,
- No lawful basis under 28 U.S.C. § 1455,
- No judicial capacity to adjudicate.

All federal jurisdiction was fabricated post hoc. The case must be dismissed permanently, not reinstated, as it was never lawfully opened.

2. Judicial Declaration of Lack of Jurisdiction Under 28 U.S.C. § 1455

The record conclusively shows that Petitioner lawfully removed under **28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)** — a statute designed to protect federal civil rights — not criminal prosecutions. **There is no criminal case.** No indictment, no verified complaint, no charging document, no corpus delicti.

The use of **§ 1455** was ultra vires, fraudulent, and jurisdictionally impossible. This Court must enter a finding that jurisdiction under § 1455 never attached, and the District Court acted **without lawful authority**.

3. Absolute Prohibition Against Remand or Further Action by Inferior Tribunals

Petitioner demands an express prohibition barring remand to any lower tribunal, including Riverside County Superior Court or any agency, due to:

- Lack of a real party in interest;
- Verified un rebutted affidavits settling all material facts as a matter of law;
- Procedural closure under operation of law by administrative default.

1 **Any remand would be an act of fraud, retaliation, and continued injury.** The
2 matter is now conclusively settled.

3 **4. Referral for Disciplinary Investigation of Judicial Misconduct**

4 This **Honorable** Court is respectfully requested to refer Respondent **Otis D. Wright**
5 **II** for investigation pursuant to **28 U.S.C. § 372(c)** and other applicable oversight
6 authorities, for:

- 7 • Knowingly executing fraudulent party substitution;
- 8 • Willful reliance on inapplicable criminal statutes to dismiss a civil rights
9 removal;
- 10 • Denial of due process and refusal to address jurisdictional facts or evidence;
- 11 • **Defamatory labeling** of Petitioner as a “sovereign citizen” to
12 mischaracterize, discredit, and suppress a legitimate constitutional challenge;
- 13 • Suppression of lawful filings, obstruction of court access, and simulated
14 process in violation of oath of office and Article III.

15 Such conduct **shocks the conscience**, destroys confidence in the judiciary, and
16 violates every canon of judicial ethics and neutrality.

17 **5. All Additional Equitable and Declaratory Relief Necessary to Cure Harm**

18 Petitioner further demands:

- 19 • **Permanent expungement** of all void orders and simulated docket entries;
- 20 • **Declaratory judgment** affirming Petitioner's rights under the Constitution,
21 the Supremacy Clause, and 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1);
- 22 • **Equitable redress** for reputational harm, emotional injury, and denial of
23 access to the courts;
- 24 • An **injunction** against further retaliation or color of law proceedings based
25 on void instruments or closed matters.

26 This Court must restore order, affirm supremacy of constitutional and equitable
27 law, and **make clear that no inferior officer or tribunal may defy the limits of**
28 **jurisdiction, falsify parties, or obstruct lawful redress.**

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 10th 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,
Plaintiff, Secured Party, Injured Party

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

LIST OF EXHIBITS / EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF
VERIFIED PETITION:

1. Exhibit A – Docket Entry No. 1:

NOTICE OF REMOVAL (May 12, 2025): Petitioner removed the state matter under 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1), asserting federal civil rights protections and jurisdiction. Includes attached evidentiary documents.

2. Exhibit B – Docket Entry No. 2:

NOTICE OF MOTION AND VERIFIED MOTION TO DISMISS VOID ACTION (June 25, 2025): Motion demanding dismissal for lack of jurisdiction and simulated legal process.

3. Exhibit C – Docket Entry No. 3:

MOTION TO STRIKE FRAUDULENT PARTY SUBSTITUTION (June 25, 2025): Challenges fictitious “USA” substitution not present in original action.

4. Exhibit D – Docket Entry No. 4:

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES in support of Verified Motion to Dismiss and for Equitable Relief.

5. Exhibit E – Docket Entry No. 5:

REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE OF UNREBUTTED AFFIDAVITS in Equity and commercial law.

6. Exhibit F – Docket Entry No. 6:

NOTICE OF AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT OF VERIFIED MOTION TO DISMISS for lack of jurisdiction and simulated legal process.

7. Exhibit G – Docket Entry No. 7:

VERIFIED NOTICE OF FILING AFFIDAVIT re: fraud, injury, color of law violations, and deprivation of rights.

8. Exhibit H – Docket Entry No. 8:

VERIFIED REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE re: jurisdictional fraud and simulated legal process under color of law.

9. Exhibit I - Docket Entry No. 9:

VERIFIED AFFIDAVIT OF MATERIAL FACTS detailing commercial injury, trauma, and constitutional deprivation.

10. Exhibit J - Docket Entry No. 10:

NOTICE OF FILING EVIDENCE establishing fraud by purported plaintiff, commercial dishonor, lack of standing, and no corpus delicti.

11. Exhibit K - Docket Entry No. 11:

JULY 9, 2025 VOID ORDER by Judge Otis D. Wright II, unlawfully citing § 1455, dismissing and remanding without jurisdiction, and defaming Petitioner as “sovereign citizen.”

12. Exhibit L - Docket Entry No. 12:

TRANSMITTAL TO STATE COURT: Sends void remand order to Riverside County despite lack of lawful jurisdiction.

Filed on June 9, 2025, But Not Yet Docketed (Pending Clerk Entry)

13. Exhibit M - Docket Entry No. 13:

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.

14. Exhibit N - Docket Entry No. 15:

NOTICE OF AFFIDAVIT AND VERIFIED AFFIDAVIT OF FACT in support of Emergency Motion to Strike Void Order, affirming un rebutted facts, equity jurisdiction, and violations of constitutional rights.

15. Exhibit O - Docket Entry No. 14:

VERIFIED REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE in support of Emergency Motion to Strike and Vacate Void Order. Incorporates prior docketed and un rebutted evidence.

16. Exhibit P - Docket Entry No. 16:

VERIFIED NOTICE OF FEDERAL JURISDICTION, NOTICE TO CLERK, AND WARNING AGAINST UNLAWFUL REMAND OR DISMISSAL UNDER 28 U.S.C. §

1443(1) – objecting to fabricated procedural basis, asserting original civil removal, and demanding federal supremacy and due process protections.

17. Exhibit Q

July 10, 2025: **Void ab Initio and fraudulent** Order Striking Verified Jurisdictional Filings and Declaring Case Closed Despite Unresolved Jurisdictional Challenges.

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

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 10, 2025**, I served the within documents:

1. [VERIFIED EMERGENCY PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS TO STRIKE VOID ORDER, DISMISS VOID CASE FOR LACK OF JURISDICTION, AND ENFORCE FEDERAL CIVIL RIGHTS REMOVAL UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1443\(1\)](#)
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.

Otis D. Wright II
350 W. 1st Street
Los Angeles, California [90012]
ODW_Chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov

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 10, 2025** in Riverside County, California.

/s/Chris Yarbra/
Chris Yarbra

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 10th 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)

