

Kevin: Realworldfare (*formerly Kevin: Walker*), *sui juris*
C/o 30650 Rancho California Road # 406-251
Temecula, California [92591]
non-domestic without the United States
Email: team@walkernovagroup.com

*Plaintiff, Real Party In Interest, Secured Party,
Injured Party,*

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

™KEVIN WALKER© ESTATE, et al,
Plaintiff/Injured Party,
vs.

Jay Promisco, et al,
Defendants.

Case No. 5:25-cv-00339-JGB-DTB

**VERIFIED JUDICIAL NOTICE OF
FILING VERIFIED
CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGE
AND DEMAND FOR RESTORATION
OF ACCESS TO COURT UNDER
ARTICLE III, RULE 17, FIRST AND
FIFTH AMENDMENTS, AND 28
U.S.C. § 1654 — CHALLENGING
UNCONSTITUTIONAL POLICY
BARRING *SUI JURIS* ACCESS FOR
PRIVATE TRUST OR ESTATE —
WITH MEMORANDUM OF POINTS
AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT**

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

TO THE CLERK OF COURT, PRESIDING JUDGE(S), U.S. TRUSTEES, ALL
COUNSEL, COURT OFFICERS, FISCAL AGENTS, AND AGENTS OF THE
UNITED STATES:

COMES NOW Kevin: Realworldfare (*formerly Kevin: Walker*), a living man, the **Real
Party in Interest, Secured Party, Creditor, Fiduciary, Injured Party, and
Beneficiary**, proceeding *sui juris* and **not pro se**, appearing in his proper private

1 **and equitable capacity by *special limited appearance only***, without submission to
2 any foreign, commercial, administrative, or statutory jurisdiction. This verified
3 filing is made for the **sole and exclusive purpose** of enforcing perfected rights,
4 exposing jurisdictional fraud, and compelling immediate and lawful equitable
5 remedy on the un rebutted record.

6 This special appearance and verified motion are made under the **exclusive original**
7 **jurisdiction of equity**, invoking the **inherent powers of this Court under Article**
8 **III of the Constitution**, the **law of equity**, and **equity jurisprudence**, wherein
9 conscience, fairness, and maximum justice govern — not procedural traps or
10 fraudulent administrative fictions. No remedy at law is adequate. Only equity has
11 the jurisdiction, the power, and the mandate to act.

12 Kevin: Realworldfare explicitly rejects and rebuts any presumption of status as a
13 “U.S. citizen” under the 14th Amendment, individual, legal fiction, corporation,
14 vessel, transmitted utility, person, or other construct created under color of law.

15 There is **no valid contract**, **no meeting of the minds**, and **no lawful jurisdiction** by
16 which this Court, or any inferior court below, may impose adhesion, suretyship, or
17 agency without express, knowing, and voluntary consent.

18 This appearance and demand arise under the **law merchant**, **common law**,
19 **commercial right**, and the **maxims of equity**. It is **not** a plea for statutory remedy,
20 nor a request for administrative permission — it is a demand, in law and in fact, for
21 the enforcement of already perfected rights and the extinguishment of colorable
22 and unlawful judicial acts.

23 **All immunities and rights are expressly reserved** pursuant to:

- 24 • **UCC § 1-308** – reservation of rights,
- 25 • **UCC § 3-501** – presentment and protest,
- 26 • **Article I, § 10** – no law impairing obligation of contract,
- 27 • **42 U.S.C. § 1983** – for deprivation of rights under color of law,
- 28 • and the **organic law and maxims of equity**.

Kevin: Realworldfare (*formerly Kevin: Walker*), a living man, the **Real Party in Interest, Secured Party, Creditor, Fiduciary, Injured Party, Appellant, and Beneficiary**, proceeding *sui juris* and **not pro se**, appearing in his proper private and equitable capacity by *special limited appearance only*, without submission to any foreign, commercial, administrative, or statutory jurisdiction, hereby gives lawful, legal, constitutional, and commercial notice that the attached:

VERIFIED CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGE AND DEMAND FOR RESTORATION OF ACCESS TO COURT UNDER ARTICLE III, RULE 17, FIRST AND FIFTH AMENDMENTS, AND 28 U.S.C. § 1654 – CHALLENGING **UNCONSTITUTIONAL POLICY BARRING *SUI JURIS* ACCESS FOR PRIVATE TRUST OR ESTATE – with MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT**

has been formally lodged into the record and incorporated by reference into all proceedings, filings, dockets, and mandates associated with the above-captioned matter. This filing is not a request for permission, courtesy, or discretionary indulgence. It is a lawful, constitutionally secured **Demand for Redress and Enforcement**, brought under the Supreme Law of the Land pursuant to **Article VI, Clause 2 (Supremacy Clause)** of the United States Constitution, and supported by binding statutory authority, equitable standing, and inalienable rights. This record is entered with full commercial and constitutional liability by the real party in interest.

The attached **VERIFIED CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGE** is not speculative or rhetorical – it delivers **undisputed facts**, controlling federal law, and binding precedent establishing the following:

- **Standing, Capacity, and Jurisdiction** are fully vested under **Article III, Section 2** of the Constitution, which mandates that the **judicial power shall extend to all cases in law and equity**, especially those arising under the Constitution, treaties, or public trusts.
- **Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17(a)(1)** recognizes that an **executor, administrator, or trustee of an express trust** may sue in their own name as

the real party in interest, without joinder or license. No policy, rule, or local custom can override this federally protected status. See also **Navarro Savings Ass’n v. Lee**, 446 U.S. 458 (1980).

- The policy, order, or administrative practice barring access to the courts based solely on non-membership in the BAR is **repugnant, unconstitutional, and void ab initio**, violating:
 - **First Amendment** – Right to petition the Government for redress of grievances and freedom of association;
 - **Fifth Amendment** – Deprivation of life, liberty, or property without due process;
 - **Ninth Amendment** – Reservation of natural and unenumerated rights, including the right to self-representation and private contract enforcement;
 - **Tenth Amendment** – Reserved powers of the people, not delegated to federal actors or private licensing cartels;
 - **Article I, Section 10** – Absolute bar on any law impairing the obligation of contracts, including trusts, private estates, and conveyances.
- **28 U.S.C. § 1654** unambiguously provides: *“In all courts of the United States the parties may plead and conduct their own cases personally or by counsel.”* This federal statute contains **no carve-out**, exception, or limitation for trusts, estates, fiduciaries, or private Americans acting sui juris. It supersedes all court policies and administrative preferences under the **Supremacy Clause**.
- Any **mandate, dismissal, or denial of access** premised on a non-statutory, judge-made rule is **ultra vires, jurisdictionally void**, and constitutes **fraud upon the court**. There is **no discretion to violate the Constitution**, per **Marbury v. Madison**, 5 U.S. 137 (1803): *“A law repugnant to the Constitution is void.”*

- Any clerk, judge, trustee, or officer who obstructs, suppresses, or dishonors this filing becomes an accomplice to:
 - **Color-of-law retaliation and deprivation of rights**, in violation of **42 U.S.C. § 1983**;
 - **Conspiracy against rights**, under **18 U.S.C. § 241**;
 - **Willful deprivation under color of law**, under **18 U.S.C. § 242**.

This filing places the court, officers, and opposing parties on **non-discretionary notice**: continued obstruction, suppression, or denial of access to the real party in interest – **suing under Rule 17 and Article III jurisdiction** – will trigger **personal liability, criminal exposure, and full commercial enforcement**.

The Constitution is not optional.

The law is not advisory.

Due process is not a privilege of the BAR – it is the unalienable birthright of every American.

If this Court refuses to vacate its unconstitutional policy and restore access to justice, it will confirm itself as a lawless administrative body, acting in rebellion to the Republic. The undersigned reserves all rights for direct appeal to the **Supreme Court of the United States**, and for enforcement of remedies in law, equity, and commerce. Silence shall be taken as consent. Injustice will be treated as dishonor. Let the record reflect: **all parties have now been warned.**

II. VERIFIED NOTICE TO ALL PRINCIPALS AND AGENTS: LIABILITY NOW ATTACHES

Let this serve as **lawful, legal, and commercial notice** to all parties, officers, agents, agencies, public officials, trustees, and third-party beneficiaries, **without exception or exclusion**:

NOTICE TO AGENT IS NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL. NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL IS NOTICE TO AGENT.

1 This maxim of agency law is universally binding across all forums of equity,
2 commerce, contract, fiduciary duty, and trust law. It creates **immediate and**
3 **irrevocable legal consequences** across all tiers of authority, public or private, and
4 **nullifies all claims of immunity, ignorance, or delegated insulation** arising from
5 title, position, office, or corporate veil.

6 This notice is **hereby served upon and binds** – without limitation or
7 reservation – the following parties and all successors, assigns, and
8 beneficiaries thereof:

- 9 • **Clerks of Court** and all deputies, assistants, and staff acting under their
10 direction;
- 11 • **Judges, Magistrates, and Judicial Officers** at all levels of state and federal
12 jurisdiction;
- 13 • **United States Trustees, Regional Trustees, and all agents of the Executive**
14 **Office for U.S. Trustees (EOUST);**
- 15 • **Attorneys of Record**, any substitute, intervenor, or successor counsel or
16 legal personnel;
- 17 • **CRIS (Court Registry Investment System) custodians**, investment officers,
18 and financial intermediaries;
- 19 • **Bureau of the Fiscal Service (BFS)** officers, accountants, agents, and
20 disbursement personnel;
- 21 • **Court-Appointed Fiduciaries, Receivers, Administrators**, or other agents
22 of judicial delegation;
- 23 • **Bonding Agents, Insurance Carriers, and Risk Management Departments**
24 covering any public office or officer;
- 25 • **Department of the Treasury**, including **Financial Management Service,**
26 **Legal Division**, and any enforcement arms;
- 27 • **Federal Reserve Banks**, fiscal intermediaries, securities underwriters, and
28 custody or transfer agents;

- **All individuals or entities acting under color of law**, color of office, or administrative regulation.

LIABILITY NOW ATTACHES FOR THE FOLLOWING:

Any act, omission, suppression, obstruction, concealment, or failure to act in full compliance with this notice shall constitute knowing and willful dishonor, bad faith, and breach of duty, thereby triggering immediate and irrevocable liability – commercial, civil, equitable, and criminal – without limitation or need for further presentment:

- Obstruction, concealment, or tampering with filings or equitable claims;
- Impairment of contract in violation of **Article I, Section 10** of the U.S. Constitution;
- Denial of access to justice and self-representation rights under the **First and Fifth Amendments**;
- Attempted conversion or trespass upon **private trust res**, secured assets, or perfected commercial instruments;
- Breach of fiduciary or public trust, interference with private trust conveyances;
- Unlawful enforcement of policy in place of law, or denial of remedy under color of statute.

THIS IS CONSTRUCTIVE AND COMMERCIAL NOTICE:

This Verified Notice constitutes **actual, constructive, and commercial notice** to all parties named and unnamed, whether public or private, direct or indirect, acting officially or in concert. **No party may claim lack of notice, immunity, or delegated insulation.** All are now placed on notice of:

- **Equitable default**, if failure to respond with verified rebuttal;
- **Commercial dishonor**, if remedy is obstructed or delayed;
- **Prejudicial estoppel**, as no contrary facts are asserted on the record;
- **Binding liability**, for all agents and principals under **common law, equity, UCC, and trust law.**

1 **Silence is acquiescence. Acquiescence is agreement. Agreement under**
2 **commercial law is binding.**

3 *Qui tacet consentire videtur ubi loqui debuit.* — He who is silent when he ought
4 to have spoken is taken to agree.

5 **III. PRESERVATION OF RIGHTS AND FINAL DEMAND**

6 This filing is made **with all unalienable rights fully reserved, nunc pro tunc,**
7 **ab initio, under commercial, constitutional, and equitable authority.** No
8 waiver of rights is made by implication, omission, or silence. The
9 undersigned stands as the Real Party in Interest and Secured Party Creditor,
10 and hereby issues this final lawful demand and irrevocable notice of intent to
11 enforce the following:

- 12 • **Immediate relief under Rule 60(b)(4)** of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure
13 to **vacate any and all void ab initio orders** rendered without jurisdiction, due
14 process, or lawful authority, including any mandate issued in violation of
15 Article III, §2 and 28 U.S.C. §1654;
- 16 • **Declaratory and injunctive relief under 28 U.S.C. §§2201–2202** to establish
17 as a matter of law that no Article III court may condition access to justice
18 upon forced membership in a private bar guild, in contravention of the **First,**
19 **Fifth, Ninth, and Tenth Amendments;**
- 20 • **Civil rights enforcement and damages under 42 U.S.C. §1983,** and if
21 necessary, **§§1985–1986,** for deprivation of rights under color of law,
22 conspiracy to obstruct redress, and systemic retaliation against
23 constitutionally protected activity;
- 24 • **Commercial enforcement and remedy** for fiduciary breach, suppression of
25 filings, unlawful interference with private trust property, securities, or
26 commercial instruments, and obstruction of equity jurisdiction — pursuant to
27 the **Uniform Commercial Code, Public Trust Law, and fiduciary liability**
28 **doctrine;**

- **Criminal referral under 18 U.S.C. §§241, 242** for willful conspiracy and deprivation of rights under color of law, including unlawful suppression of due process, First Amendment access, and equity jurisdiction – each act constituting felony-level misconduct.

Any further obstruction, suppression, mischaracterization, or refusal to honor the verified record and rightful standing of the undersigned shall constitute a **knowing and intentional violation of civil rights, fiduciary fraud, and unlawful impersonation of judicial authority.**

The undersigned hereby declares that **all rights are preserved** in perpetuity **without prejudice (UCC 1-308)** and under full **commercial, constitutional, and personal liability.**

//

//

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**, 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 2nd day of August 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

Exhibit List / Evidence:

1. **Exhibit A:** UCC1 filing #2024385925-4.
2. **Exhibit B:** UCC1 filing #2024385935-1.
3. **Exhibit C:** UCC1 filing #2024402433-7.
4. **Exhibit D:** UCC1 filing #2024411182-7.
5. **Exhibit E:** GRANT DEED recorded in Official Records County of Riverside, DOC #2024-0291980, APN: 957-570-005, File No.: 37238 KH, where the private trust property is titled to 'WG Private Irrevocable Trust, dated Febraury 7, 2022.'
6. **Exhibit F:** Affidavit: Power of Attorney in Fact.
7. **Exhibit G:** DEED OF TRUST #0000000000788382476307152022.
8. **Exhibit H:** Library of Congress Certified Copy of *The Public Statutes at Large of the United States of America* from March 1933 to June 1934: House Joint Resolution 192 of June 5, 1933, Public Law 73-10.
9. **Exhibit I:** Contract Security Agreement #9589071052700983677494.
10. **Exhibit J:** Contract Security Agreement #EI948566806US.
11. **Exhibit K:** Contract Security Agreement #RF661592042US.
12. **Exhibit L:** Contract Security Agreement #RF661592201US/ Affidavit Certificate of Dishonor, Non-response, **DEFAULT**, JUDGEMENT, and **LIEN AUTHORIZATION**, #RF661592201US.
13. **Exhibit M:** Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit L.
14. **Exhibit N:** Contract Security Agreement #RF661592802US.
15. **Exhibit O:** Form 3811 corresponding to Exhibit N.
16. **Exhibit P:** INVOICE/TRUE BILL #SIERRPHHDISHONOR13.
17. **Exhibit Q:** Registered BILL OF EXCHANGE #RF661591285US.
18. **Exhibit R:** LETTER OF CREDIT, #RF661591308US.
19. **Exhibit S:** Private Post Registered (with U.S. Treasury) \$200,000,000,000.00 USD 'MASTER DISCHARGE AND BOND,' #RF372320890US.
20. **Exhibit T:** 2022 form 1099-A, for \$669,595.

- 1 21. **Exhibit U:** 2022 form 1099-C, for \$669,595.
- 2 22. **Exhibit V:** 2022 form 1099-OID, for \$669,595.
- 3 23. **Exhibit W:** 2022 form 1099-A, for \$647,200.
- 4 24. **Exhibit X:** 2022 form 1099-C, for \$647,200.
- 5 25. **Exhibit Y:** 2022 form 1099-OID, for \$647,200
- 6 26. **Exhibit Z:** 2024 form 1099-A, for \$700,000.
- 7 27. **Exhibit AA:** 2024 form 1099-OID, for \$700,000
- 8 28. **Exhibit BB:** \$1,023,416.35 face value 'BUYER'S FINAL SETTLEMENT STATEMENT.'
- 9 29. **Exhibit CC:** Signed copy of the 'Affidavit of WALKER TODD.
- 10 30. **Exhibit DD:** NOTE #000+1365377+9+1-3 DATED JULY 15, 2022.
- 11 31. **Exhibit EE:** PASSPORT #A39235161 (this DOCUMENT *unequivocally* evidences and
12 demonstrates that the holder is a '**national**).
- 13 32. **Exhibit FF:** Copy of 4 ATTORNEY & CLIENT 7 C.J.S. and 2-3 ATTORNEY & CLIENT 7
14 C.J.S. (DEFENDANTS are wards of the court: 18 USC 8).
- 15 33. **Exhibit EE:** PASSPORT #A39235161 (this DOCUMENT *unequivocally* evidences and
16 demonstrates that the holder is a '**national**).
- 17 34. **Exhibit FF:** Copy of 4 ATTORNEY & CLIENT 7 C.J.S. and 2-3 ATTORNEY & CLIENT 7
18 C.J.S. (DEFENDANTS are wards of the court: 18 USC 8).
- 19 35. **Exhibit GG:** Service of 'VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR FRAUD, BREACH OF
20 CONTRACT, QUIET TITLE, RACKETEERING, and SUMMARY JUDGEMENT AS A
21 MATTER OF LAW', via email on **December 18, 2024 at 7:07pm.**
- 22 36. **Exhibit HH:** Service of [AMENDED] VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR FRAUD, BREACH
23 OF CONTRACT, QUIET TITLE, RACKETEERING, and SUMMARY JUDGEMENT AS
24 A MATTER OF LAW', via email on **January 10, 2025 at 7:07pm.**
- 25 37. **Exhibit II:** USPS form 3811 for Service of, 'VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR FRAUD,
26 BREACH OF CONTRACT, QUIET TITLE, RACKETEERING, and SUMMARY
27 JUDGEMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW', via Registered Mail #RF775820935US.
- 28 38. **Exhibit JJ:** USPS form 3811 for Service of, '[AMENDED] VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR

FRAUD, BREACH OF CONTRACT, QUIET TITLE, RACKETEERING, and SUMMARY JUDGEMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW', via Registered Mail #RF775821746US

39. **Exhibit KK:** Email sent to Plaintiffs by **Joseph Moran** on **December 14, 2023 at 7:50am**, instructing all Defendants *dishonorably* ignore Plaintiffs, *silently acquiesce*, and tacitly agree.

40. **Exhibit LL:** USPS Form 3811 corresponding to **Registered Mail #RF775821074US**, which evidences Respondents/Defendants have **unequivocally received** Plaintiffs' / Real Party in Interest's filings, confirming proper service and delivery.

41. **Exhibit MM:** USPS Form 3811 corresponding to **Express Mail #ER126149761US**, which evidences Respondents/Defendants have **unequivocally received** Plaintiffs' / Real Party in Interest's filings, confirming proper service and delivery.

42. **Exhibit NN:** PLAINTIFFS' **DEMAND** [MOTION] FOR CRIMINAL REFERRAL AND PROSECUTION OF DEFENDANTS, SANCTIONS, **DEMAND** [MOTION] FOR DEFAULT AND SUMMARY JUDGMENT IN PLAINTIFFS' FAVOR AS A MATTER OF LAW WITHOUT HEARING.

43. **Exhibit OO:** NOTICE OF FILING OF **VERIFIED AFFIDAVIT** IN SUPPORT OF THE PLAINTIFFS' **VERIFIED DEMAND** FOR CRIMINAL REFERRAL AND PROSECUTION OF DEFENDANTS, SANCTIONS, AND **VERIFIED DEMAND** FOR DEFAULT AND SUMMARY JUDGMENT IN PLAINTIFFS' FAVOR AS A MATTER OF LAW WITHOUT HEARING.

44. **Exhibit PP:** **VERIFIED AFFIDAVIT** IN SUPPORT OF THE PLAINTIFFS' **VERIFIED DEMAND** FOR CRIMINAL REFERRAL AND PROSECUTION OF DEFENDANTS, SANCTIONS, AND **VERIFIED DEMAND** FOR DEFAULT AND SUMMARY JUDGMENT IN PLAINTIFFS' FAVOR AS A MATTER OF LAW WITHOUT HEARING.

45. **Exhibit QQ:** PLAINTIFFS' **DECLINE** OF CONSENT TO BE HEARD BY A 'MAGISTRATE JUDGE' AND DEMAND FOR AN ARTICLE III JUDGE.

46. **Exhibit RR:** **DECLINED** NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO A U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

AND DECLINATION OF CONSENT.

47. **Exhibit SS:** A copy of the **American Bar Association's** official website affirming the validity of a **'power of attorney'**.

48. **Exhibit TT:** A copy of **Rule 8.4 of the Bar Association**, which clearly outlines the prohibition of dishonesty, fraud, deceit, and misrepresentation.

49. **Exhibit UU:** PLAINTIFFS' VERIFIED *CONDITIONAL* ACCEPTANCE OF DEFENDANT PHH MORTGAGES' NOTICE OF MOTION, MOTION TO DISMISS AND PLAINTIFFS' VERIFIED DEMAND FOR CRIMINAL ENFORCEMENT, SANCTIONS, AND PLAINTIFFS' VERIFIED DEMAND FOR DEFAULT AND SUMMARY JUDGMENT, AS A MATTER OF LAW, *WITHOUT* HEARING. – Delivered via Register Mail #[RF775822959US](#).

50. **Exhibit VV: PLAINTIFFS' VERIFIED NOTICE OF JUDICIAL FRAUD, CONSPIRACY, DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER COLOR OF LAW, VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS, AND WAR AGAINST THE CONSTITUTION AND THE PEOPLE.** —
Delivered via Register Mail #[RF775823058US](#).

51. **Exhibit WW:** Signed Form 3811 for USPS Registered Mail confirmation of delivery of Exhibit UU.

52. **Exhibit XX:** USPS Registered Mail confirmation of delivery of Exhibit VV.

53. **Exhibit YY:** VERIFIED AFFIDAVIT OF CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY, SUPREMACY CLAUSE, AMERICAN SOVEREIGNTY, NATIONAL/NON-CITIZEN NATIONAL STATUS, ESTATE CLAIM, AND REBUTTAL OF LEGAL PRESUMPTIONS. Delivered via **Registered Mail** #[RF775823013US](#), and a copy of the respective form 3811 confirming delivery is attached hereto as **Exhibit** .

54. **Exhibit ZZ:** USPS Registered Mail confirmation of delivery of Exhibit YY.

55. **Exhibit AAA: VERIFIED CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGE** AND DEMAND FOR RESTORATION OF ACCESS TO COURT UNDER **ARTICLE III, RULE 17, FIRST** AND **FIFTH AMENDMENTS**, AND **28 U.S.C. § 1654** – CHALLENGING **UNCONSTITUTIONAL POLICY BARRING *SUI JURIS*** ACCESS FOR **PRIVATE TRUST OR ESTATE** – with MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT

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 **August 2, 2025**, I served the within documents:

1. VERIFIED **JUDICIAL NOTICE** OF FILING VERIFIED **CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGE** AND DEMAND FOR RESTORATION OF ACCESS TO COURT UNDER **ARTICLE III, RULE 17, FIRST AND FIFTH AMENDMENTS**, AND **28 U.S.C. § 1654** – CHALLENGING **UNCONSTITUTIONAL POLICY BARRING SUI JURIS** ACCESS FOR **PRIVATE TRUST OR ESTATE** – WITH MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT

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

Jay Promisco, James E. Coffrini, Joseph Moran, Christian Gault, Amir Sabet, Amanda Coffrini, John Goulding, Brian Mcginley, Virginia Erbes, Corey Moore, Drew Fuerstenberg
C/o SIERRA PACIFIC MORTGAGE COMPANY INC / GREENHEAD INVESTMENTS
950 Glenn Drive, suite #150
Folsom, California [95630]

Eric D Houser (SBN 130079), Neil J. Copper (SBN 277997)
C/o HOUSER LLP
9970 Research Drive
Irvine, California [92618]

Susanne M. Nicholson, Daniel J. Foster
C/o WILKE FLEURY LLP
621 Capital Mall, suite 900
Sacramento, California [95814]

Paul Gustafson,
C/o PHH MORTGAGE CORPORATION dba PHH MORTGAGE SERVICES,
OWEN FINANCIAL CORPORATION.
3000 Leadenhall Road
Mount Laurel, New Jersey [08054]

Devin Ormonde,
C/o PRIME RECON LLC
27368 Via Industria, Suite 201
Temecula, California [92590]

On **August 2, 2025**, I served the within documents 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.

Pam Bondi, Agent(s), Fiduciary(ies)
C/o OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, North West
Washington, District of Colombia [20530-0001]
crm.section@usdoj.gov

Rob Bonta
C/o OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
1300 "I" Street
Sacramento, California [95814-2919]
Police-Practices@doj.ca.gov
PIU.PIU@doj.ca.gov

Jay Promisco, James E. Coffrini, Joseph Moran, Christian Gault, Amir Sabet, Amanda Coffrini, John Goulding, Brian Mcginley, Virginia Erbes, Corey Moore, Drew Fuerstenberger
C/o SIERRA PACIFIC MORTGAGE COMPANY INC / GREENHEAD INVESTMENTS
950 Glenn Drive, suite #150
Folsom, California [95630]
amir.sabet@spmc.com
joseph.moran@spmc.com
loanservicingqueue@spmc.com
christian.gault@spmc.com

amanda.coffrini@spmc.com
john.goulding@spmc.com
brian.mcginley@spmc.com
virginia.erbes@spmc.com
corey.moore@spmc.com
drew.fuerstenberger@spmc.com

Eric D Houser (SBN 130079), Neil J. Copper (SBN 277997)
C/o HOUSER LLP
9970 Research Drive
Irvine, California [92618]
ncooper@houser-law.com
dfoster@wilkefleury.com
snicholson@wilkefleury.com

Susanne M. Nicholson, Daniel J. Foster
C/o WILKE FLEURY LLP
621 Capital Mall, suite 900
Sacramento, California [95814]
dfoster@wilkefleury.com
snicholson@wilkefleury.com

Paul Gustafson,
C/o PHH MORTGAGE CORPORATION dba PHH MORTGAGE SERVICES,
OWEN FINANCIAL CORPORATION.
3000 Leadenhall Road
Mount Laurel, New Jersey [08054]
relationshipmanager@mortgagefamily.com

Devin Ormonde, Fiduciary(ies)
C/o PRIME RECON LLC
27368 Via Industria, Suite 201
Temecula, California [92590]
joseph.moran@spmc.com

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California
that the above is true and correct. Executed on **August 2, 2025** in Riverside County,
California.

/s/Chris Yarbba/
Chris Yarbba

-Exhibit AAA-

Kevin: Realworldfare, *sui juris*
C/o 30650 Rancho California Road # 406-251
Temecula, California [92591]
non-domestic without the United States
Email: team@walkernovagroup.com

*Plaintiff, Real Party In Interest, Secured Party,
Injured Party, Appellant*

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

™KEVIN WALKER© ESTATE, et al,
Appellant/Plaintiff/Injured Party,
vs.

Jay Promisco, et al,
Defendants-Appellees.

Case No. 25-2475

**VERIFIED CONSTITUTIONAL
CHALLENGE AND DEMAND FOR
RESTORATION OF ACCESS TO
COURT UNDER ARTICLE III, RULE 17,
FIRST AND FIFTH AMENDMENTS,
AND 28 U.S.C. § 1654 —
CHALLENGING
UNCONSTITUTIONAL POLICY
BARRING *SUI JURIS* ACCESS FOR
PRIVATE TRUST OR ESTATE — WITH
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT**

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

TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES, AND COUNSEL OF RECORD:

COMES NOW Kevin: Realworldfare, a living man, the **Real Party in Interest,**
Secured Party, Creditor, Fiduciary, Injured Party, Appellant, and Beneficiary,
proceeding *sui juris* and **not pro se**, appearing **in his proper private and equitable**
capacity by special limited appearance only, without submission to any foreign,
commercial, administrative, or statutory jurisdiction. This verified filing is made for

1 the **sole and exclusive purpose** of enforcing perfected rights, exposing
2 jurisdictional fraud, and compelling immediate and lawful equitable remedy on the
3 un rebutted record.

4 This special appearance and verified motion are made under the **exclusive original**
5 **jurisdiction of equity**, invoking the **inherent powers of this Court under Article**
6 **III of the Constitution**, the **law of equity**, and **equity jurisprudence**, wherein
7 conscience, fairness, and maximum justice govern — not procedural traps or
8 fraudulent administrative fictions. No remedy at law is adequate. Only equity has
9 the jurisdiction, the power, and the mandate to act.

10 Kevin: Realworldfare explicitly rejects and rebuts any presumption of status as a
11 “U.S. citizen” under the 14th Amendment, individual, legal fiction, corporation,
12 vessel, transmitted utility, person, or other construct created under color of law.

13 There is **no valid contract**, **no meeting of the minds**, and **no lawful jurisdiction** by
14 which this Court, or any inferior court below, may impose adhesion, suretyship, or
15 agency without express, knowing, and voluntary consent.

16 This appearance and demand arise under the **law merchant**, **common law**,
17 **commercial right**, and the **maxims of equity**. It is **not** a plea for statutory remedy,
18 nor a request for administrative permission — it is a demand, in law and in fact, for
19 the enforcement of already perfected rights and the extinguishment of colorable
20 and unlawful judicial acts.

21 **All immunities and rights are expressly reserved** pursuant to:

- 22 • **UCC § 1-308** – reservation of rights,
- 23 • **UCC § 3-501** – presentment and protest,
- 24 • **Article I, § 10** – no law impairing obligation of contract,
- 25 • **42 U.S.C. § 1983** – for deprivation of rights under color of law,
- 26 • and the **organic law and maxims of equity**.

27 This Court has original supervisory and equitable jurisdiction under:

- 28 • **Article III, § 2** of the Constitution,

- 1 • **28 U.S.C. § 1651 (All Writs Act),**
- 2 • and **Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 21 and 27.**

3 Pursuant to **Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 27**, Kevin: Realworldfare, a living
4 man, the **Real Party in Interest, Secured Party, Creditor, Fiduciary, Injured Party,**
5 **and Beneficiary**, proceeding *sui juris* and **not pro se**, appearing in his proper
6 **private and equitable capacity** by *special limited appearance only*, files this
7 **Verified Constitutional Challenge** to the Court's administrative or judicial policy
8 that bars access to the appellate docket unless a licensed member of the Bar appears
9 on behalf of a private trust or estate. Said policy is unconstitutional on its face and
10 as applied, violating the First and Fifth Amendments, Article III of the Constitution,
11 and 28 U.S.C. § 1654, and must be voided and corrected on the record without
12 further delay.

13 **I. JURISDICTIONAL BASIS FOR MOTION UNDER RULE 27,** 14 **ARTICLE III, AND FEDERAL LAW**

15 This Motion is properly and necessarily brought pursuant to **Federal Rule of**
16 **Appellate Procedure 27, Article III, Section 2** of the United States Constitution,
17 and **28 U.S.C. §§ 1291 and 1654**. Appellant invokes this Court's original and
18 ongoing jurisdiction to correct a **void, ultra vires mandate** issued in the absence of
19 lawful authority and in direct violation of binding constitutional and statutory
20 protections.

21 **A. Constitutional Jurisdiction – Article III, Section 2**

22 The Constitution mandates that the **judicial power of the United States shall**
23 **extend to all cases in law and equity arising under this Constitution, the laws of**
24 **the United States, and to controversies to which the United States shall be a**
25 **party**. This case arises under multiple constitutional provisions – **Amendments I**
26 **and V, Article I, Section 10, and Article VI, Clause 2** – and cannot be dismissed or
27 bypassed by internal court policy or administrative fiat.

28 **B. Statutory Jurisdiction – 28 U.S.C. §§ 1291 and 1654**

Jurisdiction over this appeal is vested under **28 U.S.C. § 1291**, as it involves a final order that unlawfully dismissed a matter involving perfected commercial claims, un rebutted affidavits, and equitable trust enforcement. Moreover, **28 U.S.C. § 1654** guarantees that “**in all courts of the United States the parties may plead and conduct their own cases personally or by counsel.**” This statutory right is absolute, self-executing, and overrides any internal rule, clerk practice, or licensing restriction imposed without express congressional authorization.

C. Procedural Basis – Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 27

Pursuant to **Rule 27**, this Motion for reinstatement, vacatur, and correction of record is timely and procedurally valid. It seeks no new appeal, but rather demands immediate correction of an unlawful act committed **without jurisdiction** – the issuance of a mandate or dismissal **based solely on a private man’s refusal to retain licensed BAR representation**, despite being the real party in interest, secured party, and fiduciary of a private trust.

D. Void Mandate – Denial of Constitutional Right

The dismissal or mandate issued by this Court was not merely erroneous – it was **void ab initio**. It was entered **sua sponte**, without hearing, and **not based on any failure to prosecute, jurisdictional defect, or procedural rule**. Instead, it denied Appellant’s right to be heard based on a **policy that unlawfully demands licensed legal representation for private trust enforcement**, despite clear and binding authority to the contrary.

Such a denial violates fundamental rights secured by the Constitution and amounts to a structural jurisdictional defect. Courts cannot condition access to justice on the retention of a third-party agent or attorney where a man has standing, interest, and lawful capacity to proceed under the law.

Accordingly, this Court has **both the jurisdiction and the non-discretionary duty** to vacate the void mandate, reinstate the appeal, and allow the matter to proceed under constitutional and statutory authority, not administrative overreach.

II. STATEMENT OF ISSUES FOR RECONSIDERATION AND CLARIFICATION

The following issues are not requests for review — they are constitutional thresholds this Court is obligated to address under **Article III, Amendments I and V, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17**, and **28 U.S.C. §§ 1291 and 1654**. Failure to resolve these issues constitutes continued fraud upon the court, procedural treason, and structural denial of due process. These are not abstract legal theories — they are direct constitutional violations impacting fundamental access to justice.

- 1. Whether a private living man, acting in his original, fiduciary, and equitable capacity as secured party and executor of a private express trust, may be lawfully barred from prosecuting or defending his own rights solely because he refuses to retain BAR-licensed counsel.**
Implication: Violates **28 U.S.C. § 1654, Rule 17(a)(1)(E)** (real party in interest may sue in their own name), **Article III, Section 2**, and the **First Amendment's** guarantee of access to the courts and redress without compelled association or economic coercion.
- 2. Whether this Court can lawfully issue a mandate, dismissal, or refusal to adjudicate based entirely on internal clerk policy or judicial practice that contradicts binding federal law, where no constitutional defect, no procedural waiver, and no jurisdictional deficiency exists.**
Implication: Such action constitutes **fraud under color of law**, violates the **Supremacy Clause (Article VI, Clause 2)**, and constitutes an **ultra vires** act outside the scope of judicial authority.
- 3. Whether the unqualified right to self-representation — upheld in *Faretta v. California*, 422 U.S. 806 (1975), *Bounds v. Smith*, 430 U.S. 817 (1977), and *Boddie v. Connecticut*, 401 U.S. 371 (1971) — may be arbitrarily denied where the party asserting that right is the real party in interest, without seeking to represent any third party or separate legal person.**

1 **Implication:** Denial constitutes a **structural due process violation** under the
2 **Fifth Amendment**, and **discriminatory application** of procedural policy in
3 violation of **equal protection principles** embedded in constitutional due
4 process.

5 **4. Whether an Article III court has lawful authority to suppress filings,**
6 **disregard un rebutted affidavits, and dismiss a matter without hearing, due**
7 **process, or adjudication, based solely on a party's lawful refusal to**
8 **participate in a licensed legal monopoly.**

9 **Implication:** Such conduct is a **fraud upon the court**, a **trespass upon**
10 **constitutional jurisdiction**, and a **deprivation of rights** under 18 U.S.C. §§
11 **241, 242, and 42 U.S.C. § 1983.**

12 **5. Whether this Court, once placed on verified notice of jurisdictional fraud,**
13 **administrative obstruction, and unconstitutional policy enforcement, is**
14 **under a mandatory obligation to vacate its void actions and reinstate the**
15 **appeal as a matter of right – not discretion.**

16 **Implication:** The **Constitution** does not allow the judiciary to operate
17 selectively. **Denial of fundamental rights after notice** constitutes willful
18 complicity in **color-of-law violations** and destroys all presumptions of
19 **judicial impartiality.**

20 **Rule 17**, in particular, confirms that the **real party in interest** – which
21 includes an individual “authorized by statute or contract to sue in their own
22 name” (Rule 17(a)(1)(E)) – **may bring suit directly** without interference or
23 obstruction by court-created licensing mandates. When acting in a **fiduciary**
24 **or executor capacity**, the undersigned is enforcing trust rights in law and
25 equity, a role historically recognized at common law and explicitly preserved
26 under federal rules and statutes. The Court has no lawful discretion to
27 disregard or rewrite the real-party-in-interest doctrine simply to appease
28 institutional preference or BAR exclusivity

III. VERIFIED FACTUAL BACKGROUND

1. Appellant, **Kevin: Realworldfare**, is a living man proceeding *sui juris*, and serves as the duly appointed **fiduciary, secured party, executor, and real party in interest** for the *™Kevin Walker© Irrevocable Trust* and *™Kevin Walker© Estate*, among other private, non-statutory, non-corporate, and non-BAR-controlled conveyances. Said trust and estate are private entities governed under **common law, contract law, and commercial law**, perfected by **lawful trust indenture**, and not subject to statutory jurisdiction or incorporation.
2. Appellant lawfully initiated and prosecuted this appeal in his private capacity to vindicate **secured, equitable, and contractual interests**, enforce **private conveyances of title**, and challenge ongoing **jurisdictional trespass, constructive fraud, and civil rights violations** perpetrated under **color of law** by both private actors and government officers. These efforts were preceded by **unrebutted affidavits**, perfected **UCC-1 Financing Statements**, lawful **commercial tenders**, and valid notices served in strict compliance with federal and commercial law.
3. Despite total procedural conformity, this Court — either by **administrative policy, local rule, or sua sponte ultra vires action** — **unlawfully dismissed** the appeal and **refused to docket** Appellant's verified filings **solely** because the trust or estate was not "represented" by a **BAR-licensed attorney**. No hearing was held. No judicial review of the unrebutted affidavits or instruments occurred. The dismissal was not based on law, standing, or jurisdictional defect, but on an unconstitutional presumption that **only licensed agents of the state may access the courts**, even where **constitutional and statutory rights** expressly say otherwise.
4. Appellant was not acting as an agent or third-party on behalf of another "person." He appeared **strictly in his capacity as the real party in interest** (pursuant to **Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17(a)(1)(E)**) to protect vested

rights under a **private trust**— not as an attorney or legal surrogate. Rule 17 explicitly authorizes fiduciaries, executors, trustees, and similar representatives to **bring and prosecute claims in their own name** on behalf of the interest they control, without the need for a licensed intermediary. His standing is **original, not derivative; secured, not speculative**; and grounded in **law, contract, and equity**.

5. Further, under 28 U.S.C. § 1654, "**in all courts of the United States the parties may plead and conduct their own cases personally or by counsel.**" This statute is absolute. It contains **no carve-out**, exception, or limitation for fiduciaries, executors, private trusts, or equity claimants. There is **no judicial discretion** to rewrite this Congressional mandate to suit administrative convenience or BAR cartel preferences.
6. Appellant's rights to access this Court and seek redress are protected by the **First Amendment** (right to petition), the **Fifth Amendment** (due process and equal protection), the **Ninth and Tenth Amendments** (preserved and reserved rights), and **Article III, Section 2**, which mandates that the judicial power shall extend to "**all Cases, in Law and Equity.**" Denial of these rights—based solely on policy or refusal to use BAR agents—constitutes a **structural due process violation**, an **unconstitutional prior restraint**, and a **repugnant impairment** of the obligation of contract under **Article I, Section 10**.
7. The trust and estate are **not artificial entities**, corporations, or juridical fictions, but private property conveyances controlled exclusively by the Appellant. As such, Appellant, in his capacity as **fiduciary and injured party**, possesses full authority, capacity, and standing to assert all claims directly, invoke this Court's **Article III jurisdiction**, and demand constitutional relief without forced surrender of his autonomy to a state-sanctioned intermediary. The **procedural dismissal** for "lack of representation" is therefore **unconstitutional, void ab initio**, and constitutes a **non-discretionary violation** of the Supreme Law of the Land under **Article VI, Clause 2**.

IV. CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS

A. First Amendment – Weaponized Denial of the Right to Petition for Redress

The First Amendment explicitly prohibits government actors—judicial or otherwise—from obstructing the right to petition for redress of grievances. Denying a living man access to a public tribunal based solely on his refusal to hire a private BAR-member mercenary is not only unconstitutional—it is a form of compelled association, economic coercion, and procedural racketeering. The judiciary cannot force the citizenry to purchase access to justice from a licensed cartel to be heard on matters of equity, injury, and fundamental rights. Such denial constitutes content-based suppression of protected expressive and petitioning activity and is presumptively unconstitutional.

B. Fifth Amendment – Due Process Eviscerated, Equal Protection Discarded

The arbitrary exclusion of Appellant from judicial remedy—on the sole basis that he acts in private fiduciary capacity for a non-corporate trust—violates both **procedural** and **substantive** due process. There exists **no lawful or rational basis** to treat a trust fiduciary differently from a sole proprietor, executor, or other private party appearing to protect real and equitable interests. This distinction is a legal fiction invented by clerks, not law. The Fifth Amendment guarantees **equal protection and access**, not tiered justice based on titles, licenses, or corporate privileges. This is legal apartheid under the guise of policy.

C. Article III – Jurisdictional Sabotage by Judicial Officers

Article III of the Constitution imposes a mandatory duty upon federal courts to adjudicate all legitimate cases and controversies properly before them. It does **not** authorize clerks or lower judges to refuse entry based on internal policies, administrative protocols, or arbitrary gatekeeping. Refusing to hear the claims of an injured party based solely on his rejection of licensed third-party representation is a clear **usurpation of jurisdiction, a violation of the case-or-controversy clause, and a dereliction of constitutional duty.** The court exists to hear the people—not to

1 protect its own gatekeepers. The moment it refuses, it ceases to function as an
2 Article III tribunal and becomes an administrative fraud machine.

3 **D. 28 U.S.C. § 1654 – Absolute and Unqualified Right to Appear Personally**

4 Congress has codified the right of parties to conduct their own cases in **all courts of**
5 **the United States** without interference:

6 “In all courts of the United States the parties may plead and conduct their own
7 cases personally or by counsel...”

8 There is **no statutory exception** for fiduciaries of private trusts – nor any grant of
9 authority allowing courts to override this right with judicial policy, clerk practices,
10 or unratified procedural traps. Appellant is the secured party, injured party, and
11 real party in interest. He is not a “third-party representative” of some alien entity,
12 but the living man enforcing lawful rights under a private trust contract. The
13 court’s refusal to recognize this is not only unlawful – it is a direct violation of
14 federal statute and a willful obstruction of justice under color of law.

15 **V. LEGAL DISTINCTIONS AND CONSTITUTIONAL CLARIFICATIONS**

16 A **private express trust** is not a corporate entity, statutory franchise, or juridical
17 fiction. It is a **private contract** between living men and women, lawfully established
18 and conveyed for the management and protection of property rights. It derives its
19 authority from the **law of contracts**, not legislative code, and is protected by the
20 Constitution – specifically [Article I, Section 10](#), which forbids any State from
21 impairing the obligation of contracts. No corporate law, no judicially-invented
22 procedural barrier, and no **BAR-created monopoly** has authority over private trust
23 conveyances or their equitable enforcement.

24 **The estate in question has no legal standing, will, or capacity apart from the living**
25 **executor or beneficiary. It is not a “person” – it is a res. The only party capable of**
26 **speaking for it is the living man lawfully holding fiduciary title. To suggest otherwise**
27 **– that a private man must hire a licensed agent to defend his own trust property – is**
28 **a fraudulent fabrication with no constitutional, statutory, or judicial foundation.**

1 Appellant is **not** engaged in “representation” of any separate legal person,
2 corporate entity, or third party. He is operating in his **original, secured, equitable**
3 **capacity** as the **fiduciary, beneficiary, and real party in interest**. He is defending
4 **his own private rights and property**, which requires **no license, no BAR**
5 **affiliation, and no third-party interference**. This is not legal representation — it is
6 **sovereign execution of vested rights** under private contract and trust law.
7 There exists **no statute, no rule, and no controlling precedent — federal or state —**
8 **that lawfully authorizes a court to bar a man from defending his own equitable**
9 **title or trust property**. Any such denial is not judicial — it is **administrative**
10 **obstruction, policy masquerading as law, and fraud under color of authority**. It
11 violates the separation of powers, the Contracts Clause of Article I, Section 10, the
12 Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment, and the First Amendment right to
13 petition for redress.
14 The [United States Supreme Court](#) has repeatedly and unequivocally affirmed the
15 **unqualified right to self-representation** in *Faretta v. California*, 422 U.S. 806 (1975);
16 *Bounds v. Smith*, 430 U.S. 817 (1977); and *Boddie v. Connecticut*, 401 U.S. 371 (1971).
17 These decisions affirm that **access to justice cannot be conditioned on the**
18 **retention of counsel**, and that **a man has a fundamental right to be heard on his**
19 **own behalf**, especially where property and liberty interests are at stake.
20 **The practice of conditioning court access on BAR membership is a monopolistic**
21 **protection racket** — a modern legal caste system that unlawfully converts the right to be
22 heard into a purchasable privilege. It is **repugnant to the Constitution**, incompatible
23 with the principles of equity, and wholly offensive to any tribunal claiming to operate
24 under the laws of this Republic. It replaces **lawful remedy with administrative**
25 **coercion**, substitutes **equity with exclusion**, and perverts **justice into procedure**.
26 **No Article III court** operating under the Constitution has the authority to deny a
27 man access to remedy on the basis of a **self-serving fiction that his private trust is**
28 **a legal person requiring third-party counsel**. The law demands truth, not fiction;

equity, not fraud; and justice, not silence. The denial at issue here is not merely erroneous — it is **void ab initio**, and must be reversed with prejudice.

VI. CONSEQUENCES OF DENIAL, DISHONOR, OR NONCOMPLIANCE

Let the record reflect: any refusal, obstruction, or failure by this Court — or any officer, agent, or administrator thereof — to honor and immediately execute the above demands shall constitute **willful dishonor, color-of-law fraud**, and **malicious deprivation of rights**, triggering both immediate and long-term consequences across constitutional, statutory, and commercial dimensions.

A. Constitutional Liability (Color of Law Violations)

Denial of access to the courts, obstruction of appeal, or refusal to reinstate a rightfully filed action based solely on bar-licensing policy constitutes:

- **A direct violation of the First Amendment** (right to petition the government for redress),
- **A deprivation of due process under the Fifth Amendment**, and
- **A denial of equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment**, if disparate treatment results from arbitrary application of procedural rules.

Such acts invoke civil and criminal liability under:

- **42 U.S.C. § 1983** – Civil liability for deprivation of rights under color of law;
- **18 U.S.C. § 242** – Criminal deprivation of rights under color of law;
- **18 U.S.C. § 241** – Conspiracy to interfere with constitutionally protected rights.

Judges, clerks, and officers do **not have immunity** when acting **outside their jurisdiction**, in **clear absence of all lawful authority**, or in **deliberate violation of well-settled constitutional rights**.

B. Ultra Vires Acts and Judicial Disqualification

Any continued action taken in contradiction of the verified demands herein shall be deemed **ultra vires**, null and void from inception. The issuance of any order, mandate, or denial after proper notice and demand may constitute:

- 1 • **Judicial misconduct** under Article III,
- 2 • **Disqualification under 28 U.S.C. § 455** and § 144,
- 3 • **Structural due process violations** that void all resulting rulings (*Caperton v.*
4 *A.T. Massey Coal Co.*, 556 U.S. 868 (2009)).

5 Such misconduct may be referred to:

- 6 • The **Judicial Council for disciplinary review**,
- 7 • The **Department of Justice for prosecution under Title 18**, and
- 8 • Public or congressional oversight bodies, depending on scope and
9 impact.

10 **C. Commercial and Equitable Consequences**

11 This proceeding is founded upon perfected claims, un rebutted affidavits, and
12 binding commercial instruments. Dishonor by silence, evasion, or procedural
13 trickery shall constitute:

- 14 • **Commercial default and estoppel by acquiescence**,
- 15 • **Breach of fiduciary and judicial duty**, and
- 16 • **Unlawful conversion and trespass upon secured property** under the
17 Uniform Commercial Code (see UCC §§ 1-201, 3-305, 9-609).

18 As secured party and real party in interest, Appellant reserves the right to:

- 19 • Record a **commercial lien** for damages,
- 20 • File claims against **official bonds**,
- 21 • Initiate **federal tort and constitutional damage actions**, and
- 22 • Pursue **removal or disqualification** of any officer or agent obstructing the
23 lawful exercise of rights.

24 **D. Preservation of Legal and Equitable Remedies**

25 If this Court continues to operate in fraud, concealment, or willful disregard of
26 these verified demands, all legal and equitable presumptions of judicial integrity
27 are **rebutted**. Appellant will proceed to:

- 28 • Initiate a **Petition for Writ of Mandamus** under 28 U.S.C. § 1651,

- File for **emergency injunctive relief** in an Article III tribunal,
- Notify bonding agencies and oversight bodies of actionable misconduct,
- And take any and all lawful actions necessary to remedy the injury.

Let this serve as your final and irrevocable notice: continued silence or refusal is no longer benign — it is actionable, it is injurious, and it will be met with uncompromising legal and commercial remedy.

VII. VERIFIED NOTICE TO ALL PRINCIPALS AND AGENTS: LIABILITY NOW ATTACHES

Let this serve as **lawful, legal, and commercial notice** to all parties, officers, agents, agencies, public officials, trustees, and third-party beneficiaries, **without exception or exclusion:**

NOTICE TO AGENT IS NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL. NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL IS NOTICE TO AGENT.

This maxim of agency law is universally binding across all forums of equity, commerce, contract, fiduciary duty, and trust law. It creates **immediate and irrevocable legal consequences** across all tiers of authority, public or private, and **nullifies all claims of immunity, ignorance, or delegated insulation** arising from title, position, office, or corporate veil.

This notice is **hereby served upon and binds** — without limitation or reservation — the following parties and all successors, assigns, and beneficiaries thereof:

- **Clerks of Court** and all deputies, assistants, and staff acting under their direction;
- **Judges, Magistrates, and Judicial Officers** at all levels of state and federal jurisdiction;
- **United States Trustees, Regional Trustees, and all agents of the Executive Office for U.S. Trustees (EOUST);**
- **Attorneys of Record**, any substitute, intervenor, or successor counsel or legal personnel;

- 1 • **CRIS (Court Registry Investment System) custodians**, investment officers,
2 and financial intermediaries;
- 3 • **Bureau of the Fiscal Service (BFS)** officers, accountants, agents, and
4 disbursement personnel;
- 5 • **Court-Appointed Fiduciaries, Receivers, Administrators**, or other agents
6 of judicial delegation;
- 7 • **Bonding Agents, Insurance Carriers, and Risk Management Departments**
8 covering any public office or officer;
- 9 • **Department of the Treasury**, including **Financial Management Service,**
10 **Legal Division**, and any enforcement arms;
- 11 • **Federal Reserve Banks**, fiscal intermediaries, securities underwriters, and
12 custody or transfer agents;
- 13 • **All individuals or entities acting under color of law**, color of office, or
14 administrative regulation.

15 **LIABILITY NOW ATTACHES FOR THE FOLLOWING:**

16 Any act, omission, suppression, obstruction, concealment, or failure to act in full
17 compliance with this notice shall constitute knowing and willful dishonor, bad faith, and
18 breach of duty, thereby triggering immediate and irrevocable liability – commercial,
19 civil, equitable, and criminal – without limitation or need for further presentment:

- 20 • Obstruction, concealment, or tampering with filings or equitable claims;
- 21 • Impairment of contract in violation of **Article I, Section 10** of the U.S.
22 Constitution;
- 23 • Denial of access to justice and self-representation rights under the **First and**
24 **Fifth Amendments**;
- 25 • Attempted conversion or trespass upon **private trust res**, secured assets, or
26 perfected commercial instruments;
- 27 • Breach of fiduciary or public trust, interference with private trust
28 conveyances;

- Unlawful enforcement of policy in place of law, or denial of remedy under color of statute.

THIS IS CONSTRUCTIVE AND COMMERCIAL NOTICE:

This Verified Notice constitutes **actual, constructive, and commercial notice** to all parties named and unnamed, whether public or private, direct or indirect, acting officially or in concert. **No party may claim lack of notice, immunity, or delegated insulation.** All are now placed on notice of:

- **Equitable default**, if failure to respond with verified rebuttal;
- **Commercial dishonor**, if remedy is obstructed or delayed;
- **Prejudicial estoppel**, as no contrary facts are asserted on the record;
- **Binding liability**, for all agents and principals under **common law, equity, UCC, and trust law.**

Silence is acquiescence. Acquiescence is agreement. Agreement under commercial law is binding.

Qui tacet consentire videtur ubi loqui debuit. — He who is silent when he ought to have spoken is taken to agree.

VIII. DEMAND FOR IMMEDIATE RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Appellant demands — not requests — the following **immediate and non-discretionary relief** as a matter of **constitutional right, statutory entitlement, and judicial duty**:

1. **Immediate vacatur** of any mandate, dismissal, clerk order, or judicial action that was issued on the false premise that bar-licensed representation is required for a private man to defend his own equitable interest, estate, or trust. Such actions are void ab initio and constitute structural due process violations.
2. **Full and unconditional reinstatement** of the appeal, together with all associated filings, on the grounds that Appellant is the Real Party in Interest under **Article III, Section 2** of the United States Constitution and **28 U.S.C. § 1654**, which

1 explicitly grants the right to plead and conduct one's own case personally,
2 without interference, regulation, or compelled representation.

3 3. **Formal declaratory recognition** that a living man, acting in fiduciary or
4 equitable capacity for a private trust or estate that is **not a CORPORATE**
5 **FICTION**, may appear *sui juris* in all United States courts, *without* interference
6 by administrative policy, local rule, or licensing cartel. This recognition is not
7 discretionary — it is compelled by the Constitution, by precedent, and by the
8 fundamental laws of equity and contract.

9 4. **Restitution and restoration** of all filings, dockets, notices, orders, and judicial
10 actions obstructed, suppressed, or disregarded under the unlawful BAR-only
11 access policy. The record must be corrected to reflect the verified filings,
12 un rebutted affidavits, perfected security interests, and lawful presentments
13 previously dishonored by this Court.

14 5. **Reservation of all rights, claims, and remedies**, including but not limited to:
15 ○ Declaratory and injunctive relief pursuant to **28 U.S.C. § 2201** and **§ 2202**,
16 ○ Civil rights damages and equitable compensation under **42 U.S.C. § 1983**,
17 and
18 ○ Referral for investigation of judicial misconduct, abuse of authority, and
19 violations of oath of office under federal criminal statutes including **18**
20 **U.S.C. §§ 241, 242, 2071, and 1512**, if the Court or its officers continue to
21 engage in unconstitutional obstruction under color of law.

22 This demand is made on the record, under penalty of perjury, and in full preservation of
23 all inherent, equitable, and reserved rights under **UCC 1-308, Article I, Section 10**, and
24 **Article VI, Clause 2** of the United States Constitution. Any further delay, denial, or
25 concealment constitutes willful complicity in the deprivation of rights under color of law.
26 Let the record show: the Constitution is not optional, due process is not negotiable,
27 and equity does not answer to policy.

28 //

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**, 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 28th 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/Appellant

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

IN SUPPORT OF [VERIFIED CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGE](#) AND DEMAND FOR
RESTORATION OF ACCESS TO COURT UNDER [ARTICLE III, RULE 17, FIRST AND FIFTH](#)
[AMENDMENTS](#), AND [28 U.S.C. § 1654](#) — CHALLENGING **UNCONSTITUTIONAL POLICY**
BARRING SUI JURIS ACCESS FOR **PRIVATE TRUST OR ESTATE**

I. INTRODUCTION

This Memorandum of Points and Authorities is submitted in firm support of the **Verified Constitutional Challenge** filed concurrently with this Court. The Ninth Circuit’s issuance of a **mandate dismissing Appellant’s appeal based solely on the absence of licensed BAR counsel** is not only **constitutionally impermissible**, but also **void ab initio, ultra vires**, and a **clear abuse of judicial authority**.

The ruling unlawfully elevates **internal court policy and administrative preference above controlling constitutional and statutory authority** — in direct contravention of the **Supremacy Clause (U.S. Const., Art. VI, Cl. 2)**, which establishes that the **Constitution and laws of the United States shall be the supreme Law of the Land**, binding upon all judges in every state and federal forum. No procedural rule, no internal policy, and no judicial preference can override fundamental rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

The United States Supreme Court has emphatically held that:

“The Constitution trumps court rules, policy, or deadlines. No judge has lawful discretion to violate the Constitution.”

— *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137, 177 (1803)

This foundational principle remains the law of the land. When a court purports to dismiss a verified appeal not for want of jurisdiction, not for procedural default, but for the Appellant’s refusal to retain a **state-sanctioned private intermediary (licensed counsel)** to access a federal Article III court, it has **forfeited lawful jurisdiction, invoked no lawful authority**, and **committed a constitutional violation**.

1 **No rule of court, local policy, or practice directive may override the express**
2 **language of 28 U.S.C. §1654**, which mandates that “[a]ny party may conduct
3 their own case personally or by counsel.” There is **no exception** carved out
4 for fiduciaries of private trusts or estates that would justify such blanket
5 denial.

6 This Memorandum proceeds to lay out the legal and constitutional violations
7 underpinning the mandate, and demands that this Court **immediately vacate all**
8 **orders based on that unlawful premise.**

9 **II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

- 10 1. **Appellant and Real Party In Interest** is a **private living man**, proceeding **sui**
11 **juris**, and acting in verified capacity as **fiduciary, secured party, and sole**
12 **beneficiary of a private express trust**—a lawful and recognized estate
13 organization under contract, equity, and trust law. His capacity is not fictional,
14 representative, nor statutory, and is supported by perfected instruments and
15 un rebutted affidavits of status, interest, and authority.
- 16 2. **Appellant and Real Party In Interest** lawfully filed an appeal in this Court to
17 challenge **fraudulent, ultra vires, and constitutionally repugnant actions**
18 committed by officers of the State of California and Riverside County, who
19 violated rights secured under the U.S. Constitution and federal law. These
20 claims are not frivolous; they are supported by verified filings, perfected
21 security interests, and un rebutted records of dishonor and deprivation of due
22 process.
- 23 3. Rather than address any **material fact, injury, or controlling question of law**,
24 this Court **summarily dismissed the appeal**—not on the merits, but solely due
25 to Appellant’s **refusal to associate with or retain a licensed BAR attorney** to
26 represent his private trust. No jurisdictional defect was found, and no factual or
27 legal rebuttal was issued to the verified constitutional challenge or equity claims
28 asserted.

1 4. This judicial policy of mandatory representation by licensed BAR members is
2 not only unsupported by any federal statute, court rule, or binding precedent,
3 but it directly contradicts 28 U.S.C. §1654, which guarantees that:

4 “In all courts of the United States the parties may plead and conduct their
5 own cases personally or by counsel.”

6 5. There is **no statutory exception** for private trusts, estates, or the fiduciaries
7 thereof. This blanket denial of access on administrative grounds **operates as an**
8 **unconstitutional barrier to justice**, unlawfully **impairing contract, suppressing**
9 **due process, and violating the right to petition the courts** under Amendments
10 I, V, and XIV of the U.S. Constitution.

11 III. LEGAL BASIS

12 **A. The Constitution Is Supreme Over “Court Policy” and “Administrative** 13 **Rules”**

14 The **Supremacy Clause** of the United States Constitution (Article VI, Clause 2)
15 commands that **“This Constitution... shall be the supreme Law of the Land,”** and
16 that **“the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby.”** No judicial officer, court-
17 created rule, or administrative preference may override, limit, or nullify
18 constitutionally secured rights. **Judges have no lawful discretion to enforce**
19 **unconstitutional policy** – their sole duty is to uphold the Constitution and apply
20 the law as written.

21 In *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137, 177 (1803), the Supreme Court set the
22 irrevocable precedent:

23 “A law repugnant to the Constitution is void.”

24 And further:

25 “It is emphatically the province and duty of the judicial department to say what
26 the law is.”

27 Any rule, deadline, or mandate that infringes upon a secured right is not law at all
28 – it is **void ab initio**.

This doctrine is universally binding and reaffirmed in *Sibbach v. Wilson & Co.*, 312 U.S. 1, 10 (1941):

“The Rules of Civil Procedure shall not abridge, enlarge or modify any substantive right.”

The Supreme Court in *Faretta v. California*, 422 U.S. 806, 821 (1975), further held:

“Court rules do not supersede constitutional protections.”

The Ninth Circuit’s dismissal, based purely on a policy demanding BAR membership, is a **constitutional nullity**. The court cannot enforce **internal rules** to obstruct the **First, Fifth, Ninth, and Tenth Amendments**, nor rewrite 28 U.S.C. § 1654.

B. Denying Access Based on Non-BAR Status Violates Amendments I, V, IX, and X

- **First Amendment – Right to Petition**

The Constitution prohibits the government from obstructing “the right of the people... to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.” *Faretta*, 422 U.S. at 819, recognized this as a fundamental right, not a privilege subject to licensing. Compelling private citizens to retain corporate agents (BAR members) to access the courts is state-enforced monopoly and compelled association, in violation of **First Amendment freedoms**.

- **Fifth Amendment – Due Process and Equal Protection**

Arbitrary denial of judicial access based solely on one's refusal to retain state-approved legal actors **violates both procedural and substantive due process**. *United States v. Throckmorton*, 98 U.S. 61 (1878), confirms that **fraud and procedural obstruction void any resulting judgment**.

- **Ninth and Tenth Amendments – Reserved Rights of the People**

The Ninth Amendment affirms that “the enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.” The right to **self-**

1 **representation**, to act as **trustee or beneficiary for one's own estate**,
2 and to **conduct one's private affairs without corporate interference** are
3 retained rights, not subject to judicial extinction by policy.

4 **C. 28 U.S.C. §1654 Protects the Right of Self-Representation**

5 "In all courts of the United States the parties may plead and conduct their own
6 cases personally or by counsel..."

7 This statute **does not create a discretionary privilege**; it enshrines a **mandatory**
8 **right**. The Supreme Court has consistently upheld this in *Faretta*, 422 U.S. at 832,
9 affirming:

10 "The right of self-representation is a basic right protected by the Constitution."

11 There is **no statutory exception** for private fiduciaries, trustees, or beneficiaries
12 asserting rights on behalf of their own trusts or estates. The Ninth Circuit's policy
13 directly conflicts with this statute and is therefore **legally void**.

14 **D. The Mandate Is Void Ab Initio for Lack of Jurisdiction and Constitutional Defect**

15 The Supreme Court has established that **any judgment rendered without due**
16 **process or contrary to constitutional mandate is void – not merely voidable**.

- 17 • *United Student Aid Funds, Inc. v. Espinosa*, 559 U.S. 260, 271 (2010):
18 "A judgment is void if the court that rendered it lacked jurisdiction or acted
19 in a manner inconsistent with due process of law."
20 • *Ex parte Young*, 209 U.S. 123 (1908):
21 Federal courts not only may but **must restrain unconstitutional acts by**
22 **public officials**.

23 The Ninth Circuit did not rule on the merits of **Appellant and Real Party In**
24 **Interest's** appeal. It rendered a **summary dismissal** that relies **solely on**
25 **administrative policy**, contrary to Article III, Section 2 jurisdiction, **violating both**
26 **due process and the right to be heard**. Such an act is **ultra vires and void on its**
27 **face**.

28 **E. Courts Have a Non-Discretionary Duty to Vacate Void Orders**

A void judgment is a legal nullity and **must be vacated**. It can be attacked at any time, in any court, either **directly or collaterally**.

- *Kalb v. Feuerstein*, 308 U.S. 433, 438 (1940):

“Congress has declared that the federal courts shall have exclusive jurisdiction... and any contrary judgment is void.”

- *United States v. Throckmorton*, 98 U.S. 61 (1878):

Fraud on the court and obstruction of process render all related orders and proceedings void.

- **Rule 60(b)(4), Fed. R. Civ. P.:**

“The court must set aside a judgment that is void.”

The Ninth Circuit has no lawful discretion to enforce a void policy that nullifies statutory and constitutional rights. It has a **mandatory, non-discretionary obligation to vacate its ultra vires mandate** and reinstate Appellant’s right to due process under federal law.

F. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17 Confirms Appellant's Capacity and Standing as Fiduciary and Real Party in Interest

Under **Rule 17(a)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure**, the right to bring an action lies with the **real party in interest**. The rule explicitly lists as proper parties:

- “(A) an executor;
- (B) an administrator;
- (C) a guardian;
- (D) a bailee;
- (E) a trustee of an express trust...”

Appellant and Real Party In Interest brings this challenge not as legal counsel or third-party representative, but **as the living man, sui juris, and lawfully appointed fiduciary, trustee, and beneficiary** of a private express trust and estate. As such, Appellant is the **real party in interest** under Rule 17 and has full constitutional and statutory authority to assert claims, protect trust assets, and

1 seek relief without being compelled into BAR-association or statutory
2 representation.

3 **Navarro Savings Ass'n v. Lee**, 446 U.S. 458, 465 (1980):

4 “Trustees are real parties in interest for litigation purposes when they possess
5 legal title to the trust assets and manage them.”

6 **Sprint Commc'ns Co. v. APCC Servs., Inc.**, 554 U.S. 269 (2008):

7 Standing exists when a party is asserting rights assigned or conferred by
8 legal interest or fiduciary role, even if the ultimate benefit inures to
9 another.

10 The Ninth Circuit's enforcement of a local rule or internal policy that **disqualifies a**
11 **private fiduciary from prosecuting claims or defending property on behalf of a**
12 **private trust** — unless they hire a BAR-licensed third party — directly **violates**
13 **Rule 17, Article III, and 28 U.S.C. §1654.**

14 Such a policy:

- 15 • **Rewrites federal law**, which clearly permits trustees and executors to
16 prosecute actions;
- 17 • **Strips private estates of lawful protection** unless forced into an involuntary
18 commercial contract with the BAR;
- 19 • **Violates the Fifth Amendment's guarantee of due process** by denying
20 rightful access to court for failure to associate with a monopoly legal
21 guild;
- 22 • **Interferes with the reserved rights of the People** under the **Ninth and Tenth**
23 **Amendments**, which protect pre-constitutional rights such as private
24 contract, self-governance, and estate control.

25 Furthermore, by ignoring the plain text of Rule 17(a)(1)(E), the Ninth Circuit is in
26 **procedural fraud**, issuing a mandate that is **jurisdictionally void, constitutionally**
27 **infirm, and legally indefensible.**

28 **Conclusion:**

IV. CONCLUSION

The Appellant is not a third party attempting unauthorized legal practice — he is the **authorized and vested fiduciary** of the private trust and **holds full legal and equitable interest** in the matters at bar. **Rule 17(a) mandates judicial recognition of that status.** Any dismissal or refusal to adjudicate the claims solely due to lack of BAR representation constitutes a **flagrant breach of constitutional duty, a denial of due process, and an act ultra vires** by this Court.

The Ninth Circuit’s dismissal, predicated on an internal policy requiring BAR-licensed representation, is **unconstitutional, ultra vires, and void ab initio.** The Constitution does not yield to court-created procedure, administrative preference, or corporate monopolies. Under **Article VI, Clause 2 (Supremacy Clause), Article III, Section 2 (Judicial Power), and the First, Fifth, Ninth, and Tenth Amendments**, the Court lacks lawful authority to override the self-executing rights of the People.

28 U.S.C. § 1654 codifies the absolute right of all parties to personally plead and conduct their own cases. Nowhere does the statute, Constitution, or Supreme Court precedent authorize forced association with the BAR or exclusion of private men and women acting as fiduciaries for their own estates or trusts.

“A law repugnant to the Constitution is void.” — *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137, 177 (1803)

“The Rules of Court shall not abridge, enlarge, or modify any substantive right.” — *Sibbach v. Wilson & Co.*, 312 U.S. 1, 10 (1941)

“The right of self-representation is a basic right protected by the Constitution.” — *Faretta v. California*, 422 U.S. 806, 832 (1975)

This Court cannot lawfully enforce unconstitutional policy and simultaneously claim fidelity to the Constitution. The record is clear, and the law is settled.

Therefore, Appellant demands the following immediate and non-discretionary remedies:

- 1 • **Vacatur of the void mandate issued in derogation of constitutional and**
- 2 **statutory rights;**
- 3 • **Full reinstatement of the appeal** with all rights and claims preserved;
- 4 **and**
- 5 • **A declaratory ruling that private men and women, appearing sui juris and**
- 6 **in their fiduciary capacities for private estates or trusts, may not be barred**
- 7 **from federal courts under Article III and 28 U.S.C. § 1654.**

8 This Court is duty-bound to correct its constitutional violations, or stand in open
9 defiance of its oath.

10 **Respectfully and lawfully submitted under full constitutional, commercial, and**
11 **private liability.**

12 **All rights reserved nunc pro tunc and ab initio, without prejudice or**
13 **recourse, UCC § 1-308, 3-402.**

14
15 By: 

16 **Kevin: Realworldfare**, Real Party In Interest,

17 *Plaintiff, Secured Party, Injured Party*

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 **August 2, 2025**, I served the within documents:

1. [VERIFIED CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGE](#) AND DEMAND FOR RESTORATION OF ACCESS TO COURT UNDER [ARTICLE III, RULE 17, FIRST AND FIFTH AMENDMENTS](#), AND [28 U.S.C. § 1654](#) – CHALLENGING [UNCONSTITUTIONAL POLICY BARRING SUI JURIS](#) ACCESS FOR [PRIVATE TRUST OR ESTATE](#) – WITH MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT

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

Jay Promisco, James E. Coffrini, Joseph Moran, Christian Gault, Amir Sabet, Amanda Coffrini, John Goulding, Brian Mcginley, Virginia Erbes, Corey Moore, Drew Fuerstenberg
C/o SIERRA PACIFIC MORTGAGE COMPANY INC / GREENHEAD INVESTMENTS
950 Glenn Drive, suite #150
Folsom, California [95630]

Eric D Houser (SBN 130079), Neil J. Copper (SBN 277997)
C/o HOUSER LLP
9970 Research Drive

Irvine, California [92618]

Susanne M. Nicholson, Daniel J. Foster
C/o WILKE FLEURY LLP
621 Capital Mall, suite 900
Sacramento, California [95814]

Paul Gustafson,
C/o PHH MORTGAGE CORPORATION dba PHH MORTGAGE SERVICES,
OWEN FINANCIAL CORPORATION.
3000 Leadenhall Road
Mount Laurel, New Jersey [08054]

Devin Ormonde,
C/o PRIME RECON LLC
27368 Via Industria, Suite 201
Temecula, California [92590]

On August 2, 2025, I served the within documents 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.

Pam Bondi, Agent(s), Fiduciary(ies)
C/o OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, North West
Washington, District of Colombia [20530-0001]
crm.section@usdoj.gov

Rob Bonta
C/o OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
1300 "I" Street
Sacramento, California [95814-2919]
Police-Practices@doj.ca.gov
PIU.PIU@doj.ca.gov

Jay Promisco, James E. Coffrini, Joseph Moran, Christian Gault, Amir Sabet, Amanda Coffrini, John Goulding, Brian Mcginley, Virginia Erbes, Corey Moore, Drew Fuerstenberg
C/o SIERRA PACIFIC MORTGAGE COMPANY INC / GREENHEAD INVESTMENTS
950 Glenn Drive, suite #150
Folsom, California [95630]
amir.sabet@spmc.com
joseph.moran@spmc.com
loanservicingqueue@spmc.com
christian.gault@spmc.com
amanda.coffrini@spmc.com
john.goulding@spmc.com
brian.mcginley@spmc.com
virginia.erbes@spmc.com

corey.moore@spmc.com
drew.fuerstenberger@spmc.com

Eric D Houser (SBN 130079), Neil J. Copper (SBN 277997)
C/o HOUSER LLP
9970 Research Drive
Irvine, California [92618]
ncooper@houser-law.com
dfoster@wilkefleury.com
snicholson@wilkefleury.com

Susanne M. Nicholson, Daniel J. Foster
C/o WILKE FLEURY LLP
621 Capital Mall, suite 900
Sacramento, California [95814]
dfoster@wilkefleury.com
snicholson@wilkefleury.com

Paul Gustafson,
C/o PHH MORTGAGE CORPORATION dba PHH MORTGAGE SERVICES,
OWEN FINANCIAL CORPORATION.
3000 Leadenhall Road
Mount Laurel, New Jersey [08054]
relationshipmanager@mortgagefamily.com

Devin Ormonde, Fiduciary(ies)
C/o PRIME RECON LLC
27368 Via Industria, Suite 201
Temecula, California [92590]
joseph.moran@spmc.com

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California
that the above is true and correct. Executed on **August 2, 2025** in Riverside County,
California.

/s/Chris Yarbra/
Chris Yarbra