

Date: August 8, 2025

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

TO: Pam Bondi,
U.S. Department of Justice and
950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC [20530-0001]
Certified Mail No. 9589071052701127843683

TO: Aracely Montoya-Chico, Ellin Davtyan
The State bar of California
845 S. Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, CA [90017-2515]
Certified Mail No. 9589071052702295084663

TO: Chief Judge Mary Murguia,
Susan Y. Soong
Judicial Council of the Ninth Circuit
P.O. Box 193939
San Francisco, CA [94119-3939]
Certified Mail No. 9589071052701127833318

TO: Jim Jordan
House Judiciary Committee
2138 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C. [20515]
Certified Mail No. 9589071052701127827935

DATE: August 8, 2025

**VERIFIED CRIMINAL COMPLAINT — FRAUD UPON THE COURT,
JUDICIAL COLLUSION, FEDERAL JUDICIAL TREASON, OBSTRUCTION,
FELONIOUS BAR AND JUDICIAL CONDUCT, IMPERSONATION OF
FEDERAL AUTHORITY, AND ONGOING DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER
COLOR OF LAW IN CASE NOS. 5:25-cv-01357, 5:25-cv-01434, 5:25-cv-01450,
5:25-cv-01900, 5:25-cv-01918, AND 25-4549 (NINTH CIRCUIT) AND DEMAND
FOR IMPEACHMENT AND CRIMINAL REFERRAL OF JUDGE SUNSHINE
SUZANNE SYKES UNDER ARTICLE I, SECTION 2**

**I. VERIFIED CONSTITUTIONAL STANDING, MANDATORY DUTY, AND
NOTICE TO AGENT, TRUSTEE, AND OFFICER UNDER OATH**

I, **Kevin: Realworldfare**, a living American man, *sui juris*, competent, of sound mind, and standing in full capacity as one of the People of the several united States, hereby issue this **Verified Criminal Complaint and Constitutional Demand for Action** in equity and law, under the supreme law of the land — including **the Constitution for the United States of America (1789), the Bill of Rights (1791), the Declaration of Independence (1776)**, and all statutes and maxims lawfully enacted pursuant thereto.

This is **not a mere petition or plea** — it is a **lawful Notice and Demand**, issued by right, **under authority vested in the People**, whose rights are not privileges, and whose sovereignty predates all offices, statutes, and agencies now on record. Those receiving this Notice are **not granted discretion**. You are **bound under oath by Article VI of the Constitution**, and under **18 U.S.C.**

Date: August 8, 2025

§§ 4, 241, 242, 912, 1512, and 28 U.S.C. § 535, to immediately investigate and prosecute crimes — especially those committed **under color of law, by officers of the court**, or through **systemic judicial fraud** and deprivation of rights.

The actors named herein have engaged in a coordinated criminal conspiracy to impersonate court authority, obstruct justice, and deprive the undersigned and other American nationals of due process, redress, and access to impartial tribunals — all under false pretense and criminal collusion with a disqualified federal judge.

I am hereby invoking your **non-discretionary fiduciary duty** and **trust obligation** to act, investigate, and remedy. **You are now on notice: Failure or refusal to act upon this Verified Complaint constitutes:**

- **Misprision of felony** under 18 U.S.C. § 4;
- **Complicity in conspiracy** under 18 U.S.C. § 241;
- **Breach of public oath and trust**, and
- **Aiding and abetting fraud upon the court, impersonation of federal authority**, and **systemic obstruction of justice**.

Let this serve as your **formal, constructive, and actual notice**. No immunity exists for treason, fraud, or collusion with disqualified or criminal actors. You are compelled by law, by duty, and by your own oath of office to act.

II. INTRODUCTION

This is a verified criminal complaint and demand for immediate investigation into a **deliberate and treasonous conspiracy to defraud the United States**, obstruct justice, impersonate judicial authority, and deprive constitutional rights under color of law. The following individuals are the principal perpetrators, acting in unclean hands, blatant conflict of interest, and coordinated judicial collusion:

- **John L. Bailey** (California BAR No. 103867) – Private individual and named Defendant
- **Therese Bailey** (California BAR No. 171043) – Private individual and named Defendant
- **The Bailey Legal Group** – A private law firm in Riverside County, California, and named Defendant
- **Judge Sunshine Suzanne Sykes** (California BAR No. 219455) – U.S. District Court, Central District of California

These actors have engaged in a pattern of conduct so egregious, so constitutionally offensive, and so procedurally void that **no court operating under the rule of law can condone it** without becoming complicit.

Specifically, these individuals:

1. **Illegally inserted themselves into Case No. 25-4549** (Petition for Writ of Mandamus) in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit — despite **not being named respondents**, and without any lawful authority to appear. Their fraudulent oppositions constitute **impersonation of a federal officer** and **obstruction of appellate jurisdiction**.
2. Acted in an **impossible dual capacity** — simultaneously as **attorneys of record and named Defendants** in the underlying federal civil rights actions. This is not only a grotesque ethical collapse, but also **an incurable jurisdictional defect** and **procedural nullity** under both federal law and the canons of professional conduct.
3. Filed knowingly false, procedurally defective, and **legally inadmissible declarations**, including unsworn and unverifiable documents submitted as "evidence," in a **calculated effort to defraud the court** and interfere with the adjudication of multiple pending federal matters.
4. Colluded with **Judge Sunshine Suzanne Sykes**, who unlawfully **ruled on her own disqualification** in multiple actions — in direct violation of **28 U.S.C. § 144** and binding Ninth Circuit precedent (*United States v. Sibla*, 624 F.2d 864 (9th Cir. 1980)). This judicial misconduct renders all subsequent orders and remands issued by Sykes **void ab initio**.
5. Engaged in a **systemic and sustained campaign of sabotage, retaliation, identity falsification, and impersonation of judicial authority**, including falsifying docket titles, misidentifying the Real Party in Interest, and issuing procedural filings under the false pretense of neutral advocacy — when in fact they are **acting as criminal defendants shielding themselves through judicial abuse**.

The totality of these actions constitutes a **textbook criminal enterprise** and a deliberate conspiracy to subvert lawful process and weaponize the federal judiciary for personal protection and retaliatory abuse. The following laws have been materially and repeatedly violated:

- **18 U.S.C. § 241 – Conspiracy Against Rights**
Collusive conduct to suppress the lawful exercise of protected rights, including access to court, redress, and due process.
- **18 U.S.C. § 242 – Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law**
Deprivation of constitutional rights through fraudulent orders, false filings, and acts taken without jurisdiction or lawful authority.
- **18 U.S.C. § 912 – Impersonation of a Federal Officer**
Unauthorized parties filed pleadings in the name of the Court, falsely presenting themselves as lawful agents of a judicial tribunal to which they do not belong.
- **18 U.S.C. § 1512 – Tampering With Official Proceedings**
Deliberate obstruction of appellate review through fraudulent pleadings, concealment of material facts, and procedural sabotage designed to derail a pending writ of mandamus.

- **18 U.S.C. §§ 1341 / 1343 – Mail and Wire Fraud**
Systematic use of electronic court filing systems and mail delivery to transmit knowingly fraudulent representations into judicial records for personal gain and protection.
- **28 U.S.C. § 144 – Judicial Disqualification**
Ignored and violated by Judge Sykes, who unlawfully ruled on her own disqualification and continued to preside while legally divested of jurisdiction.
- **Rules of Professional Conduct / Judicial Canons**
Massive breaches of fiduciary duty, conflicts of interest, dishonesty, advocacy while simultaneously under personal liability, and active concealment of judicial fraud.

This complaint does not raise mere procedural irregularities — it exposes a **coordinated criminal fraud** perpetrated under color of law. The individuals named herein have:

- Fabricated jurisdiction;
- Substituted themselves into judicial roles;
- Concealed material facts and disqualification orders;
- Obstructed legitimate appellate review;
- Operated as both litigants and alleged judicial officers in the same cases.

Their continued appearance in any courtroom as parties, attorneys, or so-called “officers of the court” is an affront to due process, a collapse of adversarial integrity, and a threat to the public trust in the judiciary.

Immediate criminal referral, full disbarment proceedings, and permanent removal from any legal authority or judicial position are not just appropriate — they are legally required.

III. FATAL RULE 8.4 VIOLATIONS — FRAUD, DISHONOR, AND MALICIOUS ABUSE OF POWER

The conduct of **John L. Bailey (BAR No. 103867)**, **Therese Bailey (BAR No. 171043)**, and **The Bailey Legal Group**, acting under the pretense of representation for **Naji Doumit, Daniel Doumit, and Marinaj Properties LLC**, constitutes a **systemic, willful, and criminal violation of the California Rules of Professional Conduct**, most notably **Rule 8.4**.

Their participation in fraudulent proceedings, fabricated pleadings, and obstruction of federal appellate review is not merely unethical — it is criminal. Their filings are not legitimate pleadings but **simulated legal process** intended to enforce unlawful dispossession, suppress the record of verified dishonor, and misrepresent the role and authority of the court itself.

Rule 8.4 – Professional Misconduct

It is professional misconduct for a lawyer to:

- **(a) Violate or attempt to violate the Rules of Professional Conduct;**

- **(b)** Commit a criminal act that reflects adversely on the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a lawyer;
- **(c)** Engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation;
- **(d)** Engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice;
- **(g)** Knowingly assist a judge or judicial officer in conduct that violates applicable rules of judicial conduct or other law.

Each subsection above has been grossly and repeatedly violated.

A. Knowingly Advocating on Behalf of Parties in Verified Commercial Dishonor

The Baileys continue to file pleadings on behalf of **Naji Doumit, Daniel Doumit, and Marinaj Properties LLC**, despite:

- Having received **Verified Affidavits of Dishonor**, establishing **commercial default** and **dishonored tender**;
- Having received **notices of default, opportunity to cure, and final dishonor under UCC 1-308** and **commercial maxims**;
- Knowing that their clients hold no **lawful title, possessory interest, or recorded legal right** to the property at issue.

Their participation in filings after these facts were recorded and un rebutted constitutes **fraud, deceit, and intentional misrepresentation** under Rule 8.4(c). Their conduct is not just unethical—it is the **active concealment of felony-level dishonor** in violation of **18 U.S.C. § 4 (Misprision of Felony)**.

B. Simulated Legal Process and Retaliatory Dispossession

By filing and maintaining **unlawful detainer actions** in the face of verified federal civil rights removals and quiet title claims, the Baileys are enforcing **simulated legal process—a counterfeit form of legal authority used to intimidate, retaliate, and dispossess** lawful occupants.

This is:

- **Aiding and abetting unconstitutional seizure of private property**;
- **Directly violating due process under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments**;
- **Attempting to enforce a void trustee's deed** which has been lawfully rebutted, revoked, and replaced by **prior superior title**.

They are knowingly and unlawfully **participating in a scheme to dispossess the Real Party in Interest** while cloaked in dishonor and jurisdictional fraud. This violates **Rule 8.4(d)** and **(b)** and is tantamount to **criminal fraud under color of law**.

C. Filing in the Name of the Court While Acting as Defendants

The Baileys—**while named as defendants** in multiple federal cases—have filed oppositions and responses in **Ninth Circuit Case No. 25-4549**, falsely styled as if on behalf of the U.S. District Court.

They are:

- **Not parties to the mandamus petition;**
- **Not appointed by the Ninth Circuit** to represent the court;
- **Not authorized to impersonate or substitute themselves as judicial agents.**

This is **impersonation of judicial authority**, a violation of **18 U.S.C. § 912**, and a gross breach of **Rule 8.4(g)**: knowingly assisting a judge or court in violating the law. Their filings are **void**, **criminally deceptive**, and **irreparably prejudicial** to the administration of justice.

D. Judicial Collusion with Disqualified Judge Sykes

Rather than acknowledge the mandatory disqualification of **Judge Sunshine Suzanne Sykes** under **28 U.S.C. § 144**, the Baileys:

- Continued filing motions and oppositions post-disqualification;
- Knowingly accepted, enforced, and cited rulings by a judge whose authority had legally ceased to exist;
- Participated in her scheme to suppress jurisdictional facts, strike valid filings, and block federal appellate review.

This is **direct collusion** with a disqualified judicial officer in violation of **Rule 8.4(g)** and **Canons 1, 2, and 3 of the Code of Judicial Ethics**. It renders all related rulings **void ab initio** and all subsequent participation by the Baileys **criminally complicit**.

E. Abuse of FRCP 11, Rule 12, and Procedural Tools to Harass and Suppress

The Baileys have:

- Filed **multiple duplicative, frivolous, and procedurally defective motions** under **Rule 12**, despite knowing the court had no jurisdiction;
- Repeatedly violated **Rule 11** by submitting filings without proper verification, factual foundation, or lawful standing;
- Used procedural filings to **distract from un rebutted evidence, stall judicial review, and mislead the docket.**

Their conduct is a **weaponization of procedure**, not a pursuit of law. This behavior violates **Rule 8.4(d)** and renders them **unfit to practice** or maintain any appearance of legal ethics.

F. Demand for Disbarment and Sanction

No bar-certified officer of the court has the right to:

- **Fabricate authority;**
- **Dispossess parties under known dishonor;**
- **Forge pleadings in another's name;**
- **Collude with a disqualified judge;**
- **Misrepresent the judicial record;**
- **Commit procedural sabotage under color of law.**

These are not technical violations. These are **malicious, knowing, coordinated felonies** — performed under the banner of the California State Bar, in open contempt of the Constitution, public trust, and the ethical fabric of the profession itself.

Immediate disbarment, professional discipline, and referral to the U.S. Attorney and DOJ Inspector General are not optional — they are mandatory.

IV. FATAL VIOLATIONS OF RULES 1.7, 3.3, AND 5.5 — IRREPARABLE ETHICAL COLLAPSE

The conduct of **John L. Bailey, Therese Bailey, and The Bailey Legal Group**, in tandem with their repeated unlawful filings and simulated legal process, reveals a pattern of **blatant, unrecoverable ethical violations** under the **California Rules of Professional Conduct** and **ABA Model Rules**. The violations detailed below are not theoretical — they are codified, disqualifying, and demand **immediate professional sanctions** and **referral for criminal prosecution**.

Rule 1.7 – Conflict of Interest: Current Clients

“A lawyer shall not represent a client if the representation involves a concurrent conflict of interest...”

This rule prohibits representation where:

- The representation of one client is directly adverse to another client;
- Or there is a **significant risk** that representation will be **materially limited by personal interest or duty to another party**.

Application:

- **John and Therese Bailey are named defendants** in verified civil rights litigation involving fraud, commercial dishonor, and obstruction of justice.
- Despite this, they have **continued to file pleadings on behalf of Marinaj Properties LLC, Naji Doumit, and Daniel Doumit** — clients whose legal defenses directly implicate and entangle the Baileys' own misconduct.
- This is a textbook, incurable **concurrent conflict of interest** — their **personal liability and adversarial position** renders all representation **ethically impossible**, disqualifying, and void.
- Their continued appearance is not advocacy — it is **self-preserving obstruction masquerading as legal work**, tainting every filing and poisoning the tribunal's integrity.

Rule 3.3 – Candor Toward the Tribunal

“A lawyer shall not: (a) knowingly make a false statement of fact or law to a tribunal; (b) fail to disclose controlling adverse legal authority; or (c) offer or support known false evidence.”

Application:

The Baileys have flagrantly violated Rule 3.3 in multiple filings, including but not limited to Ninth Circuit Case No. 25-4549, by:

- **Knowingly submitting false and misleading party designations** and captions — falsely suggesting party status, legal standing, and authority to file;
- **Omitting binding legal precedent** such as *United States v. Sibla*, *Studley v. United States*, and *Campbell*, which **require disqualification** and void orders entered by disqualified judges;
- **Citing void state and federal orders** as if they were valid, despite undisputed evidence of procedural disqualification and removal;

- Engaging in a pattern of **intentional omission and procedural distortion** to mislead the tribunal and **sabotage lawful appellate review**.

This is not advocacy. It is **coordinated fraud upon the court**, and a **deliberate, repeated breach of duty**.

Rule 5.5 – Unauthorized Practice of Law; Multijurisdictional Practice

“A lawyer shall not practice law in a jurisdiction where doing so violates the regulation of the legal profession... nor shall a lawyer assist another in doing so.”

Application:

- The Baileys **filed multiple oppositions in the Ninth Circuit, styled as if on behalf of the U.S. District Court** — a party that is **not a respondent, not a client, and not represented by them**.
- No motion to intervene, no appearance as amicus, and no appointment was ever issued. This was **a rogue, unauthorized intrusion into an active federal appellate matter**.
- Filing on behalf of a tribunal or institution that has not authorized such representation constitutes both:
 - **The unauthorized practice of law on behalf of a non-client**, and
 - **Criminal impersonation of court authority** under 18 U.S.C. § 912.

Their actions are equivalent to **fraudulently inserting themselves into the federal record under false pretenses** — a capital violation of both professional ethics and federal criminal law.

Conclusion of Violations:

The Baileys’ conduct, under the rules cited above, rises to the level of **gross professional misconduct, disqualifying conflict, and fraudulent impersonation of judicial authority**. These are not isolated technicalities — they are **terminal violations that warrant immediate discipline, disbarment, and federal criminal referral** under 18 U.S.C. §§ 912, 1343, 1512, and 241–242.

The record is clear. Their continued licensure and ability to file in any U.S. court is a **present and ongoing threat to the integrity of the judicial process**.

V. NATURE OF THE OFFENSE

A. CRIMINAL IMPERSONATION, UNAUTHORIZED APPEARANCE, AND FRAUDULENT INTERFERENCE WITH FEDERAL PROCEEDINGS

John L. Bailey and Therese Bailey, while simultaneously acting as **named Defendants** in **verified** federal civil rights litigation, **unlawfully filed oppositions in Ninth Circuit Case No. 25-4549**, a pending **Petition for Writ of Mandamus** in which they are not named Respondents and have no standing.

These filings were made **without leave of court**, without any legal capacity to **speak on behalf of** the District Court, and without any lawful representation of any party before the appellate tribunal. This is not legal advocacy — this is **criminal impersonation of federal authority**, in violation of:

- **18 U.S.C. § 912 – Impersonation of a federal officer** by submitting filings under color of court representation without appointment or standing;
- **18 U.S.C. § 1512(c) – Obstruction of an official proceeding**, namely the appellate review of a constitutionally significant Petition;
- **18 U.S.C. § 371 – Conspiracy to defraud the United States**, through coordinated and knowing acts intended to falsify the record and derail lawful review;
- Unlicensed and unauthorized legal practice in furtherance of an active fraud.

The Baileys are not “counsel.” They are **the accused**, attempting to disguise self-representation as judicial opinion — a grotesque collapse of adversarial integrity and a fatal jurisdictional defect. **Their filings are criminally void and must be stricken.**

B. FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND WILLFUL DEPRIVATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Every pleading submitted by these individuals is saturated with calculated misrepresentation, material omission, and bad faith. These were not good-faith legal arguments. These were **weapons of fraud**, filed with malicious intent to:

- **Conceal the facially void status of all orders issued by Judge Sunshine S. Sykes**, who was disqualified under **28 U.S.C. § 144**, and had **no lawful jurisdiction** to act in the case after disqualification was triggered;
- **Suppress and obstruct** the lawful appellate jurisdiction now vested in the U.S. Court of Appeals under **28 U.S.C. §§ 1443(1) and 1447(d)**, by misrepresenting procedural posture and injecting fraudulent filings into the record;
- **Falsely designate the Real Party in Interest** as “K. Walker,” a known legal fiction used to collapse standing, distort identity, and bypass unrebutted affidavits of ownership, agency, and possession that have been part of the record since inception;

- **Derail the adjudication of verified civil rights claims**, now pending under federal question and diversity jurisdiction, by inserting themselves as false representatives of the court.

This is not litigation — it is **strategic, coordinated judicial sabotage**, done under color of law, and it directly violates:

- **18 U.S.C. § 242** – Deprivation of rights under color of law;
- **18 U.S.C. § 1341 / § 1343** – Mail and wire fraud;
- **18 U.S.C. § 1001** – False statements and concealment in official matters;
- **18 U.S.C. § 1519** – Falsification of documents with intent to influence federal proceedings.

C. JUDICIAL COLLUSION, ULTRA VIRES CONDUCT, AND OBSTRUCTION BY A DISQUALIFIED JUDGE

Judge **Sunshine Suzanne Sykes** was formally and properly disqualified upon the filing of a **verified affidavit of bias and motion** under **28 U.S.C. § 144** — a statutory trigger that mandates immediate reassignment and removes all judicial authority. Instead of recusing, she:

- **Illegally ruled on her own disqualification motion** — a direct, open, and knowing violation of **Sibla v. United States**, 624 F.2d 864, 867 (9th Cir. 1980);
- **Issued void remand orders and suppression rulings post-disqualification**, all of which are nullities under black-letter law;
- **Facilitated fraudulent filings** by named Defendants who masquerade as court representatives, thereby **collapsing the adversarial structure of the proceedings**;
- **Enabled a coordinated pattern of retaliation, obstruction, and identity sabotage**, in violation of the Due Process Clause, federal civil rights statutes, and the constitutional doctrine of separation of powers.

These actions are not mere misconduct — they are **acts of treasonous judicial fraud**, carried out to protect co-conspirators and prevent lawful redress. Every ruling issued by Judge Sykes after disqualification is **void ab initio**. Every filing from the Baileys is **tainted by criminal conflict, impersonation, and obstruction**. And every attempt to salvage these void acts through illegal filings in appellate court must be treated as **a continuation of the criminal enterprise**.

VI. LAWS VIOLATED

This is not a case of mere procedural error. It is a calculated, coordinated, and criminal scheme executed under color of law by named Defendants and a sitting federal judge, with the intent to

obstruct justice, impersonate judicial authority, defraud the courts, suppress rights, and retaliate against a private American national seeking lawful redress.

The following laws and constitutional protections have been blatantly and repeatedly violated:

- **18 U.S.C. § 912 – Impersonation of a Federal Officer**

John and Therese Bailey filed unauthorized pleadings in a federal appellate court on behalf of a non-party (the district court), without appointment, order, or party status. This constitutes criminal impersonation of a federal judicial officer and usurpation of official function.

- **18 U.S.C. § 241 – Conspiracy Against Rights**

These actors conspired to injure, threaten, intimidate, and silence the Real Party in Interest in the exercise of his Constitutionally protected rights, including the right to petition the government, to access the courts, to due process, and to be free from judicial bias and retaliation.

- **18 U.S.C. § 242 – Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law**

Acting under the false cloak of judicial legitimacy, the Defendants and Judge Sykes deprived the Affiant of:

- Procedural and substantive due process;
- Equal protection under the law;
- Fair and impartial adjudication;
- Access to redress and remedy in equity and law.

- **18 U.S.C. § 1512 – Obstruction of Justice**

Defendants deliberately inserted false, unauthorized, and procedurally void filings into an active appellate case (25-4549) to:

- Mislead the Court of Appeals;
- Obstruct judicial review of a writ concerning unlawful district court actions;
- Retaliate against the Affiant for asserting lawful rights.

- **18 U.S.C. § 1341 – Mail Fraud**

Knowingly transmitting fraudulent court documents and impersonated filings through U.S. Mail constitutes criminal mail fraud and evidences a pattern of racketeering activity.

- **18 U.S.C. § 1343 – Wire Fraud**

Each filing electronically transmitted via CM/ECF, email, or court-authorized digital service platforms constitutes a distinct act of wire fraud, executed with intent to deceive and deprive lawful jurisdiction.

- **28 U.S.C. § 144 – Judicial Disqualification**

Judge Sykes was formally disqualified by verified affidavit under § 144. Her refusal to recuse, and her continued issuance of orders post-disqualification, renders every such order void ab initio. Her acts were:

- Without jurisdiction;
- Without lawful authority;
- In direct defiance of *United States v. Sibla*, 624 F.2d 864 (9th Cir. 1980).

- **Rules of Professional Conduct (ABA and California Bar)**

Violations include but are not limited to:

- Rule 1.7 – Conflict of Interest (Adverse representation by a party-defendant acting as counsel);
- Rule 3.3 – Candor Toward the Tribunal (Material misstatements and omissions);
- Rule 8.4 – Misconduct (Fraud, dishonesty, and prejudicial acts to the administration of justice).

- **Code of Judicial Conduct / Canons of Judicial Ethics**

Judge Sykes:

- Ruled on her own disqualification;
- Enabled collusive filings by named defendants;
- Violated Canons 1, 2, and 3 concerning impartiality, independence, and integrity;
- Acted in complicity with parties she was duty-bound to disqualify from the process.

- **Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure – Rules 21 & 27**

The Baileys filed as unauthorized, non-party actors in a mandamus proceeding without leave or legal basis. This is a procedural nullity and a usurpation of appellate process.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS VIOLATED

◆ **First Amendment**

- Right to petition for redress of grievances has been actively obstructed.
- Judicial retaliation chills the exercise of protected speech and redress rights.

◆ **Fourth Amendment**

- Retaliatory actions executed without lawful warrants or jurisdiction constitute unlawful seizures and deprivations of property and liberty interests.

◆ **Fifth Amendment**

- Procedural and substantive due process rights have been obliterated.
- Judge Sykes and Defendants colluded to deprive Plaintiff of life, liberty, and property without lawful process.

◆ **Sixth Amendment**

- The right to a **fair and impartial** tribunal has been nullified by judicial fraud, conflict of interest, and prosecutorial impersonation by named Defendants.

◆ **Seventh Amendment**

- The right to a trial by jury in a civil matter has been undermined by judicial usurpation and unlawful remand orders issued by a disqualified judge.

◆ **Eighth Amendment**

- Constructive punitive sanctions, judicial sabotage, and deprivation of remedy constitute cruel and unusual punishment by civil process under color of law.

◆ **Ninth Amendment**

- Fundamental rights not enumerated (**equity jurisdiction**, right to private capacity, etc.) have been denied under fraudulent legal constructions and ens legis assumptions.

◆ **Tenth Amendment**

- The federal government has allowed its judicial officers to operate outside the constitutional compact, violating the sovereignty of the People and undermining States' rights.

◆ **Fourteenth Amendment**

- Equal protection and due process have been egregiously violated. Defendants and Judge Sykes operated outside the scope of lawful authority, selectively enforcing law against the Affiant while shielding their own crimes.

◆ Article III, Section 1 and 2 – U.S. Constitution

- Judicial power is being exercised by actors without authority, without jurisdiction, and in contradiction to the Constitutionally delegated bounds of the judiciary.

SUMMARY

These violations are not minor. They are fatal to the legitimacy of any judgment, order, or proceeding touched by these actors. The acts constitute:

- **Felonies under federal law;**
- **Treasonous breaches of public trust;**
- **Obstruction of Article III jurisdiction;**
- **A direct threat to the Constitutional order.**

Criminal prosecution, immediate disqualification, and systemic accountability are not just warranted — they are legally **mandatory**.

VII. DEMAND FOR IMPEACHMENT PROCEEDINGS

Based on the verified record, the undersigned hereby issues this formal **Demand for Impeachment Proceedings** against **Judge Sunshine Suzanne Sykes**, a federal officer sitting in the United States District Court for the Central District of California, pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, Article II, Section 4, and supported by documented violations of federal statutes, judicial ethics, and constitutional obligations.

Judge Sykes has willfully and maliciously engaged in the following impeachable offenses:

1. **Violation of 28 U.S.C. § 144** – She unlawfully refused to recuse herself following a timely and properly filed verified affidavit of disqualification. Her continued participation constitutes judicial usurpation and nullification of due process.
2. **Fraud Upon the Court** – By issuing rulings and remand orders while disqualified, she knowingly acted without jurisdiction, rendering her orders **void ab initio**. These acts constitute a knowing fraud against the People, the Constitution, and the appellate courts.

3. **Conspiracy Under Color of Law** – Sykes willfully enabled, empowered, and colluded with private attorneys (John and Therese Bailey) who filed unauthorized pleadings impersonating the court, in violation of **18 U.S.C. §§ 912, 241, 242, and 1512**.
4. **Obstruction of Appellate Jurisdiction** – She attempted to preempt appellate review under **28 U.S.C. § 1447(d)** and civil rights removal under **§ 1443(1)** by issuing facially void suppression and remand orders post-disqualification.
5. **Breach of Oath and Article VI Violations** – Judge Sykes took an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. Her deliberate and repeated acts of judicial obstruction, retaliation, and procedural sabotage reflect a clear breach of that oath and a betrayal of public trust.
6. **Pattern of Judicial Misconduct** – Her conduct reflects an entrenched pattern of bias, partiality, denial of constitutional protections, and abuse of office incompatible with the impartial administration of justice and the ethical canons binding all federal judges.

These acts are not isolated errors or legal disagreements — they are **deliberate, coordinated, and systemic violations** that strike at the foundation of due process, judicial integrity, and constitutional government.

Therefore, the undersigned demands:

- That the **House Judiciary Committee** immediately initiate an **investigation into the conduct of Judge Sunshine Suzanne Sykes**, with a view toward recommending **Articles of Impeachment**;
- That the **Judicial Conference of the United States** be formally notified of these verified violations for referral to Congress under 28 U.S.C. § 331;
- That **Judge Sykes be suspended from all judicial activity pending the outcome** of investigation and impeachment proceedings, to preserve the integrity of the court and prevent further injury to the rights of the People;
- That **any and all orders issued by Judge Sykes after disqualification be declared void and without legal force**, as a matter of due process and constitutional necessity.

The Constitution does not permit a disqualified judge to rule. Nor does it tolerate fraud upon the court committed under the cloak of federal authority. The People demand accountability.

Impeachment is not optional — it is required.

VIII. RELIEF DEMANDED

The acts described above are not mere violations of court procedure — they are acts of criminal impersonation, coordinated judicial fraud, and systemic sabotage of

constitutionally protected rights. These actions demand swift and uncompromising federal response.

Accordingly, I demand the following immediate remedies and actions, without delay, leniency, or excuse:

1. **Full-scale federal investigation** by the U.S. Department of Justice and the Office of the Inspector General into the conduct of:
 - **John L. Bailey**
 - **Therese Bailey**
 - **The Bailey Legal Group**
for criminal impersonation of the judiciary, filing unauthorized and fraudulent pleadings in a federal appellate court, obstruction of justice, and conspiracy under color of law to defraud the United States and deprive a private national of constitutional rights.
2. **Immediate ethics and judicial misconduct review of Judge Sunshine Suzanne Sykes** by the Judicial Council of the Ninth Circuit and Office of Judicial Conduct, for:
 - Willful violation of **28 U.S.C. § 144** by ruling on her own disqualification;
 - Issuing void ab initio orders without jurisdiction;
 - Knowingly enabling conflicted parties to manipulate judicial process under her protection;
 - Weaponizing her office to suppress rights, falsify records, and collapse lawful appellate review.
3. **Criminal referral to the United States Attorney** and/or Special Counsel for prosecution under:
 - **18 U.S.C. § 912** – Impersonation of federal authority;
 - **18 U.S.C. §§ 241 & 242** – Conspiracy and deprivation of rights under color of law;
 - **18 U.S.C. § 1512** – Obstruction and tampering with judicial proceedings;
 - **18 U.S.C. §§ 1341 & 1343** – Mail and wire fraud through knowingly false and fraudulent court filings and use of government communications systems to commit fraud and deception.
4. **Immediate federal intervention** to halt the unlawful interference with and sabotage of **Ninth Circuit Case No. 25-4549**, including:

Date: August 8, 2025

- A formal strike of all unauthorized pleadings submitted by non-party Defendants;
- Preservation of the appellate record free from fraudulent insertions;
- Sanctions and criminal referrals for all actors attempting to collapse the appellate review of federal rights secured under **28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)**.

Failure to act swiftly and decisively in the face of this judicial insurrection and impersonation crisis will signal to the public that the Department of Justice tolerates open fraud, bar-member criminality, and systemic abuse of federal judicial authority for personal protection.

//

//

//

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 8th 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

a man on the land and soil of the De'Jure republic.

EXHIBIT LIST

1. EXHIBIT A:

VERIFIED AFFIDAVIT OF FACT IN SUPPORT OF VERIFIED CRIMINAL COMPLAINT – FRAUD UPON THE COURT, JUDICIAL COLLUSION, FEDERAL JUDICIAL TREASON, OBSTRUCTION, FELONIOUS BAR AND JUDICIAL CONDUCT, IMPERSONATION OF FEDERAL AUTHORITY, AND ONGOING DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER COLOR OF LAW IN CASE NOS. 5:25-CV-01357, 5:25-CV-01434, 5:25-CV-01450, 5:25-CV-01900, 5:25-CV-01918, AND 25-4549 (NINTH CIRCUIT) AND DEMAND FOR IMPEACHMENT AND CRIMINAL REFERRAL OF JUDGE SUNSHINE SUZANNE SYKES UNDER ARTICLE I, SECTION 2

All referenced records are matters of public record and are judicially noticeable under FRE 201.

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 #406-251, Riverside California. On or about **August 8, 2025**, I served the within documents:

1. VERIFIED CRIMINAL COMPLAINT – FRAUD UPON THE COURT,
JUDICIAL COLLUSION, IMPERSONATION OF FEDERAL AUTHORITY,
AND ONGOING DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER COLOR OF LAW IN
CASE NOS. 5:25-CV-01357, 5:25-CV-01434, 5:25-CV-01450, 5:25-CV-01900, 5:25-
CV-01918, AND 25-4549 (NINTH CIRCUIT)

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.

TO: Pam Bondi,
U.S. Department of Justice and
950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC [20530-0001]
Certified Mail No. 9589071052701127843683 with form 3811

Date: August 8, 2025

TO: Aracely Montoya-Chico, Ellin Davtyan

The State bar of California
845 S. Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, CA [90017-2515]
Certified Mail No. 9589071052702295084663 with form 3811

TO: Chief Judge Mary Murguia, Susan Y. Soong

Judicial Council of the Ninth Circuit
P.O. Box 193939
San Francisco, CA [94119-3939]
Certified Mail No. 9589071052701127833318 with form 3811

TO: Jim Jordan

House Judiciary Committee
2138 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C. [20515]
Certified Mail No. 9589071052701127827935 with form 3811

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.

TO: Pam Bondi,

U.S. Department of Justice and
950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC [20530-0001]
crm.section@usdoj.gov

TO: Aracely Montoya-Chico, Ellin Davtyan

The State bar of California
845 S. Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, CA [90017-2515]
admissions@calbar.ca.gov
feedback@calbar.ca.gov
info@calbar.ca.gov

TO: Chief Judge Mary Murguia, Susan Y. Soong

Judicial Council of the Ninth Circuit
P.O. Box 193939
San Francisco, CA [94119-3939]
judicialcouncil@jud.ca.gov

TO: Jim Jordan

House Judiciary Committee
2138 Rayburn House Office Building

Date: August 8, 2025

Washington, D.C. [20515]
Certified Mail No. 9589071052701127827935

Sunshine K. Sykes, Dolly Maize Gee
C/o **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL
DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE**
3470 Twelfth Street Riverside
Riverside, California [92501-3801]
DMG_Chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov
SSS_Chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov
Vanessa_Figueroa@cacd.uscourts.gov
yolanda_skipper@cacd.uscourts.gov

Naji Doumit, Mary Doumit, Daniel Doumit
C/o **NAJI DOUMIT, MARINAJ PROPERTIES, FOCUS
ESTATES INC**
louisatoui3@yahoo.com
najidoumit@gmail.com
jbailey@tblglaw.com
tbailey@tblglaw.com
udlaw2@aol.com

John L. Bailey (#103867), Therese Bailey (#171043)
C/o **THE BAILEY LEGAL GROUP**
jbailey@tblglaw.com
tbailey@tblglaw.com

Barry-Lee: O'Connor (#134549)
C/o **BARRY LEE O'CONNOR, BARRY LEE O'CONNOR &
ASSOCIATES**
udlaw2@aol.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 8, 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.

Date: August 8, 2025

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 8th day of August, 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)

