

Date: July 31, 2025

Kevin: Realworldfare (formerly Kevin: Walker)
Care of: 30650 Rancho California Road # 406-251
Temecula, California [92591]
non-domestic without the United States
Email: team@walkernovagroup.com
(310) 923-8521

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

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

**WG PRIVATE IRREVOCABLE TRUST,
et al**

Plaintiffs/Real Parties In Interest/

vs.

MARINAJ PROPERTIES LLC, et al,

Defendants,

MARINAJ PROPERTIES LLC,

[Purported] Cross-Complainant,

vs.

KEVIN LEWIS WALKER, et al.,

[Purported] Cross-Defendants.

Case No. 5:25-cv-01434-__ - __

**VERIFIED NOTICE OF APPEAL
UNDER 28 U.S.C. §§ 1447(D), 1443(1),
AND RULE 3, FED. R. APP. P.,
INVOKING ORIGINAL EQUITY
JURISDICTION UNDER ARTICLE III,
SECTION 2 OF THE UNITED STATES
CONSTITUTION AND THE DUE
PROCESS CLAUSE, TO VACATE VOID
REMAND, FRAUDULENT POST-
DISQUALIFICATION ORDERS, AND
THE UNLAWFUL STRIKING OF
JURISDICTIONAL FILINGS IN BAD
FAITH**

**(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, and Beneficiary of the Private Trust, proceeding sui juris, not pro se,
in his proper private capacity, and by Special Limited Appearance only, without
submission to any foreign, statutory, or commercial jurisdiction, and appearing

Date: July 31, 2025

solely to challenge unlawful authority, enforce perfected rights, and demand equitable and commercial relief on the verified record.

I am **not** a 14th Amendment "U.S. citizen," person, individual, legal fiction, or transmitted utility. I do **not** consent to joinder, suretyship, agency, or statutory representation for any *ens legis* entity, artificial person, or trust organization without full disclosure, mutual assent, and explicit bilateral agreement on the private record.

This **Special Limited Appearance** is made pursuant to the **common law**, the **law of equity**, and **private commercial right**, and is **not** a plea for statutory remedy or corporate benefit. **No adhesion contract, presumption of benefit, waiver of rights, or assumption of jurisdiction is granted**, either tacitly or expressly. **All immunities, rights, liberties, and protections** are expressly reserved and preserved **without prejudice**, pursuant to **UCC § 1-308, UCC § 3-501, Article I, Section 10, Article I, Section 2**, and the **natural law** endowed to all living men and women by the Creator.

This filing invokes this Court's **original and exclusive jurisdiction under Article III, Section 2** of the Constitution for the United States of America, and demands strict enforcement of lawful **equity, contract, and truth**, without recourse to **fraudulent presumptions, color of law, or administrative fictions** foreign to the living man

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that **Kevin: Realworldfare**, proceeding sui juris and as the **Secured Party, Creditor, Injured Party and Real Party in Interest**, hereby appeals to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit from the following **final and void ab initio orders** entered in this matter.

This Verified Notice of Appeal is filed as a matter of right, under binding federal authority, to challenge a coordinated scheme of **fraud upon the court, retaliation, and procedural sabotage** by a **disqualified judge** acting ultra vires after being lawfully divested of jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 144. Appellant invokes this

Court's original equity jurisdiction under Article III, Section 2 to enforce civil rights, commercial standing, and due process denied below.

I. VOID AND APPEALED ORDERS:

1. **Docket Entry 75** – *Order Striking Filed Documents from the Record*, entered July 31, 2025, fraudulently suppressing multiple verified jurisdictional filings **after the case was remanded and marked closed**, without jurisdiction, and for the purpose of concealing judicial fraud and misconduct;
2. **Docket Entry 70** – *Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion to Remand and Denying All Other Motions*, entered July 22, 2025, **after judicial disqualification had been triggered by Verified Affidavit**, in violation of 28 U.S.C. § 144, and **without adjudication of the civil rights basis for removal under 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1);**
3. **Docket Entry 69** – *Order Denying Motion to Disqualify Judge Sunshine Suzanne Sykes*, entered July 22, 2025, **issued ultra vires by the very judge subject to disqualification**, rendering all subsequent actions void ab initio;
4. **Docket Entry 71** – *Transmittal of Documents to State Court*, entered July 22, 2025, effectuating a fraudulent and jurisdictionally void remand in violation of exclusive federal jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d).

II. JURISDICTIONAL BASIS FOR APPEAL

This appeal is taken **as of right** and is **properly and timely preserved** under controlling constitutional, statutory, and judicial authority. The record establishes that the district court entered **void and ultra vires orders** in direct violation of **28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)**, while under mandatory disqualification pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 144, and proceeded to **strike verified jurisdictional filings post-remand (Dkt. 75) to conceal fraud, suppress due process, and retaliate under color of law.**

This appeal is **not** barred by **§ 1447(d)**; on the contrary, it falls squarely within its **express statutory exception**, which **permits appellate review of remand**

orders which it were removed pursuant to **§ 1443**. The Ninth Circuit has **mandatory jurisdiction** to review such civil rights removals and to vacate any remand entered in derogation of those rights. No court may evade or suppress that statutory pathway.

Appellate jurisdiction is **non-discretionary** and fully authorized under the following authorities:

Statutory Authority:

- **28 U.S.C. § 1443(1):**

Authorizes removal of state cases to federal court where a party is denied specific **civil rights** enforceable in federal court. This is the foundational statutory basis for removal and appeal herein.

- **28 U.S.C. § 1447(d):**

Although appellate review is generally barred for remand orders, § 1447(d) **explicitly preserves appellate review** for civil rights removals under § 1443. The statute reads, in relevant part:

*"An order remanding a case to the State court from which it was removed is not reviewable on appeal or otherwise, **except** that an order remanding a case to the State court from which it was removed pursuant to section 1442 **or 1443** of this title **shall be reviewable** by appeal or otherwise."*

This is a **statutory exception** carved out by Congress to prevent the suppression of federally protected rights by *improper* remand, **as occurred here**.

- **28 U.S.C. § 1291:**

Grants courts of appeal jurisdiction over **final decisions** of district courts, including remands that terminate federal proceedings.

- **28 U.S.C. § 1651(a):**

The All Writs Act, preserving appellate power to issue necessary writs to prevent jurisdictional evasion or lower court obstruction.

1 • **28 U.S.C. § 2101(c):**

2 Governs timeliness and procedure for appeals in civil cases.

3 • **Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, Rules 3, 4, and 28:**

4 Control notice of appeal, briefing, and procedural compliance.

5 **Controlling Case Law:**

6 • **Griggs v. Provident Consumer Discount Co., 459 U.S. 56 (1982):**

7 Filing a notice of appeal or petition divests the district court of jurisdiction
8 over the matter appealed. Any post-disqualification or post-remand orders
9 are **void ab initio**.

10 • **California v. Campbell, 138 F.3d 772 (9th Cir. 1998):**

11 Confirmed that **remand orders under § 1443 are appealable**, and failure to
12 address the § 1443 removal grounds on the record **requires reversal**.

13 • **Georgia v. Rachel, 384 U.S. 780 (1966):**

14 Established that § 1443(1) applies where civil rights are explicitly guaranteed
15 by law and enforceable in federal court. The district court **may not evade this**
16 **analysis**.

17 • **United States v. Sciuto, 521 F.2d 842 (7th Cir. 1975):**

18 Held that orders entered by a judge after disqualification under § 144 are
19 **void**, not merely voidable, and have no legal effect.

20 • **Rankin v. Howard, 633 F.2d 844 (9th Cir. 1980):**

21 Acts taken outside a judge's jurisdiction or after loss of authority are **not**
22 **judicial acts** and are **fully reviewable and reversible**.

23 **Summary:**

24 The remand order (Dkt. 70), the suppression order (Dkt. 75), and all actions taken
25 after disqualification (Dkt. 69) are jurisdictionally void and constitutionally
26 offensive. The appeal is expressly authorized by **statute** and **binding precedent**,
27 and this Court is obligated to:

28 • **Vacate all unlawful orders;**

- **Restore exclusive federal jurisdiction under § 1443(1);**
- **Reassign to a neutral Article III judge; and**
- **Enforce the rights, remedies, and immunities of the Real Party in Interest without further obstruction.**

III. BASIS FOR APPEAL

This appeal arises from a calculated sequence of **jurisdictionally void, procedurally fraudulent, and constitutionally offensive acts** committed by a disqualified district judge who knowingly proceeded in **open defiance of federal law** to suppress filings, conceal the record, and facilitate an unlawful remand in violation of **28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)**. The following facts are uncontested by the record and fatal to the validity of all orders at issue:

1. The District Judge Was Disqualified Under 28 U.S.C. § 144 and Had No Lawful Authority to Proceed

On July 11, 2025, Appellant filed a **Verified Affidavit of Bias and Motion to Disqualify** Judge Sunshine Suzanne Sykes under **28 U.S.C. § 144** (Dkt. 58 and Dkt. 59). This filing **automatically divested the judge of jurisdiction** over any further proceedings. The law is unambiguous: once a party submits a timely and legally sufficient affidavit of bias, the judge **must step aside and may not rule further**. See *United States v. Sciuto*, 521 F.2d 842 (7th Cir. 1975); *Studley v. United States*, 783 F.2d 934 (**9th Cir.** 1986).

Despite this, Judge Sykes unlawfully proceeded to issue the following **void post-disqualification acts**:

- **Dkt. 68 (July 21, 2025): *Scheduling Notice*** setting a hearing on the disqualification motion — a judicial act prohibited after disqualification.
- **Dkt. 69 (July 22, 2025): *Order Denying Motion to Disqualify***, ruled on by the very judge subject to disqualification — a direct violation of § 144.
- **Dkt. 70 (July 22, 2025): *Order Granting Remand and Denying All Other Motions*** — issued without jurisdiction and without adjudicating the removal under § 1443(1).

- **Dkt. 71 (July 22, 2025):** *Transmittal of Remand to State Court* — effectuating a void remand based on an unlawful order.
- **Dkt. 75 (July 31, 2025):** *Order Striking Verified Filings from the Record* — issued after remand, after case closure, and after judicial authority had terminated, for the sole purpose of concealing misconduct and suppressing the appellate record.

All of these actions were taken **after judicial disqualification was triggered and before any neutral Article III judge was assigned**. Every single order listed above is **void ab initio**, not entitled to any presumption of validity, and must be vacated as a matter of law.

2. Judge Unlawfully Ruled on Her Own Disqualification Motion

Following the Verified Affidavit of Bias and Verified Motion to Disqualify (Dkts. 58 and 59), the law **categorically prohibited** Judge Sunshine Suzanne Sykes from taking **any further judicial action**, including ruling on her own disqualification.

Nevertheless, in direct defiance of **28 U.S.C. § 144**, Judge Sykes entered **Docket 69 on July 22, 2025**, an order **purporting to deny** the disqualification motion and thereby unilaterally attempting to restore her own authority. This is a **flagrant violation of controlling law** and renders the order not merely erroneous, but **legally void and without force**.

Federal courts have repeatedly held that **a judge cannot rule on their own disqualification under § 144**. Once a timely and sufficient affidavit is filed, the judge **is disqualified by operation of law** and has no discretion or authority to self-adjudicate the matter. See:

- **United States v. Sciuto**, 521 F.2d 842, 845 (7th Cir. 1975):
“The judge loses all power and jurisdiction to act in the case once a § 144 affidavit is filed, and any orders entered thereafter are *null and void*.”

- 1 • **Studley v. United States**, 783 F.2d 934, 940 (9th Cir. 1986):

2 “Section 144 expressly prohibits the challenged judge from ruling on the legal
3 sufficiency of the affidavit.”

- 4 • **Berger v. United States**, 255 U.S. 22, 36 (1921):

5 “The disqualification is complete when the affidavit is filed, and the judge
6 may not pass upon its veracity or sufficiency.”

7 Here, the judge not only violated the statutory command by issuing **Dkt. 69**, but
8 then used that unlawful order as the **pretext for further ultra vires actions**,
9 including the remand (Dkt. 70), transmission (Dkt. 71), and the post-remand
10 suppression order (Dkt. 75). The entire sequence of events is tainted by this original
11 violation.

12 The appellate courts have made clear that **any action taken by a disqualified judge**
13 **is null, no matter how ministerial it may appear**, and that **judicial immunity does**
14 **not shield intentional disregard of jurisdictional disqualification mandates**. This
15 is not merely reversible misconduct — it is a **jurisdictional nullity and fraud upon**
16 **the court**.

17 Accordingly, **Dkt. 69 must be vacated as void**, and all subsequent actions taken in
18 reliance upon it — including Dkt. 70, Dkt. 71, and Dkt. 75 — must be **struck and**
19 **nullified** as actions taken **without lawful authority by a judge who had already**
20 **lost power to act**.

21 **3. The Court Refused to Adjudicate the Civil Rights Removal Under 28** 22 **U.S.C. § 1443(1)**

23 This case was **properly removed** under **28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)**, asserting civil
24 rights violations enforceable in federal court, supported by **verified**
25 affidavits, un rebutted filings, perfected UCC security interests, and
26 documentary evidence of procedural fraud, discrimination, and denial of
27 equitable remedy in state court.

28 Despite this, the district court:

- **Never issued findings of fact or conclusions of law** on the removal grounds;
- **Never addressed the constitutional basis** for jurisdiction;
- **Ignored binding precedent** under *Georgia v. Rachel*, 384 U.S. 780 (1966), and *California v. Campbell*, 138 F.3d 772 (9th Cir. 1998), both of which require adjudication of civil rights claims before any remand;
- And instead **issued a remand order (Dkt. 70) in silence**, as if no civil rights claim was ever filed. — **Fraud by omission.**

This omission is **not harmless** — it is **fatal**. A court may **not** lawfully remand without addressing a § 1443 removal, and **remand by silence is no remand at all**. The failure to rule on these claims **strips the remand of legal effect** and mandates reversal.

4. The Court Struck Verified Filings After Remand to Cover Up Jurisdictional Fraud and Destroy the Evidentiary Record

After remanding the case and closing it on July 22, 2025, the court then entered **Dkt. 75 on July 31, 2025**, striking multiple verified filings, including:

- **Dkt. 72** – Verified Notice of Disqualification by Operation of Law and Notice of Pending Mandamus
- **Dkt. 73** – Verified Notice of Judicial Conspiracy, Fraud on the Court, and RICO Collusion
- **Dkt. 74** – Verified Notice of Void, Unsigned, and Unsealed Remand Order

All of these were filed to **document judicial misconduct**, protect the record, and preserve issues for appeal. The court responded by **striking them after the case was closed**, with no jurisdiction to do so, and with no legal basis other than to cover its own tracks.

This was an act of **record tampering**, suppression of evidence, and obstruction of appellate review. No lawful court acting in good faith or within the bounds of its jurisdiction would engage in such concealment. This is textbook **fraud upon the court**, and it taints the entire proceeding.

5. The Entire Chain of Orders Was Issued in Bad Faith, Outside Jurisdiction, and in Retaliation for Lawful Invocation of Rights

This was not mere error. The sequence of actions taken by the court — from denying disqualification, to remanding in silence, to striking jurisdictional filings — was executed:

- **In direct violation of 28 U.S.C. § 144 and § 1443;**
- **In bad faith** and with full awareness that disqualification stripped the judge of lawful authority;
- **To suppress constitutionally protected removal** and silence a secured party creditor asserting lawful rights in equity;
- **To retaliate against Appellant** for invoking civil rights, equity jurisdiction, commercial protections, and natural law.

This is not judicial discretion. It is a pattern of **fraud, suppression, retaliation, and obstruction**, conducted under color of law and executed without jurisdiction.

6. Remedy Is Not Discretionary — It Is Legally Compelled

All post-disqualification orders — **Dkts. 68 through 75** — are **nullities**, and the failure to adjudicate civil rights removal strips the remand of legitimacy. This Court is bound by law to:

- **Vacate all void orders (Dkts. 68-75);**
- **Reverse the unlawful remand (Dkt. 70);**
- **Reinstate full federal jurisdiction under § 1443(1);**
- **Restore all stricken filings to the docket;**
- **Reassign the matter to a neutral, Article III judge;**
- **And issue sanctions or protective relief** as required to prevent further fraud, retaliation, and irreparable harm.

No court of law or equity can stand on a foundation of fraud and disqualification. If this Court does not act, it will be ratifying a jurisdictional cover-up and constitutional violation of the highest order.

IV. RELIEF DEMANDED ON APPEAL

Appellant/Injured Party/Plaintiff/Secured Party Kevin: Realworldfare, the Real Party in Interest, respectfully demands that this Court grant the following **mandatory** and **non-discretionary** relief to remedy ongoing judicial fraud, obstruction of justice, constitutional treason, willful suppression of evidence, and systemic violations of federally protected rights committed under color of law by a disqualified district judge acting in excess and absence of all lawful authority. This is a lawful and unavoidable demand for correction of a judicial process that has been weaponized to suppress civil rights, conceal fraud upon the court, and retaliate against the living man for invoking original jurisdiction and truth on the record:

1. **VACATE** the jurisdictionally void remand order (Dkt. 70), which was issued by a disqualified judge in direct violation of **28 U.S.C. § 144** and binding precedent, and declare it **null and of no legal effect**;
2. **VACATE** the unlawful July 31, 2025 Order (Dkt. 75), which fraudulently struck verified jurisdictional filings and affidavits **after disqualification and after remand**, in direct violation of **Griggs v. Provident**, 459 U.S. 56 (1982), and **United States v. Sciuto**, 521 F.2d 842 (7th Cir. 1975);
3. **REINSTATE** full and proper **federal jurisdiction** under **28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)**, **nunc pro tunc** to the original date of removal, and confirm this Court's exclusive jurisdiction over the enforcement of Appellant's civil rights, commercial interests, and equitable standing;
4. **REASSIGN** this case to a **neutral, lawfully seated Article III judge** pursuant to **28 U.S.C. §§ 144 and 455**, to ensure adjudication free from bias, conflict of interest, and willful suppression of the record;
5. **ORDER** the **full reinstatement** of all verified motions, un rebutted affidavits, judicial notices, and equitable pleadings that were wrongfully and unlawfully struck by Dkt. 75;

6. **ISSUE SANCTIONS** and enter immediate **protective and injunctive relief** as required to prevent further retaliation, jurisdictional fraud, and irreparable harm to Appellant's property, rights, and access to lawful remedy;
7. **ISSUE FINAL JUDGMENT** in favor of Appellant based on the **unrebutted verified record**, procedural default by all opposing parties, and the legal mandate to honor truth, **equity**, and uncontested affidavits as **self-executing judgments in law and commerce**.
8. **ISSUE FINAL DECLARATORY JUDGMENT IN EQUITY** in favor of Appellant due to unrebutted affidavits, procedural default, and fraud on the record.

This appeal is not merely procedural — it is a lawful demand for final remedy against sustained judicial malfeasance and fraud upon the court. **The record stands unrebutted. The law requires judgment.**

VERIFICATION:

Pursuant to **28 U.S.C. § 1746**

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

Executed, signed, and sealed this 31st 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,

Respondent, Secured Party, Injured Party

Date: July 31, 2025

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE)

I competent, over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within action. My mailing address is the Walkernova Group, **care of:** 30650 Rancho California Road suite #406-251, Temecula, California [92591]. On or about **July 31, 2025**, I served the within documents:

1. **VERIFIED NOTICE OF APPEAL UNDER 28 U.S.C. §§ 1447(D), 1443(1), AND RULE 3, FED. R. APP. P., INVOKING ORIGINAL EQUITY JURISDICTION UNDER ARTICLE III, SECTION 2 OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE TO VACATE VOID REMAND, FRAUDULENT POST-DISQUALIFICATION ORDERS, AND THE UNLAWFUL STRIKING OF JURISDICTIONAL FILINGS IN BAD FAITH**

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.

Naji Doumit, Mary Doumit, Daniel Doumit
C/o NAJI DOUMIT, MARINAJ PROPERTIES, FOCUS ESTATES INC
louisatoui3@yahoo.com
najidoumit@gmail.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 **July 31, 2025** in Riverside County, California.

/s/Chris Yarbra/
Chris Yarbra