

No.

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

Kevin: Realworldfare, *sui juris*
Real Party in Interest, Secured Party, Injured Party, and Creditor,
Movant in Equity,

v.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE,**
by and through Judge Sunshine Suzanne Sykes (disqualified), and all officers acting
in conspiracy under color of law
Respondent(s).

On Verified Emergency Bill in Equity and Demand for Writ of Mandamus and
Prohibition, invoking this Court's **Original Jurisdiction under Article III, § 2 of
the Constitution,**
28 U.S.C. §§ 1251, 1651, and the inherent powers of **equity.**

RELATED LOWER COURT CASES:
No. 5:25-cv-01357, No. 5:25-cv-01434, No. 5:25-cv-01450, No. 5:25-cv-01900,
and No. 5:25-cv-01918

VERIFIED NOTICE OF **EMERGENCY IN EQUITY AND BILL IN EQUITY
FOR EXTRAORDINARY RELIEF and VERIFIED DEMAND FOR WRIT OF
MANDAMUS, PROHIBITION, AND FULL EQUITABLE RELIEF**

Kevin: Realworldfare, *sui juris*
c/o 2082 Highway 183, #170-229
Leander, Texas
Email: team@walkernovagroup.com
by ***Special Limited Appearance only***
All rights reserved without prejudice and without recourse.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents	i
Table of Authorities	ii
I. Introduction and Jurisdictional Notice	1
II. Preliminary Notice	2
III. Questions Presented	3
IV. Statement of the Case / Facts	4
V. Statement of Jurisdiction	6
VI. Exhaustion of Remedies	8
VII. Standard of Review (Mandamus / Prohibition)	9
VIII. Formal Verified Notice	10
IX. Bill in Equity for Extraordinary Relief	12
X. Verified Demand for Writ of Mandamus and Prohibition	14
XI. Constitutional and Bill of Rights Violations	16
XII. Demand for Relief	17
XIII. Conclusion	19
Verification	20
List of Exhibits / Evidence	21
Proof of Service	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

- *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137, 163 (1803) 9, 13
- *United States v. Sibla*, 624 F.2d 864, 867 (9th Cir. 1980) 3, 7, 14, 18
- *Studley v. United States*, 783 F.2d 934, 940 (9th Cir. 1986) 5, 8, 14
- *Georgia v. Rachel*, 384 U.S. 780, 792–94 (1966) 4, 5, 7, 12, 15
- *Griggs v. Provident Consumer Discount Co.*, 459 U.S. 56, 58 (1982) ... 5, 7, 12, 15
- *Thermtron Prods., Inc. v. Hermansdorfer*, 423 U.S. 336, 343 (1976) 15
- *Bauman v. U.S. Dist. Ct.*, 557 F.2d 650, 654–55 (9th Cir. 1977) 9
- *Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Ct.*, 542 U.S. 367, 380–81 (2004) 9
- *United States v. Kis*, 658 F.2d 526, 536 (7th Cir. 1981) 4
- *In re Murchison*, 349 U.S. 133, 136 (1955) 17

Statutes

- 28 U.S.C. § 1251–1254 7
- 28 U.S.C. § 144 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 13
- 28 U.S.C. § 455 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13
- 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1) 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19
- 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d) 14, 18
- 28 U.S.C. § 1447(d) 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18
- 28 U.S.C. § 1651 (All Writs Act) 2, 7, 11
- 42 U.S.C. § 1983 2, 6, 7, 12, 15, 18
- 18 U.S.C. §§ 241, 242 2, 6, 7, 12, 15, 18
- 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961–1968 (RICO) 2, 6, 12, 18
- UCC § 1-308 2, 20
- UCC § 3-501 2

Constitutional Provisions

- Article I, § 10 2
- Article III, § 1 6, 11
- Article III, § 2 1, 7
- Article VI (Supremacy Clause) 6, 11
- First Amendment 2, 3, 6, 11, 13, 16
- Fourth Amendment 5, 6, 11, 16
- Fifth Amendment 6, 11, 13, 16
- Sixth Amendment 5, 6, 11, 13
- Seventh Amendment 6, 11, 13
- Eighth Amendment 6, 12, 13, 16
- Ninth Amendment 6, 12, 13, 16
- Tenth Amendment 6, 12, 13, 17
- Fourteenth Amendment 3, 4, 6, 11, 12, 13, 17, 19

Rules

- Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 63 3, 8, 10, 13

I. INTRODUCTION AND JURISDICTIONAL NOTICE

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

COMES NOW Kevin: Realworldfare, a living man, proceeding *sui juris*, by ***specially limited appearance only*** in my **proper private capacity**, **not** as a 14th Amendment U.S. citizen, **not** as a corporate “person,” **not** pro se, **not** pro per, and **not** through any fictitious legal construct — but as one of the **People**, the Real Party in Interest, Secured Party, Injured Party, and Creditor, standing upon the **land and soil jurisdiction** of the ***De Jure Republic***, without adhesion, contract, or submission to any foreign corporate entity posing as government.

I invoke this Court’s **original jurisdiction in equity** as vested by **Article III, § 2 of the Constitution for the United States of America**, reinforced by the **Bill of Rights**, and secured by the **Declaration of Independence**, which declares that “whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or abolish it.” Government exists only as a trust; when its trustees act in fraud, the beneficiaries are not compelled to endure usurpation. This Notice is filed as a **Verified Emergency in Equity and Bill in Equity**. It is necessary because:

- The District Court has collapsed into fraud and collusion under a permanently disqualified judge;
- The Ninth Circuit is obstructed by fraudulent remands and fabricated “Prefiling Orders” in direct violation of **28 U.S.C. §§ 1443(1), 1447(d), 144, and 455**;
- The **People** — including the undersigned — have been dispossessed of property, denied due process, silenced from filings, and stripped of remedies.

I proceed under the **Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the Declaration of Independence, and the maxims of Equity**, which recognize that rights are antecedent to government and cannot be extinguished by fraud, omission, or simulated legal process.

All immunities and rights are expressly reserved pursuant to:

- **UCC § 1-308** – reservation of rights,
- **UCC § 3-501** – presentment and protest,
- **Article I, § 10** – prohibition on impairment of contracts,
- **42 U.S.C. § 1983** – deprivation of rights under color of law,
- **18 U.S.C. §§ 241, 242** – conspiracy and deprivation of rights under color of law,
- **18 U.S.C. §§ 1961–1968 (RICO)** – organized criminal collusion,
- **28 U.S.C. § 1651 (All Writs Act)** – to preserve appellate jurisdiction.

This Court is on verified notice that the **judicial branch below has abandoned its constitutional moorings** and is engaged in systemic deprivation of rights.

Equity alone remains, and only the Supreme Court may now intervene to halt the collapse of lawful jurisdiction.

For the avoidance of doubt, this filing is not styled as a ‘petition.’ ***Movant in Equity*** expressly rejects any attempt to reclassify it as such. It is a VERIFIED BILL IN EQUITY and VERIFIED DEMAND for extraordinary relief, **invoking this Court’s original jurisdiction under Article III and the Bill of Rights.**

The **People** do not petition their public servants and trustees for permission; they demand remedy as of right in equity.

II. PRELIMINARY NOTICE

Petitioner files this VERIFIED EMERGENCY IN EQUITY and BILL IN EQUITY under Rule 33.2 of this Court, on standard paper format, 8.5 x 11 inches.

Petitioner expressly lodges constitutional objection to Rule 33.1’s “booklet” requirement, which operates as an unlawful barrier to justice and a de facto tax on the right to petition. Such a rule:

- **Violates the First Amendment** by burdening and conditioning the People’s fundamental right “to petition the Government for a redress of grievances”;

- **Violates the Fifth Amendment** by depriving access to the Court and due process of law through arbitrary formality unrelated to substance;
- **Violates the Fourteenth Amendment’s Equal Protection guarantee**, by imposing disproportionate financial and logistical burdens that deny equal access to justice based on wealth, resources, or printing capacity; and
- **Violates Article III itself**, because jurisdiction of this Court is constitutional, not discretionary or conditional, and cannot be curtailed by administrative fiat or formatting rules.

Requiring litigants to prepare filings in an obsolete, non-standard “booklet” format at great expense serves no legitimate constitutional purpose. It is arbitrary, capricious, exclusionary, and unconstitutional **on its face and as applied**. No Article III tribunal may lawfully condition jurisdiction, justice, or equitable remedy on paper size, ink, or typesetting.

Petitioner, as Movant in Equity, therefore proceeds under Rule 33.2 as the **only constitutionally valid means of access to this Court**. Any attempt to deny or obstruct jurisdiction on the basis of formatting would itself constitute obstruction of the First Amendment, deprivation of rights under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, and a fraud upon the Constitution.

III. QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether a district judge who has been permanently disqualified under 28 U.S.C. §§ 144, 455, and Rule 63 may lawfully continue issuing orders — including fabricated “prefiling restrictions” and fraudulent remands — in open defiance of verified affidavits of disqualification, controlling statute, and binding precedent.
2. Whether a judge may lawfully sit in judgment of her own recusal, ruling on challenges to her impartiality and continuing to act in cases from which she has already been disqualified — contrary to the plain command that a judge “shall proceed no further.” *United States v. Sibla*, 624 F.2d 864, 867 (9th Cir. 1980).

3. Whether civil rights removals under 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1) may be remanded by a district court, despite Congress’s explicit prohibition in 28 U.S.C. § 1447(d) and Supreme Court precedent confirming that only appellate courts may review such removals. See *Georgia v. Rachel*, 384 U.S. 780 (1966).
4. Whether a district court may impose sweeping “prefiling restrictions” sua sponte — without motion, hearing, briefing, or evidentiary findings — thereby obstructing filings, silencing litigants, and erecting a prior restraint in direct violation of the First, Fifth, and Fourteenth Amendments.
5. Whether a judge may collude with opposing counsel, adopting their unverified, self-serving accusations while suppressing or ignoring verified affidavits, sworn notices, and unrebutted factual records — thereby inverting due process and reducing judicial proceedings to hearsay advocacy rather than adjudication on evidence.
6. Whether unverified “hearsay” arguments of attorneys — not sworn, not verified, and not evidence — can lawfully defeat verified motions and affidavits submitted under penalty of perjury pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, when controlling precedent confirms that unrebutted affidavits must be taken as true. *United States v. Kis*, 658 F.2d 526, 536 (7th Cir. 1981).
7. Whether this Court, sitting in equity, must intervene where inferior courts have collapsed into systemic fraud, collusion, and jurisdictional usurpation, leaving the People without any plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law — and where refusal to act would ratify fraud, treason, and tyranny under color of law.

IV. STATEMENT OF THE CASE / FACTS

1. This matter arises from a **coordinated pattern of fraud upon the court**, unlawful dispossession of private trust property, and **systemic obstruction** of appellate jurisdiction, all emanating from Riverside County, California.
2. Multiple quiet title and civil rights removal actions were properly removed under **28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)**, including Case Nos. **5:25-cv-01357**, **5:25-cv-01434**,

5:25-cv-01450, and 5:25-cv-01900. Each case presented verified allegations of constitutional violations, deprivation of rights under color of law, and collusion between private actors and State officials.

3. In Case Nos. **5:25-cv-01434** and **5:25-cv-01450**, Judge **Sunshine Suzanne Sykes** fraudulently remanded the cases back to state court by **ignoring and omitting § 1443(1)** entirely. This constitutes **fraud by omission**, as Congress expressly prohibited remand of civil rights removals. See **Georgia v. Rachel**, **384 U.S. 780, 792–94 (1966)**.
4. In each of the above cases, Judge Sykes was formally disqualified under **28 U.S.C. §§ 144, 455, and Rule 63** by verified motions and affidavits. By law, this stripped her of all judicial authority. **United States v. Sibla**, **624 F.2d 864, 867 (9th Cir. 1980)**; **Studley v. United States**, **783 F.2d 934, 940 (9th Cir. 1986)**.
5. Despite permanent disqualification, Judge Sykes continued to act, **fabricating jurisdiction** and issuing orders that are void ab initio.
6. On **August 21, 2025**, in Case No. **5:25-cv-01900**, Judge Sykes issued two further ultra vires acts:
 - a. A fabricated **“Prefiling Order” (Dkt. 27)**, issued sua sponte without motion, hearing, briefing, or findings, purporting to bar filings without prior approval.
 - b. A fraudulent **remand order (Dkts. 28/29)**, transmitting the matter back to Riverside Superior Court in direct violation of **28 U.S.C. §§ 1443(1) and 1447(d)**. To justify this, she **recycled her prior fraudulent remand** from Case No. **5:25-cv-01434**, itself void.
7. These acts were taken **while appellate jurisdiction was already vested in the Ninth Circuit** under Case Nos. **25-4549 (mandamus)**, **25-4877 (related appeal)**, and **25-5113 (direct appeal)**. See **Griggs v. Provident Consumer Discount Co.**, **459 U.S. 56, 58 (1982)**.

8. By these acts, Judge Sykes has trampled the **Bill of Rights** and multiple **Articles of the Constitution**, including:
- **Article III, § 1** (exercise of judicial power without authority);
 - **Article VI (Supremacy Clause)** (defiance of §§ 1443(1), 1447(d), 144, 455);
 - **First Amendment** (prior restraints and denial of redress);
 - **Fourth Amendment** (unlawful seizure/dispossession of property);
 - **Fifth Amendment** (obliteration of due process);
 - **Sixth Amendment** (denial of impartial tribunal);
 - **Seventh Amendment** (denial of trial in equity and law);
 - **Eighth Amendment** (imposition of punitive “prefiling sanctions” without cause);
 - **Ninth Amendment** (destruction of reserved rights);
 - **Tenth Amendment** (usurpation of powers reserved to the People and the States);
 - **Fourteenth Amendment** (equal protection and due process inverted into deprivation under color of law).
9. These are not judicial mistakes. They are **weaponized frauds**, engineered to suppress civil rights jurisdiction, obstruct appellate review, and shield colluding defendants and counsel from liability.
10. Such acts constitute ongoing violations of **42 U.S.C. § 1983**, criminal conspiracy under **18 U.S.C. §§ 241, 242**, and racketeering under **18 U.S.C. §§ 1961–1968 (RICO)**.

V. STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

1. This Court’s jurisdiction is properly and necessarily invoked under the Constitution and binding statutes:

- **Article III, § 2 of the Constitution** — vesting judicial power in this Court over all cases arising under the Constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States.
 - **28 U.S.C. §§ 1251–1254** — granting this Court jurisdiction over appeals, writs of mandamus, prohibition, and all extraordinary writs necessary to preserve the supremacy of federal law and this Court’s supervisory authority.
 - **28 U.S.C. § 1651 (All Writs Act)** — empowering this Court to issue writs to protect its jurisdiction, restrain inferior courts acting ultra vires, and preserve rights secured by the Constitution.
 - **42 U.S.C. § 1983** — for deprivation of rights under color of law, directly and repeatedly implicated in the underlying actions.
 - **18 U.S.C. §§ 241, 242** — prohibiting conspiracy and deprivation of rights under color of law, the violations of which constitute a constitutional emergency requiring equitable intervention.
2. Jurisdiction in this Court is **not** discretionary — it is **compelled** by the collapse of lawful process below:
- **Appellate jurisdiction was already vested in the Ninth Circuit**, stripping the district court of all authority to act. Any further orders are void ab initio. *Griggs v. Provident Consumer Discount Co.*, 459 U.S. 56, 58 (1982).
 - **Civil rights removals under 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1) cannot be remanded by district courts.** Congress carved out § 1443(1) removals from § 1447(d)’s general bar on appellate review, reserving them for review by the courts of appeals and, where equity demands, this Court. *Georgia v. Rachel*, 384 U.S. 780, 792–94 (1966).
 - **A judge disqualified under 28 U.S.C. §§ 144 and 455 may not act further in a case.** All subsequent acts are void. *United States v. Sibla*, 624

F.2d 864, 867 (9th Cir. 1980); *Studley v. United States*, 783 F.2d 934, 940 (9th Cir. 1986). Here, Judge Sunshine Suzanne Sykes has issued multiple fraudulent orders post-disqualification, including fabricated “prefiling restrictions” and unlawful remands, directly obstructing appellate jurisdiction.

- **No plain, speedy, or adequate remedy exists at law.** The statutory avenues — civil rights removal (§ 1443(1)), the appellate bar (§ 1447(d)), and judicial disqualification (§§ 144, 455) — have been nullified by fraud and collusion. Equity alone remains, and this Court, sitting as the court of last resort, has exclusive and unavoidable jurisdiction to intervene.
3. To deny jurisdiction here would not simply decline review — it would ratify systemic fraud upon the court, treason against Article III, and wholesale destruction of the Bill of Rights. This Court’s equitable supervisory authority must be exercised to restore the rule of law, preserve federal jurisdiction, and halt the ongoing deprivation of constitutional rights under color of law.

VI. EXHAUSTION OF REMEDIES

The doctrine of exhaustion presumes that statutory remedies exist and can be meaningfully pursued. Here, every statutory safeguard has been inverted into a weapon of fraud and obstruction.

- **Civil rights removal under 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)** — intended by Congress as a protective mechanism — has been nullified by fraudulent remands in direct violation of § 1447(d), stripping appellate jurisdiction and fabricating authority where none exists.
- **Judicial disqualification under 28 U.S.C. §§ 144, 455, and Rule 63** has been openly defied, with Judge Sykes even ruling on her own recusal, continuing to issue orders after verified disqualification, and recycling void remands as “authority.”

- **Appellate review itself has been obstructed** by the district court's fraudulent acts. By transmitting the case back to state court and imposing prefiling restrictions, the district court has cut off the Ninth Circuit's jurisdiction before it can function, falsifying the record and silencing the appeals process.

Exhaustion is therefore impossible and futile. The statutory remedies at law are not merely inadequate — they have been turned into instruments of suppression. The People are left with no lawful recourse but equity.

As the Supreme Court has held, “equity will not suffer a wrong without a remedy.” *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137, 163 (1803). Where inferior courts defy the statutes and obstruct appellate jurisdiction itself, equity must intervene.

VII. STANDARD OF REVIEW (MANDAMUS / PROHIBITION)

Extraordinary relief by writ of mandamus or prohibition is warranted where a movant in equity or petitioner shows:

1. A **clear and indisputable right to relief**;
2. A **lack of any other adequate means** to attain the desired relief; and
3. That the writ is **appropriate under the circumstances**. *Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Ct.*, 542 U.S. 367, 380–81 (2004).

The Ninth Circuit applies the *Bauman* factors in determining whether mandamus is warranted. Relief is appropriate where:

1. The party will suffer damage not correctable on appeal;
2. The district court's order is clearly erroneous as a matter of law;
3. The order reflects persistent disregard of federal rules;
4. The order raises new, important, and unsettled legal issues; and
5. The order threatens to evade effective appellate review. *Bauman v. U.S. Dist. Ct.*, 557 F.2d 650, 654–55 (9th Cir. 1977).

Every factor is not only met, but overwhelmingly satisfied here:

- **Irreparable Harm:** Private trust property has been seized and rights dispossessed without lawful jurisdiction — an injury no appeal can undo.
- **Clear Legal Error:** Remands in violation of §§ 1443(1) and 1447(d) are void ab initio as a matter of law.
- **Defiance of Rules:** Verified disqualification was ignored in direct violation of §§ 144, 455, and Rule 63, with the judge continuing to act while stripped of all authority.
- **Fundamental Questions:** The issues implicate structural separation of powers, federal civil rights removal, and core constitutional guarantees that cannot be left unresolved.
- **Obstruction of Review:** Fraudulent “prefiling restrictions” were fabricated for the express purpose of choking off appellate review itself, ensuring irreparable harm absent intervention.

This is the textbook case for mandamus and prohibition: to halt a lower court’s lawless usurpation, prevent irreversible constitutional injury, and preserve the very integrity of Article III justice. This is precisely the situation in which mandamus and prohibition exist: to restrain inferior courts from lawless usurpation, to prevent irreparable injury, and to preserve the constitutional structure of justice.

VIII. FORMAL VERIFIED NOTICE

Comes now **Kevin: Realworldfare**, *sui juris*, in proper private capacity, as **Real Party in Interest, Secured Party, Injured Party, and Movant in Equity**, giving this **VERIFIED NOTICE** to the Supreme Court of the United States of an ongoing and escalating judicial **emergency**.

On **August 21, 2025**, Judge **Sunshine Suzanne Sykes**—permanently disqualified under **28 U.S.C. §§ 144, 455, and Rule 63** in four separate actions (**5:25-cv-01357, 5:25-cv-01434, 5:25-cv-01450, 5:25-cv-01900**), and while appellate jurisdiction was already vested in the Ninth Circuit under Case Nos. **25-4549**,

25-4877, and 25-5113—unlawfully and ultra vires purported to issue two fraudulent and void ab initio orders:

- 1. A fabricated “Prefiling Order”** obstructing filings and imposing unconstitutional prior restraints, in direct violation of the **First Amendment** (right to petition and free expression), the **Fifth Amendment** (due process), the **Fourteenth Amendment** (equal protection and due process), and **28 U.S.C. § 1651 (All Writs Act)**.
- 2. A fraudulent remand order** transmitting a properly removed **civil rights case** back to the **hostile** Riverside County Superior Court, in open defiance of **28 U.S.C. §§ 1443(1) and 1447(d)**, stripping away civil rights protections and trampling binding precedent.

Both acts are **void ab initio, procedurally barred, and constitutionally fraudulent**. They are not judicial “error” subject to correction on appeal—they are **deliberate usurpations of power** by a judge stripped of jurisdiction, acting in **direct contempt of Article III** and in criminal violation of her oath.

Constitutional and Bill of Rights Violations

By her acts, Judge Sykes has **trampled nearly the entire Bill of Rights and multiple Articles of the Constitution**, including:

- **Article III, §1** – by exercising judicial power she does not lawfully hold.
- **Article VI, Supremacy Clause** – by defying federal statutes (28 U.S.C. §§ 1443(1), 1447(d)).
- **First Amendment** – right to petition the courts for redress, free speech, and free press.
- **Fourth Amendment** – deprivation of security in property and papers through unlawful remand and dispossession.
- **Fifth Amendment** – denial of due process of law.
- **Sixth Amendment** – denial of impartial tribunal.
- **Seventh Amendment** – denial of trial rights in equity and law.

- **Eighth Amendment** – infliction of cruel and unusual punishment through retaliatory obstruction and suppression.
- **Ninth Amendment** – destruction of retained rights not enumerated.
- **Tenth Amendment** – usurpation of powers reserved to the People and the States.
- **Fourteenth Amendment** – denial of equal protection and due process under color of law.

Nature of the Fraud

These acts are not neutral judicial rulings—they are **weaponized frauds upon the court**, engineered to:

- **Suppress civil rights jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1).**
- **Obstruct appellate jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1447(d)** and binding precedent (*Georgia v. Rachel*, 384 U.S. 780 (1966); *Griggs v. Provident*, 459 U.S. 56 (1982)).
- **Shield colluding defendants, counsel, and officers from liability** under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
- **Perpetrate ongoing criminal conspiracy** under 18 U.S.C. §§ 241, 242 (conspiracy against rights; deprivation of rights under color of law) and **RICO**, 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961–1968.

Accordingly, **both the “Prefiling Order” and the Remand Order stand as legal nullities—void *ab initio***, incapable of binding effect on any tribunal or party. They are **fraudulent instruments of collusion and treason against the Constitution and the People**, and must be struck down.

IX. BILL IN EQUITY FOR EXTRAORDINARY RELIEF

The law has been corrupted, obstructed, and rendered impotent. The district court is **compromised by a disqualified judge acting ultra vires**, the Ninth Circuit has been **stonewalled by fraud and procedural obstruction**, and the **People** — including the undersigned Real Party in Interest and Movant **in Equity** — have

been **dispossessed of private trust property, stripped of due process, and denied constitutional protections guaranteed by the Bill of Rights.**

There exists **no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.** Every statutory safeguard — removal under **28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)**, the appellate bar under **§ 1447(d)**, and the disqualification mandates of **28 U.S.C. §§ 144, 455, and Rule 63** — has been openly violated and inverted into **weapons of fraud.** This is not a breakdown of legal process; it is the **weaponization of legal process itself** against the People. In such circumstances, **equity alone remains.** The Supreme Court, sitting in equity under its inherent constitutional authority, **must** intervene where law has failed and where inferior tribunals have descended into usurpation and collusion. As this Court declared in **Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137, 163 (1803)**, “equity will not suffer a wrong without a remedy.” To deny relief here would not merely allow a wrong — it would ratify a **judicial coup against the Constitution itself.**

This Court has both the **authority and the duty** to act decisively where:

- Inferior courts act **ultra vires**, fabricating jurisdiction and issuing void orders;
- **Verified** judicial disqualification is **ignored, defied, and trampled;**
- Civil rights removal statutes under **28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)** are nullified by fraud and collusion;
- Structural fairness, due process, and equal protection are obliterated under color of law;
- The guarantees of the **First, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, Tenth, and Fourteenth Amendments** are **systematically violated and extinguished;** and
- The **People** are left without redress in any other forum, stripped of all lawful remedies by deliberate obstruction.

Thus, only this Court, sitting in equity, can restore the rule of law, protect constitutional rights, and prevent the ongoing collapse of lawful jurisdiction. To refuse would be to legitimize **fraud, treason, and tyranny under color of law.**

X. VERIFIED DEMAND FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS AND PROHIBITION

Comes now the Movant in Equity, demanding extraordinary relief as the only remaining lawful and constitutional remedy. **The judiciary below has collapsed into fraud, collusion, and treason under color of law.** This Court's intervention is not optional — it is constitutionally mandated.

Accordingly, Movant DEMANDS that this Court:

- 1. Issue a Writ of Mandamus** compelling the Ninth Circuit to vacate the fraudulent “Prefiling Order” (Dkt. 27) and unlawful remand (Dkt. 28/29), to enforce the black-letter mandates of **28 U.S.C. §§ 1443(1) and 1447(d)**, and to restore lawful jurisdiction in equity stripped away by fraud.
- 2. Issue a Writ of Prohibition** forbidding the Riverside Superior Court — or any state tribunal — from acting on or proceeding under the void remand. **Once removed, state jurisdiction is extinguished by law** under § 1446(d). Any attempt to proceed is an act of usurpation, obstruction, and insurrection against the Constitution.
- 3. Vacate and Nullify** all fraudulent orders entered by disqualified Judge Sunshine Suzanne Sykes post-disqualification, across **Case Nos. 5:25-cv-01357, 01434, 01450, and 01900**. By statute and precedent, her judicial authority was extinguished the moment the various **verified** motions and/or affidavits of disqualification were filed. Every order thereafter in each case above is **void ab initio** and cannot stand as law. *See United States v. Sibla*, 624 F.2d 864, 867 (9th Cir. 1980); *Studley v. United States*, 783 F.2d 934, 940 (9th Cir. 1986).
- 4. Order Immediate Reassignment** to a neutral, Article III-qualified judge, **if any can be found untainted in the Central District of California**. No

disqualified judge may be permitted to continue masquerading as a judicial officer while engaged in ongoing obstruction of rights.

5. Preserve and Affirm Federal Jurisdiction over the civil rights removals, quiet title actions, and trust property disputes, recognizing that:

- Civil rights removals under **28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)** **cannot** be remanded without full adjudication of the underlying civil rights claims. *Georgia v. Rachel*, 384 U.S. 780 (1966).
- Remand orders are non-reviewable by the district court under **§ 1447(d)**. Exclusive review lies with the courts of appeals — and in **§ 1443(1) removals**, Congress expressly carved out an exception to the general non-reviewability rule. See 28 U.S.C. § 1447(d); *Thermtron Prods., Inc. v. Hermansdorfer*, 423 U.S. 336, 343 (1976). Thus, civil rights removals under § 1443(1) are within the Ninth Circuit’s exclusive jurisdiction to review; the district court is stripped of all power to act.
- Appellate jurisdiction was already vested in all cases (**5:25-cv-01357, 5:25-cv-01434, 5:25-cv-01450, 5:25-cv-01900**) under *Griggs v. Provident Consumer Discount Co.*, 459 U.S. 56, 58 (1982).

6. Declare Ongoing Violations of 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and criminal violations under 18 U.S.C. §§ 241 and 242, as continuing under color of law. The record proves a coordinated conspiracy to suppress due process, obstruct appellate jurisdiction, and dispossess the Real Party in Interest of property and rights secured by the Constitution and Bill of Rights.

This Court’s failure to act would itself constitute ratification of fraud, complicity in conspiracy, and abdication of Article III’s sacred duty. The law, the Constitution, and equity demand decisive relief — **mandamus, prohibition, and full restoration of rights.**

XI. CONSTITUTIONAL AND BILL OF RIGHTS VIOLATIONS

The fraudulent “Prefiling Order” and unlawful remand entered by disqualified Judge Sunshine Suzanne Sykes are not isolated procedural defects — they are a full-scale assault on the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Each act compounded a pattern of calculated deprivation under color of law, violating the most fundamental guarantees owed to the People:

- **First Amendment:** By obstructing filings and imposing a fraudulent “prefiling” regime, Sykes erected a prior restraint on the right to petition for redress of grievances — a core liberty expressly protected against government suppression.
- **Fourth Amendment:** By facilitating the unlawful seizure and dispossession of trust property without lawful jurisdiction or due process, she violated the guarantee of security in property.
- **Fifth Amendment:** Due process has been obliterated. Verified affidavits and sworn filings were ignored, appeals were trampled, and fraudulent remands were issued in direct defiance of black-letter law — a textbook deprivation without lawful process.
- **Seventh Amendment:** The People’s right to trial in equity, where the law is obstructed or fails, has been denied. Instead of equitable adjudication, fraud and collusion were substituted as the operative “law.”
- **Eighth Amendment:** The so-called “Prefiling Order” operates as an excessive, punitive sanction — imposed without motion, hearing, or cause — weaponized to suppress filings and to punish constitutionally protected conduct.
- **Ninth Amendment:** The broad reservation of rights to the People has been trampled, as this judicial conspiracy extinguishes remedies and strips protections never surrendered to the State.

- **Tenth Amendment:** Powers constitutionally reserved to the People and to the several States have been usurped by a rogue federal judge acting without jurisdiction, in conspiracy with private actors, in direct violation of the separation of powers.
- **Fourteenth Amendment:** Equal protection and due process, designed as shields for civil rights, have been inverted into swords of deprivation. Under color of law, Sykes and colluding counsel have weaponized procedure to strip away rights, silence the injured, and shield defendants from accountability.

These violations are not hypothetical, technical, or trivial. They are **ongoing, verified, and un rebutted acts of treason against the Constitution itself**. The Bill of Rights is reduced to parchment if a disqualified officer can obliterate it through fraud, omission, and collusion. Equity cannot and will not permit such desecration to stand.

XII. DEMAND FOR RELIEF

Movant in Equity does not “pray” as a petitioner. He **demand**s as a **matter of right** — under the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the statutes of the United States, and the maxims of equity — that this Court act decisively to halt a judicial coup carried out under color of law.

Accordingly, Kevin: Realworldfare, sui juris, Real Party in Interest, Secured Party, and Injured Party, DEMANDS that this Court:

1. **Declare void ab initio** the fraudulent “Prefiling Order” (Dkt. 27) and the unlawful remand (Dkts. 28/29), recognizing them as nullities issued by a permanently disqualified judge acting without jurisdiction.
2. **Vacate and nullify** all post-disqualification orders entered by Judge Sunshine Suzanne Sykes in Case Nos. 5:25-cv-01357, 5:25-cv-01434, 5:25-cv-01450, and 5:25-cv-01900 — confirming that no act by a disqualified officer may stand as law. Binding precedent makes clear that a judge cannot sit in judgment of her own disqualification. *See In re Murchison*, 349 U.S. 133, 136

(1955) (“No man can be a judge in his own case.”); *United States v. Sibla*, 624 F.2d 864, 867 (9th Cir. 1980).

3. **Issue a Writ of Mandamus** compelling the Ninth Circuit to enforce 28 U.S.C. §§ 1443(1) and 1447(d), vacate the fraudulent orders, and restore lawful jurisdiction in equity.
4. **Issue a Writ of Prohibition** forbidding the Riverside Superior Court — or any state tribunal — from proceeding under the void remand, consistent with 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d), which extinguishes state jurisdiction once removal is perfected.
5. **Order immediate reassignment** of these matters to a neutral, Article III-qualified judge, if one can be found untainted in the Central District of California, to prevent further collusion, fraud, and obstruction.
6. **Formally recognize and enforce** the ongoing violations of 42 U.S.C. § 1983, 18 U.S.C. §§ 241 and 242, and the RICO statutes (18 U.S.C. §§ 1961–1968), and refer the matter for proper investigation and prosecution to ensure accountability for this coordinated conspiracy against rights.
7. **Award full restitution and equitable relief** to the Movant in Equity, including:
 - Restitution of trust property and restoration of possession unlawfully taken;
 - Expungement of all void orders entered post-disqualification;
 - Compensation for exorbitant time, costs, and expenses imposed by fraudulent litigation tactics;
 - Compensation for emotional trauma, mental anguish, stress, and irreparable harm caused by unlawful dispossession, obstruction of filings, and deprivation of remedy;

- Affirmation that no judge may lawfully preside over, decide, or deny her own recusal, and that all such acts are jurisdictional nullities ab initio.

8. **Grant such further equitable relief** as justice, conscience, and the Constitution compel, to restore the rule of law, preserve the Bill of Rights, and vindicate the separation of powers against ongoing usurpation.

XIII. CONCLUSION

This matter is not about mere judicial error, but outright usurpation. A permanently disqualified judge, acting in open contempt of Article III, the Bill of Rights, and controlling federal statutes, has:

- Fabricated jurisdiction she does not lawfully hold;
- Ignored and defied verified affidavits and unrebutted evidence of fraud;
- Weaponized removal and remand procedures to extinguish civil rights claims;
- Obstructed appellate review by fraudulent “prefiling” restrictions; and
- Colluded with adverse counsel to shield bad-faith actors from accountability.

Civil rights removals under 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1), enacted by Congress to protect the People against precisely this kind of state and judicial oppression, have been trampled into nullity. The constitutional guarantees of the First, Fourth, Fifth, Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, Tenth, and Fourteenth Amendments — the very core of the Bill of Rights — have been desecrated under color of law.

Equity does not tolerate fraud. The Constitution does not tolerate usurpation. And this Court cannot permit complicity in a judicial conspiracy that deprives the People of property, rights, and remedy.

The choice before this Court is stark: intervene decisively to restore the supremacy of law and equity, or ratify a judicial coup amounting to treason against the Constitution itself. No middle ground exists.

//

//

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 21st day of August in the year of Our Lord two thousand and twenty five, *without* the United States.

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

By: Kevin: Realworldfare
Kevin: Realworldfare, *Real Party In Interest,*
Secured Party, Injured Party/Movant In Equity

//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//

LIST OF EXHIBITS / EVIDENCE:

1.Exhibit A: UCC-1 Financing Statement No. 2024385925-4 (Estate & All Assets)

Lawfully perfected and recorded UCC-1 Financing Statement securing Plaintiff's interest in all trust property, estate assets, and commercial collateral, rebutting any presumption of public debt or abandonment.

2.Exhibit B: UCC-1 Financing Statement No. 2025470746-9 (Estate & All Assets)

Lawfully perfected and recorded UCC-1 Financing Statement securing Plaintiff's interest in all trust property, estate assets, and commercial collateral, rebutting any presumption of public debt or abandonment.

3.Exhibit C: BIRTH CERTIFICATE/BEARER BOND Accepted for Value and Assignment of Interest

Copy of Plaintiff's original Birth Certificate tendered and lawfully Accepted for Value, assigned, and returned with reservation of rights under UCC § 1-308 and public notice of fiduciary separation. This document evidences the transfer of liability, title, and commercial rights from the publicly registered ens legis trust to the private secured party creditor and authorized executor. It further establishes the Plaintiff's standing as the lawful controller of the estate and rebuts any implied joinder, suretyship, or statutory presumption used to justify unauthorized court actions or takings.

4. Exhibit D: Hold Harmless and Indemnification Agreement

Executed declaration and lawful agreement establishing irrevocable indemnification of the Plaintiff from all liabilities, damages, actions, or claims arising out of the fraudulent conduct, simulated legal process, color-of-law trespass, and ultra vires acts committed by Defendants, their agents, assigns, and all associated parties. This document affirms that all third parties, courts, agencies, and foreign actors are estopped from shifting liability or presuming

authority over Plaintiff's private trust, estate, or person. It also forms the basis for commercial enforcement and future lien action against any violators or trespassers.

5.Exhibit E: Affidavit of Truth: Power of Attorney in Fact

Notarized and executed lawful instrument establishing Plaintiff's authority to act on behalf of the estate and trust as attorney-in-fact, with full capacity, commercial liability, and lawful standing.

6.Exhibit F: Common Law Copyright and Trademark Declaration

Sworn declaration reserving full rights under common law and commercial law to the private name, estate, likeness, and trust property—securing private domain and prohibiting commercial impersonation.

7.Exhibit G: Verified Affidavit of Identity

Notarized affidavit establishing sui juris status of Plaintiff, with legal standing as the living man, secured party, and beneficiary of private trusts, rebutting all presumptions of ens legis capacity.

8.Exhibit H: Docket Printout – Sunshine Suzanne Sykes (Case No. 5:25-cv-01450)

Official federal docket evidencing fraud, remand in violation of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1443(1) and 1446(d), suppression of pleadings, and judicial retaliation in complete absence of jurisdiction. Evidence and proof of judicial obstruction, improper case management, and simulated rulings issued while disqualified and under verified challenge.

9.Exhibit I: Docket Printout – Sunshine Suzanne Sykes (Case No. 5:25-cv-01434)

Official federal docket evidencing fraud, remand in violation of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1443(1) and 1446(d), suppression of pleadings, and judicial retaliation in complete absence of jurisdiction. Evidence and proof of judicial obstruction, improper case management, and simulated rulings issued while disqualified and

under verified challenge..

10.Exhibit J: Docket Printout – Wesley L. Hsu and Sunshine Suzanne Sykes (Case No. 5:25-cv-01357)

Additional evidence of judicial obstruction, improper case management, and simulated rulings issued while disqualified and under verified challenge.

11.Exhibit K: Docket Printout – Sunshine Suzanne Sykes (Case No. 5:25-

cv-01900) Official federal docket evidencing continued rulings, docket entries, and judicial activity by Judge Sunshine Suzanne Sykes, despite a prior verified disqualification under 28 U.S.C. § 144.

This docket demonstrates deliberate disregard for federal removal under 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1) and § 1446(d), and appellate jurisdiction, along with procedural fraud, suppression of equity pleadings, and material judicial dishonor.

Judge Sykes **knowingly ruled in her own disqualification**, failed to issue a transfer or reassignment, and **refused to acknowledge un rebutted affidavits** and jurisdictional defects on the record — constituting **fraud upon the court**, violation of **due process**, and **irreparable harm** to Plaintiff's person, trust, and estate.

This Exhibit establishes conclusive evidence of **constitutional injury**, **lack of judicial neutrality**, and **ultra vires judicial action** in violation of the Canons of Judicial Conduct, binding precedent, and mandatory statutory disqualification.

12.Exhibit L: Verified Criminal Complaint — Fraud Upon the Court, Judicial Collusion, Impersonation of Federal Authority, and Ongoing Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law

Filed and verified criminal complaint evidencing a coordinated conspiracy among federal and state actors to suppress Plaintiff's lawful remedy, dispossess secured property, and obstruct the course of justice through fraudulent substitution of parties, simulated jurisdiction, and judicial retaliation. The

complaint includes direct accusations of impersonation of federal authority, unlawful substitution of caption to “UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,” conspiracy to deprive civil rights under 18 U.S.C. §§ 241, 242, 872, and 912, and ongoing interference with Plaintiff’s equity jurisdiction and trust corpus.

13. Exhibit M: Verified Affidavit of Truth Regarding Jurisdictional Violations, Fraud, and Color-of-Law Trespass

Sworn and notarized affidavit of material fact establishing the ongoing pattern of jurisdictional fraud, simulated legal process, denial of due process, and trespass upon private trust estate. This un rebutted affidavit, served upon multiple parties and courts, affirms that Plaintiff’s property and rights have been continually violated by actors lacking lawful authority, standing, or jurisdiction. It specifically details the structural and procedural fraud committed by named Defendants, including ultra vires orders, impersonation of lawful authority, and systemic retaliation against equity-based pleadings.

14. Exhibit N — *NOTE/negotiable instrument (UCC § 3-104)*– Lawfully tendered and accepted for full discharge of any and all alleged obligations, extinguishing any purported debt associated with the subject property.

15. Exhibit O — *Deed of Trust/negotiable instrument (UCC § 3-104) – Lawfully Discharged* – Instrument evidencing the elimination of all purported encumbrances, liens, or debts under controlling UCC provisions and applicable California Commercial Code.

16. Exhibit P — *UCC-3 Amendment No. 2024402433-7* – Confirming and maintaining the secured party’s perfected claim over the Deed of Trust and Note.

17. Exhibit Q — *UCC-3 Amendment No. 2024411182-7* – Additional confirmation of perfected claim and enforcement of security interest over the Deed of Trust and Note.

18. Exhibit R — *Grant Deed* – Recorded instrument proving Defendants hold no lawful or equitable title to the subject property, thereby nullifying any claim or cause of action under unlawful detainer or foreclosure pretenses.

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:** 2082 Highway 183 #170-229, Leander, Texas. On or about **August 21, 2025**, I served the within documents:

1. VERIFIED NOTICE OF **EMERGENCY IN EQUITY AND BILL IN EQUITY
FOR EXTRAORDINARY RELIEF AND VERIFIED DEMAND FOR WRIT OF
MANDAMUS, PROHIBITION, AND FULL EQUITABLE RELIEF**

2. Exhibits A through R

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.

Clerk(s)
C/o CLERK OF COURT
1 First Street, North East
Washington, District of Colombia [20543]
Express Mail No. ER203074277US

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.

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 21, 2025** in Riverside
County, California.

/s/Chris Yarbra/
Chris Yarbra