

Date: July 24, 2025

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

Respondent, Interested Party, Secured Party,
Real Party In Interest, Injured 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.

[Removed from California Superior Court,
for the County of Riverside, Case No.
[CVME2504043](#)]

VERIFIED NOTICE OF REMOVAL
UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1) FOR
CIVIL RIGHTS DEPRIVATION,
WITH VERIFIED NOTICE OF VOID
REMAND ISSUED BY
DISQUALIFIED JUDGE ACTING
ULTRA VIRES — NO TIME LIMIT
FOR REMOVAL

(SPECIAL LIMITED APPEARANCE —
EQUITY JURISDICTION PRESERVED)

TO THE COURT CLERK AND ALL INTERESTED PERSONS:

This matter is brought in equity, under the original and exclusive jurisdiction of this
Court as authorized by the Constitution of the United States, Article III, Section 2.

All statutory jurisdiction is expressly denied and rebutted. This is a Court of
Record. All rights are reserved without prejudice pursuant to UCC 1-308

Kevin: Realworldfare, **a living man**, private American national, proceeding
sui juris, in propria persona, by *Special Limited Appearance only*, NOT as a

“Defendant,” **not pro se**, **not a “resident”**, and **not** a U.S. citizen under the 14th Amendment, but as the *Real Party in Interest* and *Secured Party*, *Injured Party*, *Master Beneficiary*, and *Respondent* for the ens legis, artificial entity, and corporate fiction **KEVIN LEWIS WALKER** (hereinafter *Purported* “Cross-Defendant” or “ENS LEGIS”), hereby gives formal notice of removal of the above-captioned action from the Superior Court of California for the County of Riverside to the United States District Court for the Central District of California, pursuant to **28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)**. This removal is based **exclusively** on the invocation of federally protected **civil rights** that cannot be enforced in the California state court forum.

I. STATE COURT IDENTIFICATION

The removed action is styled:

WG EXPRESS TRUST, et al. v. MARINAJ PROPERTIES LLC,
Superior Court Case No. CVME2504043
County of Riverside, California.

The subject matter involves an unlawful attempt to dispossess the real party in interest of real property located at:

31990 Pasos Place, Temecula, California 92591 (APN: 957-570-005).

II. BASIS FOR REMOVAL - 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)

This action is removed pursuant to **28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)**, which mandates federal removal where a defendant is:

“denied or *cannot* enforce in the courts of such State a right under any law providing for the equal civil rights of citizens of the United States...”

This provision operates as a federal jurisdictional override where state proceedings constitute a systemic denial of federally guaranteed rights under color of state law. Removal under § 1443(1) is proper and required when the record demonstrates, as it does here, that the defendant:

The state court has and continues to:

- 1 • **Ignore and refuse to adjudicate un rebutted verified affidavits**, constituting
- 2 binding judicial admissions under both federal and state law;
- 3 • **Disregard *perfected* and recorded UCC security interests**, including prior
- 4 claims to title under governing commercial and equity law;
- 5 • **Deny access to lawful remedy in equity** by enforcing void instruments,
- 6 enabling fraudulent conveyance, and insulating facially defective claims.

7 The removal is compelled by active and ongoing violations of federally secured
8 rights under **42 U.S.C. § 1983**, including:

- 9 • **Deprivation of due process** through extra-jurisdictional rulings;
- 10 • **Suppression of equal protection** by procedural weaponization of court
- 11 rules;
- 12 • **Obstruction of private access to a neutral tribunal**, contrary to the
- 13 **Fourteenth Amendment**.

14 Pursuant to **Georgia v. Rachel**, 384 U.S. 780, 794 (1966), and **Johnson v.**

15 **Mississippi**, 421 U.S. 213, 219 (1975), **§ 1443(1) removal is not only permitted but**
16 **required where the defendant asserts:**

17 Rights explicitly granted under federal civil rights statutes (e.g., § 1983), and

18 That such rights are **systematically obstructed** by the state court itself, rendering
19 enforcement impossible.

20 This standard is **unequivocally met here**. The California state court forum has
21 functioned as a tool of retaliation, deprivation, and commercial harm.

22 To compound the violation, the prior remand order was issued by a judge
23 disqualified under **28 U.S.C. § 144**, with no lawful authority to act. That
24 order was:

- 25 • **Unsigned,**
- 26 • **Unsealed, and**
- 27 • **Silent on § 1443(1) – rendering it void ab initio, a legal nullity with no**
28 **binding effect.**

Where the first remand did **not** address the merits of civil rights removal, a **second removal under 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1) is not barred**:

“The bar only applies where the remand was ‘on the merits.’”

— *FDIC v. Santiago Plaza*, 598 F. Supp. 2d 233, 237 (D.P.R. 2009)

— *Seedman v. U.S. Dist. Ct.*, 837 F.2d 413, 414 (9th Cir. 1988)

Here, the prior remand failed to address § 1443(1) at all. Accordingly, this renewed and exclusive invocation of 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1) is procedurally proper and substantively mandatory. No judicial order has yet lawfully reviewed the civil rights removal on its merits. As such, jurisdiction remains in the federal forum, and any further attempt to obstruct this removal constitutes **fraud, deprivation of rights under color of law, and federal offenses under 18 U.S.C. §§ 241, 242.**

III. THIS IS NOT A “SUCCESSIVE REMOVAL” – THIS IS ENFORCEMENT OF UNDIVESTED FEDERAL JURISDICTION AFTER A VOID REMAND

This action does not constitute a second or successive removal. Rather, it is the lawful enforcement of federal jurisdiction that properly attached under **28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)**, which has **never been lawfully divested**, and remains intact **by operation of law.**

“The bar on successive removals only applies when the original remand order was based on a substantive determination of the federal court’s jurisdiction.”

— *FDIC v. Santiago Plaza*, 598 F. Supp. 2d 233, 237 (D.P.R. 2009)

— *Seedman v. U.S. Dist. Ct.*, 837 F.2d 413, 414 (9th Cir. 1988)

Here, no such adjudication ever occurred. The prior remand was **not based on a ruling on the merits** of Plaintiff’s properly invoked civil rights removal under **28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)**. Instead, the district court remanded sua sponte without a motion, hearing, or substantive analysis of the federal question, and in **complete omission of Plaintiff’s stated civil rights claims** under **42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 3617**, among others.

Worse, the remand was issued **after Plaintiff filed a Verified Affidavit of Bias and Prejudice under 28 U.S.C. § 144**, which by law **divested the assigned judge of all jurisdiction to act**. Any order issued thereafter — including the remand — is **void ab initio**, legally nonexistent, and without force. It cannot trigger the “remand” clause of 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d) because no lawful remand ever occurred.

“A void order is no order at all. It confers no rights, it is entitled to no respect, and it does not divest or confer jurisdiction.”

— *Valley v. Northern Fire & Marine Ins. Co.*, 254 U.S. 348 (1920)

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

Therefore, federal jurisdiction remains intact, and this filing is properly titled and styled as a **Verified Enforcement of Federal Jurisdiction**, not a second removal.

The Plaintiff is not seeking to remove anew but to vacate a **fraudulent, void remand order** and to **reassert original jurisdiction under § 1443(1)**, which was never defeated, rebutted, or lawfully relinquished.

The bar on successive removals is wholly inapplicable to this matter. Any contrary assertion constitutes an attempt to validate fraud, violate due process, and unlawfully shield ultra vires judicial acts from correction.

IV. PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS

This removal is brought solely under 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1), which provides for removal of a state court action **at any time before trial** when a defendant is unable to enforce federally protected civil rights in the state forum.

Unlike removals under other statutes, **§ 1443(1) is NOT subject to the 30-day limitation in § 1446(b)**. The statute expressly permits removal **whenever** it becomes evident that enforcement of federal civil rights is obstructed by the state process. That standard is met here.

This Notice of Removal will be promptly filed with the Clerk of the Superior Court of California, County of Riverside, and served on all adverse parties. Upon such filing and service, **the state court is immediately divested of jurisdiction**, and any

further proceedings are unlawful and void under the Supremacy Clause and governing federal removal authority.

V. THE PRIOR REMAND ORDER IS A LEGAL NULLITY: UNSIGNED, JURISDICTIONALLY DEFECTIVE, AND ISSUED BY A DISQUALIFIED JUDGE ACTING ULTRA VIRES

The so-called remand order issued in the prior federal matter (**Case No. 5:25-CV-01434**) is a **legal nullity** — wholly void and of no force or effect. It was:

- **Unsigned and unsealed**, in violation of **Fed. R. Civ. P. 58(a)** and local rules requiring authenticated entry of judgment;
- Issued **without jurisdiction**, following the filing of a **Verified Affidavit of Bias and Prejudice** under **28 U.S.C. § 144**, which by law **immediately divested** the presiding judge — **Sunshine Suzanne Sykes** — of any further authority in the case;
- Executed in direct **omission of controlling federal jurisdiction** under **28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)** and **42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 3617**;
- Committed **ultra vires**, outside any lawful authority, and in open violation of federal due process and civil rights law.

“A void judgment is a legal nullity, subject to attack at any time in any court, and binds no one.”

— *Valley v. Northern Fire & Marine Ins. Co.*, 254 U.S. 348 (1920)

— *Ex parte Craig*, 282 F. 138 (2d Cir. 1922), cert. denied, 260 U.S. 745 (1923)

At the time of the remand, Judge Sykes was **already disqualified by operation of law** under 28 U.S.C. § 144, having been served a verified affidavit containing facts and sworn testimony evidencing personal bias, prejudice, and misconduct. Upon receipt of that affidavit, the judge was **statutorily stripped of all jurisdiction**, and **any subsequent act is void ab initio**, including the unlawful remand.

“The judge shall proceed no further...” — 28 U.S.C. § 144

Because the remand was entered after judicial disqualification, and in total disregard of mandatory federal jurisdiction under § 1443(1), **no lawful remand occurred**. The document labeled a “remand” has **no signature, no legal authority, and no jurisdictional basis** — it is an **illusory act committed under color of law and in direct violation of federal statutory command**.

Moreover, the disqualified judge in question — **Sunshine Suzanne Sykes** — is now the subject of an impending **personal civil suit** for her **ultra vires conduct**, including:

- Knowingly issuing void orders after disqualification;
- Depriving Plaintiff of due process rights under color of law;
- Obstructing justice, engaging in judicial fraud, and violating civil rights protections under **42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985, and 1986**.

“When a judge acts where he or she has no jurisdiction, and particularly after being disqualified by law, they engage in conduct outside the judicial function, and are therefore not immune.”

— *Gregory v. Thompson*, 500 F.2d 59 (9th Cir. 1974)

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

Thus, the prior remand cannot serve as a basis for resuming state court jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d), because **no valid remand was ever issued**. This enforcement action seeks to vacate the void order, restore original jurisdiction, and formally bar all downstream actions taken in reliance on the null remand.

VI. EXHIBITS

Attached as exhibits are true and correct copies of all pleadings, filings, and orders served or filed in the state court action, including but not limited to:

- **Exhibit A:** Verified Complaint for Quiet Title (Filed 04/16/2025)
- **Exhibit B:** Summons (Filed 04/16/2025)
- **Exhibit C:** Cross-Complaint and related Answer (Filed 05/07/2025) — rejected and then retroactively added to the docket on 05/20/2025.

- 1 • **Exhibit D:** VERIFIED RESPONSE, CONDITIONAL ACCEPTANCE, AND
2 MOTION AND DEMAND TO STRIKE CROSS-COMPLAINT, SANCTION
3 COUNSEL FOR FRAUD, AND QUIET TITLE IN FAVOR OF PLAINTIFFS, as
4 a matter (File on 05/12/2025)
- 5 • **Exhibit E:** Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings on Complaint for Quiet
6 Title of WG PRIVATE IRREVOCABLE TRUST (Filed on 05/13/2025)
- 7 • **Exhibit F:** VERIFIED RESPONSE, REBUTTAL, AND MOTION AND
8 DEMAND FOR SANCTIONS AGAINST FALSE ALLEGATIONS OF
9 UNAUTHORIZED PRACTICE OF LAW, AND AFFIRMATION OF PRIVATE
10 CAPACITY STANDING (Filed on 05/19/2025)
- 11 • **Exhibit G:** VERIFIED MOTION AND DEMAND FOR SUMMARY
12 DISPOSITION, JUDICIAL ESTOPPEL, STRIKING OF DEFECTIVE CROSS-
13 COMPLAINT, AND ENTRY OF DEFAULT AND SANCTIONS FOR
14 DEFENDANTS' DISHONOR, FRAUD, UNCLEAR HANDS, AND BAD
15 FAITH, WITHOUT HEARING AS A MATTER OF LAW (Filed on
16 05/19/2025)
- 17 • **Exhibit H:** Opposition of Defendant Marinaj Properties LLC to Plaintiffs'
18 Verified Notice, Conditional Acceptance, Rebuttal, Motion and Demand to
19 Strike Fraudulent Related Case Designation, with Affirmation of Non-
20 Related Standing and Motion and demand for Sanctions (Filed on
21 05/19/2025)
- 22 • **Exhibit I:** Opposition Opposition of Defendant Marinaj Properties LLC to
23 Plaintiffs' Verified Motion and Demand for Judgment on the Pleadings and/or
24 Summary Judgment as a Matter of Law (Filed on 05/19/2025)
- 25 • **Exhibit J:** VERIFIED NOTICE OF DEFENDANTS' FRAUD, BAD FAITH,
26 unclear hands, AND PROCEDURAL BAR TO EX PARTE RELIEF, AND
27 CONDITIONAL ACCEPTANCE OF EX PARTE RELIEF, UPON verified and
28 sworn REBUTTAL and LAWFUL PROOF OF CLAIM (Filed on 05/19/2025)

- 1 • **Exhibit K:** Opposition of Defendant Marinaj Properties LLC to Plaintiffs'
2 Verified Response, Rebuttal, and Motion and Demand for Sanctions Against
3 False Allegations of Unauthorized Practice of Law, and Affirmation of Private
4 Capacity Standing on Complaint for Quiet Title of WG PRIVATE
5 IRREVOCABLE TRUST (Filed on 05/29/2025)
- 6 • **Exhibit L:** Opposition of Defendant Marinaj Properties LLC to Plaintiffs'
7 Verified Motion and Demand for Summary Disposition, Judicial Estoppel,
8 Striking of Defective Cross-Complaint, and Entry of Default and Sanctions
9 for Defendants' Dishonor, Fraud, Unclean Hands, etc on Complaint for Quiet
10 Title of WG PRIVATE IRREVOCABLE TRUST (Filed on 05/29/2025)
- 11 • **Exhibit M:** VERIFIED MOTION AND DEMAND TO DISMISS CROSS-
12 COMPLAINT WITH PREJUDICE FOR FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM,
13 FRAUD ON THE COURT, AND LACK OF STANDING and
14 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES (Filed on 05/30/2025)
- 15 • **Exhibit N:** VERIFIED AFFIDAVIT AND CONDITIONAL ACCEPTANCE
16 FOR VALUE, RETURN OF FRAUDULENT CROSS-COMPLAINT, NOTICE
17 OF FRAUD, COMMERCIAL CRIMES, TITLE FRAUD, COLOR-OF-LAW
18 CRIMES, AND DEMAND FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE OF UNREBUTTED
19 FACTS AND PUBLIC RECORD (Filed on 05/30/2025)
- 20 • **Exhibit O:** VERIFIED NOTICE OF FEDERAL JURISDICTION AND PREEMPTION,
21 JURISDICTIONAL DIVESTITURE, DUE PROCESS VIOLATIONS, SIMULATED
22 LEGAL PROCESS, JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT, AND DEMAND FOR IMMEDIATE
23 STAY OF STATE PROCEEDINGS (Filed on 06/03/2025)
- 24 • **Exhibit P:** Affidavit re: Verified Affidavit of Status on Complaint for Quiet
25 Title of WG PRIVATE IRREVOCABLE TRUST (06/06/2025)
- 26 • **Exhibit Q:** Verified Response to Order to Show Cause, Motion to Intervene
27 on Complaint for Quiet Title of WG PRIVATE IRREVOCABLE TRUST
28 (06/06/2025)

- **Exhibit R:** Docket for the State Court Action
- **Exhibit S:** Notice of Removal to be filed in the State Court

VI. NOTICE

17. Concurrently with the filing of this Notice, Purported Cross-Defendant shall cause a copy of this Notice of Removal to be filed with the Clerk of the Superior Court of California for the County of Riverside. A true and correct copy of the docket for the State Court Action is attached hereto as **Exhibit R**. A copy of the Notice of Removal to be filed in the State Court Action is attached hereto as **Exhibit S**.

VII. CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, the *Real Party in Interest, Secured Party, Injured Party, Master Beneficiary, and Respondent Kevin: Realworldfare* hereby **removes this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)** for ongoing and un rebutted **civil rights violations**, and provides this **Verified Notice of Void Remand Order** previously issued **without jurisdiction** by a disqualified judge acting **ultra vires**. Federal jurisdiction under **28 U.S.C. § 1443(1)** attaches by operation of law upon the filing of this Verified Notice, and **preempts all further proceedings in the State forum**. Under **28 U.S.C. § 1446(d)**, the State court is **divested of all authority** the moment this notice is filed and served. Any further action attempted by the State court or its actors shall constitute a continuing and willful violation of **federal law, due process, and the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution**.

“The State court shall proceed no further...” — 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d)

Any judicial officer or party proceeding in disregard of this removal does so **under color of law**, in open **defiance of controlling federal authority**, and may be held personally liable for **civil rights violations, fraud upon the court, and ultra vires acts**.

Kevin: Realworldfare demands immediate recognition of federal jurisdiction and full enforcement of constitutional and statutory protections under **28 U.S.C. §§ 1443(1), 1446(d), and 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983**

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 24th 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 24, 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. On or about **July 24, 2025**, I served the within documents:

- 1. VERIFIED NOTICE OF REMOVAL UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1) FOR CIVIL RIGHTS DEPRIVATION, WITH VERIFIED NOTICE OF VOID REMAND ISSUED BY DISQUALIFIED JUDGE ACTING ULTRA VIRES – NO TIME LIMIT FOR REMOVAL**

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 24, 2025** in Riverside County, California.

/s/Chris Yarbra/
Chris Yarbra