

RECEIVED

MAR 21 2024

S.C. SUPREME COURT

No.
IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF UNITED STATES

Zaatnure Xi-Amaru

PETITIONER

VS. Appellate case no 2023-000036

City of Greenwood

RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
Supreme Court of South Carolina 1231 Gervais Street Columbia South Carolina
29201; South Carolina Court of Appeals 1220 Senate street Columbia South
Carolina 29201; Court of Common Pleas 528 Monument Street #114
Greenwood South Carolina 29646; City of Greenwood Municipal Court 520
#203 Monument Street Greenwood South Carolina 29646; Padgett 414
Monument Street Greenwood South Carolina 29646

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI


Zaatnure Xi-Amaru

indigenous of the North #**-***4136

P.O. Box 1601

Region 3 Yamasih (Aboriginal Region).

Clinton South Carolina 29325

Page 2 of 28

Zaatnurexiamaru@gmail.com

646-387-9205

LIST OF PARTIES

[✓] All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1.) Do the Corporate state of South Carolina (Respondents acting under the color of authority) have Jurisdiction over a Non-Citizen non-resident Aboriginal American with just Soli and just sanguineous rights who indigenous government ISIS (International Society of Indigenous Sovereigns) Xi-Amaru Tribal Government Also Known as Aboriginal Republic of North America which said government practices Completely Autonomy

1.a) Do the respondents have Jurisdiction over a Non-Citizen non- resident U.S. National Indigenous tax exempt Business

1.b) Can the Respondents “Ignore” the petitioner credentials proclaiming the Petitioner Nationality and Political Status while never stating, producing any evidence to the contrary

2.) Can the respondents practice a willful destruction of evidence

3.) Can the respondents out right falsify True grounds on which the arrest is Made

4.) Can the Respondent search, seize and arrest with out reasonable suspicion and no probable cause

5.) can the respondents hold a trail in which which district (jurisdiction) “have not” been previously ascertained by law

6.) Can the respondent convict with evidence that’s not substantiated and untrue

6.a) Can the respondent(s) uphold a conviction where actual malice was practice

7.) Can the respondent (s) practice biological war fare

7.a) can the respondents strip search in a non violent non drug related non felony non misdemeanor

8.) can the respondent designate a political status (Denationalization) where non has been established or exist

9.) Can respondents take a foreign national ambassador non-citizen non- resident non corporate property and give it to a white Citizen corporation business

- 10.) Can respondents remain on the case after it was established that respondent (judge) was bias
- 11.) Can respondents not answer an action of extraordinary bill for quo warranto after objections was made for any previous codes that exist for not answering such action and natural law, U.S Constitutional Law, and Nationality as a U.S National, Non-Citizen, Non-Resident asserted
- 12.) Can the respondents act as the legislative branch and executive branch
- 13.) Can the respondent (s) hold a jury trial in which by law is suppose to be a judge and cop trial
 - 13.a) can respondent hold a jury trial with out a grand jury indictment
 - 13.b) can the respondent (s) hold a jury trial without consent of all parties
 - 13.c) can respondents hold a trail where the judge of such trail was proven to be bias
- 14.) General Amnesty act May 22 1872 [17 stat. 142] Is this act of Congress adversely affecting the Petitioner and this case, can grounds of Treason against the Petitioner be made?
 - 14.a) Is recognition as applied to the Petitioner the Brother of General Amnesty act May 22 1872 [17 stat. 142]
- 15.) Because ISIS, the Xi-Amaru tribal Government aka The aboriginal republic of North America is not a welfare nation and not dependent do that give the respondents the right to deprive its tribal members constitutional rights and autonomy ascertain by way of natural Law
- 16.) should the Petitioner jus soli and sanguineous right be construed to conform to the respondents corporate political ideology and judicial opinion
- 17.) Is the Petitioner facing genocide and denationalization by the State corporation of South Carolina (respondents)
- 18.) Was the Petition on the date of May 17, 2022 an Political Prisoner
- 19.) Was there judicial misconduct in this case herein
- 20.) Was the Charges against the petitioner blatantly falsified based off the State Corporation of South Carolina and it's Police and judges (respondents) political views

- 21.) Did the Petitioner have an tribal International Tribal Drivers License and is the Petitioner a Tribal Persons exempt from Licensing
- 22.) Do the Petitioner have to register his Tribal Vehicle with the state of South Carolina
- 23.) Was the petitioner in Greenwood County South Carolina at the time of the arrest
- 24.) can the respondents fail to follow South Carolinas own codes, rules and regulations
- 25.) Do the Petitioner have the right to freedom of speech, freedom of press and freedom to assembly
- 26.) Do the petitioner have to be right to substantive due process
- 27.) Do the petitioner have the right to an impartial jury
- 28.) Do the petitioner have the right for the Government to ascertain jurisdiction over the Petitioner before prosecuting
- 29.) Do the Petitioner have the right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment by the respondents
- 30.) Do the petitioners have to right to equal protection of the Law
- 31.) Do the Petitioner have the right to be free from slander and defamation of character by the respondents
- 32.) can the respondents forge the petitioner signature on the bail hearing document where it state's defendant signature
- 33.) can the respondents hold a trail against the petitioner when the South Carolina attorney general office states that there is no indictment concerning the Petitioner
- 33.a) did the respondent practice deprivation of petitioners rights under the color of law
- 33.b) do the petitioner have the right of immunity from attachment and execution of property of a foreign (respondents) state
- 34.) can the respondents hold a jury trail against the Petitioner without a grand jury indictment

34.a) Is Jury Nullification Lawful
34.b.) Can the Respondents use Jury Nullification to attack the Petition constitutional, and Human rights
34.c) Do the respondents have to Follow the rule of Law
34.d) Is the General Amnesty act of May 22, 1872 [17 stat. 142] Treason against the Petitioner By the United States Government and Directly related to the Conviction herein which the Petitioner Appeals

35.) Is South Carolina Court of Appeals Remittitur in this case 2023-001935 In this case a violation of the the Petitioner United States Constitutional rights 6th and 1st Amendment rights

36.) Is the South Carolina Supreme Court Ruling to strict this Case 2023-001935 due to South Carolina Court of Appeals Remittitur a violation of the Petitioner 6th, 8th. And

37.) Did the Officers State of Mind at the time of the Petitioner arrest indicate a malicious aspect in this case constituting a 8, 14th, 1st and 4 amendment United States, Constitution violations against the petitioner.

38.) Should the Petitioner be acquitted on all charges? Should the Petitioner conviction concerning related charges be expunged from the Petitioner record.

LIST OF PARTIES

a.) City of Greenwood Municipal Court 520 #203 Monument Street Greenwood South Carolina 29646 b.) Court of Common Pleas 528 Monument Street #114 Greenwood South Carolina 29646 c.) South Carolina Court of Appeals 1220 Senate street Columbia South Carolina 29201 d.) Padgett 414 Monument Street Greenwood South Carolina 29646 e.) South Carolina Supreme Court 1231 Gervais street Columbia SC 29201

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.
On March 18th 2024)

Related Cases

39.) HAROLD BERNARD MASON vs Vickie Churchman
Flint RiverQuarium inc., et. al.

(Whereas the matter is limited to controlling intervening circumstances of obstructing justice, which did in fact occur to manipulate decision making Whereas not filing, the destruction of or discarding of key information, actions committed does in fact directly affect the Decision making with consequential affects and violates due process and equal protection under the law. 18 U.S. Code § 1519)

39.a) Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519,

40.) *McGirt v. Oklahoma*

the federal government—not the state—has jurisdiction over crime (s) committed by Native Americans

41.) MARYLAND, Petitioner, v. Jerry Lee WILSON.

the reasonableness of the particular governmental invasion of a citizen's personal security, 434 U.S., at 108-109, 98 S.Ct., at 332, and that reasonableness depends on a balance between the public interest and the individual's right to personal security free from arbitrary interference by officers,

42.) Rice v. Cay-

etano, 528 U. S. 495, 517. Pp. 9-16.

“distinctions between citizens solely because of their ancestry are by their very nature odious to a free people whose institutions are founded upon the doctrine of equality.”

43.) Bridges v. Wixon, 326 U.S. 135, 152-53 (1945) (agency "rules are de- signed to protect the interests of the alien and afford him due process of law" by providing

"safeguards against essentially unfair procedures"). In *United States ex rel. Accardi v. Shaughnessy*, 347 U.S. 260 (1954), the Court reaffirmed the principle that an agency must follow its own rules,

43.a) *United States Vs Dow*, enclosed deliberate concealment of material information in a setting of fiduciary for the public and if he deliberately conceals information from him he is guilty of fraud. Page 5 of 17

43.b) *Row vs Wade*, all federal rights composed within the term liberty protected by the federal constitution from invasion of the state

43.c) *Kent Vs Dulles US 116, 125* "The right to travel is part of Liberty of which the natural person, citizen cannot be deprived without due process of Law under the fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution, the right to travel on public highways and to transport one's property Theron either by carriage or automobile is not a mere privilege that the city may prohibit or admit at will but a common right which he/she has under the right of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness

Thompson V. Smith 154 SE 579

TABLE OF CONTENTS

aa.) proof of service of the Petitioner's WRIT OF CERTIORARI upon the respondents page 1..

bb.) Petitioners Petitioner's WRIT OF CERTIORARI Zaatnure Xi-Amaru vs City of Greenwood

cc.) LIST OF PARTIES, All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

dd.) QUESTION(S) PRESENTED numbers 1 through 33.b)

ee.) LIST OF PARTIES, letters a through d

ff.) Related Cases, numbers 34 through 38.c)

gg.) TABLE OF CONTENTS, letters aa.) through

hh.) INDEX TO APPENDICES, appendix letters a through p

ii.) TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED; STATUTES AND RULES; OTHER

jj.) OPINIONS, numbers 39 through 43

kk.) jurisdiction

ll.) CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED, numbers 44 through 50

mm.) STATEMENT OF THE CASE, numbers 51 through 58

nn.) REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT/ REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION, numbers 59 through 65

oo.) CONCLUSION, numbers 66 through 69

page 8 of 28

INDEX TO APPENDICES

a.) Appendix A, South Carolina Supreme Court Gervais street Columbia SC 29201

APPENDIX A, South Carolina Court of appeals 1220 Senate street Columbia South Carolina 29201
APPENDIX B, Court of Common Pleas 528 Monument Street #114 Greenwood South Carolina 29646
APPENDIX C, 520 Monument Street Greenwood South Carolina 29649
APPENDIX D, The date on which the highest state court decided my case was A copy of that decision appears at Appendix D
APPENDIX E, [Affidavit of Tribal Vehicle exemption of Registration and Tribal person exempt from licensing] Page 6 of 17
APPENDIX F, [Traffic tickets for failing to register vehicle and driving without a license South Carolina and bail hearing for failing to register vehicle and driving without a license]
APPENDIX G, [Tribal International Drivers License]
APPENDIX H tribal vehicle Certificate of title]; APPENDIX I [Petitioner Tribal Business unincorporated association business articles EIN # 81-***4136];
APPENDIX J [Tribal Credentials];
APPENDIX K, [Regional Jurisdiction];
APPENDIX L, [Tribal Lands, tribal inhabitants, Indigenous Aboriginal Native American Business
Deed tax Parcel ID# 6837950018; L.1) Deed tax Parcel ID # 6837-936201, 6837-942-030 and 6836-947-992; and L.2) Deed tax Parcel ID # 051-00-00-141];
APPENDIX, M [tribal license plates]
APPENDIX, N [Destruction of Tribal License Plates]
APPENDIX, O [Attorney General of South Carolina Response to the Petitioner stating that their is no indictment against the Petitioner]
APPENDIX, P [William Moultrie who created South Carolina state Flag which is used for South Carolina License Plates practice genocide and denationalization against Indigenous aboriginal Americans,]
APPENDIX, Q [South Carolina code of Laws Unannotated, title 17- Criminal Procedures Chapter 19 indictments; exceptions (1) (2) and (3)]

Page 9 of 28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

STATUTES AND RULES/ OTHER

South Carolina Code 17-28-350 (Willful Destruction Evidence; SC Code Section 17-28-70 (a) (b) (c) (d); SC code Section 17-13-170 (d) Tribal Identification; SC code Section 17-13-50- (A) (1) (2) (3) True Grounds in which arrest is made and unlawfulness of officers; SC code section 16-7-150 slander & Libel Defamation of Character; United States Constitution; Xi-Amaru Constitution; United Nations Declaration of Human rights of Indigenous People UN 61/195, UN 60/147; United States Code title 18 section 112 protections of internationally protected persons and 2442 deprivation of rights under the color of Law; United States Code title 18 section 241 conspiracy against rights article 1 section 2 clause 3; United States Code title 8 section 1401 clause b; USC 28 section 1609 Immunity from attachment and execution of property of a foreign state

United National declaration on the rights on Indigenous people

Article 9 Indigenous peoples and individuals have the right to belong to an indigenous community or nation, in accordance with the traditions and customs of the community or nation concerned. No discrimination of any kind may arise from the exercise of such a right.

Page 7 of 17

Article 1 Tribal Traffic Code-Laws of Motor Vehicles Code of the 50 States/ Tribal Vehicles exempt from registration 1.); 2.); 3.); and 4/ Tribal Persons exempt from Licensing (see appendix E)

U.S Constitution The Contracts Clause in Article 1, Section 10 of the United States Constitution establishes that a State is not allowed to pass any law that “impairs the obligation of contracts”

The Legality of Jury Nullification

According to the U.S Supreme Court decision in Sparf vs U.S written by Justice Harlan, Juries have no right to ignore Law when rendering the juries verdict.

Page 10 of 28

Is the General Amnesty act of May 22, 1872 [17 stat. 142] adversely affecting the Petitioner and do a Question of treason against the Petitioner arise

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

[N/A]For cases from federal courts:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix the petition and is

[N/A] reported at ; or, [N/A] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or, [N/A] is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix the petition and is

[N/A] reported at ; or, [N/A] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or, [N/A] is unpublished.

44.) [✓] For cases from state courts:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at appendix A; Supreme Court of South Carolina 1231 Gervais Street Columbia South Carolina 29201;

A; South Carolina Court of appeals 1220 Senate street Columbia South Carolina 29201 and is reported at appendix A

45.) The opinion of the the court of South Carolina Greenwood Court of common pleas to review the Merits appears at appendix B; Court of Common Pleas 528 Monument Street #114 Greenwood South Carolina 29646 and is reported at appendix B

46.) The opinion of the the court of South Carolina Greenwood municipal court to review the merits appears at appendix C; 520 Monument Street Greenwood South Carolina 29649 and is reported at appendix C;

47.) [✓] For cases from state courts:

The date on which the highest state court Supreme Court of South Carolina 1231 Gervais Street Columbia South Carolina 29201; decided my case 2023- 001935 on the date of December 19 2023

Jurisdiction

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

48.) 1st, Amendment United States constitution violations including government (Respondents) making laws that abridge the Petitioner freedom of speech, the freedom of press, and the freedom of assembly, as the Respondents South Carolina corporate states, judge and police acting under the color of authority arrested, strip searched, committed Biological warfare (by putting the petitioner Indigenous

person in a cell with Covid 19 vaccinated inmate foreigners) after the petitioner told arresting police that's the Petitioner is a Native America that do not get vaccinated) physically (placing petitioner arms behind back with metal braces) and emotionally injury, trialed seized Petitioner property tribal vehicle (which prohibited the petitioner right to assemble) thats foreign to said jurisdiction, fined slander and defamed the Petitioner for having tribal credentials authorized by the United States States department [U.S. Dept No. 06013144-1]

49.) 4th, Fourth Amendment United States Constitution violations including (Respondents) unreasonable searches seizures and arrest against the Petitioner, Nor was any warrants issued by a judge or magistrate to justified probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, nor was any particular place described to be searched persons or things to be seized.

49.a) that the respondents (Greenwood Police) destroyed the petitioner tribal license plates which was cause for the initial stop, search, seizure and arrest of the Petitioner which violates the Petitioner 4th, forth Amendment US Constitutional rights and gives no reasonable suspicion for the initial stop

50.) 5th, Fifth Amendment United States Constitution violations against the Petitioner by the Respondents including (the judge) yelling out (while the Petitioner was in the holding cell, in front of Prisoners and Prison Guards state employees) Z (meaning Zaatnure the Petitioner) Said this case is a Liberty issue (referring to the case Law the petitioner quoted during the bond hearing "The right to travel is part of liberty Kent vs Dulles us 116, 125") well Z the respondent continued "better have a South Carolina Drivers License or he will be Jailed" .. This quote from the judge (respondent) is obstruction of justice and makes the respondent bias against the Petitioner

50.a) Procedural due process requires government officials to follow fair procedures before depriving a person of life, liberty, or property, substantive due process which protects certain fundamental rights from government interference. The Supreme Court has also held that the Due Process Clause contains fundamental rights against vague laws and that

50.b) respondents denied the petitioner the right to produce at a Jury trial evidence that the License plates (registration in South Carolina) issued by the states of South Carolina was created by William Moultrie (South Carolina state flag) who practiced genocide and denationalization against indigenous, aboriginal, Native Americans [see appendix P]

50.c) That the respondents denied the petitioner the right at Jury Trail to produce his Affidavit of Tribal Exemption for registration municipal judge quoting that “we don’t allow affidavits in this Court”

50.d) That the respondents denied the Petitioner the right to a pretrial hearing

51.) 6th, Six Amendment United States Constitutional Violations in which the accused (Petitioner) did not receive an impartial jury of the state in which the respondents (judge) quote

“better have a South Carolina Drivers License or he will be Jailed” as outlined in number 50 herein at 5th amendment violations as such judge resided over jury and that which district shall have been previously ascertained by law was not in fact ascertained by law as the Petitioner inhabits not In Greenwood county South Carolina but his own Aboriginal, Indigenous Jurisdiction (Native American) Region 3 Yamasih in which tribal business property inhabitation including vehicle and international drivers license and exemption for registration and that Petitioner was denied compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, including Prison guard who asked arresting police “you not going to accept his International drivers License” and Prisoners and Prison Guards who witness respondent (Judge) outburst “better have a South Carolina Drivers License or he will be Jailed” and that

52.) 8th, Eighth Amendment United States Constitution violation cruel and Unusual Punishment violation against the Petitioner by the respondents in that as mentioned herein 1st, Amendment United States constitution violations in that as mentioned herein 4th, Fourth Amendment United States

Constitution violations Fifth Amendment United States
Constitution violations in that as mentioned herein 6th, Six
Amendment United States Constitutional violations and 14th United States
Constitution Violations which in its totality constitute cruel and unusual
punishment against the petitioner by the respondents and that

53.) the petitioner was striped searched for a non violent non drug related non
misdemeanor non felony charge which constitutes 8th, Eighth Amendment United
States Constitution violation cruel and unusual punishment

53.a) in that the Petitioner request to not be put in the cell with prisoners as the
Petitioner do not receive vaccinations especially Covid 19 vaccinations and the
petitioner request was ignored and was placed in the cell with prisoners who
received Covid 19 vaccinations which constitute biological warfare which result in
the petitioner having constant chest pains, head aches and breathing problems

53.b) in that petitioner request not to be handcuffed behind the back which result
in the petitioner having arm, wrist, elbow and back pains

53.c) in that the Petitioner was imprisoned solely based off the way the Petitioner
contract having Jus Soli and Jus Sanguinis rights being an Indigenous, Aboriginal,
Native American and operating under a Indigenous, Aboriginal, Native American
business The **Contracts Clause** in Article 1, Section 10 of the United States
Constitution **establishes** that a State is not allowed to pass any law that “impairs
the obligation of contracts”

53.d) and that the respondents denied the petitioner the right to produce at a Jury
trail evidence that the License plates (registration in South Carolina) issued by the
states of South Carolina was created by William Moultrie (South Carolina state
flag) who practiced genocide and denationalization against indigenous, aboriginal,
Native Americans which goes against the Petitioner Indigenous Culture.

53.e) The respondents wrote a letter to the Petitioner threatening to sick, attack the
South Carolina state troopers on the Petitioner if the Petitioner Failed to pay the
Fine associated with this case herein of over \$400.00 Four hundred dollars even
thought the Petitioner put said fine in his South Carolina Bankruptcy proceedings
which commenced in September of 2022

53.f) The Respondents Traffic tickets as mentioned in Appendix F, state that the
Petitioner race is Black even though the Petitioner tribal credentials label the
Petitioner as Indigenous, Aboriginal, Native American. The respondents
classifying the Petitioner as Black is an act of Denationalization as the respondents
have no proof of such claims.

54.) 14th fourteenth amendment United States Constitution violations against the Petitioner by the respondents which states that No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall

any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. Indeed the Petitioner was denied the right of equal protection of the law by the respondents based of the Petitioner race, creed, nationality and contract as mentioned herein

54.a) The petitioner tribal vehicle was seized by the respondents and placed in the custody of a white citizen business who contract with the state and the petitioner was forced to pay over three hundred dollars \$300.00 in order to get it the Petitioner tribal vehicle back which is a violation of the equal protection clause.

54.b) South Carolina department of motor vehicle is currently refusing to release the Petitioner tribal vehicle into custody of the petitioner (who tribal business owns said vehicle) into the custody of the Petitioner unless the petitioner register his business with South Carolina secretary of state which the Petitioner refuse. This is extortion, racketeering, blackmail and denial of equal protection of the law

ArtI.S1.3.1 Separation of Powers, Checks and Balances

55.) Separation of powers is a doctrine of constitutional law under which the three branches of government (executive, legislative, and judicial) are kept separate. This is also known as the system of checks and balances, because each branch is given certain powers so as to check and balance the other branches. Each branch has separate powers, and generally each branch is not allowed to exercise the powers of the other branches.

Recognition can only come from Nationals within the Petitioner Tribal Government the Aboriginal Republic of North America, Nevertheless As the petitioner Indigenous government was Recognized by the executive branch of the federal government [U.S State Department Number 0613144-1] the respondents is in violation of ArtI.S1.3.1 Separation of Powers, as the corporation state of Carolina have no authority or jurisdictions of the Petitioner rights to travel especially since the State of South Carolina codes governing indigenous people inhabiting said area is in conformity with the Petitioner right to exist and a Aboriginal, native person section 17-13-170 (d) SC Tribal identification

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

56.) I Petitioner (prose litigant) Zaatnure Xi-Amaru born on 03/01/1983 in Aboriginal Region 1 Northeast SAMAL Shariq Abannki misnomer Queens New York am of age of Maturity, Mentally competent and have personal knowledge of the facts herein and do swear under the penalties of perjury that this WRIT OF CERTIORARI in it's entirety is true and correct under the Laws of the United States Constitution, the Aboriginal Republic of North America (ARNA) the Xi-Amaru Tribal Government also known as ISIS (International Society of Indigenous Sovereigns) and any applicable Foreign venue that the forgoing is true and correct.

Due Petitioner's disability in the rules of law, now elects Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, wherein the court has directed that those who are unschooled in law making pleadings and/or complaints shall have the court look to the substance of the pleadings rather than the form, and hereby makes the following pleadings/notices in the above referenced matter without waiver of any other defenses or offenses.

57.) We the people of South Carolina State Republic sue on relation of private egressed upon an Indigenous American National Inhabitant, non-resident of United States of North America and National of a member of the International Indigenous society- ARNA [U.S Department Number 0613144-1] that Zaatnure Xi-Amaru Petitioner is a Non belligerent, non enemy combatant who comes in his private person capacity treated as a real complaint respectfully shows the court [see Appendix J, Tribal credentials]

57.a) The Petitioner Inhabits tribal lands Region 3 (Aboriginals, Indigenous, Native America Region 3 Yamasih) misnomer Greenwood county South Carolina, misnomer Abbeville South Carolina [see appendix K, Regional Jurisdiction,] [see appendix Tax seed and Parcel numbers L, L.1) and L.2)]

57.b) The Petitioner Indigenous business was founded in 2016 named Indigenous of the North Zaatnure Xi-Amaru [see Appendix I] Indigenous of the North Zaatnure Xi-Amaru

57.c) The Petitioner purchased his tribal vehicle on February 16, 2021 [see Appendix H, Tribal Vehicle certificate of title]

57.d) That the Petitioner is Indigenous with just Soli and just sanguineous rights in North America and Exempt from Vehicle registration [see appendix E]

Initial Contact with Greenwood County Police which caused stop, arrest and conviction of Petitioner.

58.) On May 17th 2022 the Petition was pulled over by the Greenwood county Police South Carolina and was issued two traffic tickets and arrested for failing to register his vehicle and driving without a license South Carolina violation 56-01-0020 and 55-03-001 [see Appendix F,]

58.a) SC Code § 56-1-20 (2012) which Reads No person, except those expressly exempted in this article shall drive any motor vehicle upon a highway in this State unless such person has a valid motor vehicle driver's license issued to him under the provisions of this article. And

58.b) SC Code § 56-3-110 (2012) [see appendix F] which reads Every motor vehicle, trailer, semitrailer, pole trailer and special mobile equipment vehicle driven, operated or moved upon a highway in this State shall be registered and licensed in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.

Petitioner Defense

58.c) That South Carolina violation 56-01-0020 and or SC Code § 56-1-20 do not apply to the Petitioner as the Petitioner is licensed through his own Tribal government which the respondents ignored and failed to address [See the Petitioner International drivers license at Appendix G] as stated and that further more on the said ticket the respondents failed to put the Petitioner International Drivers licenses number instead falsified the instrument by adding “NONE” which is FRAUD

58.d) South Carolina violation 55-03-001 and or SC Code § 56-3-110 do not apply to the Petitioner as the Petitioner is exempt from Vehicle registration [see Appendix E, Tribal Vehicle exempt from Registration] all which constitute a violation of the Petitioner’s rights under South Carolina Section 17-13-50- (A) (1) (2) (3) including True Grounds on which arrest is made and, Unlawfulness of Officers as the Petitioner stated herein, Prison guard who asked arresting police “you not going to accept his International drivers License” further more on the said ticket the respondents failed to put the information on the respondents tribal plates instead falsified the instrument by adding “NONE” which is FRAUD

59.) The Respondents Traffic tickets as mentioned in Appendix F, state that the Petitioner race is Black even though the Petitioner tribal credentials label the Petitioner as Indigenous, Aboriginal, Native American. The respondents classifying the Petitioner as Black is an act of Denationalization, dehumanization and FRAUD as the respondents have no proof and offered no proof of such claims.

60.) On the date of May 17, 2022 the arresting officer from Greenwood Police department (Respondents) told the Petitioner that the Petitioner is not apart of a Tribal Government, that the Petitioner Vehicle is not registered under the Petitioner tribal Vehicle, that the Petitioner do not reside on tribal land which is denationalization and a hate crime against the petitioner as the respondents never produced any evidence to the contrary

61.) The respondents (Greenwood police department) ordered the Petitioner out of his Tribal vehicle and arrested the Petitioner for failing to register his tribal vehicle and for driving without a license even though the Petitioner have a International tribal drivers license and affidavit which exempt the Petitioner from registration as mentioned in appendix E; F and G

62.) The Petitioner tribal vehicle was thoroughly searched by the respondents and the Petitioner was ordered to put his hands behind his back, since this was a non violent, non drug related offense the Petitioner asked to be handcuffed in the front and such request was denied

63.) While at the Greenwood county dentition center the arrest officer went through the Petitioner wallet and the prison guard asked the arresting office “you not going to accept his (Petitioner) International driver license”? Which a mean stare was given in return to the prison guard.

63.a) The Prison Guards ordered that the Petitioner Strip Search even when the Petitioner objected since the Charge was a non-Violent non drug related non misdemeanor offense, the prison guards responded that “strip search was procedure” adding insult to Petitioner injury..

63.b) The Petitioner advised the prison guards that he’s an Indigenous American and do not receive vaccinations especially Covid 19 vaccinations and asked not to be placed in the cell with foreigners who receive such vaccinations, again the Petitioner requested was denied and the petitioner was placed in the cell with foreigners who receive Covid 19 vaccinations (as the petitioner did ask) which resulted in the Petitioner getting shortage of breath, headaches and chest pains)..

63.c) The Judge residing over the bail hearing procedure and later the Jury Trail refused to look at the Petitioner Tribal Credentials and affidavit of exemption of vehicle registration

63.d)) during the bail hearing procedure the Petitioner let the Judge (respondent know that his was a Liberty issue quoting Kent vs Dulles us 116, 125 and Thompson Vs Smith 154 Se 579, the bail hearing officer (respondent) afterward came down to the holding cell and In front of the prison guards, state employees and prisoners said “Z, the Petitioner, raised a liberty issue, well he “the Petitioner better have a South Carolina drivers license or he will be imprisoned”.. Later this same judge would reside over a jury trail after the Petitioner Objected and told him in the court that he’s bias against the Petitioner and ask him to remove himself from the case which he refused. The Petitioner was not assumed innocent until proven guilty and by the respondent flat out rejection the U.S case law not only makes this judicial misconduct but obstruction of justice.

Extraordinary Bill for action in Quo Warranto

64.) The Respondent (s) failed to answer the Petitioner Extraordinary Bill for action in Quo Warranto even after objects was made by the Petitioner for any reasons the respondents should not answer to Quo Warranto including the Petitioner documentation of jus Soil and sanguineous rights, Tribal Credentials, Tribal land inhabitants, Tribal Vehicle occupation, tribal licensing, non resident exemptions of vehicle registration and respondents not having jurisdiction over these said facts

Willful Destruction of Evidence

65.) After being released from Prison the respondent was forced to pay over three hundred dollars to retrieve his Tribal vehicle in which the Petitioner Tribal License plates was destroyed by the respondent(s) [see APPENDIX M and N]. When the Petitioner

asked the respondents (arresting officer) on the stand at trial the reason they (greenwood police destroyed) the Petitioner License Plates the Petitioner remained silent (admission of guilt).

Attorney General of South Carolina States “No Indictment concerning the Petitioner”

66.) The Attorney General of South Carolina states that there is no indictment concerning the Petitioner [see appendix O]

67.) the the respondents held a jury trial against the Petitioner without a grand jury Indictment with a prosecutor Padgett 414 Monument Street Greenwood South Carolina 29646 acting against the Petitioner which is in violation of South Carolina code of Laws Unannotated, title 17- Criminal Procedures Chapter 19 indictments; exceptions (1) (2) and (3)

The Supreme Court of South Carolina order dated December 19th 2023 case 2023-001935 to Strick the Petitioner WRIT OF CERTIORARI and dismiss this case herein

without granting Remedy in Favor of the Petitioner or to ascertain the truth And lawfulness fair practices and rights of the United States Constitution in regards to the Petitioner WRIT OF CERTIORARI violated the Petitioner writes under the 1st Amendment, 4th Amendment, 6th amendment 8th and 14th amendment of the United States Constitution

68.) The Appeal Court of South Carolina never ascertained Jurisdiction by way of Law according to The United States Constitution 6th Amendment “ In criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right in which district have been previously ascertained by Law”.

68.a) The Petitioner was in his tribal vehicle registered under his tribal business, the Petitioner inhabits tribal lands registered under his tribal business, the Petitioner travels using International tribal license, the Petitioner vehicles is insured under the petitioner tribal business. The Petitioner Aboriginal Jurisdiction in which the Petitioner inhabits is Region 3 Southeast Yamasih not Greenwood County South Carolina. The Petitioner tribal License plates were destroyed by the arresting officer which was the reason for the initial stop of the Petitioner.

69.) For the Supreme Court of South Carolina to Stricken the Petitioner WRIT OF CERTIORARI and dismiss due to South Carolina Appeals Court Remittitur sent to S.C Supreme Court is a Violation of the 6th Amendment United States Constitution as Jurisdiction never been perilously ascertain by Law for South Carolina to remove Jurisdiction of the Petitioners WRIT OF CERTIORARI by legal strategy of Remittitur.

The Petitioner Did Serve in a timely Manner

70.) In the Supreme Court of South Carolina order dated December 19th 2023 This court claimed that the Petitioner Failed to serve in a timely Manner which is completely false.

On the date of April 21st 2023 the Petitioner Received an Order from the South Carolina Court of Appeals dated April 21st 2023

On the Date of July 21st 2023 the Petitioner Filed a writ of Certiorari with the United States Supreme Court and Paid his \$300 filing fee, in which the Petitioner had ninety days to file.

According to McGrit Vs Oklahoma “The Federal Government-not the State- has Jurisdiction over crimes committed by Native Americans”..

On The Date of November 21st 2023 the Petitioner received a response from The United States Supreme Court which advised the Petitioner to Appeal to the highest Court in the State.

On the date of December 15th 2023 the Petitioner sent a Writ of Certiorari to South Carolina Supreme Court with a \$250.00 Money order

On the Date of December 19th 2023 the Petitioner received a order from The South Carolina Supreme Court who returned the Petitioner Filing fee of \$250.00 claiming the Petitioner failed to serve in a timely manner

The Supreme Court of South Carolina in its Order dated December 19th 2023 stated “This Court will Take no action on the Petition for a writ of Certiorari Filed July 1st 2021.

This Date of July 1st 2021 is totally inaccurate Please relate to the timeline the Petitioner address herein at Number 70 entitled “The Petitioner Did Serve in a timely Manner.”

General Amnesty act of May 22, 1872 [17 stat. 142] the Brother of recognition.

71.) During the Trial the municipal judge harassed the Petitioner with words of recognition. What the United States recognize? What the United States does not recognize? During the American Civil war the United States Government did not recognize the Confederate states of America in which the Petitioner was a Non-citizen United States National. U.S Nationals because the Petitioner Ancestors had allegiance to the Union. The General Amnesty act of May 22, 1872 [17 stat. 142] the Brother of recognition Allowed former enemy combatants of the Union the right to hold public office such as the case of South Carolina. Now descendants of the Confederate states of America that wasn't recognize are attempting to denationalize the Petitioner indigenous person who the United States Constitution wasn't referring to in its preamble.

72.) The Creator of the South Carolina Flag which South Carolina use on its license plates was created by William Moultrie who practice Genocide and Denationalization against Indigenous Americans. William Moultrie parents was immigrants. South Carolina altered the Flag when it rebelled against the United States under the Confederacy.

European Settlers have a right to their Traditions even if rooted in Political practice that's detrimental to the Petitioner Well being but to Criminalize, assault, slander, defame and financial plunder the Petitioner Indigenous person because of his lack of participation in such traditions is Treason, denationalization, Deprivation of Human rights, cruel and unusual punishment and purposeful negligence.

The Respondents used Jury Nullification in the Conviction and absence of Rule of Law concerning the Petitioner.

74.) to circumvent the Petitioner human, indigenous and United States Constitutional rights, the municipal judge on his own accord and with out consent of the Petitioner called a Jury to convict the Petitioner of a Crime that never occurred.

Petitioner citizenship

Petitioner is a U.S. National non- citizen status and the 16th Amendment concerning the us census is not applicable to the Petitioner
The only citizenship that would apply to the Petitioner if elected would be under the Indian Act of 1924 which protect the Petitioner Tax exemptions.
United States Constitution 14th Amendment Indians not Taxed
Indians are the name Given to the Aborigines Inhabitants of North America

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

75.) That the Petitioner Have three Children two of which was Born into the Petitioners Indigenous Government who the Petitioner assisted in the Home birthed no medications and no vaccinations and who are being deprived the right to assemble and travel due to the respondents lawlessness which is an act of denationalization and attempted genocide upon the Petitioner Indigenous family who are U.S Nationals

76.) The Petitioner pray that this Court Grant this Petition as the Petitioner have jus Soil and sanguineous rights and that the Petitioner Parents, Grandparents and ancestors come from no other country or continent other than North America and that

77.) This unwarranted conviction against the Petitioner set the stage for the respondents to increase the penalties for the next interaction with the corporate state of South Carolina including Fines and Long jail sentences and that

The Petitioner has Been a Prisoner Since May 17th 2022

77.a) The Petitioner have been unable to travel and assemble freely due to these unwarranted charges and conviction(s) concerning this case herein in fear of retaliatory and arbitrary imprisonment by the Respondents acting under the color of authority in which respondents superseded their authority by violating the Petitioner. Human, indigenous and Constitutional rights

78.) the Petitioner is absolutely innocent of all charges and on the date of arrest May 17, 2022 the petitioner was a Political Prisoner who was unlawfully arrested, jurisdiction not established, Quo warranto unanswered, striped searched (sexual assault) unlawfully have Property seized and still being held under Black Mail, racketeering and extortion subject to biological warfare, denationalized, denied witness, trailed by jury without consent, subject to judicial misconduct, obstruction of justice, assaulted, slandered and defamed and destruction of property for not other reason than being what nature attended the Petitioner to be (Petitioner operating under a natural law body politic).

79.) That the Petition addressing multiple U.S Constitutional rights violations herein allow the Respondents an opportunity to fine tune their attack against citizens, nationals, natural persons and indigenous people with more malicious and sadistic strategies and tactics to deprive Americans of their fundamental rights, liberty and Freedom

80.) That all Charges against the Petitioner herein is not an error or mistake but completely untrue, false a fabrication and outright slander and defamation of the Petitioner Character

81.) during the bail hearing procedure the bail hearing judge forged the petitioner signature on the bail hearing document (see appendix F) in which the petitioner labeled as defendant reused to sign document as the court has not established jurisdiction yet the respondent (judge) signed the document against the petitioner objects which is fraud, alteration of the instrument and forger of the necessary signature.

Conclusion

The Petitioner comes with clean hands and is not here to challenge the integrity of our court Judicial system but simply wish for a review of these interactions between Petitioner and respondents in hope to come to a practice resolution in the expungement of all Charges against the Petitioner concerning this case herein.


82.) That the Respondents is Practicing Slander and defamation of character against the Petitioner; That the respondents falsified true grounds on which arrest was made against the Petitioner; That the respondents participated in a willful destruction of evidence against the Petitioner;

83.) That the Petitioner do have a International tribal Drivers License and that
84.) The Petitioner is Exempt from Vehicle Registration and the Petitioner is a Tribal Persons exempt from Licensing

85.) That the respondents have no Jurisdiction in these matters herein

86.) That the petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted that this court review the conviction of the Petitioner concerning this case herein

Respectfully submitted,



Zaatnure Xi-Amaru

Date: March 18th 2024

Zaatnurexiamaru@gmail.com

646-387-9205

P.O. Box 1601

Region 3 Yamasih (Aboriginal Region)

Clinton South Carolina 29325

FROM:

2000 W. HI-Away
P.O. Box 1601
Clinton SC
29325



Opened and Inspected by BPS Security
Date: 3/21/24 Time: 11:55

RECEIVED
MAR 21 2024
S.C. SUPREME COURT

TO:

Supreme Court
of South Carolina
1231 Concord Street
Columbia SC
29201



U Mailer
10 x 16"

ReadyPost