

Exhibit

maple

# 1

==

\*

\*

COURT of APPEALS  
FOR THE 4th CIRCUIT et al.,

---

(15 pages)

Petitioners FROM South Carolina

(CASE 2:17-cv-027-JMC-MGB et al.)

---

Docket No. (S) 17-6693; 17-6925; 17-6960;  
17-7139; 17-7137; 17-7134; 17-7068; 16-1953;  
16-2041; 17-1415; 16-2299; 17-7186; 17-7410;  
17-7428 et al.,

---

LAWRENCE L CRAWFORD aka JAHNAH GABRIEL  
JAHNAH T. TISHBITE aka JAHNAH AL MAHDI  
et al.,

PETITIONERS

vs.

LOG 49

The Judges who signed the order in  
CASE 16-1953, The United States, Judge  
Robert E. Hood et al.

defendants

Affidavit of Service


We, JAHNAN AL MAHDI et al, do  
hereby certify, that we have mailed  
and or served a copy of an affidavit  
of facts giving judicial notice, renewing  
the motions etc. in the document  
entitled, "Affidavit of Facts Giving  
Judicial Notice, Filing in Form A  
PAUPER'S documents, submissions of  
2 of 49

Brief and motion Jo motion therefor;  
(5) pages dated November 3, 2017;  
Filing Writ of ERROR repealing orders  
issued in CASE 17-1415 due to FRAUD  
upon the COURT, supplementing the  
ISSUES on APPEAL in substitute informal  
BRIEF, on the 4th Circuit Court of  
APPEALS and all involved parties by  
US mail postage prepaid, by depositing  
it in the institution's mailbox on  
November 9, 2017. It is deemed  
filed that date, Houston v Lack, 207 U.S.  
266, 273-76, 100 S.Ct 2379 (1908).

Respectfully

Jahrah Al Mahdi

30849



Anthony Cook  
Anthony Cook

Robert Mitchell

Robert Mitchell

David Diven

David Diven

Christopher Wilson

Christopher Wilson

Yahya Muqit

Yahya Muqit

November 9, 2017

4 of 49

Court of Appeals  
For the 4th Circuit et al.

Petition From South Carolina

(CASES 2:17-cv-1127-JMC-MGB et al.)

Docket No. (S) 17-6693; 17-6925; 17-6960;  
17-7139; 17-7137; 17-7134; 17-7068; 16-  
1953; 16-2041; 17-1415; 16-2299; 17-7186;  
17-7410; 17-7428 et al.

LAWRENCE L Crawford aka Jahjah  
Gabriel Jahjah T. Tishbite aka Jahjah  
Al Mahdi et al.

petitioners

vs.  
5 of 49

The Judges who signed the order in  
CASE 16-1953 The United States  
Judge Robert E. Hood et al,

defendant(s)

affidavit of facts giving judicial notice;  
Reviewing the motions etc. In the  
document entitled "affidavit of facts  
giving judicial notice; filing in FORMA  
PAUPERIS documents; submission of  
brief and motion to motion therefor";  
(5) pages dated November 3, 2017;  
filing writ of error vacating orders  
issued in CASE 17-1415 due to fraud  
upon the court; supplementing  
6 of 49

# The issues on Appeal in substitute informal Brief

HERE the 4th circuit court and parties will find:

(1) A copy of the affidavit of service and affidavit of facts giving judicial notice, filing objections to the report and recommendations and motions to motion therefor, (3) pages dated November 3, 2017 that is filed in case Q:17-cv-140-TW-BM that establishes the appeal under case 17-740.

(2) A copy of the affidavit of service and affidavit of facts giving  
7 of 49

Judicial notice; establishing service upon  
all judges and cases through the King-  
Khalifah's Trustee, Judge Jacquelyn  
Austin, (3) pages dated November 3,  
2017 that was served on her related  
to case 8:16-cv-3328-RBH-JDA and all  
other related parallel cases sub  
judice that establish the parallel  
appeals within the 4th circuit.

The petitioners give the court  
and parties within all cases captioned  
judicial notice. The order issued in  
case 17-cv-145 filed October 31, 2017 is  
void for fraud and due process  
violation. Due to this fraud upon  
the court, writ of error is law  
8 of 49

filed pursuant to the independent  
Action Rule, which faints the order  
issued in CASE 17-1415 rendering it  
void and inadmissible. This means  
that the ruling obtained from the  
4th circuit court under CASE 17-1415  
cannot be used by any court, specifically  
within all 4th circuit cases pending,  
also establishing that neither RES  
JUDICATA nor collateral estoppel attaches  
regarding the (20) page document  
dated October 5, 2017, BLUE SKY TRAVEL  
AND TOURS, LLC v AL JAYYAR, - Fed Appx' -  
2015 WL 451636 CA4 (Va 2015), BARLOW  
v COLGATE PALMOLIVE CO., 772 F.3d 1001, 90  
Fed R. Serv. 3d. 85 CA4 (Md 2014);  
9 of 49

Johnson v United States - SCT - , 2015  
Will 2473450 (US 2015); Yates v Ford  
Motor Co. - FSU App 3d. - , 2015 Will  
6758983 (EOPH 2015).

You have fraud upon the court.  
The Judges presiding over Case 17-1415  
abused their discretion in acts of fraud  
upon the court, criminal conspiracy,  
manipulation and obstruction of justice.  
When they saw the magnitude of the  
(70) page document dated October 5,  
2017. The 4th circuit judges under  
Case 17-1415 conspired under color  
of law and or authority, with the  
SC Attorney General, The Federal  
US Attorneys, the defendant and the  
1008 49

United States and other parties to  
make the document moot by making  
a fraudulent ruling upon it for the  
purpose of concealing material facts  
in violation of 18 USC §§ 242 and 1001.  
The 4th Circuit judges knew if the  
SC Attorney General or the US Federal  
Attorneys were required to respond  
to respond to the (70) page document  
dated October 5, 2017. The Federal  
Attorneys nor the SC Attorney General,  
as was sought under case 17-6960, would  
have not been able to produce any  
evidence to prove that they,  
including the United States, responded  
timely to defeat the affidavits of  
1108 49

default and voiding of jurisdiction  
filed in case 2013-cv-400-0084 which  
now give TAH-TAH Al Mahdi the  
superceding attorney judicial and  
legislative power and authority to  
act as he do and intend to do within  
these proceedings. The conspiring  
with circuit judges under case 17-14515  
plan, scheme and plot was to make  
the fraudulent ruling that they did  
in efforts to render the document  
void to alleviate the DUE PROCESS  
requirement that the Federal Attorneys  
and SC Attorney General respond to  
the document because the judges  
knew they could not defeat the  
12 of 49

claims or successfully rebut the document in acts of fraud upon the court, criminal conspiracy, manipulation and obstruction of justice. Thus, the order issued in case 17-1115 is void and cannot be used by the court standing in egregious violations of 18 USC §§ 202 and 1001, as well as the Rico Act, produced to conceal the material fact with clear intent of misrepresentation, that the SC Attorney General, The Federal Attorneys for the United States could produce any evidence that would substantiate that they timely responded in case 2013 CP 400-0084 to defeat the affidavits.

130849

of default and voiding of jurisdiction  
and was designed to aid the defen-  
dants and their employer the  
United States avoid suit. Thus, not  
only is the order issued in case  
17-1445 void for violations of 18 USC  
§§ 242 and 1001, fraud upon the  
court and DUE PROCESS violation. It  
cannot be used as a basis for  
any determination, which include  
RES JUDICATA or collateral estoppel in  
the 4th circuit, and the 4th circuit  
must now rule on the document  
within the pending parallel appeals  
to maintain the integrity of the  
court and the parties must be required  
to respond as DUE PROCESS demands,

Inhabitants of Town of Fairfield v.  
Jimie Warner Cable Northeast LLC,  
- FSupp 3d - , 2015 WL 1565237 (2015);  
In RE: CHINESE MANUFACTURED TRAGWALL  
Products Litigation, FSupp.3d, 2016 WL  
1584060 (2016); FERRARA v OVAIROZZI  
EQUIPMENT LEASING CORP., 2013 WL  
3226755 (E.D. N.Y. 2013); IN RE: CLEAN  
BURN FUELS, LLC, 2014 WL 2987330  
(M.D. 2014); Williams v Secretary of  
Veteran Affairs - FSupp.3d. - , 2015 WL  
5935169 (M.D. Ala. 2015); LAPPEL v GOVERN-  
MENT EMPLOYEES TRUS. CO., 316 Fed Appx'  
894, 2009 WL 485274 (11th Cir. 2009);  
Miller v Parish, FSupp 2d, 2013 WL  
1868028 (La 2013); MORRIS v Wachovia  
SECURITIES INC., 448 F3d 268, Fed.  
150849

See. L. Rep. P. 93, 858 CA4 (Va 2006);  
NORBERGA v HINKLE, 576 Fed Appx 224  
CA4 (Va 2014); US v Eccleston - Fed Appx  
2015 WL 4591890 CA4 (Md 2015);  
FOX EX REL FOX v ELK RUN COAL CO. INC.,  
739 Fed. 131 CA4 (2014); Nelson v U.S.  
BANK N.A., 2015 WL 6852712 (DSC 2015);  
STANTON v MCKENBERG COUNTY DEPT.  
OF SOCIAL SERVICES, 521 Fed Appx 278,  
2013 WL 2364587 CA4 (N.C. 2013);  
WALKER v BEAUMONT INDEPENDENT  
SCHOOL DISTRICT, 2016 WL 6666833; CAHI  
v BOSTON CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL, 161 F. Supp3d  
136 (2016); BENTON v BURPS, 2017 WL  
491251 (DC Md 2017); PEGG v HEARN BERGER,  
845 Fed 112 (4th Cir 2017); US v LAWRENCE,  
F. Supp3d, 2015 WL 856866 (SD Va 2015);

NUKAR CORP v BELL, 251 F.R.D. 191, 194  
(TDC 2008) | GREAT AMERICAN TIRE Co v  
Nextday Network Hardware Corp., 73  
FSupp3d 636 (2014); In RE Wallace,  
649 Fed Appx 298 (mem) (4th Cir 2016).

FURTHERMORE, THERE IS A CONSTITU-  
TIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR THAT EXISTS IN  
CASE 17-1115, NOT SUBJECT TO THE HARMLESS  
ERROR DOCTRINE WHICH ALSO REPEALS  
THE ORDER AND CASE VOID. CASE 17-1115  
WAS INITIATED INVOKING THE PROVISIONS  
OF THE PLRA PURSUANT TO THE FILING  
IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS. SINCE  
THE JUDGES UNDER THAT CASE ORDERED  
US TO SUBMIT FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS  
DOCUMENTS INVOKING THIS PROVISION OF  
LAW WHICH VIOLATES THE UNITED STATES

17 of 49

SUPREME COURT holdings under Ex parte Virginia, 100 US 339 (1880), the proceedings became illegal and void. Until a ruling was made addressing the constitutionality of the PLRA and the AEDPA as is argued within these parallel cases. CASE <sup>17-1415</sup> IS illegal and void and the court was required to stay that case until such a determination was made. We object. The law as is determined by the US SUPREME COURT is clear and unambiguous on issues such as this. If a ruling has been obtained under an unconstitutional statute or legislative provision and or interpretation of law. The court explained that

18 of 49

"if this position is well taken, which it is, it effects the "Foundation" of the "whole" (emphasis added) proceeding. An unconstitutional law or judicial determination is void and is as if there were no determination made at all, being a structural constitutional error not subject to the harmless error doctrine. By this, the order and determination under case 17-1115 is tainted and cannot be used in any pending appeal and res judicata nor collateral estoppel attaches in these cases by this fraud upon the court and structural error, Vines v United States, 28 Fed 123 crim. law 163(1), 165(1); Robinson v Aronoff, 27 Fed 877 rehearing denied, cert. 1968 49

GRANTED ~~WRIT~~ US SCT 1247, 513 U.S.  
486, 131 LEd 2d 129; Laurie v United  
States, 65 FSupp 3d 19 (2014); Johnson v  
United States, -SCT-, 2015 WL 2473450  
(US 2015); Montgomery v Louisiana, 136  
SCT 710, 193 LEd 2d 599, 84 USLW 4063  
(US 2016); Graft outdoors LLC v Consoli-  
dation City of Indianapolis ~~\*\*\*~~, 187  
FSupp 3d 1002, 1012, 510 Ill.; Hill v  
Snyder, 821 F3d 763, 765+ (6th Cir 2016);  
People v Solo, 11E3d, 2017 WL 1838423  
(2017). We object.

The order issued in case 17-1415  
filed on October 31, 2017 and prior to  
that is illegal standing in egregious  
violation of 18 USC §§ 242 and 1001  
making it a criminal act for any  
judge, court or party to use it except  
20 of 49

for highlighting the fraud that produced it where it was produced to conceal the material fact that the 4th circuit judges in case 17-1415 conspired to make the (70) page document dated October 5, 2017 moot to aid the SC Attorney General, the US Federal Attorneys and their employer the United States avoid suit because the conspiring 4th circuit judges knew if the defendants were placed in a position where they would be required to respond, they could not produce any evidence that would demonstrate they timely moved to defeat the affidavits of default and voiding of jurisdiction

2 of 49

to stop the King Khalifah from invoking  
the superseding Attorney, Judicial and  
legislative power and authority given  
to him by the default emerging from  
CASE 2013 CP 400-0084. We object to  
this fraud upon the court. The SC  
Attorney General due to the proceedings  
under CASE 17-6960 is required to  
respond to rebut the claims, not the  
4th circuit in any manner to  
include their fraudulent effort to  
meet the document to prevent that  
response and aid them. US v Ron Paul  
Enterprises Inc, 409 US 235, 19-5CT  
1027, 103 Fed 2d 290 (US 1989) [IN RE  
ARGO Credit LLC, -BR-, 2007 WL 4404269  
(2007); LAKE CARRIER Ass'n v Macmillan,  
220849

406 US 498, 92 Sct 1749 (US 1972); U.S. v.  
\* 41,320 US CURRENCY, 9 FSupp 3d 582, 2014  
WLL 1266240, 1997 WLL 10291 US (Appellate  
BRIEF) BRIEF of SENATOR ORIN G. WATKINS  
STROM THURMOND et al.; JARRISTER v.  
White, 484 US 219, 108 Sct 538 (US 1988);  
Pulliam v. Allen, 466 US 522, 536-543,  
104 Sct 1970, 1977-1982, 80 LEd.2d 565  
(1984); Ex Parte Virginia, 100 US 339, 348-  
349, 25 LEd. 676 (1880).

FURTHERMORE, the (10) page document  
dated October 5, 2017 cannot be deemed  
meat for additional reasons:

(1) It was not filed within cases  
17-7410 and 17-7428 at the time of the  
issuing of the order in case 17-1415.  
Thus, any fraudulent determination  
23 of 49

made would not impact those parallel cases or effect their being filed as informal brief.

(2) By the document entitled, "Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice, Filing in Forma Pauperis documents, submission of Brief and motion to motion therefor", (5) pages dated November 3, 2017 served on the 4th circuit. The (10) page document is submitted in substitution of the informal Brief for all cases captioned. The (10) page document dated October 5, 2017 is an appeal document. Case 07-1415 is a writ of mandamus proceeding. The (10) page document throughout its pages clearly inform the court that

24 of 49

THESE ARE ISSUES ON APPEAL. THE 4TH  
CIRCUIT JUDGES IN CASE 17-1415 CONSPIRING  
UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY  
TO RENDER THE DOCUMENT MEET IN AND  
ABUSE OF DISCRETION AND FRAUD UPON  
THE COURT CANNOT ISSUE RULING ON  
APPEAL ISSUES SUBSTITUTING A MANDAMUS  
PROCEEDING FOR AN APPEAL. THIS IS  
ESSENTIALLY WHAT THEY HAVE DONE  
IN VIOLATION OF CLEARLY ESTABLISHED  
LAW. A MANDAMUS CANNOT SUBSTITUTE  
AS AN APPEAL. RUCHE V EVAPORATED  
MILK ASSN, 391 US 21, 63 S Ct 938, 87  
L Ed 1185 (US 1943); IN RE WILLIAMS, 381  
Fed Appx 284, 2010 WL 223 1958 (4th  
Cir 2010); WILLIAMS V UNITED STATES, 2015  
WL 1109497, \* 1, E.D. Va.

(3) By the (2) documents attached,  
The Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial  
Notice, Filing objections to the Report  
and Recommendations and motion to  
motion therefor, (3) pages dated  
November 3, 2017 in case 9:17-cv-114  
TW-BM establishing the appeal under  
CASE 17-710 the (10) page document  
is pending review in response to the  
Report and Recommendations. By the  
document entitled Affidavit of Facts  
Giving Judicial Notice, establishing  
SERVICE UPON ALL JUDGES AND CASES  
through the King Khalifah's Trustee,  
Judge Jacquelyn Austin, (3) pages dated  
November 3, 2017. The (10) page document  
is pending review in case 8:16-cv-

3328-REBUTIA And all presently  
pending cases sub\_judice that establish  
all parallel appeals pending before  
the 4th circuit if Judge Austin did  
not engage in any fraud. Thus, the  
document is not moot establishing  
that the SC Attorney General and/or  
the US Federal Attorneys are required  
to respond. It is pending in the  
David Duran state appeal before the  
SC Supreme Court. Again, the document  
is not moot having never been challenged  
by the respondent within that state  
case where that state case is removed  
to the US District Court establishing  
the appeal under case 17-6693. We  
renew our motion that the (10) page

document dated October 5, 2017 be  
accepted in substitution of the  
informal Brief within all cases  
listed within the caption of this  
document. This is motioned and granted  
by decree and judgment of the  
Chief Justice of the Global Theocratic  
Court whose superseding power and  
authority is binding upon this court  
by the default emerging from case  
2013 CP 100-0084. It is so ordered.

Since there was no ruling on  
the constitutionality of the PRA and  
the AEDPA as they relate to Ex Parte  
Virginia, 100 US 339, 348-349, 25 LEd  
676 (1880) or The Slaughter House  
Cases, 83 US (16 Wall) 36, 1873. The  
2009 49

Court under case 17-145's jurisdiction  
is void and illegal due to the existing  
structural error, fraud upon the court,  
violation of 18 USC §§ 242 and 1001  
and due process violations which corrupts  
the entire case and all orders  
contained therein, US v 41,320 US  
Currency 9 F.Supp.3d 582, 2014 WL  
1266240, Brown v US, 2014 WL 2871398  
(DC 2014). The 4th Circuit cannot abstain  
from answering this crucial Federal  
question even via declaratory judgment  
which was clearly sought even  
through the writs of mandamus in  
acts of fraud, manipulation and  
obstruction of justice in violation  
of due process law which voids the  
20 of 49

COURTS JURISDICTION FOR THAT DUE  
PROCESS VIOLATIONS PAUL ADAMS v.  
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTIONS, 2016 WL 6464444  
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY  
- FSUPP 3d -, 2016 WL 1755891 | US v. HARRIS,  
820 F3d 93 (4th Cir 2016); US v. Alshabara  
2010 WL 4054267 (DC Md 2010); HUNT v.  
U.S., FSUPP 2d, 2007 WL 5131716 (DSC 2007);  
LAKE CARRIER ASSN v. MAEMILLIAN, 406  
US 498, 92 Sct 1749 (US 1972). THESE ARE  
<sup>Now</sup> ALSO ISSUES ON APPEAL. Thus, the  
DOCUMENT IS NOT Moot.

IF SOMEHOW YOUR ACTIONS VIOLATE  
THE CONTRACT, THE GRANT, GIVEN TO  
YOUR NATIONS BY THE SOLE CORPORATION  
IMPAIRING THE OBLIGATIONS OF THE  
CONTRACT IN VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 1  
30 of 49

section 10 of the US Constitution  
establishing CAUSE before all courts  
allowing ~~ME~~ to intervene and  
RENDER void all orders issued in  
CASE 17-1115, PRESAULT v ICC, 494 US  
1, 110 Sct 914, 108 LEd2d 11 (US 1990);  
BROWN v BROWN, FSUPP 2d, 2013 WL 2338233  
(DC KY 2013); HARRIS v H H GREGG Title, FSUPP 2d,  
2013 WL 1331166 (Fla 2013); AMERICAN Mkt  
Liberty Ins Co v. Plywood-Plastics Corp., 81  
FSUPP 157 (DSC 1948); OPARAH v New York  
Dept of Educ, FSUPP 3d, 2015 WL 4240733  
(NYDC 2015).

I, TAHIRAH AL MAHDI, give the 4th  
circuit court of Appeals in all cases  
listed within the caption of this document  
judicial notice that I am invoking  
31 of 49

AND EXERCISING SUPREMACY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY AND POWER AND I AM REPEALING OF A nullity, void, all orders issued in CASE 17-1115 FOR VIOLATIONS OF 18 USC §§ 242 AND 1001, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, MANIPULATION AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. CASE 17-1115 IS NOW ESSENTIALLY ON REMAND LIMITING AND RESTRICTING THE 4TH CIRCUIT'S JURISDICTION TO DO NOTHING EXCEPT GRANT THE RELIEF THAT IS SOUGHT. AS I FURTHER TOLD YOU.

THE "TERM" OR "CONCEPT" OF A "JUDGE" OR "ATTORNEY" "LAWYER" DO NOT COME FROM YOU OR YOUR LAWS. THEY DO NOT COME FROM YOUR NATION, NOR DO THEY COME FROM ENGLAND OR ENGLISH LAW.

32 of 49

They come from us, the Sole Corporation  
and is intellectual property given to  
your nations as a "grant" with "restrie-  
tions" through Adam and Abraham,  
members of the Sole Corporation  
as is argued in case 16-2299. Their  
ownership is with me, JAHSH AL MAHDI,  
as the fiduciary their King, Khalifah,  
Lawgiver of the Sole Corporation being  
the original fountain of all law and  
sovereign power. You cannot legally  
attach, arrest or execute the  
intellectual property of a foreign  
sovereign sole corporation without  
consent, which is witherquin due  
to your fraud, obstruction of justice,  
machination and violations of 18

USC §§ 242 and 1001, Absent of its  
Rights and prerogatives. DUE to the  
default emerging from CASE 2013 CP  
400-004, and by the "contract",  
"contract", as fiduciary their, King,  
Khalifah and lawyer protected  
under Article 1 sections 10 of the US  
Constitution. The 4th circuit court  
cannot by my original status under  
contract take away the King-Khalifah's  
rights or prerogatives, or burden the  
obligations of that contract with ex  
post facto law, Trustees of Dartmouth  
College v Woodward, 17 US 518, 1819 Vol  
2201. Also SEE GENESIS 17:17, GENESIS  
18:17-19, LUKE 11:52, ISAIAH 11:5,  
34 of 49

Zachariah 6:12-13; Isaiah 60:1-5; Isaiah  
32:1-4; Isaiah 42:10-22; Jeremiah  
23:5-6; Jeremiah 33:15-21 (A crucial  
one); Ezekiel 34:22-30; Ezekiel 37:22;  
Daniel 11:1-3; Malachi 3:1-6; Psalm 89;  
Psalm 132; Prugh v U.S. 133 S Ct 2012,  
106 Fed 2d 84, 81 USW 4372 (2013); US  
v Wells 578 Fed Appx 234 (CA4 Va 2014);  
Grattam v McFadden, 2015 WL 505536  
(DC 2015); Ogden v Saunders, 25 U.S. 213  
(1807); Trustees of Cincinnati Southern  
Ry v Porter, 21 Ohio N.P. (N3) 441, 1918  
WL 96530.

The SC Attorney General and the  
US Federal Attorneys for the United  
States must respond, not the 4th  
circuit judges conspiring under color  
35 of 49

of law and or authority attempting  
to make the (10) page document  
dated October 5, 2017 moot to protect  
them and conceal material facts in  
violation of 18 USC §§ 242 and 1001. The  
state and federal attorneys must  
demonstrate that they timely sought  
to defeat the default and voiding of  
jurisdiction by uncontested affidavits  
in case 2013-CP-400-0084 or all rights,  
privileges and titles stand. If such,  
the 4th circuit nor any state may  
exclude a person, namely, the foreign  
sovereign judicial King-Khalifah with  
superior attorney, judicial and  
legislative power and authority, by

36 of 49

his original status as such before this  
nation was formed, to practice law  
(Lawgiver, Attorney, Judge, Legislator  
of God), or any other occupation  
given to him by "covenant", "contract"  
(Fiduciary, King, Khalifah), in a manner  
or for reasons that contravenes the  
DUE PROCESS rights, power or authority  
given to him or in a manner that  
violates the equal protection of the laws  
clause or Article I section 10 of the US  
Constitution. The Fiduciary and  
Judicial duty commands it, 28 USC §  
1041, Spires v Schools - 859 F.3d - 2017  
with 474774 (5th Cir 2017), Fifth Third Bancorp  
v. Dudley Hoffer, 132 S.Ct 2459, 189 L.Ed.2d  
3708 49

457, 82 USLW 4578 (US 2014) | PIERCE v  
CHIMES District of Columbia Inc Resupp 304,  
2016 WL 6124679 (DC Md 2016).

I, ZAHNAN AL MAHDI, fulfilled  
my duty by your patients. THE PROCESS  
LAWS AND PROPERLY, AS A NON-COMBATANT,  
FILED LEGAL ACTION TO ESTABLISH THE  
RIGHTS. I GAVE ALL REQUIRED PARTIES  
FAIR AND PROPER NOTICE. I PROPERLY  
SERVED THE PARTIES AND BROUGHT  
THE MATTERS TO THEM UPON CASE  
2013-CA-400-0084 TO WHICH THEY  
APPEARED, WHERE THEY DEFAULTED IN  
THE STATE CASE AND THAT STATE CASE  
WAS REMOVED TO THE FEDERAL DISTRICT  
COURT PRODUCING THESE FEDERAL CASES.

38 of 49

to exclude me from practice of law  
as king, Khalifah and lawgiver of  
God with superseding Attorney,  
judicial and legislative power and  
authority via the Sole Corporation  
binding upon this court by contract,  
and to hinder me in my occupation  
as fiduciary their established by due  
process via case 2013-CP-000-0084  
protected under Article 13 section 10 of  
the US Constitution, just like your  
nation did for them sodomites and  
Gomorrhahrites when it came to  
same sex marriage, would violate  
the equal protection of the laws  
clause behind religious and racial

WANTED. If we object. The (10) page document dated October 5, 2017 is submitted as informal Brief within all cases listed in the caption where appeal relief is sought. It is so ordered by decree and judgment of the chief justice of the Global Theocratic state and court, Schwartz v Board of Exam of State of N.M., 353 U.S. 232, 72 Sct 752, 64 A.L.R. 2d. 288, 1 L.Ed.2d 796 (US 1957); Faure v Sullivan, 2017 WL 3710066 (DC N.J. 2017); Virginia Board of Medicine v Zakrisen, 67 Va. App. 461, 796 S.E.2d 866 (2017); Dove v Rogers, 139 F.Supp.3d 120 (DC 2015); Bells v. Virginia Bd of Examiners, 81 F.Supp.2d 1260 (E.D. Va 2011); In re Green, 980 F.2d

590 (4th Cir 1992).

Your jurisdiction and the orders are void under case 17-1415 and you shall grant all relief demanded, as in all previous filed mandamus and cases involved due to the structural constitutional error, fraud upon the court, manipulation, conspiracy and obstruction of justice as well as for due process violation, Garcia Financial Group v Virginia Accelerators Corp, 3 Fed Appx 86, 2001 WL 17497 (4th Cir 2001) which can be raised at any time even after the final order in case 17-1415 due to the infirmities to render  
408 49

those orders void, BOARD of JUSTICES  
of International Union of Operating  
ENGINEERS, 2016 WL 1253285; Wells  
FARGO Bank N.A. v FARGO, 2016 WL  
2944561 (2016); CHRISTIANSEN v M.B. N.A.  
AMERICAN Bank N.A. SE2d, 2013 WL  
8507850 (SC App. 2013); STRATHEP v  
MEEKLENBERG County Dept of Social Services,  
521 Fed Appx 278, 2013 WL 2364587 (CA4  
(Mo 2013)); LOUGHMAN v U.S., 134 S Ct 2384  
(US 2014); SMITH v CLARK / SMOOT / RUSSELL,  
- F3d -, 2015 WL 4717232 (CA4 (Mo 2015)).

As the Foreign Sovereign King -  
Khalifah, I, TAHIR AL MAHDI, give  
the 4th circuit court judicial notice  
in case 17-1415 and within all  
42 of 49

other cases listed within the  
caption of this document. As a  
matter of law let it be known and  
for all records within all cases  
listed in the caption of this docu-  
ment. I, The King-Khalifah, demand  
that the judges in case 17-118 and  
all other cases listed within the  
caption of this document, that you  
produce your bond and writ of  
commission and or oath of office that  
would allow any judge to legally  
negate the terms of the contract  
established by the sole corporation  
protected under Article 1 section 10  
of the US constitution. All relief  
43 of 49

sought must be granted by decrees  
of the King-Khalifah or produce your  
Bonds, writ of commission or oath of  
office and citing of law that demon-  
strate you can violate the provisions  
of Article 1 section 10 of the US  
Constitution and the decrees of a  
Sovereign Foreign King-Khalifah  
who by his original status is  
Sovereign with superseding attorney,  
judicial and legislative power and  
authority by contract and default  
or stand down in or the orders in  
Case 17-1115 are void and the 4th  
circuit shall order in congruence  
with the King-Khalifah's decrees  
-44 of 49

ALL RELIEF sought and the SC Attorney  
GENERAL and the US FEDERAL ATTORNEYS  
ARE REQUIRED to respond on the  
COURT RECORD. If we, motion for  
DECLARATORY judgment and these  
too ARE ISSUES that ARE NOW on  
APPEAL. PURSUANT to 28 USC §§ 2201,  
2202. IN CASES of actual controversy,  
... ONLY COURT of the United States,  
upon the filing of an appropriate  
pleading, may declare the right  
and other legal relations of any  
interested party seeking such  
declarations whether or not relief  
is or could be sought ~~we~~, William  
DOUGLAS BROWN and BRENDA HARRIST  
45 of 49

Broun v CSX Transportation Inc, 2017  
will 1028579 (4th Cir 2017); Allstate  
Insurance Company v Ingraham,  
2017 will 976301 (TSC 2017); L-3 Commun-  
ications Corporation v Sereo Inc, Fed.  
Appx' - , 2016 will 723218 (4th Cir 2016).

In referring back to the constitutionality of the TRA and AETPA, affirming what the US Supreme Court ~~adjudicated~~ in the Montgomery case. The general rule is that an unconstitutional statute and/or legislative provision of law, though having the form and name of law, it is in reality no law, but is wholly void and ineffective for any use.

- 46 of 49 -

PURPOSE, SINCE ITS UNCONSTITUTIONALITY  
DATES FROM THE TIME OF ITS ENACTMENT  
... IN LEGAL CONTEMPLATION, IT IS  
INOPERATIVE AS IF IT HAD NEVER  
BEEN PASSED ... SINCE AN UNCONSTITU-  
TIONAL LAW IS VOID, THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE  
FOLLOWS THAT IT IMPOSES NO DUTY,

CONFERS NO RIGHTS, CREATES NO OFFICE  
(JUDICIAL), BESTOWS NO POWER (JURISDICTION)  
OR AUTHORITY ON ANYONE, AFFORDS NO  
PROTECTION (YOU ARE NOT IMMUNE  
ONCE WE NOTIFIED YOU OF THE PROBLEM  
IF YOU CONTINUE TO ACT) AND JUSTIFIES  
NO ACTS (EMPHASIS ADDED WHICH INCLUDES  
THE STATE V GENTRY CASE) PERFORMED  
UNDER IT ... A VOID ACT CANNOT BE  
42 OF 49

legally consistent with a valid one.  
An unconstitutional law cannot  
operate to supersede an existing  
law (this means the law established  
before these provisions of law were  
enacted must now stand allowing  
us to jointly file etc.). Indeed  
insofar as a statute and or legislative  
provision run counter to the  
fundamental law of the land  
(the constitution, EX PARTE VIRGINIA,  
indictments are adjudicated under  
the due process prong to subject  
matter jurisdiction), it is superseded  
thereby, no one is bound to obey  
an unconstitutional law and no courts

ARE bound to enforce it BONNETT v. Walker, 16 Pet. 885, 136 U.S. 193 (1908);  
North v. Shelby County, 18 U.S. 425 (1806).  
All laws, rules, statutes and practices  
which ARE REPUGNANT to the Constitution  
ARE null and void, MARBURY v. Madison,  
5th US (2 Cranch) 137, 180.

Yahya Mevrit  
Yahya Mezil

Christopher Wilson  
Chris Wilson

November 8, 2017

Respectfully,  
JAHJAH Al Mahdi - The Chief  
Justice of The Global  
Theocratic State and Court



Anthony Cook  
Anthony Cook

Robert Mitchell  
Robert Mitchell

David Derven  
David Derven

490849