

Exhibit

duren



# 2

||

State of South Carolina  
vs THE SUPREME COURT et. al.

---

Appeal from Sumter County  
Judge Newman, Presiding Judge

---

Appellate Case 2017-000605

---

David Duren et al.,

Appellant(s)

vs

State of South Carolina et al.

Respondents

---

1 of 15

# Affidavit of Service

I, David Duren et al. do hereby certify that we have mailed and or served a copy of an Affidavit of Facts giving Judicial Notice; Notice seeking leave to Appeal and motions to motions therefor on the SC SUPREME COURT, THE 4th circuit, THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT, THE SC ATTORNEY GENERAL, ATTORNEY GARDY et al by US mail POSTAGE PREPAID on October 27, 2017. It is deemed filed on that date Houstop v Lark, 287 US 266, 273-76, 108

set 2379 (1988). Placed in box  
Friday to sit over weekend.

Respectfully,

David Deven

David Deven

October 27, 2017

3 of 15

State of South Carolina  
In the Supreme Court et. Al.,

Appeal from Sumter County  
Judge Newman, Presiding Judge

Appellate Case 2017-000605

David Duren et. Al.,

Appellant(s)

vs.

State of South Carolina et. Al.,  
Respondent(s)

40715

affidavit of facts giving judicial  
notice & notice seeking leave  
to appeal and motion to motions  
therefor \_\_\_\_\_

to: the SC SUPREME COURT,  
the 4th circuit court of  
appeals,  
the SC US DISTRICT COURT,  
the SC ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
ATTORNEY CARA MARY CAUDY  
et al,

HERE the 4th circuit in cases

5 of 15

17-6693; 17-6925; 17-6960; 17-7139;  
17-7137; 17-7134; 17-7068; 16-2299;  
17-7186 et al will find:

(1) A copy of the order issued  
by the SC SUPREME COURT dated  
October 20, 2017. It was received on  
October 25, 2017 giving me, David  
Loren, (14) days to seek leave to  
Appeal this order making me et al,  
timely. Rule 4(d) of Appellate Court  
Rules attaches. I want a copy of  
the outside front of the envelope  
filed within the 4th circuit to show  
6 of 15

When it reached the 4th circuit  
made a part of the court record  
to prevent any unjust delay. It  
David Curen and/or the petitioners  
of the parallel cases listed seek  
leave to appeal this attached order  
from the SC Supreme Court within  
all cases previously listed previously  
within the 4th circuit. Normally  
the 4th circuit would not have  
jurisdiction over a state case at  
this juncture, but circumstances exist  
that would dictate otherwise. On its  
face it appears as a state case but

presently it is not. Case 2017-000605  
is petitioned removed to case 2017-cv-  
1127-JME-MGB and the other parallel  
cases establishing this case as a  
federal case related to these appeals  
where no remand order exist. The  
order issued within this state case  
was issued to subvert the Federal  
Court which include the 4th circuit's  
jurisdiction over these matters pending  
within the 4th circuit. Therefore,  
we are seeking leave to appeal it  
within all cases above listed. The  
SC Supreme Court's jurisdiction is  
divested until this matter is heard.

(2) The court will find: A copy of the affidavit of service and affidavit of facts giving judicial notice; motion to terminate state appointed counsel due to fraud upon the court(s), criminal conspiracy and obstruction of justice; petition to remove and motion to motion therefore, (6) pages dated September 4, 2017.

This document is submitted as evidence to further prove and substantiate that we meet the criteria established by Ross v Blake, 906 LS

136 SCT 1850 (2016) and also substantiate why we sought leave to appeal the order from the SC SUPREME COURT due to their efforts to cause a detrimental effect upon the parallel appeals presently pending as is argued within the (6) page document. To prevent any irreparable damage to our pending appeals within the 4th circuit. I and the petitioners felt it best that in the absence of caution we add it to the appeal since the order is void due to removal and it was issued to subvert the

4th circuits jurisdiction.

→ 10: Attorney LARA MARY CAUDY,  
→ the SC Attorney General and  
→ the SC SUPREME COURT with all of  
its JUDGES. This document is also  
submitted in lieu of SERVICE of  
a document entitled, "Affidavit of  
facts giving judicial notice, Filing  
Writ of ERROR, motion to Amend  
PARTIES, motion FOR RECUSAL, motion  
TO REINSTATE CASES 17-7068 and 17-  
7186 et al., motion TO STAY CASES  
17-7139, 17-7136, 17-6925, 17-7068;  
11 of 15

17-7137 ; 17-7186 ; \*\*\* (70) PAGES dated  
October 5, 2017. BY this document served  
on you via the 4th circuit. I david  
duren ALREADY HAVE legal counsel  
Appointed in the form of the Judiciary  
HEIR. The SC Attorney General was  
served this document through case  
17-6960. The SC Attorney General  
is required to see that a copy of  
this document is filed with the SC  
Supreme Court. Attorney Caudy  
I am giving you notice the SC  
Supreme Court is in error. I ALREADY  
have counsel in the form of the

Fiduciary HEIR. By law you are  
REQUIRED to obtain a copy of the  
(70) page document and SEE that it  
is filed in case 2017-000605. Please  
do so because structural errors now  
exist that voids the SC Supreme  
Court of Jurisdiction where I have  
been also deprived counsel of choice  
in violation of the holdings made  
in United States v Gonzalez-Lopez supra;  
Mampo v Rhy, 389 U.S. 128, 134, 88 S.Ct. 254  
(1968). Even though the right to counsel of  
choice is not absolute. It becomes  
absolute by the (70) page document

13 of 15

in question. This REQUIRE you to  
obtain A COPY FROM THE 4th circuit  
in the cases afore listed Attorney  
Cindy and SEE that it is filed with  
the SC SUPREME COURT. SC SUPREME  
COURT YOU ARE REQUIRED BY DUE PROCESS  
law to obtain A COPY. This document  
is submitted in lieu of SERVICE of  
the (10) PAGE document, giving you  
notice of its EXISTENCE and SIGNIFICANCE  
REQUIRING YOU ALL to obtain A COPY  
electronically FROM THE 4th circuit  
AND ENSURE that it is filed within  
CASE 2017-000605 FOR PURPOSE OF

14 of 15

EXERCISING my constitutional right of  
course of choice established by contract  
protected under Article 1 Section 10 of the  
US Constitution where the issue of who  
is legal counsel over these cases is  
before the 4th circuit divesting the  
SC SUPREME COURT of jurisdiction on this  
issue. I demand of all to produce your  
Writ of Commission, Bond or Oath of office  
that would allow you to violate Article  
1 Section 10 of the US Constitution and  
the superseding Attorney, Judicial and  
Legislative Authority of a Foreign Judiciary  
their and sovereign.

October 27, 2017

Respectfully  
David Curen  
David Curen

150815