Exhibit (7)

Nebulous / ~~Frivolous~~ - plot! #6

=

COURT of APPEALS

FOR THE 2nd CIRCUIT

U.S DISTRICT COURTS

State of NEW York ET AL,

THE CRAWFORD AND OR SUTCLIFFE

APPEALS WITHIN THE 2nd 15-3907,

15-15414 AND WITH CIRCUITS ET AL, 15-14078

14078

ALSO RELATED TO U.S. DISTRICT COURT

CASES 9:15-CV-984 ; 9:15-CV-183;

9:14-CV-1501 ; 1:15-CV-2309 ; 1:15-CV-

2310 ; 15-1494 ; 15-1386 ; THE NEW

WRIT of ERROR IN GEORGIA DISTRICT COURT

COOK ET AL, PETITIONERS

V.S.

The United States et al.,

defendants

Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Supplementing The Newly Filed Georgia Writ of Error, Also The Crawford and Sutcliffe Appeals of Cases 9:15-cv-183; 9:14-cv-150; 1:15-cv-2310 and All Pending State and Federal Cases; Motions for Sanctions; Motions to Strike; Motions for Recusal; Motions for En Banc Review; Evidentiary

Hearing, the appointment of legal counsel, and to exceed any page limits, motion for an extension of time, motion to expand the scope and for inclusion, motion for an official independent investigation by the U.S. Department of Justice

---

In re: various state cases, the Crawford and Sutcliffe Appeals, case 9:15-cv-984, the Writ of Error case in Georgia District Court "GDCS" to, the 2nd and 4th Circuit Courts of Appeals,

The Georgia and New York District Courts et al.,

The plaintiffs / petitioners in the above captioned matters have recently received conditional and or final orders in the Sutcliffe and Mitchell cases and report and recommendation in cases 1:15-cv-2309, 2310 and 4005 also new GA. Writ of ERROR.

Since Judge Batten in acts of fraud upon the court adjudicated the motion for extension of time within a case (1) years closed when he had no jurisdiction not

being the presiding Judge over this case conspiring with Evans and defendants. Also due to Judges in case 15-1386 in Acts of Fraud upon the court asserting there was no arguable bases in law to get ahead of us establishing that arguable bases in law within case 9:15-cv-804, and kill the emergency stays on the state cases. We seek sanctions and the determinations must be made void for Due Process violation and Fraud upon the courts deeming this Response timely.

DUE to REMOVAL of the Sutcliffe And mitchell PCRs at the time the conditional orders And final orders was submitted. This tainted those documents rendering them void. The court was to proceed no further And You conspired with the federal actors across multiple state And federal jurisdictions to do so. The motion to strike those PCR orders in the Sutcliffe And mitchell PCRs via sanctions sought for the sake of justice And fairness due to the parties resorting to unjust legal tactics, judicial chicanery And

FRAUD UPON THE COURT SEE HARPER & JAMES THE LAW OF TORTS 1642-1643 L. (1956).

ANY DETERMINATION MADE IN CASE 15-1386 IS MADE VOID BY FRAUD UPON THE COURT. FIRST THERE WAS AN INDEPENDENT WRIT OF ERROR FILED THAT REQUIRED A SEPERATE CASE NUMBER. THE 2ND CIRCUIT ASKED FOR IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS TO ESTABLISH A SEPERATE INDEPENDENT CASE THEY ADJUDICATED UNDER THE CLOSED CASE 15-1414. THIS IS FRAUD. THERE WAS MOTION FOR LIVINGSTONS RECUSAL BEING A DEFENDANT CIRCUMVENTED. SHE SAT ON THE PROCEEDING REGARDING ADDITIONAL

judges in fraud who are now defendants and whose recusal is sought, to place forth fraudulent adjudication to keep herself from being sued. Another act of fraud is that you conspire combine or consolidate cases 15-1494 and 15-1386 without first giving us notice and issuing an order stating such is being done. This is fraud and the damage is it prejudiced the hearing of the independent Writ of Error filed to address what Livingston did in case 15-1494. The 2nd Circuit then files motions intended to be adjudicated in the

closed CASE 15-1484 to PREJUDGMENT RULING in CASE 15-1386. They REALIZED WE CAUGHT them, CALLED them on it, which is why they at the last minute inAPPROPRIATELY CONSOLIDATED without ORDER OR NOTICE. Yet the documents still WERE CIRCUMVENTED being RULED on OR JUDGE Livingston would not HAVE BEEN ABLE to sit upon these PROCEEDINGS where RECUSAL WAS REQUIRED, CONSPIRING with SHARPE and MCAULAY within the LOWER COURT; They determined that WE ESTABLISHED an ARGUABLE BASES in law within CASE 9:15-CV-984 and wanted to

get ahead of that litigation and Untie the Stagger (ies). So they made a fraudulent Ruling in case LS-13886. Inasmuch, here the Georgia Court will find served upon you within this New Writ of Error which you Received in prior proceedings!

(1) A copy of A motion to strike all magistrate Report(s); motion for Recusal; motion for extension of time and En Banc Review, (4) pages dated July 16, 2015, with its (7) page attachment dated July 16, 2015.

(2) A copy of the (2) page certificate of service dated July 10, 2015 with its summons and affidavit of facts citing judicial notice; motion for recusal; motion for extension of time due to additional fraud upon the court(s); motion for sanctions; motion for emergency stays; supplementing all state and federal actions; motion for en banc hearing, (43) pages dated July 8, 2015.

Again we review our previous filed motions to strike and motion for sanctions. We object to these

reports are conditional and or final orders being admitted into the court records because they are tainted by acts of fraud upon the court(s) where these parties conspired across multiple state and federal jurisdictions to submit them. If the afore listed documents are not filed in cases 2309, 2310 then you have further acts of spoliation by the conspiring parties requiring sanctions and the reports be stricken from the court record. The conditional and final orders submitted in

The Sutcliffe and Mitchell Pearls were submitted via Fraud upon the Court at a time of Removal requiring signatures. The motion for such.

Pursuant to Houston v Lack that (43) page document was deemed filed on July 10, 2015 (3) days prior to the issuing of the Report where emergency stay was in place via the 2nd Circuit. Thus, no Report should have been entered into the Court Record due to emergency stay and where the Reports issued in both cases "2309" and "2310" are tainted by Fraud. The Orders

submitted in the sutcliffe and mitchell
pcrs were submitted during time
of removal. Add to this the aggravating
factors of the 2nd circuit filing the
documents in a closed case to pre-
vent adjudication and made a
fraudulent Ruling in case 15-1386
to get ahead of the fact that we
established and arguable bases in
law in case 915-cv-984. We object
and move to strike the Reports
and conditional or final orders
and render all orders in cases
15-1386 | 15-cv-2309 and 2310 void
on the bases of fraud upon the

COURT AND THE SPOLIATION WHERE JUDGE HARRINGTON DESTROYED OR PREVENTED FILING OF THE ORIGINAL SUBSEQUENT REMOVAL DOCUMENTS, CHRISTIANSON V. M.B.-N.A. AMERICAN BANK PLAINTIFF 2013 WL 8507850 (SC APP 2013); MILLER V COLUMBIA FOREST INC, SE2d 2014 WL 5390504 (SC APP 2014); CALDWELL V WIQUIST, 402 SC 595, 741 SE2d 583 (SC APP 2013); U.S. V STERLING, 724 F3d 482 (4TH (VA 2013); SUNOCO PRODUCTS CO V. GUNTER, 2014 WL 5474633 (D SC 2014); HAWKINS V COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON, 2013 WL 6050324 (D SC 2013); TURNER V U.S, 736 F3d 274 (4TH (N.C 2013);

NUCOR Corp v Bell, 251 F.R.D. 191, 194 (DSC 2008); Ex Parte Virginia, 110 U.S. 339, 25 L.Ed 676 (1872); 28 U.S.C §§ 2014, 2072.

We RENEW our objections to Apply (3). STRIKE CONCERNS being levied at Crawford. This is also what they are being SUED for; to render all past adverse orders void. The arguable bases in law to do so is litigated in case as-is-case and will now be litigated within this document to include the right Crawford has to interject himself into his citizen members legal cases acting as Judge, legislator and attorney. Further,

the issue of threat of imminent danger pursuant to any (3) strikes in full related to these cases was already adjudicated within the 2nd Circuit Under case is-now. That higher court granted informa pauperis review addressing these same claim(s) where the plaintiff, Jahtah Al Mahdi, survived at minimum (4) previous assassination attempts directly connected to these cases. Once the 2nd Circuit in case is-now granted informa pauperis filing related to these

cases, which threat still exist until this very date. The Georgia District Court or any other subsequent court is barred in challenging such by collateral estopped. To deny such when the 2nd Circuit granted it in case is very Unfair same conditions and circumstances would be fraud upon the court, and abuse of discretion, a miscarriage of justice and a violation of the equal protection of the laws clause. The Georgia District Court can provide no justifiable reason for the disparity in treatment

where the 2nd Circuit is a higher court addressing the same issues under LS-USA. The threat of imminent danger is continuous and is directly connected to this case where Jah Jah Al Mahdi, is now legally (Emphasis added) established as the Global Theocratic King-Khalifah of the (4) Global Theocracies by default and collateral estoppel where the United States and other 192 member states of the U.N. are parties, appeared and defaulted.

We object to any claim of "shot gun" pleading, or that the

case wreaks havoc on the judicial system, or that this case is frivolous or incomprehensible. You are dealing with the largest case in earth's judicial history which carves an exception to the concept of the "shot gun" pleading. If it were "shot gun" pleading everybody in the world would be named as defendants. Only specific parties are named who were involved directly to the facts and causes of action who are necessary to bring the suit. Furthermore, they defaulted at the state level in case 2013-CA-000-0084

Now removed to these cases, making all claims true. By the default and collateral estopped the courts circumvented or failed to acknowledge, in acts of fraud upon the court, all claims are made true. Thus it would be and is an abuse of discretion to state the claims are frivolous or that there is no arguable bases in law. The default makes the claims true clearly establishing an arguable bases in law and fact. Inasmuch, via the default, we are dealing with "Acts of God", Acts of God carves an exception to the "shotgun"

pleading analysis. Acts of God tend to wreak havoc when and wherever they manifest themselves. But by law they cannot be deemed to injure anyone. No one can be penalized by judicial determinations or otherwise for "Acts of God". The fulfilling of Religious prophesy is an "Act of God". Elijah must Restore "all "(Emphasis added) things. How can the Elijah, Al mahdi, Restore "all "(Emphasis added) things unless there was a case filed in this manner addressing all things God command to be addressed pursuant to Religious prophesy. See Mark 9:12

New Testament (Bible).

Additionally, you cannot legally call a case frivolous or incomprehensible, which is tangible proof of the Georgia District Court is fraud upon the court, where the case was pleaded within the state courts under 2013-CA-000-0084 and New Jersey A-05205-13 T4 and the 2nd Circuit in case 15-1386 and all Judges and Attorneys, State and Federal, comprehended the pleadings. Thereafter, in case 2013-CA-000-0084, the parties, which include all 193 member states of the United Nations

defaulted, making all claims TRUE and the case is merely being removed to the Federal Courts pursuant to Article III section 2 of the U.S Const., the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Foremost the Foreign Sovereign Immunity Act of 28 U.S.C § 1602-1612. The Courts are procedurally barred from calling this case frivolous or stating there is no arguable bases in law or fact by collateral estopped. We object, Blue Sky Trading and Tours, LLC v Al Tayyar - Fed Appx - 2015 WL 1455636 (9th Cir (Va 2015); 448 F3d 268; 772 F3d 1101; Slater v South Carolina Ry Co, 29 SC 96, 6 SE

936 S.C (1888) ; Smith v Georgia Power Co, 172 SC 142, 173 S.E 297 SC (1954); Mountbatten SUR Co. Inc v Town of Wareshoales, FSupp 2d 2008 WL 2704921 (DSC 2008); Addys Harbor Dodge LLC v. Global Vehicles U.S.A Inc, 2014 WL 4929335 (DSC 2014); Norfolk Southern Ry Co v. Baltimore and Annapolis R.R. Co, 2015 WL 685303 (DSC 2014); S.E.C v. Jarkas, 557 Fed Appx 204 CA4 (Va 2014); U.S Bank Nat. Ass'n v Zarabi, 560 Fed Appx 181 CA4 (Va 2014).

We object to the Report submitted in both cases "2309", "2310", the final order in case "183", the Georgia District Court cases, and case 15-1386, as

well as three orders submitted in the sutcliffe and mitchell perus, because you circumvented and did not address the claims of default and collateral estopped, ignored or spoliated emergency stay documents, crucial evidence filed or removal documents, adjudicated documents presently filed in closed cases, some closed for over (7) years, in eg egregious acts of fraud upon the court(s) warranting sanctions. The reports, conditional and or final orders are tainted with fraud and must be stricken from the court record or rendered

void due to violations of the 6th, 7th, and 14th Amendments, 28 U.S.C. § 1602-1612 and DUE PROCESS LAW. Judges Wright, Cooper, Eubanks, Harding-Lowe etc. collaborating with Sharpe and defendants did not merely abuse their discretion. They conspired with the Judges in spoliation within State and Federal cases to which they were void of all jurisdiction, stripping them of immunity and engaged in acts of fraud upon the courts. They never properly or sufficiently addressed or rebutted the acts of fraud or spoliation in the reports,

orders submitted or in their determinations. We object. We object also to the failure to rule on class action certification, the right to an evidentiary hearing, en banc review, the appointment of legal counsel to represent the class members and they bringing the plow "legally" established foreign sovereigns before this court in violation of the terms they dictate. By their criminal fraudulent assessment. They are asserting that the constitutional right to be presumed innocent until proven guilty by a jury of ones peers,

not OUR convictions being illegally adjudicated by the GRAND JURY via the language presented is frivolous and has no arguable bases in law? The Right of a legally established Sovereign not to have his property or liberty attached, arrested or executed without his consent is frivolous despite the default which makes the claims true by law and collateral estopped has no arguable bases in law? They are asserting by actions that the evils and atrocities done during slavery and Jim Crow are frivolous and have no arguable bases in law or fact? They are asserting that the violating of essential jurisdictional prerequisites

and jurisdictional requisites are frivolous and have no arguable bases in law? What was done during slavery and Jim Crow by this nation with all of its atrocities committed thereby is frivolous and have no arguable bases in law? Do we really want to go down this road? These conspiring parties are repugnant liars and white supremacist or black uncle tom slave overseer types, fraudulent thieves deprived of sagacity, justice and fairness. Their judicial discretion have become egregiously compromised via overwhelming acts of fraud upon the court(s)

and ulterior motives creating a miscarriage of justice. They have entered into a deliberate scheme to defraud the plaintiffs and inmates of this nation making a mockery and abuse of the judicial process involving themselves in crimes, spoliation, requiring their recusal by sanctions sought, U.S. v Ray, 547 Fed Appx' 348 (4th Cir Va 2013); U.S. v Blondeau, 480 Fed Appx' 211 (4th Cir 2010); Wellons v Hall, 558 U.S. 220, 130 S.Ct 727 (U.S 2010); Ochoa Lizarbe v Rivera Rondon, 402 Fed Appx' 834 (4th Cir 2010); Project Management Co. v. Dyn Corp Int'l LLC, 734 F3d 366 (4th Cir Va 2013); Hawkins v College of Charleston, 2013 WL 6050

324 (DSC 2013) | BRUNSON v U.S. 2014 WL 4410 2803 (DSC 2014) | MASSI v WALGREEN Co, 2015 WL 3796507 (DSC 2015) | GRAYSON Consulting Inc v CPATH CARE, 2013 WL 3941 6203 (DSC 2013) | EX PARTE VIRGINIA, 100 U.S. 339.

DUE to THESE continuAl injustices THE INJUNCTION AND PROTECTIVE ORDER ONCE filed must be requested to get AT THE truth AND also to bring THE COURT transcripts from THE Judge LEE AND GRIFFITH hearings before THESE COURTS AND make them A part of THE COURT RECORD. I WANT THE audio PRESERVED AS EVIDENCE from both THOSE Judges hearings. WE need to determine

What Judge Lee said about the affidavits of facts and how I need to file them where she determined if I detach the word "motion" from the affidavit of facts they legally stand, do not have to be ruled on unless by Rules of Court they are timely challenged when served upon the parties. We must establish that the pleadings were comprehensible to all judges and parties which will prove the fraud upon the court via the various Federal Judges in the Georgia District Court. Even the 2nd Circuit once they reviewed the pleading,

comprehended them where they made a fraudulent ruling stating that there was no arguable bases in law to inappropriately avoid recusal, and they consolidated cases without order or notice. I will deal with the issue as to whether there is an arguable bases in law later. Nevertheless, none of the state or federal parties who made appearance and whom were properly served, including the U.S., moved for an extension of time to answer before the default was filed. Nor did they timely challenge any subsequent related document.

They did not resist entry of the default document or rights, claims to exercise power given by the default. They did not "timely" contest damages. They did not seek to appeal the filed default document nor those subsequently filed which sought to exercise sovereign power and authority or move to defeat them in a "timely" (emphasis added) manner making all claims, assertions of rights, titles, power and authority true. This bars all subsequent state and federal courts from

challenging these claims by default and collateral estopped. Thus it was an act of fraud and an abuse of discretion to claim there is no arguable bases in law. Hodges v State Farm mut. Auto Ins Co, 488 FSupp. 1057 (DSC 1980); Standard Sewing machine Co. v. Hendry, 43 SC 71, 20 SE 790 SC (1895); White Oak manor Inc v Lexington Ins Co, 407 SC 1, 753 SE 2d 537 (SC 2014); Ashcroft v Iqbal, 557 U.S. 662, 129 SCt 1937 (U.S 2009); Pyatt v Bypass, FSupp 2d, 2012 WL 7997262 (DSC 2012); Kuest v Lorea, 404 SC 619, 746 SE 2d 360 (SCApp 2013); In Re Jones, 396 SC 303, 721 SE 2d 437 (SC 2012); Walker v Brooks, 403 SC 212,

742 SE2d 869 (SCApp. 2013); Medford v. U.S., FSupp 2d 2006 WL 2946187 (DSC 2006); Aughtry v. Richland / Lexington School Dist. 5, FSupp 2d 2009 WL 2257615 (DSC 2009); State v. Brockmeyer, 406 SC 324, 751 SE2d 645 (SC 2013); In re Brunty, 411 SC 434, 769 SE 2d 426 (SC 2015); Taylor v. Taylor, SE2d 2013 WL 8541 474 (SC 2013); In re Lapham - SE2d - 2015 WL 3761615 101 (SC 2015).

Once the 2nd and 4th circuits and other courts see that the parties were served, see that they made appearance or acknowledge receipt of complaint and summons but failed

to timely RESPOND, that is it. THE COURTS CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR of law OR COLOR of AUTHORITY shall go NO further EXCEPT to ACKNOWLEDGE this TRUTH within THE FEDERAL COURT RECORD. THE COURTS CANNOT CALL THE CASE frivolous OR claim THERE IS NO ARGUABLE BASES in LAW OR FACT in ACTS of FRAUD upon THE COURT CONSPIRING with THE UNITED STATES AND defendants to help them avoid suit. THEY CANNOT DUE to COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL RELIEVE THE defendants of THE default acting as THEIR legal counsel when they failed to timely plead before THE

State court or challenge those subsequent documents in question, Shah v Palmetto Health Alliance, SE2d 2012 WL 10862486 (SC App. 2012); Burgess v Burgess, SE2d 2012 WL 10864559 (SC App. 2012); Sheppard v Higgins, SE2d 2014 WL 5771187 (SC App. 2014); In re Smith 401 SC 96, 736 SE2d 270 (SC 2012); Mims Exp Rel Mims v Babcock Center Inc, 399 SC 344, 732 SE2d 395 (SC 2012).

They past the (30) days permitted by Rules of Court to challenge the default document or subsequent filed and served documents exercising new established power and authority.

They did not properly seek leave but attempted further Acts of fraud and got caught requiring sanctions which were timely sought, Holmes v Haynes Worth, Sinkler & Boyd PA, 408 SC 620, 760 SE2d 399 (SC 2014); Kinlock v Pinkney, SE2d, 2014 WL 2589672 (SC App 2014); McBride, SE2d, 2013 WL 8541576 (SC App. 2013).

By the default and collateral estoppel three claims in total are made true, not frivolous producing clear arguable bases in law, establishing Rights and titles as King-Khalifah, Imam, High Priest, Lawgiver

Who is legislator, Judge and Attorney combined, with the right to remove pursuant to the F.S.I.A which cannot be challenged, Stratten v Mecklenberg County Dept of Social Services, 521 Fed Appx 278, 2015 WL 2364587 (4th Cir 2013); 134 Sct 2250; Yousuf v Sampathar, 699 F3d 763 (Va 2012); Ele Guam v Long Term Credit Bank, Japan, 320 F3d 635 (6th Cir 2003); Liu v Republic of China, 892 F2d 1419, 1424 (9th Cir 1989) Cert. dismissed — U.S. — 111 Sct 27, 111 L Ed 2d 840 (1990).

Judges Wright, Burns, the court in case 15-1386 failed to rule on whether or not we meet the criteria for

the commercial exception carried pursuant to the F.S.I.A. due to the default. We object. They failed to rule on the claim or acknowledge the default with all rights, titles and authority because in acknowledging such they could not make the fraudulent claim of frivolous or there being no arguable bases in law.

Is the punitive damages and or liens in the amount sought of $75 trillion exorbitant, outrageous or unreasonable? Lets look at it. The King Khalifah is bringing suit for the atrocities done during the

time of the U.S. and Global slave trade and the Neo-slavery period of Jim Crow here in America. Pursuant to 18 USC § 1116 Jah Jah do not have to be recognized by this government though the default establishes these rights. The U.S. and United Nations should have timely responded to prevent Jah Jah from obtaining power and authority of this magnitude. The F.B.I. who are employees of the United States supplied, trained and armed the Ku Klux Klan various instances, in their raids and attacks upon African Americans here in the United States. This makes the U.S.

culpable. White slave traders and their governments, even the African nations they paid that sold their brethren to these white slave traders are culpable. Nations who remained silent benefitting from the commerce and trade globally are culpable. All maritime operations, railroads, Banks, companies that engaged, supported, transferred funds and assets, purchased the products produced by the blood and torture of slaves. Global and U.S. companies directly tied to it. These global and U.S. companies are

businesses built in the future off of this wealth. The Saudi oil empire whose oil infrastructure and commerce was indeed established and built from revenue obtained via the slave trade. They now trade this oil until this present date, built off the blood and torture of slaves, with the global nations and their oil companies. All either directly or indirectly had a hand in it. This blood wealth is benefitted globally until this present date, especially by the top 2% via their ancestors. The hand of one is the hand of

all by the accomplice liability doctrine and Pinkerton doctrine of liability pursuant to conspiracy. All are culpable. These claims are not delusionable, but are clearly documented facts. My African heritage gives me standing even without any claims of sovereignty which are established by the default. This carves an exception to the "shotgun" pleading analysis producing exceptional circumstances because all or any one can be sued pursuant to 18 USC § 242, The C.A.T. Treaty, Rico Act and other provisions of law, as well as foreign law defaulted on by

the defendants in the state court proceedings, Rule 44. Additionally, Foreign Law (via [3] Holy Books and Sunnah) make the claims true, also defaulted on, establishing rights under International probate law, 18 U.S.C § 1116 (a)(b)(4); 18 U.S.C § 1116 (a)(b)(2)(3)(A); United States v Dizdar, 682 (N.Y) 1978, 581 F2d 1031; Wheeler v United States, - U.S. - 106 S.Ct 179, 88 L.Ed. 2d 148 (1985); English v Gen. Elec Co, 496 U.S. 72, 79, 100 S.Ct 2270, 2275, 110 L.Ed 2d 65 (1990); Caprius v Franklin Mint. Co, 24 F.Supp 2d 1013; 28 U.S.C §§ 2071, 2072.

Walter Edgar, the Great Histo-

Rippa who lives until this present
date wrote in his Book entitled,
"The History of The South", He
stated that if you were to take
the U.S. Cotton Trade for (30) years.
It would take all the wealth from
all gold mines from around the
entire world for (500) years to
equal the wealth obtained from
the blood and torture of slaves
within the (30) years of the U.S.
Cotton Trade. Now do not be
afraid to interject and correct
me in my calculations. But lets
do the math. Slavery in America

existed from 1619-1865. That comes to (246) years. So you take the (30) years of cotton trade and divide it into the (246) total years of slavery which comes to 8.6 (30) year periods. Then multiply the 8.6 (30) total year periods of cotton trade by the (500) years of the earths gold. This means it would take 4,300 years of all the gold on earth to equal the wealth obtained by slavery within these (246) years. Give or take a few dollars. Would this amount be more than the "75 Trillion

then we seek to impose? Of course it would be, ... astronomically. This is just the cotton trade. You also had rice, sugar and tobacco trades. Now multiply these additional (3) square produced products by that 4,300 years of the world's gold if they are only where equivalent. This figure would equate to 13,200 years of all the gold on the face of the planet. Do the $75 trillion then and freeze touch or even come close to this amount? Of course it does not. Its not even a drop in the bucket.

Where not finished calculating.
Now you add in the aggravating
factors such as. Over 100 million
killed or dumped in oceans, fed
to the sharks during the middle
passage being forced to lie in their
own blood, urine and feces packed
like sardines on top of each other.
Factor in the acts of torture, rape,
beatings, dismemberments, adult
and child sex slavery, sodomizing
males, females and children right
before each others eyes, the
crucifixions, the tearing apart
of families, children from their

fathers and mothers, husbands from their wives, the lack of homes, the beheadings, the Robbing of land and property after Re-construction, being burnt at the stake, Eaten while hanged, the cutting of unborn fetus' from their mothers wombs'. And the depriving of education, job opportunities, unfair lending practices, discrimination, taxation without proper and fair representation that occurred during the neo slavery period of Jim Crow, the murdering of my people by klans men,

government officials and others when they sought to vote or obtain other civil rights. Are you bastards and dogs telling me that these crimes against humanity are delusional, frivolous and have no arguable bases in law? Factor into this interest, the loss of wages and productivity due to loss of life and cost of living increases over the (246) years period until this present day, the debt not being paid. Factor in the cost of pain, prison, suffering and mental anguish. Add in the retribution that was

obtained from the Saudi oil empire, OPEC, that was founded off the blood and torture of slaves. The amount owed would be staggering, blinding, requiring the human conscience in shock and awe, inconceivable, impossible to pay in over two hundred thousand lifetimes. This is delusional to you rats and snakes? Are you trying to tell us that we, African Americans, do not have an established right to address what you've done to my ancestors during slavery and Jim Crow? You attacked and fragmented me now due to my

claim of being the heir to the Ethiopian throne and these people who suffered in the past. This produces cause of action now not applying CAT Treaty or Rico Act retroactively violations of the CAT Treaty or Rico Act are not delusional and Rights are established thereby. We can give the defendants a choice. All the Oil wealth since the time of slavery, coupled by the wealth gained by the Global Banks, along with 13,200 years of the earths gold plus punitive damages for the additional aggravating

factors mentioned and unmentioned?
OR "75 trillion spreading thee cost
over thee 193 sovereign nations'
assets in lien and freeze? Which
is thee more less, more reasonable
more merciful, more forgiving amount?
Its not rocket science. "75 trillion
is a small insignificant figure
and drop in thee bucket compared
to what is truly owed. You're telling
me this is delusional and not an
established right of African Americans?

Thee four horsemen of thee
Apocalypse must be sent into
repose. How many more random

mass killing must occur within this platform before you come to realize that I spoke the truth all along. Those babies dying in Newtown should have been this nation's wake up call. How more have died!!! The anger of God is kindled. Same sex marriage globally must be annulled. Civil Unions, not Gods intellectual property and religious covenant, my property as his appointed king. The raping, killing, bombing, mayhem and global Jihad around the world must be brought to an end! The

only way to accomplish this task and bring the world a period of peace is to unite all contending factions under the banner. my people, Africans, its diaspora, Christians, Muslims and Jews do not need another hero. They need their King, Khalifah, Imam, Lawgiver and High Priest of Religious Prophesy. The one foretold who would purge them, lead them back to the old paths and Godly truths from the days of Yore, back to their "promised land", a land flowing with "milk and honey". I have come.

I am sent. I must be freed to go as God commands me. That "is trillions is written in the Book of Daniel chapter 11 verses 1-3. Thus, it too, is an "Act of God". Though they tend to wreak havoc, and "Act of God" injuries no one. All of this is established by the default making the claims true by law. That which is written cannot be broken. The courts and 2nd Circuit abuse their discretion in acts of fraud upon the court for calling clearly written religious doctrine of Christianity,

Judaism and Islam delusional where no man shall be called into question for the verity of his religious beliefs and the United States and U.N. members defaulted on all of this binding all by the supremacy clause and Kings decree!. This is where the 2nd Circuit and courts are controlled by an error of law. They have construed the pleadings to believe that the head sovereign opened the door to address these claims. This is the error of law. The head sovereign did not open the door on these religious claims no matter how strange or fantastic

they may sound. The truth is that the State of South Carolina not only opened the door to the religious beliefs being argued before all courts, but they used these religious beliefs for the purpose of obtaining a murder conviction in violation of State and Federal Law. The claim, as ludicrous and false that it is. Is that the head sovereign beat his family member to death over A "S microscope. If no witness the state produced ever stated that "God told me to do it". There what the heck is my religious beliefs, no matter how strange, doing being brought up in that trial for murder

for the sake of establishing law when the beliefs, no matter how strangle have no relevance to the facts argued within the murder conviction? This creates an arguable bases in law and establishes and indisputable constitutional right of all citizens not to be prosecuted for their religious beliefs if they are not relevant to the facts in a case or break any established laws. The state, not the head sovereign, opened the door for all of this the day they used these beliefs to obtain that murder conviction violating the 1st, 5th, 6th

13th, 14th, and 15th amendments as attached to the structural error in the indictments where our presumption of innocence is clearly taken away. This taints and compromises the conviction, is clear reversible error requiring a new trial. This is addressed in the (240) page Kershaw County petition sought by discovery, Bank of St. Matthew Baptist Church, 406 SC 156, 750 SE 2d 605 (SC 2013); McGowen v Maryland, 366 U.S. 420, 81 S.Ct 1153 (mem) (U.S 1961); U.S. v Poston, 312 F Supp 58 (DSC 1970); Valley Forge Christian College v Americans United for Separation of Church and State, Inc 454 U.S. 464, 102 S.Ct 752, 70 L.Ed 700 (1982).

We request all previous filed motions, petitions etc for rehearing review, evidentiary hearing, appointment of legal counsel in all Federal Courts and Richland County State Court, for extensions of time to make additional response in the New York and Georgia District Courts once the 2nd and 11th Circuits rule establishing the Crawford and Sutcliffe Appeals. We request all emergency stays and seek that the Georgia District Court, not the 2nd Circuit, consolidate all (3) Cook, Crawford, and Sutcliffe cases. We

motion to expand the scope and for inclusion and that all documents filed in cases 9:15-cv-984; 9:15-cv-183; 9:14-cv-1501; 2013-cp-400-0084, 2294; 1:14-cv-3713; 1:15-cv-2309; 2310 and 4005; The Kentucky District Court cases and New Writ of Error processed in Georgia "4005", be deemed filed, added to the Record in each of these cases seeking that both the 2nd and 4th Circuit grant all relief sought within all cases collectively, including emergency stay on same sex marriage nationally until these matters are brought to trial, middleton v plissard

Motor Co Ltd, FSupp 2d 2012 WL 3612572 (DSC 2012); U.S. ex rel Knight v Reliant Hospice Inc, FSupp 2d 2011 WL 1321584 (DSC 2011); Harbison v Bell, 556 U.S. 180, 129 SCt 1481 (US 2009); U.S. v Athar, 92 F3d 1182 (4th Cir 1996). They blocked Crawford from exhausting by fraud.

Jo! Judges Harrington, Markley, Ellipus, McQuay, Joseph L Yannotti, of Duke New Jersey Superior Court and Judge Hummell. We motion for your recusal and to strike any conditional orders, final order(s) Report and Recommendations issued in these cases. No one judge

can sit on these cases until after en banc review is initially given within the relevant courts to prevent any further acts of fraud upon the court(s). This includes seeking recusal of the panel in case 15-1494, 15-1386 and any judge in the 2nd Circuit that sat on any past case involving Crawford. The remaining judges must give en banc review. These names are officially supplemented as defendants in case 9:15-cv-904 and the writ of error being processed in the Georgia District Court. Wright, Eppes and

other Georgia judges initiated legislative functions, acting as legislators changing law as they went, then violating the separation of powers provisions by implementing unsanctioned new law by their actions stripping them of immunity, conspiring to prevent these cases from moving forward and stifle our right to be fairly heard before a jury which is extrinsic fraud upon the court. Conduct for Judges (Canon 3(C)(1)(d)) mandates recusal of these judges involved in total who conspired with Sharpe and the 2nd Circuit.

We supplement the Appeal in both the 2nd And 4th Circuit And Writ of mandamus also sought Reinstated to Require this, MACA Rusco v Key-span Energy, No. 05-CV-823, 2007 WL 104 1602 At *14 (E.D.N.Y 2007); And "Jal Tasy South Carolina, FSupp 2d 2012 WL 3467298 (DSC 2012); Kolon Industries Inc v E.I. Dupont de Nemours & Co, 748 F3d 160 CA 4 (Va 2014); Liteky v United States 510 U.S. 540, 114 SCt 1149 (U.S. CA. 1994).

We give the 2nd And 4th Circuits Notice. Judge Yamamoto in case A-00-5205-LBT4 just transferred the case out of his jurisdiction in Acts

of Fraud upon the Court by order dated July 27, 2015 Remanding case to lower Court. this intent was to avoid being required to be subject to any pending Ruling that may come from the 2nd and with Circuits. Appeal of that order is sought within the dist. Supreme Court Docket case number 076372. We motion to supplement to require that any determination by the 2nd and with Circuits Apply to any Court the dist. case Resides in at the time of the 2nd and with Circuits Ruling. By the way. The Court in case A-005205-

1374 and the lower court the case was transferred to via video conference understood the pleading and even ruled partially in the appellate court. This too, proves the fraud upon the court via the Georgia District Court when it asserted the claims were incomprehensible. Again we motion to exceed any page limits because we are dealing with multi-District and State and Federal jurisdiction litigation where response to report and recommendations, conditional and final orders is mandated and these issues must

be properly addressed. The lead foreign sovereign is laboring under a disability to his hands placing him in pain arguing a case this complex and size. This format is needed pursuant to his rights under ADA. This includes any defect.

Addressing the constitutional and or final orders in the Sutcliffe and mitchell cases. Attached the court will find a supplement per application that is to be filed in both cases 2015-CA-10-2153 and 3080.

The structural constitutional error in the indictments taking away the presumption of innocence etc

is being argued in both cases. Since the conspiracy indictment was not pros in the Mitchell case. The murder indictment do not allege who Mitchell conspired with. The Sutcliffe indictment do not allege what Battery took place. In the supplement PCR is placed litigation arguing elements, even though it may refer to other elements. The same litigation applies to the elements deficient in these two cases. The (180) day article 4 judicial order is being argued in both cases. Sutcliffe's judicial matters were supposed to have been conducted by July of

2011, not March of 2012. Mitchells case was suppose to be concluded by May of 2003, not November of 2004. You doubt have a successive PCR on Mitchell because its tainted by a similar judicial order requiring the PCR to be concluded within (365) days. All these are claims of subject matter jurisdiction and Authority was adjudicated under fraud upon the court. Your use of it opens the door for attack. Violations of Anti Peonage Act is being argued. Issue of this can be waived, can be raised at any time and is not subject to limitations bar

which include lashes and successive constructive amendment of the indictments and Geometry Fraud issue is being argued in both cases. A hearing is required and the appointing of legal counsel. You have foreign sovereign issues argued. This too is a challenge to jurisdiction requiring all parties, including Crawford be brought before any court together, not seperately. We move to consolidate all pending acts and seek class action certification arguing preemption under Rules (19) and (23) joinder of parties. Crawford is now party pursuant to preemption, Rule

19 UNDER FEDERAL RULES. WE MOVE CRAWFORD BE ADDED AS A PARTY IN ALL PENDING PCRIS SINCE HE DISCOVERED THE LEGAL ISSUE(S) PURSUANT TO SEEKING CLASS ACTION OR CONSOLIDATION. HE MUST BE PERMITTED UNDER FEDERAL LAW, RULE 19 TO PROTECT HIS INTEREST. WE MUST BE BROUGHT BEFORE ANY STATE OR FEDERAL COURT TOGETHER EVEN PURSUANT TO REMOVAL, 28 USC §§ 2011, 2012.

REFERRING BACK TO THE ISSUE OF COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL. DOES IT ATTACH AND DID JAHTAH AL MAHDI, CRAWFORD, ESTABLISH ALL RIGHTS AND TITLES WITH

his ability of Act as Lawgiver within the 193 member states of the United Nations borders which include the United States clearly binding all state and Federal Courts due to the default via the Supremacy clause of the U.S. Constitution and King's decrees establishing and arguable bases and law relied for this claim. Legally all the plaintiffs have to do is prove the United States was served, made and appearance and produced no challenge to any claim submitted and a judg-

ment attaches. This is all that is needed. The documents filed in cases 9:14-cv-1501; 9:15-cv-183; 1:14-cv-3713-WSD prove the United States was served many times, conspired at one point to avoid service. Yet they snook into the proceedings under concealment through the back door and the Richland Court conspired to conceal their appearance in the court record by fraud upon the court. They failed to timely respond or challenge securing all Rights making them true by failure to respond.

There are additional circumstances in this case that indisputably establishes the default and the attachment of collateral estoppel. That being that the default emanates from a judicial order adjudicated, determined and resolved by the SC Supreme Court under article V § 4 of the South Carolina constitution where all administrative factors attached to the order have been rescinded. This it is not an administrative issue or determination. It

is a judicial order, mandatory, draconian, based upon sc constitution due process law creating a 6th and 14th amendment claim, under fair and impartial hearing and equal protection of laws.

Further the order has been attached to the sc constitution where under article 142 3 of the sc constitution, by the language of the order it is not discretionary. It by this additional provision makes it mandatory, draconian, creating a "jurisdictional prerequisite", unless there

is something in the language of the order that states otherwise; to wit, there is not. This applies to the Sutcliffe and Mitchell cases also.

Once the state court fails to be in compliance to this essential "[J]urisdictional [P]rerequisite" by the time demanded via the SC Supreme Court order (c) file a written order of continuance within the pending case within (365) days of its original filing to proceed with the case beyond the (365) days demanded via SC Supreme

COURT ORDER. This applies to the (180) day provision for trial courts as well.

Failure to be in compliance immediately voids the state courts jurisdiction. So once the party detects this "jurisdictional" flaw or defect and enters it into the court record by affidavit of facts, plot a motion as was determined by Judge Lee. The affidavit of facts stands as true in the court record as a final determination on the issue, plot being contested by the court or parties within (30) days of filing as is required by S.C.

law. The affidavit of facts is then made true on the court record by S.C. SUPREME COURT ORDER, determination, resolution and adjudication even though Judge Lee made a similar oral determination to support this fact related to the affidavits standing. It becomes a final determination supported by the S.C. SUPREME COURT ORDER in the pending case because the state court and parties, which include the United States, would be procedurally barred in challenging the affidavit being past the (30) days permitted to challenge by South Carolina Rules

of court, now also being divested of jurisdiction. Collateral estoppel would immediately attach preventing challenge from any subsequent court. The affidavit of facts laid clear claim on all titles, Rights, power, authority established by all documents filed in the case which include the memorandum of Law and Declaration of Sovereignty as well as the (95) page document dated December 8, 2014 exercising all Rights as Lawgiver of God and as King-Khalifah etc of the (4) Global Thrones. The affidavit of facts

claiming default with that (95) page subsequent document and those that followed them, now become binding on all courts, all appearing parties, all those served, who conspired to avoid service and who failed to timely respond or respond at all. This specifically includes the United States. The other 192 member states were served at the U.N. and additional service was done on the United States via the U.S. Justice Dept., the U.S. Congress, the U.S. Senate and various other Federal Attorneys; Ex Parte Virginia, 100 U.S. 339, 25 Led 676 (1012).

There are (4) essential elements to establishing a claim of collateral estoppel. (1) The issue of fact is identical to the one previously litigated. The affidavit of facts filing default pursuant to the Article V § 4 S.C. Supreme Court order and mandate was previously litigated in the State Court. The clock stamp on the document is proof of its filing. It is argued in subsequent pleading. (2) The issue of fact was actually resolved in a prior proceeding. Judge Lee resolved the issue of the filing of the affidavits in a prior pro-

ceeding by oral determination where she said the affidavits stand, do not have to be ruled on if the word "motion" is detached and no one timely rebuts them. The issue was also resolved by the S.C Supreme Court where via their Article V powers they detached any administrative factors so it could not be construed as an administrative proceeding. They resolved it as an order and jurisdictional requisite, being mandatory, draconian in nature further establishing it to be so by also attaching it to

the S.C. Constitution under Article 1§23. This placed double emphasis on it being mandatory. (3) The issue of facts is critical and necessary to the judgment in the prior proceeding. This issue is so critical and necessary to the judgment that failure to be in compliance to this jurisdictional requisite divest and/or voids their jurisdictional powers to proceed further or render any additional judgment. (4) The judgment in the prior proceeding is final and upheld. Due to the divesting and/or voiding of

jurisdiction. The judgment of Judge Lee on the court record related to the filing of the affidavit of facts, their claims being valid unless timely disputed, which the court or no party timely disputed, is final and valid. Additionally the finality and validity of the judgment becomes strengthened by the S.C. Supreme Court order in that prior proceeding where the S.C. Supreme Court's decision is final and valid being the states highest court. And (5) The party to be foreclosed by the prior Judge Lee and S.C. Supreme Court resolution of the issue of fact, the filing of the af-

affidavit of facts and article 4 § 4 order, had full and fair opportunity to litigate the issue of fact in the prior proceeding. That default document with its subsequent (95) page document and those that followed exercising power by default was served on all parties since may of 2014 where they appeared. South Carolina law gives them (30) days to challenge any pleading filed. They never, all parties involved (Emphasis added), timely challenged any of these facts. The United States instead of taking

advantage of the opportunity to litigate, conspired at points to avoid service, then concealed their appearance before the court and then got caught hiding, creeping like a bunch of back door ghost. The plaintiffs exposed them and moved for default. They engaged in fraud upon the court warranting sanctions which was sought. The aforementioned meets every element for estoppel, U.S Bank Nat. Assn v. Zarrabi, 560 Fed Appx 181 (4th Cir 2014); In Re Raguci, 433 B.R. 889, 895 Bankr (MD Tenn 2010).

Claim preclusion only requires a valid and final judgment. In these exceptional circumstances we have two. One from Judge Lee's determination on the filing of the affidavit of facts. The second further making that prior Lee judgment final and valid comes via the SC Supreme Court Article VIII §4 order where all administrative factors have been rescinded where it could not be construed as an order emanating from an administrative proceeding, creating a jurisdictional requisite. The S.C.

SUPREME COURT THEN TIED IT TO THE SC CONSTITUTION TO EMPHASIZE THIS PROVISION WAS AND IS MANDATORY, DRACONIAN IN NATURE. STATE JURISDICTION IS VOIDED PREVENTING THE UNITED STATES AND DEFENDANTS FROM CHALLENGING THE AFFIDAVIT THAT ESTABLISHED THE DEFAULT BEING SO LATE IN THE GAME, SEE V JARKAS, 557 FED APPX 204 (4TH CIR 2014); DELTA APPARREL INC V JARKINA, 406 SC 257, 750 SE 2d 615 (SC APP. 2013); MOORE V BYARS, 2013 WL 6710 273 (DSC 2013); IN RE ESTRAND, 529 B.R 865 BKRPTCY (DSC 2015); PARKER V. ASBESTOS PROCESSING, LLC, 2015 WL

L27930 (DSC 2015) | Joyner v La Salle Bank Nat Assn, 36 FSupp 3d 657 (DSC 2014) | Harper & James The Law of Torts 1642-1643 L. (1956).

When a party has substantially participated in an action in which he has had full opportunity to defend, like the state court proceedings and mandamus under 15-1494 where the United States appeared in both proceedings then engaged in acts of fraud upon the court(s) conspiring to defeat the mandamus and then concealed their appearance in case 2013-cp-400-0084, 2094 and got caught. They never disputed or challenged

the merits. The case was placed on the complex case docket demonstrating the pleadings were comprehended by all parties proving Georgia's fraud. It is not an abuse of discretion to apply collateral estoppel after default document was filed which void their jurisdiction for due process violation, and Judge Lee Resolved the issue of the Affidavit of Facts as a final determination on that issue, before jurisdiction was then void by order preventing any further challenge to the document. When substantial participation and simple

tions where sought for dilatory or obstructive conduct. Such as the United States hiding its appearance to negate the requirement to respond to the pleadings, or avoiding service, conspiring in fraud upon the court, skirting procedural rules where they failed to timely respond. Or placing the case on the complex case docket after the fact to evade the voiding of their jurisdiction or circumvent their failure to timely be in compliance to the initial SC Supreme Court Article VI §4 order because the complex

CASE docket has different time RULES. OR spoliating EVIDENCE and documents in SUBSEQUENT CASES BECAUSE they did not WANT EVIDENCE of this default placed in SUBSEQUENT COURT RECORDS. SANCTIONS SOUGHT FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT(S), intimidation of plaintiffs, JUDGES acting AS investigators conducting EX PARTE investigations subjecting US to official MENTAL and physical TORTURE, RETALIATION FOR US SEEKING REDRESS and other MISCARRIAGES of justice producing AGGRAVATING factors. The "ACTUAL litigated" REQUIREMENT is

moot and collateral estopped Attaches, Institutform Tech Inc v Amerik Supplies Inc, 850 FSupp 2d 1336, 1362 (NDGA 2012); Eastern Association Coal Co. v. Director Office of Workers Compensation Programs, 578 Fed Appx 165 (4th Cir 2014); Radmite v University of SC, SE2d 2015 WL 4275972 (SC App. 2015); Jillery v Jaguar / Land Rover Hilton Head, 2015 WL 3736216 (DSC 2015); In re Russo-Chiest plut 522 B.R. 148 (DSC 2014); White, 2014 WL 1513280 (DSC 2014).

This is the issue of controversy here. The defendants never expected the plow "legally" (emphasis

Abdul) established foreign sovereign king, khalifah and lawgiver of the one true God, to have knowledge of the SC Supreme Court order and jurisdictional requirement as well as how and when to make use of it. One rights of S.C Constitutional due process law was played on the court record making all claims true by default. Thereupon per-mitting the plaintiffs to exercise now established foreign sovereign power and authority. It was an abuse of discretion for Judge Casey manning, who is a defen-

dupnt in these cases and who was not the presiding judge in these cases. In violation of the code of judicial conduct, to place these cases on the complex case docket, after the fact, as a means to circumvent the jurisdictional written order of continuance requirement. Done to conceal the fact that they "dropped the ball" and are in procedural error and default, creating a SC state constitutional jurisdictional defect voiding their jurisdiction to submit any further judgment, violating the

plaintiffs DUE PROCESS Rights Under the J.S.I.A of 28 USC § 1602-1612 et seq., his 4th Amendment Rights PURSUANT to the illegal SEIZURE of A SOVEREIGN, his 6th Amendment Right to A fair and impartial hearing and his 14th Amendment Rights Under the EQUAL PROTECTION of the Law CLAUSE RELATED to ESTABLISHED Rights via default clearly demonstrating AN ARGUABLE BASIS in law. The United States is involved in this conspiracy concealing its APPEARANCE within the Richland Court. This satisfys the minimal ADVERSITY REQUIREMENT permitting us to REMOVE

and disqualify pursuant to sanctions and 28 USC § 1602-1612 et seq of the Foreign Sovereign Immunity Act, see Elec Guam v Long Term Credit Bank, Japan supra; Currency, 9 FSupp3d 582 (2014)

Once the default and collateral estoppel attaches making all claims true, establishing all Rights, titles and authority of the Global Theocratic King-Khalifah, which include his right to act as Lawgiver with superseding authority. It also automatically made the (3) Holy Books true as the last will and Testament of Gods Holy Prophets

and Kings pursuant to International Probate law. This established the "Act of Marriage", as a Religious Covenant, one of Gods Laws and commands given to "Adam and Eve", Gods servants, not "Adam and Steve". "Adam and Steve" cannot "procreate" which is an essential requirement to be given and practiced by this Religious law and Covenant.

The laws of God are an intrinsic part of the intellectual property and portion of the inheritance given to this Global Theocratic King, Khaliph, High Priest, Imam and Prophet as it relates to the ole-

descendants of Aaron and King David. This is clearly written in the Biblical text. Is the court calling the Holy Bible delusional? You acted as a theologian not a judge stripping you of immunity. This property cannot now, legally by law, due to the default, be arrested, attached or executed without Gods Appointed Kings expressed consent which this state or any global nation have related to same sex marriage. "Elijah must first come and restore all things" (mark 9:12). All of this is an intrinsic part of the default establishing the Right to secure my

And Goods property. Suit is being brought for this. Declaratory Judgment and injunctive Relief is sought as well. By the aforementioned these cases should have never been dismissed sua sponte or said frivolous without first serving the parties in the Federal Court to make them respond to the default that occurred in the state court and all crimes, torts, spoliation connected to it. There exist genuine issues of dispute and arguable bases in law ei foreign Law with rights and titles, Theocratic Law, Probate

law defaulted on by the defendants, specifically, the United States, made true by the existing default where they failed to respond, instead contacted their appearance. Travel upon the Court(s) is established requiring en Banc review, Jones v Sherwin Heimer, 387 Fed Appx 366 2010 WL 2711305 (CA4 (Va 2010); US v. Watson, -F3d- 2015 WL 4385697 (CA4 (Va 2015); Hartley v South Carolina Dept of Corrections, 2013 WL 5428585 (DSC 2013); People v Rogers, FSupp2d 2010 WL 4024201 (DSC 2010); Gentry Technology of S.C. Pte v Baptist Health South

Florida Inc, 2015 WL 12192851 (DSC 2013).

Referring back to the issue of subject matter jurisdiction and/or voiding jurisdiction as it relates to the Article VI § 4 orders that is one of the sources of the default, as well as jurisdictional prerequisites and/or jurisdictional requisites in total as they exist within State and Federal courts, which can be raised at any time and cannot be waived. We bring the courts and parties attention to the following cases

State v Gentry, 365 SC 93, 610

SE 2d 494, 495 (SC 2005); United States v Cotton, 535 U.S. 625, 122 SCt 1781, 152 LEd 2d 860 (2002); State v Parkhurst, 845 S.W. 2d 31 (MO 1992); Russell v United States, 369 U.S. 749, 82 SCt 1038 (1962); Indictment sufficiency 70 Columb L Rev 876, 888 (1970); United States v Abrams, 539 FSupp. 378, 384 (SDNY 1982); Stirone v United States 361 U.S. 212 (1960); Gaither v United States, 413 F2d 1061 (DC Cir 1969). We are suing the State of South Carolina and the 4th Circuit for injunctive relief and the abuse of discretion and acts of fraud upon the Rule

unjust courts for their deceptive, fraudulent, criminal adjudications they have done and related to the State v Gentry case. This is further reason why we are suing to disqualify them, injunctive relief.

By the holdings made in the Gentry case. They purposely misinterpreted the holdings made in U.S v Cotton and destroyed the true concept of OUR DUE PROCESS Rights as they relate to subject matter Jurisdiction and Indictments. They adopted the Federal laws and requirements of the indictment

via their states constitutions. They engaged in acts of fraud upon the courts for the purpose of essentially establishing modern day slavery in violation of the Anti Peonage Act where we can no longer be deemed "duly" (emphasis added) convicted making void their power and jurisdiction. We are suing them for this as well as Judge Sharpe and all Judges listed within these cases because they conspired during and after the fact to establish modern day slavery in violation of the U.N. Treaty and Rico

Act and to conceal this crime and miscarriage of justice. They conspired to conceal the fact that the legal issues affected the state of New York and all (50) states producing public juris claims and the minimum contact requirement pursuant to long arm statute provisions and conspiracy pursuant to the RICO Act and extra-territorial jurisdiction claims.

By the holdings made in the Gentry case. That court essentially took the position that courts powers of subject matter jurisdiction are absolute via state legislative or

Congressional statutes or enactments of laws and at no time can that power be divested or voided. The Gentry court essentially claimed there can be no situations that can develope during the course of judicial proceedings that can divest or void jurisdiction. We object to this. This is a ludicrous and criminal position to take which will be proven by judicial determinations made after the Gentry case was established.

There are essentially (2) prongs to subject matter jurisdiction. One (1) is where the courts lack subject matter jurisdiction (ei where a

family court would attempt to try a criminal case, or a probate court would attempt to try a military tribunal case). Of course in these situations those courts would "lack subject matter jurisdiction".

This is essentially what the Cotton court was saying which is the reason why the litigant in that case did not prevail. By state and federal statutes or congressional enactments, specific courts have jurisdiction to hear cases of a general class (ei criminal courts have jurisdiction to hear criminal cases). (2) But there is

A second prong to subject matter jurisdiction where jurisdiction is made void because of due process violation despite any existing state statute or federal law. So the Cotton court was essentially saying is that the litigant, by the language he presented, the was arguing his case under the wrong prong. More specifically, the litigant should have asserted that jurisdiction is made void due to a particular due process violation. see cases

The Gentry court knew the Cotton court was vague on this issue and went on a "fishing ex-

predilection" to find Cotton and Parkhurst so they could adjudicate the Gentry case under the same incorrect prong to defraud the inmates of this state. Like the articles 440 orders leading to the claims of default and collateral estoppel in these cases. The sufficiency of an Indictment is a "jurisdictional prerequisite" and Due Process claim that voids jurisdiction as opposed to the other prong where the Family Court would attempt to try a criminal case and would lack subject matter jurisdiction. The Due Process prong is what we

ARE ARGUING THE ARTICLE VI § 4 ORDERS default, and STRUCTURAL ERROR of religious prophesy pertaining to the indictments predetermining in advance the outcome of the proceedings, taking away of presumption of innocence, convicting us before plea or trial under. Thus the determination made by Judge Lee related to the filing of the affidavit of facts becomes a final judgment where every act done after becomes void upon the documents filing where they went past the (30) days to challenge it. This is a crucial part of the fraud upon the court they perpetrated

against the inmates of this state and plaintiffs, Sharpe conspired to aid them conceal this, attempt by acting as and investigator, a quasi-judicial act, with parties, the SC atty Gen, SCDC etc, conducting ex parte secret investigations, and bringing that tainted knowledge back into court to initiate ruling in case "183", for the purpose of establishing modern day slavery in violation of the C.A.T. Treaty carving and exception to they being sued though they are judges. Congress confers upon no court, state or federal, the

power to establish modern day slavery, The Amistad, 40 U.S. 518, 15 Pet 518, 1841 WL 5024.

When the constitutionality of a ruling is in doubt (ei the Cotton and Gentry cases). The court has an obligation to interpret the Cotton case as it relates to Gentry, Abrams, Gaither, Stroupe, Russell and the voiding of jurisdiction for DUE PROCESS violations under this prong, not the other. Stare Decisis et non quieta movere". Once clearly decided the courts shall not move from it. Certain violations of DUE

Process void jurisdiction, 9 FSupp3d 582.

If a criminal case is appealed but no trial transcript is produced, what occurs? The trial transcript is a jurisdictional requirement in the Appeals court. The court must remanded for a new trial. If a case is in the state court and a petition to remove is filed, what occurs? The state court jurisdiction is divested and that court can't not proceed until remanded order is issued. State v Lindsay, 373 SC 320, 644 SE2d 271 (SC App 2007); Lovett v Deutsche Bank Nat' Trust Co, FSupp 2d, 2013 WL 841679 (DSC 2013). A case

is in lower court. A motion is filed where adverse ruling is given. The party appeals it, what occurs? The higher court cannot hear it without the jurisdictional prerequisite final order, Fortmill v Fitzgerald, SE 2d, 2014 WL 733 944 53 (SC App. 2014). In civil cases parties must be in compliance to all Rules of constructive service. Compliance is jurisdictional prerequisite. If a step is omitted (comparingly a sufficient indictment omitted) decree or ruling is void, Caldwell v Wingquist, 402 SC 565, 741 SE 2d 583 (SC App 2013). Where case

filed in District Court but parties file a second case to subvert the District Courts jurisdiction in the state court. This act would void state courts jurisdiction. This jurisdiction is not absolute despite legislative statute of a state or federal law, Ackerman v Exxon mobil Corp, 734 F3d 237 (4th (Md 2013). jurisdictional defects in tax cases void jurisdiction; Reading v Tebbco, LLC, 402 SC 195, 740 SE2d 507 (SCApp 2013). money amounts jurisdictional in wills, probate and estates Dickson v Alexander Hospital, 177 F2d 876 (4th (Va 1949); Andrekcha 2010 WL 4054267 (2010).

Where a conviction fails to comport with DUE PROCESS if the statute under which it is obtained, and we can add to this an indictment, fails to provide a person of ordi- to comport i.e., but mean and fine nary intelligence "fair" notice or other essential requirements of DUE PROCESS (ei double jeopardy protection, presumption of innocence), jurisdiction is void. If the court fails to act in a manner consis- tent with DUE PROCESS and author- izes and or encourages arbitrary and discriminatory practices (ei ordered or obj- deny us equal protection of the laws, constructively amended

indictments of essential elements, taking away our presumption of innocence predetermining the outcome of the proceedings by indictment language, spoliating documents and evidence, illegally seizing evidence and foreign sovereigns, engaging in acts of fraud upon the courts, depriving us of proper notice in violation of the 4th, 5th, 6th, 13th, 14th, 15th Amendments. Jurisdiction is made void for violation of due process. Century Tech Industry v. Baptist Health South Florida, 2015 WL 12192751 (SDFL 2015); Yates Estate of

Yates, 2014 WL 2579417 (SC App 2014); Wahle v Wahle, 404 SC 443, 743 SE2d 817 (SC App 2013); Orlando Residence Ltd v Hilton Head Hotel Investors, F Supp 2d, 2013 WL 1103027 (DSC 2013); Federal Land Bank Assn of Asheville, Inc. v C.I.R., 573 F2d 179 (4 Cir 1978); Al Shimari v C.A.C.I. Int'l Inc, 679 F3d 205 (4 Cir (Md 2012). The use of U.S. v Cotton, Parkhurst and Guenther must be deemed misplaced or overruled due to vagueness, Johnson v United States, — Sct — 2015, WL 2473450 (US 2015); US v McKee, 506 F3d 225, 229-32 (3rd Cir 2007); U.S. v Resendiz-Ponce, 549 U.S. 102, 127 Sct 782 (US 2007); U.S. v Hurt,

665 F3d 588 (3rd Cir 2008); Ingram v Phillips, 36 S.C.L. 200, 1850 WL 2857 SC App. Law 1850; Lewis-Murray v Murray, SE2d 2005 WL 708 v 812 (SC App 2005); Bankers v South Carolina, FSupp2d, 2010 WL 558580 (DSC 2010); Lamp mfrd v Dremolff Bobberg & Associates, Inc, 319 Fed Appx 293 (4th Cir 2009); United Student Aids Funds, Inc v Espinosa, 559 U.S. 260, 130 S.Ct 1367 (US 2010); Aranda v Village West Owners Assn Inc, SE2d 2011 WL 1735004 (SC App 2011); Elderberry of Webber City, LLC v. Living Centers-Southeast, Inc - F3d -, 2015 WL 4430836 (4th Cir 2015). The Judgment in these cases (ie Country

15-1386 | 15-1494 | 11 LS-CV-2309, 2310; 9 LS-CV-183; 9 LV-CV-1501 etc) is quite affected by fundamental infirmities. There is arguable bases in law, established Rights and clear error. The state opened the door for the religious matters to be argued, not Crawford, where they tried him quit to obtain a murder conviction and it had no relevance to the facts in the case. You can not conflict a man for the verity of his religious beliefs when they had no bearing on the case. The claims are made true by default and anything occurring after is made void. Removal is permitted now under the F.S.I.A.

We meet the criteria for establishing class action. The legal issue(s) affects (50) states, 2.3 million inmates. No sua sponte dismissal should have occurred. Counsel should have been appointed to represent class. Evidentiary hearing and en banc review is required. You have fraud upon the courts, spoliation and the establishing of modern day slavery via the defective indictments and complaints we not being "duty" convicted. You have judges conspiring in vehicles in which they are void of all jurisdiction doing non judicial acts stripping them of immunity in their effort to prevent this case

from going to trial. These infirmities may be raised after any judgment becomes final, United States Aids Funds, Inc v Espinoza supra; Rose v. Hamilton, 10 Rich 465, 1857 WL 3239 S.C. Err. 1857; Norbrega v Hinkle, 576 Fed Appx 224 (4th Cir (Va 2014); Jones v. Sternheimer, 387 Fed Appx 366 2010 WL 2711305 (4th Cir (Va 2010); U.S. v. Watson -- F3d -- 2015 WL 4385697 (4th Cir (Va 2015); Harley v South Carolina Dept of Corrections, 2013 WL 5428585 (D.S.C 2013); People v Rogers, F Supp 2d 2010 WL 424 201 (D.S.C 2010); Gentry Technology of SC Inc v Baptist Health South Florida Inc, 2015 WL 12192 51 (D.S.C 2015).

There are essentially two

REQUIREMENTS that must be met be-
fore a case can be deemed frivolous
or it be stated there is no arguable
bases in law. One - is which it is
clear that the defendants are
immune from suit. The Writ of Error
in Georgia being processed list all
defendants as do case 9:15-cv-984.
many are not Judges. Some are indi-
viduals and companies. You have judges
doing non judicial acts and acting in
vesture where they are void of all
jurisdiction. You have them creating
law (legislative functions) and implemen-
ting them. You have Judges acting as
investigators, destroying evidence
and doing executive functions. So

It is obvious the courts have not met the first requirement for establishing there is no arguable bases in law, Baggs v Merchant, 2014 WL 13309844 (DSC 2014); Forrester v White, 484 U.S. 219, 108 S.Ct 538 (US 1988); Wise v U.S., FSupp 2d 2009 WL 3052608 (DSC 2009); King v Myers, 973 F2d 354 (4th Cir 1992); Abebe v Seymour, FSupp 2d 2012 WL 1130660 (DSC 2012); Ex Parte Virginia supra.

The second requirement is where claims infringement of a legal interest which clearly does not exist. The lead Sovereign did not first bring this seemingly strange religious beliefs up. The state did

when they tried him in a murder case for these beliefs where they had no bearing on the case at all and did not break any law to believe such. The sovereign has a legal interest under the 1st, 6th, with amendments not to be tried for the verity of his religious beliefs. Furthermore, unless the 2nd, 11th circuits or any court address the issue of default and collateral estoppel. no court can legitimately claim that these claims infringement of a legal interest which clearly does not exist because they are made true by the default. The default and collateral estoppel must be addressed before any court

can claim the case is frivolous or has no arguable basis in law because the default makes the claims true and establishes all rights and titles, White v White, 886 F2d 721 (4th Cir. 1989); Ex Parte Virginia, 100 U.S. 339 (1872).

Where complaint has arguable bases in law (ei bringing my religion in the court for the purposes of establishing law or the default making all claims true). Notice of any deficiency was required where the party was to be given opportunity to amend which was sought in C.A. 2nd Circuit, via seeking extension of time to submit Writ of Error

which was not given by fraud. It would have allowed clarification to explain further the default that established the rights. Numerous injuries were listed within the documents filed expanding over centuries. The case was required to be factually developed within the District Courts requiring service on the parties due to the existing state default. This created a miscarriage of justice and denial of meaningful access to the courts and proper Due Process of Law. King v Atiyeh, 814 F2d 565, 568 (9th Cir 1987); Procunier v Martinez 416 U.S. 396, 419, 94 S Ct 1800, 1814,

40 L.Ed.2d 224 (1974); Johnson v Avery, 393 U.S. 483, 485-87, 89 S.Ct 747, 748-50, 21 L.Ed.2d 718 (1969); Bounds v Smith, 430 U.S. 817, 97 S.Ct 1491, 52 L.Ed.2d 72 (1977); White v Gregory, 1 F.3d 267 (4th Cir W Va 1993); Neitzke v Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 109 S.Ct 1827, 104 L.Ed 2d 338 (U.S 1989); Bierskey v Dunbell, 952 F.2d 395 (4th Cir W Va 1991); Marple v Bell-McKenzie, 2015 WL 12242999 (D.S.C 2015); Whiteside v U.S., 775 F.3d 180 (4th Cir 2014).

A plaintiff must allege with specificity facts to support the claims. The documents filed in these cases do just that expanding over the (10) years we struggled

to get these matters heard. It is an abuse of discretion to dismiss an artfully pleaded case, which this case is, where a sympathetic reader of the documents filed in these cases indicate that it is not beyond a reasonable doubt that the plaintiffs could prove a set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief. The claims can be proven true in that there is a default making them true, White v Gregory, 510 U.S. 1096, 114 S Ct 934, 127 L Ed 2d 223 (U.S. 1994); Rogers v McKinley, F Supp 2d 2009 WL 4920800 (D SC 2009); U.S. v Jones, 538 Fed Appx 285 (4th Cir (Va 2013); Prielo v.

Zook, 791 F3d 465 CA 4 (Va 2015); Saunders v Warden at Lieth CI 2015 WL 4635144 (DSC 2015); Ortiz v U.S., 555 Fed Appx 261 CA 4 (Md 2014); U.S. v. Surratt, -- F3d --, 2015 WL 4591677 CA 4 (Md 2015); U.S. v Newbold, 791 F3d 455 CA 4 (Md 2015).

It is an abuse of discretion and an act of fraud upon the court to state there is no arguable bases in law when these cases are criminal proceedings as well arguing for class action certifications under Habeas Corpus and venue falls to us under the FSIA and

We are suing to disqualify the 4th Circuit where their actions cause detrimental effect in all other Circuits nationally. Criminal actions historically are non frivolous And the criminal issue of they bringing up Religion at trial And the indictments / criminal complaints by their language predetermining in advance the outcome of the proceedings swearing oath our guilt before trial our plea can be clearly proven. These are not in dispute able meritless theories. The

government was the one who opened up the door for the religious rhetoric to be argued where they brought it in that court for the purpose of establishing law and convicted me of it in a murder trial which should have never occurred requiring a new trial, then blocked exhaustion.

Once the 2nd Circuit or courts came back and made a determination that there is no arguable bases in law. It is an act of fraud upon the court where they are conspiring to protect their employer the United States who

attempted to conceal them appearance and defaulted in the state case. The court then acts as their attorney or their associate partner and is attempting to correct their fraud and failure to respond by not addressing the default where there also exist actual innocence claim creating a miscarriage of justice which voids your orders for due process violation and fraud upon the courts. You were required to address the fraud and default. You were required

to address the criminal claims and allow discovery to establish and develop the case. This is arguable bases in law, Morris v York, 2013 WL 2635610 (DSC 2013); Milligan v Drug Enforcement Admin., 2014 WL 897144 (DSC 2014); Clement v. West, 86 F3d 1149 (4th Cir 1996); Bryant v Lee, 993 F2d 1535 (4th Cir 1993); Whiteside v U.S., 135 SCt 2890 (U.S 2015); Denton v Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 112 SCt 1728 (U.S. 1992); Cruz v Gomez, 202 F3d 593 (2nd Cir 2000); Smith v. Wadermoth, 2015 WL 403108 (N.D N.Y. 2015); Morse v Network of Al Qaida Attorneys, 2012 WL 1155821 (E.D Pa 4.2002)

SWAYZEE's LESSEE v BURKE, 37 U.S.A. 1839 WL 3940 (U.S. 1839); Lough MAN v U.S., 134 SCt 2384 (U.S. 2014); U.S. v PIERCE, 400 F3d 176 (4 Cir 2005); Smith v Clark / Smoot / RUSSELL, -- F3d -- 2015 WL 4717932 (4 Cir (Md 2015); LUCAS v Bristol Condominium PROPERTY OWNERS Ass'n, SE 2d 2015 WL 3885837 (SC App 2015); Fox Ex Rel Fox v ELK RUN Coal Co, Inc, 739 F3d 131 (4 Cir 2014); U.S. v Abdul Wahab, 715 F3d 521 (4 Cir (Va 2013); U.S. Ex Rel. Mathan v Takeda Pharmaceuticals North American Inc, 707 F3d 451 (4 Cir (Va 2013); U.S. v JONES, 716 F3d 851 (4 Cir (Va 2013); U.S. v Pavlock,

494 Fed Appx 366 (4th Cir. Va 2012); Browning v Tiger Eye Benefits Consulting, 313 Fed Appx 656, 2009 WL 497391 (4th Cir Va 2009).

To Attorney Karen J. Lesperance U.S. Attorney N.D.N.Y. U.S. Courthouse 445 Broadway, Albany N.Y. 12207 OR any Federal Attorney assigned to this case, the 2nd and 4th Circuits. What the heck is going on within the 2nd, 4th Circuits Courts? You have additional acts of fraud upon the courts. You cannot consolidate two seperate cases

with different parties unless you first issue an order saying you are doing so and you must give the parties notice before you do it. You did not rule on the recusal. Living stops pressing the proceedings and ruling requiring it be voided. We motion for recusal of all judges involved, and who sat on any past case dealing with arguments. Ept Bane review is sought by those judges remaining. We filed Writ of mandamus, not appeal in the 11th Circuit December

of 2014. What are you doing accepting tainted evidence in the appeal without our consent? The Neither the 11th Circuit Court didn't make any sense. What the heck is the 11th Circuit doing shielding you our documents after blocking us and being silent for over (6) months unless someone in the 2nd Circuit told them to shield them? There was no pending action in the 11th Circuit. How did they know of the pending 2nd Circuit Appeal? It appears this was done to secretly file those documents in case 15-11386 to conceal the spoliation that occurred in the lower court by Shapee. Would

You have mentioned that the documents you are in possession of are from the 11th Circuit? Or would you have asserted that no spoliation occurred under the guise of having these sent 11th Circuit documents? New appeal and actions are filed in Both the Georgia and New York District Courts justifying reinstating the mandamus due to also your fraud in case 15-1386. Additional Criminal Acts done by Sharpe, Bathen, Evans and others are challenged. We sent that Writ of Error into the 2nd Circuit a long time ago. The Court told us all

We had to do is fill out in forma pauperis forms and a separate case number would be assigned. We complied and this was not done. Additional damages are occurring due to delay and your fraud. The Lee PCR case is making efforts to further conceal the spoliation. Sutcliffe PCR in Charleston has spoliation. We have other inmates whose cases are being attacked and SCDC is denying us copies to prevent us from placing these cases in proper form by Sharpe and the cops perjuring 2nd, 4th Court judges secret orders requiring you grant the injunction if I am not speaking

the truth. It was never explained why the Writ of Error was not assigned a seperate independent case number when the court via the case manager gave instructions this would be done in your acts of fraud upon the court. We are officially motioning for an independent investigation done by the U.S. Justice Dept. to look into the spoliation, the fraud, the U.S hiding their appearances in the Richland court and other criminal acts done. Who called for those documents from the 4th

Circuit? Its been over (8) months of silence and filled with criminal conspiracy and obstructions of justice. Now these documents show up in cases 15-1194 and 15-13866? We object. There is no telling what has been spoliated within these documents and you added them despite our warning and protest. We demand an investigation and seek that you, attorney Lee Perrence or any U.S. attorney now assigned and the 2nd and 4th Circuits, forward our official request to the Justice Dept. and all pending Appeals in 2nd and 4th

11th Circuit be stayed with all related state and federal cases until that Independent investigation is completed and its findings are officially made a part of the record in all involved courts. I want that DNA tested to michael Lee and a copy of the findings. I want copy of the search warrant in the Crawford murder case. Karen H, Us attorney(s), and and with Circuits, by duty you are required to act on this request also by motion pursuant to 42 USC § 1986. We motion to exceed any page limits due to the exceptional circumstances that surrounded this case. This is also Response to

REPORTS, CONDITIONAL AND FINAL ORDERS IN GEORGIA, NEW YORK AND SOUTH CAROLINA CASES. LIVINGSTON SHOULD HAVE NEVER SAT ON THE 2ND CIRCUIT CASES FOR THE PURPOSE OF HEADING IN FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. WE MOTION FOR AN INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION AND STAY UNTIL IT IS CONCLUDED, Ashcroft v Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 129 SCt 1939 (U.S. 2009); Mill Brook of U.S., 133 SCt 1111 (US 2013); In Re Grand Jury Subpoena May 1978 at Baltimore, 596 F2d 630 CA4 (Md 1979); Riley v. California, 134 SCt 2473 (US Cal. 2014);

J.D.B v North Carolina, 131 SCt 2394 (US Jun 2011); J.A.A v Cooper, 132 SCt 1441 (US 2012); Nix v US, 572 F2d 998 (4th Cir 1978); City of Los Angeles, Calif v Patel, 135 SCt 2443 (US 2015); Atkins v Holder, F Supp 2d, 2012 WL 4378594 (DSC 2012); US v Windsor, 133 SCt 2675 (2013); Schuette v Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action, Integration and ..., 134 SCt 1623 (US 2014); Bardaes v Hanley, 58 F Supp 3d 514 (DSC 2014); Obergefell v Hodges, 135 SCt 2584 (US 2015); DeCecco v University of South Carolina, 918 F Supp 2d 411 (DSC 2013); Lord & Taylor, LLC v White

Flint, LP, 780 F3d 24 (CA4 (Md 2015); IT SUGAR, LLC v. Lollie SUGAR, Inc, 2013 WL 6077353 (DSC 2013); Wallu Wapke, 74 F3d 492 (CA4 (Va 2014); Ex Parte Virginia, 100 US 339, 25 LEd 676 (1812); 28 USC § 2071, 2072.

Respectfully,

Mason Johnson

Isaiah Al Mahdi

Robert Mitchell

Anthony Cook

September 14, 2015

John E Sutcliffe